

Special Committee on Taxation Follow Up Items from November Meeting for December Meeting

CRE

1. APEX Detail

Social Security and Retirement Income Taxation

2. KAGI Income Bracket Information
 - a. Social Security Benefits
 - b. Retirement Income
3. In and Out Migration by Age
4. In and Out Migration by Destination
5. 2019 SB 174 Testimony
6. KPERS Beneficiaries by State

Property Valuation Uniformity

7. Residential Parcel Count Data
8. Proposed Statutory Language to Address KREAB Approval of PVD Courses

KDOR Spreadsheets Updated with Requested Information Also Provided

November 2022 CRE - APEX/Panasonic Impact

| (\$ in millions) | FY 2023 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Corporate Income Tax Rate Reduction | \$ - | \$ (25.0) |
| Panasonic APEX Incentive | \$ (27.0) | \$ (77.5) |

Assumptions:

Corporate Rate Reduction of 0.5 percent effective Tax Year 2024

Panasonic Capital Investment of \$1 billion in 2022 and \$2 billion in 2023

Supplier Capital Investment of \$200 million in 2022 and 2023

Panasonic Payroll of \$100 million in 2023

Supplier Payroll of \$56 million in 2023

Additional Capital Investment and Payroll Outside of the Forecast Period

#1: If we exempt all **Social Security Benefits**, the Estimated Fiscal Impact per KAGI group (based on KAGI in Tax Year 2020) for Tax Year 2023 is as follows:

**Kansas Individual Income Tax by Adjusted Gross Income Bracket
TY 2020 Taxpayers**

| KAGI | Number of Returns | Fiscal Impact TY2023 | AVG Fiscal Impact TY2023 |
|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| No KAGI - | 78 | \$0 | \$0 |
| \$0.01 - \$25,000 | 1,726 | (\$264,250) | (\$153) |
| \$25,000.01 - \$50,000 | 5,553 | (\$3,942,722) | (\$710) |
| \$50,000.01 - \$75,000 | 7,631 | (\$8,943,796) | (\$1,172) |
| \$75,000.01 - \$100,000 | 22,582 | (\$29,657,099) | (\$1,313) |
| \$100,000.01 - \$250,000 | 33,263 | (\$54,887,053) | (\$1,650) |
| \$250,000.01 - Over | 5,495 | (\$10,586,348) | (\$1,927) |
| All Residents | 76,328 | (\$108,281,267) | (\$1,419) |
| Part-Year Residents | 1,015 | (\$557,520) | (\$549) |
| Non-Residents | 15,013 | (\$3,950,538) | (\$263) |
| All Taxpayers | 92,356 | (\$112,789,325) | (\$1,221) |

Data: Tax Year 2020 K40 tax returns, processed through Dec 31, 2021.

#2: If we exempt all **Retirement Benefits** (NOT including Social Security), the Estimated Fiscal Impact per KAGI group (based on KAGI in Tax Year 2020) for Tax Year 2023 is as follows:

**Kansas Individual Income Tax by Adjusted Gross Income Bracket
TY 2020 Taxpayers**

| KAGI | Number of Returns | Fiscal Impact TY2023 | AVG Fiscal Impact TY2023 |
|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| No KAGI - | 4,803 | (\$1,183,604) | (\$246) |
| \$0.01 - \$25,000 | 80,795 | (\$27,148,189) | (\$336) |
| \$25,000.01 - \$50,000 | 54,934 | (\$36,507,014) | (\$665) |
| \$50,000.01 - \$75,000 | 24,701 | (\$14,797,548) | (\$599) |
| \$75,000.01 - \$100,000 | 28,769 | (\$28,617,819) | (\$995) |
| \$100,000.01 - \$250,000 | 50,175 | (\$76,479,087) | (\$1,524) |
| \$250,000.01 - Over | 8,407 | (\$25,590,942) | (\$3,044) |
| All Residents | 252,584 | (\$210,324,202) | (\$833) |
| Part-Year Residents | 5,505 | (\$5,456,955) | (\$991) |
| Non-Residents | 35,867 | (\$47,520,449) | (\$1,325) |
| All Taxpayers | 293,956 | (\$263,301,607) | (\$896) |

Data: Tax Year 2020 K40 tax returns, processed through Dec 31, 2021.

