

SESSION OF 2016

**SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE ON SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE
BILL NO. 462**

As Recommended by Senate Committee on
Federal and State Affairs

Brief*

Sub. for SB 462 would make changes to the Protection From Stalking Act. Under the bill, the definition of “harassment” would be expanded to include any course of conduct carried out through the use of an unmanned aerial system over or near any dwelling, occupied vehicle, or other place where one may reasonably expect to be safe from uninvited intrusion or surveillance.

The bill would define “unmanned aerial system” to mean a powered, aerial vehicle that:

- Does not carry a human operator;
- Uses aerodynamic forces to provide vehicle lift;
- May fly autonomously or be piloted remotely;
- May be expendable or recoverable; and
- May carry a lethal or nonlethal payload.

Background

At the hearing before the Senate Committee on Federal and State Affairs, a private citizen and a representative of the Kansas Livestock Association appeared in support of the bill.

*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>

A representative of the Kansas Chamber of Commerce appeared in opposition to the bill. Written testimony in opposition to the bill was provided by a representative of the Kansas Grain and Feed Association, Kansas Cooperative Council, and Kansas Agribusiness Retailers Association. Neutral written testimony on the bill was submitted by the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.

The Senate Committee created a subcommittee to study the bill, as introduced (relating to the regulation of drones). The Senate Committee deleted the original contents of the bill, inserted language drafted by the subcommittee, and recommended a substitute bill.

According to the fiscal note provided on the bill, as introduced, the Office of Judicial Administration has indicated the bill could increase the number of cases filed in district courts, which would increase the workload of judges and other staff and the collection of docket fees. However, a fiscal effect cannot be estimated as it is not possible to predict the number of additional court cases that would arise or how complex or time-consuming the cases would be. Any fiscal effect associated with the bill is not reflected in *The FY 2017 Governor's Budget Report*.