SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE ON SENATE BILL NO. 201

As Recommended by Senate Committee on
Federal and State Affairs

Brief*

SB 201 would amend the Kansas Consumer Protection Act (Act). The bill would add members of the military to the definition of “protected consumer” found in the Act. Current law includes veterans, surviving spouses of veterans, and immediate family members of members of the military, but does not specifically include current members of the military.

Background

The bill was introduced in the Senate Committee on Federal and State Affairs at the request of Senator Rogers. In the Senate Committee hearing, Senator Rogers and a private citizen testified in support of the bill. The two proponents stated they believed the omission of active duty military personnel from the definition was an oversight. Written-only proponent testimony was provided by the Attorney General and a private citizen. No other testimony was provided.

The Senate Committee considered the bill on March 14, 2017, and recommended the bill favorably for passage the same day.

The bill was removed from the Senate Calendar and rereferred to the Committee on April 4, 2017. On April 5, 2017, the Committee again recommended the bill favorably

*Supplemental notes are prepared by the Legislative Research Department and do not express legislative intent. The supplemental note and fiscal note for this bill may be accessed on the Internet at http://www.kslegislature.org
for passage and recommended the bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.

According to the fiscal note prepared by the Division of the Budget, the Office of the Attorney General (Office) indicates expanding the list of protected consumers may result in an increase in the number of complaints filed with the Office, which would increase expenses in the form of additional staff time. The bill could also result in additional revenues from recoveries. Under current law, a person who is found to be in violation of the Kansas Consumer Protection Act against a protected consumer may face civil penalties of up to $10,000 per violation. However, the fiscal effect is unknown because the Office is unable to estimate the number of additional complaints that may be filed with the agency. Any fiscal effect associated with enactment of the bill is not reflected in *The FY 2018 Governor’s Budget Report.*