NSPE-KS™ KANSAS SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS

To: **Senate Commerce Committee**
From: **Travis Lowe**
Kansas Society of Professional Engineers
Date: **February 20, 2020**
Re: **Comments on SB 168**

Madam Chairwoman and members of the committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to offer remarks regarding Senate Bill 168.

I serve as Executive Director of the Kansas Society of Professional Engineers. The Kansas Society of Professional Engineers (KSPE) represents the individual licensed Professional Engineers across the state. For over 110 years, KSPE has worked to promote engineering and public safety by delivering professional engineering services and encouraging licensure, in addition to advocating legislation and public policy for the betterment of human welfare and the industry.

Last year during the 2019 Session, KSPE submitted opposition testimony on SB 168, which as proposed, would place an additional layer of regulation, financial and education requirements on licensed Professional Engineers who are already well qualified to perform home inspections. Licensed Professional Engineers spend over eight years learning, training and testing to become a Professional Engineer. Professional Engineers are under the oversight of the Board of Technical Professions that require a host of continual training and education to maintain their license.

KSPE diligently worked with the stakeholders over the last eleven months to reach consensus to exempt licensed Professional Engineers from the bill's addition requirements but require Professional Engineers that perform home inspectors to register with the new act.

However, there is a drafting error in the revisor's substitute bill draft presented to the committee on Tuesday. It appears the sections were reorganized and renumbered between the internal stakeholder draft and the revisor's substitute bill draft. In the substitute bill drafts' section 15, licensed Professional Engineers should be exempt from both sections 11 and 12. The draft presented to the committee only mentions exemption of section 12, which in the stakeholder's draft, included language both sections.

KSPE will support a revised bill if this technical amendment can be made. Otherwise, we unfortunately oppose the substitute bill amendment as currently presented as it still adds additional financial requirements to our members.

We sincerely appreciate the opportunity to voice our thoughts and concerns.

Respectfully,

Travis Lowe