| State name | Total returns | | Outflow returns | | Inflow Returns | | Net Flow | | Net Flow as Percent of Total | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | All ages | 65 and over | All ages | | All ages | 65 and over | All ages | 65 and over | All ages | 65 and over |
| | Number of individuals | Number of individuals |
| Kansas | 2,416,208 | 418,583 | 83,168 | 6,775 | 76,963 | 6,397 | -6,205 | -378 | -0.26% | -0.09% |
| \$1 under \$10,000 | 114,462 | 41,579 | 5,840 | 747 | 5,689 | 725 | -151 | -22 | -0.13% | -0.05% |
| \$10,000 under \$25,000 | 309,062 | 64,502 | 14,587 | 1,072 | 14,055 | 1,064 | -532 | -8 | -0.17% | -0.01% |
| \$25,000 under \$50,000 | 560,205 | 80,517 | 23,081 | 1,256 | 20,559 | 1,279 | -2,522 | 23 | -0.45% | 0.03% |
| \$50,000 under \$75,000 | 408,898 | 67,114 | 13,492 | 985 | 12,016 | 870 | -1,476 | -115 | -0.36% | -0.17% |
| \$75,000 under \$100,000 | 320,730 | 52,429 | 9,314 | 741 | 8,369 | 699 | -945 | -42 | -0.29% | -0.08% |
| \$100,000 under \$200,000 | 522,086 | 84,009 | 12,322 | 1,325 | 11,978 | 1,256 | -344 | -69 | -0.07% | -0.08% |
| \$200,000 or more | 180,765 | 28,433 | 4,532 | 649 | 4,297 | 504 | -235 | -145 | -0.13% | -0.51% |

IRS Statistics of Income, 2019-2020 Data

| 2019 Residents Relative to 2018 State of Residence | | | |
|--|---------|-----------|----------------------|
| State | Into KS | Out of KS | Net Migration for KS |
| Alabama | 1,021 | 1,212 | -191 |
| Alaska | 7 | 1,296 | -1,289 |
| Arizona | 2,367 | 3,742 | -1,375 |
| Arkansas | 1,830 | 1,139 | 691 |
| California | 4,957 | 2,941 | 2,016 |
| Colorado | 7,224 | 6,544 | 680 |
| Connecticut | 208 | 94 | 114 |
| Delaware | 379 | 189 | 190 |
| District of Columbia | 266 | 41 | 225 |
| Florida | 3,828 | 1,813 | 2,015 |
| Georgia | 3,105 | 3,931 | -826 |
| Hawaii | 167 | 466 | -299 |
| Idaho | 76 | 179 | -103 |
| Illinois | 2,449 | 2,307 | 142 |
| Indiana | 1,609 | 1,349 | 260 |
| Iowa | 1,010 | 1,295 | -285 |
| Kentucky | 1,297 | 565 | 732 |
| Louisiana | 313 | 133 | 180 |
| Maine | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maryland | 219 | 91 | 128 |
| Massachusetts | 6 | 274 | -268 |
| Michigan | 537 | 1,039 | -502 |
| Minnesota | 2,373 | 607 | 1,766 |
| Mississippi | 521 | 220 | 301 |
| Missouri | 27,065 | 20,685 | 6,380 |
| Montana | 1,227 | 137 | 1,090 |
| Nebraska | 2,836 | 4,054 | -1,218 |
| Nevada | 147 | 559 | -412 |
| New Hampshire | 92 | 0 | 92 |
| New Jersey | 509 | 480 | 29 |
| New Mexico | 403 | 475 | -72 |
| New York | 1,497 | 1,329 | 168 |
| North Carolina | 1,757 | 857 | 900 |
| North Dakota | 515 | 292 | 223 |
| Ohio | 309 | 1,318 | -1,009 |
| Oklahoma | 4,258 | 4,371 | -113 |
| Oregon | 553 | 954 | -401 |
| Pennsylvania | 2,189 | 1,073 | 1,116 |
| Rhode Island | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 308 | 1,043 | -735 |
| South Dakota | 39 | 581 | -542 |
| Tennessee | 1,316 | 1,204 | 112 |
| Texas | 8,374 | 12,823 | -4,449 |
| Utah | 378 | 552 | -174 |
| Vermont | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Virginia | 1,556 | 973 | 583 |
| Washington | 2,325 | 1,924 | 401 |
| West Virginia | 174 | 45 | 129 |
| Wisconsin | 610 | 1,421 | -811 |
| Wyoming | 442 | 366 | 76 |

**STATE OF KANSAS
SENATE CHAMBER**

Representing
Atchison, Brown, Doniphan, Jackson and
Nemaha Counties, and portions of Marshal and
Pottawatomie Counties

District Address:
2979 KINGFISHER RD.
HIAWATHA, KANSAS 66434
(785)742-3780

Capitol Office:
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 234-E
TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612
(785)296-7379



Senator Dennis Pyle
1st District

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

MEMBER: EDUCATION

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
AND INSURANCE

JUDICIARY

Testimony on Senate Bill 174

Senate Committee on Assessment and Taxation

March 12, 2019

Madam Chairman and members of the Committee:

Thank you for holding hearings and for the opportunity to provide testimony on Senate Bill 174.

As the committee is well aware, this legislation will exempt Social Security benefits from Kansas income tax. This proposal was offered by me, as an amendment to SB22, the decoupling bill, January 26, during floor debate.

