

Economic Impact Statement

LSA Document #09-5

IC 4-22-2.1-5 Statement Concerning Rules Affecting Small Businesses

IC 4-22-2.1-5(a) provides that an agency that intends to adopt a rule under IC 4-22-2 that will impose requirements or costs on small businesses must prepare a statement that describes the annual economic impact of the rule on small businesses after the rule is fully implemented as described in IC 4-22-2.1-5(b). The statement must be submitted to the Indiana Economic Development Corporation (IEDC), and the IEDC is required to review the rule and submit written comments to the agency not later than seven days before the public hearing.

The proposed rule amends 68 IAC 2-7 and 68 IAC 15 regarding patron counting systems. Specifically, the proposed rule identifies patron counting systems as "associated equipment", establishes standards for tracking patron ingress and egress on riverboats, outlines the process for approval and testing of patron counting systems, establishes requirements for secondary backup systems, and removes outdated provisions. The proposed rule adds terms regarding deviations of rule provisions. The proposed rule imposes no requirements or costs on small businesses.

Estimated Number of Small Businesses Affected:

The Indiana Gaming Commission (Commission) estimates that the proposed rule will impose no requirements or costs on small businesses as defined in IC 4-22-2.1-4.

Estimated Administrative Costs Imposed on Small Businesses:

The Commission estimates that there will be no administrative costs to small businesses as a result of compliance with the proposed rule.

Estimated Total Annual Economic Impact on Small Businesses:

None.

Justification of Requirements or Costs:

The Commission offers no justification of requirements or costs as the proposed rule imposes no requirements or costs on small businesses.

Regulatory Flexibility Analysis:

The Commission does not propose an alternative regulatory method since the proposed rule has no impact on small businesses. The Commission did not rely on studies in its decision not to employ alternatives to the proposed rule.

Posted: 04/01/2009 by Legislative Services Agency

An [html](#) version of this document.