

SESSION OF 2010

**SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE ON HOUSE BILL NO. 2685**

As Amended by House Committee on  
Federal and State Affairs

**Brief\***

HB 2685, as amended, would modify the Personal and Family Protection Act (the concealed carry laws) pertaining to state agencies and municipalities. School districts specifically would be excluded from the definition of municipalities.

First, the bill would clarify that carrying concealed weapons in state or municipal facilities shall not be prohibited, unless such facilities have adequate security measures to insure that no weapons are permitted into the facilities.

Second, the bill would clarify that no state agency or municipality shall prohibit an employee who has a concealed carry license from carrying a weapon in the employee's work place, unless such work places have adequate security measures to insure that no weapons are permitted into the work place.

Adequate security measures would be defined in the bill to specify the means and measures that must be used in preventing weapons to be carried into state or municipal facilities.

**Background**

Proponents testifying in support of the bill were Representative Forrest Knox, a parole officer, and representatives of the National Rifle Association and the

---

\*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>

Kansas Rifle Association. Opponents testifying included representatives of the League of Kansas Municipalities, the Kansas Association of Counties, the City of Overland Park, and the Kansas Peace Officers Association. Written testimony opposing the bill was submitted by the Kansas Association of Chiefs of Police, Sedgwick County, the Sedgwick County Sheriff, the Kansas Highway Patrol, the City of Wichita, and the Kansas Board of Regents. Neutral testimony was presented by the Kansas Hospital Association.

The House Committee amended the bill to include technical clarifications suggested by the Revisor of Statutes Office to address certain concerns about the content of the proposed legislation and the criminal law provisions for enforcing the Personal and Family Protection Act that were not address in the bill as introduced.

According to the Office of the Attorney General, HB 2685 as introduced would have no fiscal effect on the agency's budget as it relates to the Office's responsibility to carry out the provisions of the Act.

The Kansas Association of Counties states that a basic security system consisting of walk through metal detectors and wands would cost approximately \$2,500 per facility entrance. Also, additional staff would be required to work at the entrance, which would cost approximately \$50,000 a year. Therefore, a building with two entrances would cost \$105,000 ( $\$52,500 \times 2$ ). It is not known how many facilities would choose to install the security measures to prohibit weapons on county premises. Therefore, a precise fiscal effect to counties is unknown.

The League of Kansas Municipalities estimates that a walk through electric scanner costs approximately \$5,000 each. If each of the 627 cities in Kansas chose to install one walk through scanner, the total cost would be \$3,135,000. Although, the League states that some cities currently have security measures, those cities that currently do not could choose to use less expensive hand wand detectors. Also, if a city decides to

install those security measures, then more than one detector could be needed for multiple access points in a building.

No fiscal note was available for HB 2685 as amended.