Many members of the senate from both parties, while not supporting the amendment, expressed their desire to see this proposal in bill form. The deadline for individual bill drafts had passed, so I requested the Senate Fed and State Committee and they agreed to allow the introduction!

Research staff provided information showing a fiscal cost for this policy change. I am sure they can provide the committee with the same. Information from the KPERS director with some out-of-state data shows that approximately 15% of our KPERS retirees leave Kansas. They take about 10% of KPERS payments with them. Data from the director shows similar numbers for KP&F.

I believe from this we can assume an economic benefit is counter to the revenue hit. And while we don't know the economic impact of SB 174, we do know that the economic impact of those absentee retirees is GONE! Kansas gets **zero** economic benefit from departing KPERS and KP&F retirees and **zero** from our investment in their retirement!

Also GONE – Kansas gets **zero** economic benefit from other retirees that leave for a better tax environment and health of their retirement nest egg.

Our goal as a state should be to:

1. **C**ompete with the ZERO income tax states.
2. **O**pen the door to Kansas retirement living by creating a tax appeal to those in other states.
3. **D**o not drive them away with our tax policy.
4. **E**ncourage all Kansas retirees to remain and use their retirement nest egg to help better the Kansas economy with positive growth.

This is **CODE** for growth – the economic plus, achieved by driving more housing, dining, health care, etc. which all retirees need.

We have heard a lot about the out migration of business due to tax policy, but let's not neglect the same when it comes to individuals, specifically those who are retiring or are retired. When they leave the state, many jobs go with them. Let's take the step to eliminate the income tax on retirees receiving Social Security benefits and stop the hemorrhaging by passing SB 174.

Additionally, Taxing Social Security benefits as a revenue source is plain and simple – BAD policy. These beneficiaries have paid their taxes only to be taxed again.

What is the reasoning behind taxing Social Security benefits while we exempt KPERS and KP&F recipients?

Finally, if you want to continue to keep the four congressional seats and the representation Kansas has in Washington, we need to address the continued decline in population growth of our state. SB 174 is a positive step towards reversing the decline.

Thank you.

Note – Should the committee work this bill, I would propose an amendment to reinstate the food sales tax deduction.

Americans Keep Moving to States with Lower Taxes

By Sarah Quinlan

Americans continued to migrate from states with more burdensome tax systems to ones with lower taxes in 2018, an analysis by the Tax Foundation states.

The Tax Foundation compared migration patterns to the structure and level of taxes and regulations as revealed by the more than 100 variables in its 2019 *State Business Tax Climate Index*.

The analysis used data from the National Movers Study released annually by United Van Lines, the largest moving company in the United States, which reveals relocations among the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia.

Where People Move From

Since 1977, United Van Lines has annually reported migration patterns on a state-by-state basis. The 2018 study is based on household moves handled by United and a survey of the company's clients, states a United Van Lines press release on the 2018 National Movers Study.

The states with the most outbound migration were New Jersey, Illinois, Connecticut, New York, and Kansas, in descending order. Roughly two people

for each person who moved into the state.

In the Northeast, Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York were among the top 10 outbound states for the fourth consecutive year. In the Midwest, Kansas, Illinois, Iowa, and Ohio experienced high outbound relocations as well.

States where inbound migration nearly balanced outbound migration include Arkansas, Maine, and Mississippi, the study found.

Where People Move To

The states with the most inbound migration as a percentage of interstate household moves were Vermont, Oregon, Idaho, Nevada, and Arizona. Roughly three people moved into Vermont for each person who left the state, the study reports.

States in the Mountain West and Pacific West regions, including Oregon, Idaho, Nevada, Washington, and South Dakota, continue to increase in popularity for inbound moves. Arizona joined the list of top 10 inbound states in 2018.

Several southern states also experienced high percentages of inbound migration, such as North Carolina and South Carolina. United Van Lines determined the top reasons for moving



"States experiencing prolonged periods of outbound migration ought to evaluate how their fiscal landscape might be playing a role and take steps to facilitate a fiscal landscape that invites, rather than deters, investment and long-term growth."

KATHERINE LOUGHEAD, POLICY ANALYST, TAX FOUNDATION

south include job change, for nearly half the people moving, and retirement.

Why People Move

The survey showed a leading motivation behind these migration patterns across all regions is career change, the United Van Lines press release states. About half of the people who moved in the past year moved for a new job or company transfer.

Other reasons for the high percentage of moves to Mountain West states in 2018 include retirement, proximity to family, and lifestyle change. Idaho experienced the nation's largest influx of new residents desiring a lifestyle change.

More people flocked to New Mexico for retirement than to any other state. In past decades, the study found California was a popular destination for retirees, but now they are leaving California and moving to other states in the Pacific West and Mountain West.

