

SESSION OF 2010

**SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE ON  
HOUSE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 449**

As Recommended by House Committee on  
Health and Human Services

**Brief\***

House Sub. for SB 449 would amend existing law by requiring that all repairs, maintenance, or inspection of medical gas piping systems be completed by a person that is licensed under plumbers and plumbing in cities' and counties' statutes and is certified under the appropriate professional qualifications standard or standards of ASSE Series 6000. The installers would be required to obtain a proper permit from the county or city for which the medical gas is being installed. In addition, all inspections would be done by a third party agency certified under the same standards and all documents of the inspection and certificates of the installer would be provided to the county or city prior to any occupancy of the building or unit in which the medical gas piping has been installed. Finally, the bill would provide that this section of law would not apply in counties or cities in which building codes require the inspection of medical gas piping systems installation prior to an occupancy permit being issued.

**Background**

The House Committee placed the amended contents of HB 2590 into House Sub. for SB 449. Appearing as proponents of HB 2590 were representatives of the Plumbers & Pipefitters Local 441 and individual citizens of Kansas. The City of Overland Park presented written opposition to the original bill, as the City believed the bill would place additional mandates on local governments with no guarantee of improvement of safety.

---

\*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>

The original SB 449 would have amended current law concerning the licensure of audiologists.

The fiscal note for HB 2590 indicates that the bill would cause additional expenses for cities and counties required to implement this certification process, but fees would offset these expenses. There would be no fiscal effect on the state budget.