Young professionals are migrating to vibrant metropolitan economies such as Washington, DC and Seattle, the press release states.

Taxes Play a Role

Taxes are rarely cited as a reason for individual state-to-state moves, but they can certainly factor into relocation

decisions, says Katherine Loughead, a policy analyst with the Tax Foundation who wrote "Where Did Americans Move in 2018?"

"A state's fiscal landscape, including tax structure and burdens, plays a role in the types of employment opportunities available and whether prospective employees would be willing to move to a particular state for a job," said Loughead.

Comparing the states with the highest percentage of inbound moves to the states with the best scores on the Tax Foundation's 2019 State Business Tax Climate Index shows significant overlap, says Loughead.

"Five of the ten worst-performing states on our State Business Tax Climate Index are also among the ten states showing the highest outbound moves on this year's United Van Lines National Movers Study," said Loughead.

Population and Economic Growth

When it comes to demonstrating the effect of state tax policies, migration patterns provide powerful data to consider, says Loughead.

"States experiencing prolonged periods of outbound migration ought to evaluate how their fiscal landscape might be playing a role and take steps

to facilitate a fiscal landscape that invites, rather than deters, investment and long-term growth," Loughead said.

"For example, tens of thousands of individuals work in greater Chicago but live in Indiana, where many interstate commutes are attributable, at least in part, to stark differences in tax landscape," Loughead noted in her analysis.

'Driving Out the Middle Class'

Some states have natural advantages that outweigh the burden of state taxes, says economist Devon Herrick, a policy advisor to The Heartland Institute, which publishes *Budget & Tax News*.

"California and the southwestern states, and Florida and other southern states, have sunny climates that attract people," said Herrick. "And coastal states with natural harbors, such as New York City and Los Angeles, have advantages as major hubs of international commerce that could allow them to have more burdensome tax regimes but also have higher incomes," Herrick said.

Despite those advantages, the higher cost of living, including tax burdens, in some states makes them less attractive to the middle class and retirees, says Herrick.

"States like California and New York class," said Herrick.

Sarah Quinlan (think@heartland.org) writes from New York City, New York.

INTERNET INFO

Katherine Loughead, "Where Did Americans Move in 2018?" Tax Foundation, January 3, 2019: <https://taxfoundation.org/where-did-americans-move-in-2018/>

"United Van Lines' National Movers Study Reveals Americans Are Moving West and South," press release, United Van Lines, January 2, 2019: <https://www.heartland.org/publications-resources/publications/2018-national-movers-study>

Jared Walczak, Scott Drenkard, and Joseph Bishop-Henrichman, "2019 State Business Tax Climate Index," Tax Foundation, September 2018: <https://www.heartland.org/publications-resources/publications/tax-foundation-2019-state-business-tax-climate-index>

Number of Retirees and Monthly Retirement Benefits

KP&F Retirees Only

Calendar Year 2017

| State | Number of KP&F Retirees | Percent of KP&F Retirees | Total Monthly KP&F Retirement Benefits | Percent of Total Monthly KP&F Retirement Benefits |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Alabama | 2 | 0.0% | \$5,844 | 0.0% |
| Alaska | 2 | 0.0% | \$2,061 | 0.0% |
| Arizona | 22 | 0.5% | \$69,462 | 0.5% |
| Arkansas | 23 | 0.6% | \$55,046 | 0.4% |
| California | 7 | 0.2% | \$17,564 | 0.1% |
| Colorado | 26 | 0.6% | \$72,484 | 0.6% |
| Connecticut | 1 | 0.0% | \$1,338 | 0.0% |
| Delaware | - | 0.0% | \$0 | 0.0% |
| District of Columbia | - | 0.0% | \$0 | 0.0% |
| Florida | 48 | 1.2% | \$144,121 | 1.1% |
| Georgia | 8 | 0.2% | \$23,375 | 0.2% |
| Hawaii | - | 0.0% | \$0 | 0.0% |
| Idaho | 2 | 0.0% | \$3,581 | 0.0% |
| Illinois | 5 | 0.1% | \$10,005 | 0.1% |
| Indiana | 1 | 0.0% | \$3,716 | 0.0% |
| Iowa | 2 | 0.0% | \$5,823 | 0.0% |
| Kansas | 3,610 | 88.3% | \$11,622,805 | 89.8% |
| Kentucky | 1 | 0.0% | \$6,942 | 0.1% |
| Louisiana | - | 0.0% | \$0 | 0.0% |
| Maine | 1 | 0.0% | \$4,078 | 0.0% |
| Maryland | 1 | 0.0% | \$3,202 | 0.0% |
| Massachusetts | - | 0.0% | \$0 | 0.0% |
| Michigan | 1 | 0.0% | \$2,000 | 0.0% |
| Minnesota | 2 | 0.0% | \$6,025 | 0.0% |
| Mississippi | 2 | 0.0% | \$3,109 | 0.0% |
| Missouri | 171 | 4.2% | \$482,416 | 3.7% |
| Montana | 1 | 0.0% | \$1,335 | 0.0% |
| Nebraska | 3 | 0.1% | \$11,349 | 0.1% |
| Nevada | 11 | 0.3% | \$30,733 | 0.2% |
| New Hampshire | 1 | 0.0% | \$4,067 | 0.0% |
| New Jersey | 1 | 0.0% | \$1,188 | 0.0% |
| New Mexico | 5 | 0.1% | \$13,502 | 0.1% |
| New York | 2 | 0.0% | \$5,702 | 0.0% |
| North Carolina | 4 | 0.1% | \$11,599 | 0.1% |
| North Dakota | - | 0.0% | \$0 | 0.0% |
| Ohio | 2 | 0.0% | \$4,931 | 0.0% |
| Oklahoma | 35 | 0.9% | \$82,129 | 0.6% |
| Oregon | 4 | 0.1% | \$6,410 | 0.0% |
| Pennsylvania | 1 | 0.0% | \$4,184 | 0.0% |
| Puerto Rico | - | 0.0% | \$0 | 0.0% |
| Rhode Island | - | 0.0% | \$0 | 0.0% |
| South Carolina | 7 | 0.2% | \$26,318 | 0.2% |
| South Dakota | 9 | 0.2% | \$35,411 | 0.3% |
| Tennessee | 8 | 0.2% | \$24,182 | 0.2% |
| Texas | 39 | 1.0% | \$92,007 | 0.7% |
| Utah | - | 0.0% | \$0 | 0.0% |
| Vermont | 1 | 0.0% | \$3,654 | 0.0% |
| Virginia | 4 | 0.1% | \$13,205 | 0.1% |
| Washington | 9 | 0.2% | \$20,582 | 0.2% |
| West Virginia | - | 0.0% | \$0 | 0.0% |
| Wisconsin | 1 | 0.0% | \$2,547 | 0.0% |
| Wyoming | 2 | 0.0% | \$4,065 | 0.0% |
| US Military Overseas | 1 | 0.0% | \$5,254 | 0.0% |
| Outside of the United States | - | 0.0% | \$0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 4,089 | 100.0% | \$12,949,302 | 100.0% |

Notes:

This table reflects payments to retired KP&F members who received at least one retirement payment during CY 2017. No payments to beneficiaries are included.

Monthly retirement benefits reflects the sum of the monthly benefit amount for each KP&F retiree that received a payment in CY 2017. It is not a sum of total KP&F benefits paid in CY 2017.

Number of Retirees and Monthly Retirement Benefits

Calendar Year 2017

| State | Number of Retirees | Percent of Retirees | Total Monthly Retirement Benefits | Percent of Total Monthly Retirement Benefits |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Alabama | 69 | 0.1% | \$60,693 | 0.0% |
| Alaska | 22 | 0.0% | \$20,140 | 0.0% |
| Arizona | 641 | 0.7% | \$739,369 | 0.6% |
| Arkansas | 484 | 0.5% | \$562,853 | 0.4% |
| California | 337 | 0.4% | \$335,883 | 0.3% |
| Colorado | 941 | 1.0% | \$1,072,589 | 0.9% |
| Connecticut | 15 | 0.0% | \$17,720 | 0.0% |
| Delaware | 10 | 0.0% | \$13,191 | 0.0% |
| District of Columbia | 7 | 0.0% | \$17,414 | 0.0% |
| Florida | 840 | 0.9% | \$1,155,338 | 0.9% |
| Georgia | 172 | 0.2% | \$172,561 | 0.1% |
| Hawaii | 14 | 0.0% | \$16,288 | 0.0% |
| Idaho | 65 | 0.1% | \$59,314 | 0.0% |
| Illinois | 160 | 0.2% | \$143,609 | 0.1% |
| Indiana | 111 | 0.1% | \$104,236 | 0.1% |
| Iowa | 207 | 0.2% | \$204,256 | 0.2% |
| Kansas | 82,041 | 86.1% | \$110,099,743 | 87.9% |
| Kentucky | 61 | 0.1% | \$57,287 | 0.0% |
| Louisiana | 65 | 0.1% | \$61,223 | 0.0% |
| Maine | 31 | 0.0% | \$35,321 | 0.0% |
| Maryland | 45 | 0.0% | \$47,998 | 0.0% |
| Massachusetts | 21 | 0.0% | \$28,017 | 0.0% |
| Michigan | 70 | 0.1% | \$61,633 | 0.0% |
| Minnesota | 125 | 0.1% | \$121,391 | 0.1% |
| Mississippi | 44 | 0.0% | \$37,306 | 0.0% |
| Missouri | 3,690 | 3.9% | \$4,670,013 | 3.7% |
| Montana | 40 | 0.0% | \$31,382 | 0.0% |
| Nebraska | 381 | 0.4% | \$336,670 | 0.3% |
| Nevada | 157 | 0.2% | \$178,939 | 0.1% |
| New Hampshire | 14 | 0.0% | \$11,063 | 0.0% |
| New Jersey | 29 | 0.0% | \$29,753 | 0.0% |
| New Mexico | 164 | 0.2% | \$162,215 | 0.1% |
| New York | 63 | 0.1% | \$64,537 | 0.1% |
| North Carolina | 136 | 0.1% | \$155,004 | 0.1% |
| North Dakota | 20 | 0.0% | \$22,525 | 0.0% |
| Ohio | 74 | 0.1% | \$73,554 | 0.1% |
| Oklahoma | 1,447 | 1.5% | \$1,540,249 | 1.2% |
| Oregon | 109 | 0.1% | \$117,253 | 0.1% |
| Pennsylvania | 62 | 0.1% | \$85,894 | 0.1% |
| Puerto Rico | 2 | 0.0% | \$702 | 0.0% |
| Rhode Island | 7 | 0.0% | \$5,123 | 0.0% |
| South Carolina | 109 | 0.1% | \$141,181 | 0.1% |
| South Dakota | 86 | 0.1% | \$114,195 | 0.1% |
| Tennessee | 136 | 0.1% | \$150,624 | 0.1% |
| Texas | 1,368 | 1.4% | \$1,488,728 | 1.2% |
| Utah | 44 | 0.0% | \$40,819 | 0.0% |
| Vermont | 11 | 0.0% | \$16,926 | 0.0% |
| Virginia | 110 | 0.1% | \$123,925 | 0.1% |
| Washington | 192 | 0.2% | \$228,081 | 0.2% |
| West Virginia | 17 | 0.0% | \$13,469 | 0.0% |
| Wisconsin | 77 | 0.1% | \$66,844 | 0.1% |
| Wyoming | 62 | 0.1% | \$76,504 | 0.1% |
| US Military Overseas | 3 | 0.0% | \$7,404 | 0.0% |
| Outside of the United States | 31 | 0.0% | \$25,604 | 0.0% |
| Total | 95,239 | 100.0% | \$125,224,552 | 100.0% |

Notes:

This table reflects payments to retired members who received at least one retirement payment during CY 2017. No payments to beneficiaries are included.

Monthly retirement benefits reflects the sum of the monthly benefit amount for each retiree that received a payment in CY 2017. It is not a sum of total benefits paid in CY 2017.

Table 1. Fiscal Impact of Social Security Benefit (SSB) Tax Policy Changes

| Simulation | Number of Returns Affected | Social Security Benefit (SSB) Subtraction | Fiscal Impact* |
|--|----------------------------|---|----------------|
| Allowing SSB Subtraction for Married Filing Jointly with FAGI < \$150K | 43,614 | \$1,020,560,679 | (\$51,488,090) |
| Allowing SSB Subtraction for All Taxpayers (No income Threshold) | 71,772 | \$1,672,167,676 | (\$87,769,006) |

(\$51,488,090)-Additional fiscal impact if legislation allowed MFJ with FAGI of \$150,000 or less to claim a subtraction modification of SSB
 (\$87,769,006)-Additional fiscal impact if legislation allowed all filers to claim a subtraction modification of SSB with no FAGI limitation

Table 2: Income Sources of KS Social Security Recipients

| | Count | Average Amount | Median Amount |
|--------------------------|---------|----------------|---------------|
| Social Security Benefits | 271,152 | \$22,453 | \$20,676 |
| Pensions | 73,049 | \$52,343 | \$27,592 |
| Capital Gains | 72,798 | \$21,200 | \$3,781 |
| Business Income | 25,216 | \$15,102 | \$4,119 |
| Farm Income | 6,912 | \$20,204 | \$6,596 |

KS resident taxpayers that are receiving SSB and other income

Table 3: Current Social Security Income Exemptions by Filing Status

| | Number of KS Returns Reporting SSB Subtraction Modification | Social Security Benefit (SSB) Subtraction | Tax Impact* |
|---------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|
| Married Filing Jointly | 60,674 | \$589,098,020 | (\$22,247,567) |
| Married Filing Separately | 2,452 | \$32,175,526 | (\$1,383,735) |
| Single | 50,734 | \$411,888,495 | (\$19,800,819) |
| Head of Household | 2,417 | \$16,673,095 | (\$744,127) |
| Total | 116,277 | \$1,049,835,136 | (\$44,176,248) |

Note:

* Fiscal/Tax impact was computed by applying the 2019 Kansas income tax rates.

Sources:

1. Kansas Department of Revenue, Tax Year 2017 K40 tax returns.
2. Internal Revenue Services, Tax Year 2017 1040 tax returns.

Number of Retirees and Monthly Retirement Benefits¹

KPERs, KP&F and Judges - Calendar Year 2021

| State | Number of Retirees | Percent of Retirees | Total Monthly Retirement Benefits ² | Percent of Total Monthly Retirement Benefits |
|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Alabama | 100 | 0.1% | \$117,421 | 0.1% |
| Alaska | 24 | 0.0% | \$23,562 | 0.0% |
| Arizona | 716 | 0.7% | \$898,722 | 0.6% |
| Arkansas | 525 | 0.5% | \$660,394 | 0.4% |
| California | 336 | 0.3% | \$374,311 | 0.2% |
| Colorado | 1,049 | 1.0% | \$1,330,243 | 0.9% |
| Connecticut | 13 | 0.0% | \$17,993 | 0.0% |
| Delaware | 13 | 0.0% | \$20,460 | 0.0% |
| District of Columbia | 9 | 0.0% | \$17,914 | 0.0% |
| Florida | 1,075 | 1.0% | \$1,640,094 | 1.1% |
| Georgia | 226 | 0.2% | \$253,718 | 0.2% |
| Hawaii | 18 | 0.0% | \$20,704 | 0.0% |
| Idaho | 76 | 0.1% | \$84,775 | 0.1% |
| Illinois | 199 | 0.2% | \$187,598 | 0.1% |
| Indiana | 113 | 0.1% | \$113,959 | 0.1% |
| Iowa | 244 | 0.2% | \$274,718 | 0.2% |
| Kansas | 89,779 | 85.4% | \$131,489,475 | 87.3% |
| Kentucky | 76 | 0.1% | \$74,105 | 0.0% |
| Louisiana | 69 | 0.1% | \$66,284 | 0.0% |
| Maine | 34 | 0.0% | \$36,766 | 0.0% |
| Maryland | 56 | 0.1% | \$60,029 | 0.0% |
| Massachusetts | 29 | 0.0% | \$26,077 | 0.0% |
| Michigan | 93 | 0.1% | \$94,142 | 0.1% |
| Minnesota | 157 | 0.1% | \$151,953 | 0.1% |
| Mississippi | 61 | 0.1% | \$63,105 | 0.0% |
| Missouri | 4,281 | 4.1% | \$5,879,596 | 3.9% |
| Montana | 49 | 0.0% | \$52,093 | 0.0% |
| Nebraska | 445 | 0.4% | \$444,587 | 0.3% |
| Nevada | 160 | 0.2% | \$241,456 | 0.2% |
| New Hampshire | 14 | 0.0% | \$16,790 | 0.0% |
| New Jersey | 25 | 0.0% | \$22,842 | 0.0% |
| New Mexico | 169 | 0.2% | \$174,772 | 0.1% |
| New York | 76 | 0.1% | \$84,904 | 0.1% |
| North Carolina | 170 | 0.2% | \$188,041 | 0.1% |
| North Dakota | 20 | 0.0% | \$29,328 | 0.0% |
| Ohio | 95 | 0.1% | \$92,458 | 0.1% |
| Oklahoma | 1,636 | 1.6% | \$1,868,620 | 1.2% |
| Oregon | 127 | 0.1% | \$147,551 | 0.1% |
| Pennsylvania | 64 | 0.1% | \$101,692 | 0.1% |
| Rhode Island | 8 | 0.0% | \$4,334 | 0.0% |
| South Carolina | 150 | 0.1% | \$194,133 | 0.1% |
| South Dakota | 106 | 0.1% | \$155,177 | 0.1% |
| Tennessee | 170 | 0.2% | \$183,711 | 0.1% |
| Texas | 1,579 | 1.5% | \$1,861,121 | 1.2% |
| Utah | 56 | 0.1% | \$61,832 | 0.0% |
| Vermont | 11 | 0.0% | \$16,504 | 0.0% |
| Virginia | 144 | 0.1% | \$171,472 | 0.1% |
| Washington | 230 | 0.2% | \$293,783 | 0.2% |
| West Virginia | 18 | 0.0% | \$20,826 | 0.0% |
| Wisconsin | 106 | 0.1% | \$103,996 | 0.1% |
| Wyoming | 69 | 0.1% | \$83,967 | 0.1% |
| US Territories | 8 | 0.0% | \$13,595 | 0.0% |
| Foreign Countries | 32 | 0.0% | \$27,430 | 0.0% |
| Total | 105,108 | 100.0% | 150,635,130 | 100.0% |

¹ This table reflects payments to retired members who received at least one retirement payment during CY 2021. No payments to beneficiaries are included.

² Monthly retirement benefits reflects the sum of the monthly benefit amount for each retiree that received a payment in CY 2021. This sum is approximately the monthly amount paid in retirement benefits, it is not a sum total of benefits paid in CY 2021.

| Tax Year | "R" Parcel Count | "R" Assessed Value | Assessed Value per Parcel | % Change in "R" Parcels |
|----------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1992 | | | | |
| 1993 | | | | |
| 1994 | | | | |
| 1995 | | | | |
| 1996 | | | | |
| 1997 | | | | |
| 1998 | 889,410 | \$7,364,954,129 | \$8,281 | |
| 1999 | 899,801 | \$7,974,302,456 | \$8,862 | 1.17% |
| 2000 | 911,131 | \$8,766,107,028 | \$9,621 | 1.26% |
| 2001 | 914,765 | \$9,487,446,781 | \$10,371 | 0.40% |
| 2002 | 928,615 | \$10,091,871,744 | \$10,868 | 1.51% |
| 2003 | 940,680 | \$10,821,273,257 | \$11,504 | 1.30% |
| 2004 | 951,372 | \$11,466,539,039 | \$12,053 | 1.14% |
| 2005 | 972,389 | \$12,206,742,380 | \$12,553 | 2.21% |
| 2006 | 982,245 | \$13,082,641,710 | \$13,319 | 1.01% |
| 2007 | 995,686 | \$13,957,434,620 | \$14,018 | 1.37% |
| 2008 | 992,998 | \$14,453,619,867 | \$14,556 | -0.27% |
| 2009 | 1,000,992 | \$14,516,031,685 | \$14,502 | 0.81% |
| 2010 | 999,446 | \$14,535,694,073 | \$14,544 | -0.15% |
| 2011 | 1,004,507 | \$14,640,293,064 | \$14,575 | 0.51% |
| 2012 | 1,008,835 | \$14,608,747,192 | \$14,481 | 0.43% |
| 2013 | 1,007,084 | \$14,779,423,604 | \$14,675 | -0.17% |
| 2014 | 1,011,590 | \$15,278,887,378 | \$15,104 | 0.45% |
| 2015 | 1,015,202 | \$15,845,353,946 | \$15,608 | 0.36% |
| 2016 | 1,024,916 | \$16,489,518,114 | \$16,089 | 0.96% |
| 2017 | 1,024,529 | \$17,350,763,980 | \$16,935 | -0.04% |
| 2018 | 1,029,956 | \$18,316,446,211 | \$17,784 | 0.53% |
| 2019 | 1,041,746 | \$18,316,446,211 | \$17,582 | 1.14% |
| 2020 | 1,038,525 | \$20,312,900,466 | \$19,559 | -0.31% |
| 2021 | 1,052,881 | \$21,403,017,629 | \$20,328 | 1.38% |
| 2022 | 1,056,513 | \$24,005,770,050 | \$22,722 | 0.34% |

19-430. County appraiser; appointment, term and qualifications; vacancies; registered mass appraiser designation. (a) On July 1, 1993, and on July 1 of each fourth year thereafter, the board of county commissioners or governing body of any unified government of each county shall by resolution appoint a county appraiser for such county who shall serve for a term of four years expiring on June 30 of the fourth year thereafter. No person shall be appointed or reappointed to or serve as county appraiser in any county under the provisions of this act unless such person shall have at least three years of mass appraisal experience and be qualified by the director of property valuation as an eligible Kansas appraiser under the provisions of this act. Whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of county appraiser the board of county commissioners or governing body of any unified government shall appoint an eligible Kansas appraiser to fill such vacancy for the unexpired term. The person holding the office of county or district appraiser or performing the duties thereof on the effective date of this act shall continue to hold such office and perform such duties until a county appraiser is appointed under the provisions of this act. No person shall be appointed to the office of county or district appraiser or to fill a vacancy therein unless such person is currently: (1) A certified general real property appraiser pursuant to article 41 of chapter 58 of the Kansas Statutes Annotated, and amendments thereto; or (2) a registered mass appraiser pursuant to rules and regulations adopted by the secretary of revenue. Notwithstanding the foregoing provision, the board of county commissioners or governing body of any unified government may appoint an interim county appraiser, subject to the approval of the director of property valuation, for a period not to exceed six months to fill a vacancy in the office of county appraiser pending the appointment of an eligible county appraiser under the provisions of this act.

(b) The secretary of revenue shall adopt rules and regulations necessary to establish qualifications for the designation of a registered mass appraiser.

(c) On and after July 1, ~~2022~~2023, all appraisal courses necessary to qualify for the designation of a registered mass appraiser and all continuing education appraisal courses necessary to retain such designation shall be courses [developed by the director of property valuation specifically related to the administration of the assessment and tax laws of the state, or courses](#) approved by the Kansas real estate appraisal board pursuant to K.S.A. 58-4105, and amendments thereto.