



To: House Federal & State Affairs Committee
From: International Association of Amusement Parks and Attractions
Date: Thursday, March 23, 2017
Subject: Neutral Testimony on HB2389 (Written Only)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee,

On behalf of the International Association of Amusement Parks and Attractions (IAAPA), thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on HB2389.

Founded in 1918, IAAPA is the largest international trade association for permanently located amusement facilities, attractions and suppliers and is dedicated to the preservation and prosperity of the attractions industry, representing more than 5,300 facility, supplier, and individual members from 99 countries. Member facilities include amusement and theme parks, water parks, attractions, family entertainment centers, zoos, aquariums, museums, science centers, and resorts.

Safety is the number one priority for the attractions industry. The U.S. attractions industry is a world leader in the promotion and development of ride safety standards. IAAPA works with ASTM International and other standards-setting groups worldwide to develop and update industry safety and maintenance requirements. This, in conjunction with state and local regulation of amusement rides and devices, has resulted in a strong safety record for the industry.

IAAPA supports Kansas's effort to improve its amusement ride safety law and would like to submit the following comments and concerns on certain provisions proposed in the bill.

- Page 1, Lines 16-17: The terms "certification of fabrication" and "certification of manufacturer's tested ride" need clarity. Is the intent of this language to require certification that a ride meets ASTM International F24 Committee standards?
- Page 1, Lines 21-22: An \$840 per ride permit fee is substantially more than the fees charges by neighboring states.
- Page 1, Lines 29-31: It would be preferable if monies collected from fees be allocated to the Department of Labor to administer the program.
- Page 1, Lines 32-36 & Page 2, Lines 1-3: Regarding the breakdown of insurance coverage requirements, why not have a standard coverage requirement across the board? Additionally, who would decide if a ride is designed for patrons 18 or younger and how would that be decided?

- Page 4, Lines 13-29: The definition of a “qualified inspector” is complicated. Why move away from the NAARSO or AIMS guidelines? NAARSO or AIMS certified inspectors are required by many states, including the neighboring states of Arkansas, Colorado and Missouri.
- Page 4, Lines 35-37: It is necessary to expand upon the definition of medical treatment. As written, “other significant injury or illness that requires medical treatment” is too broad.
- Page 5, Lines 21-24: What is the purpose of inspection fees being paid by the insurance company issuing the liability insurance policy? This will likely deter insurance companies from insuring amusement rides.
- Page 6, Lines 3-15: ASTM International has multiple committees that deal with testing and materials for the multiple industries impacted. As written, the bill currently references all 12,000 ASTM International standards that represent all industries, only the standards developed by the ASTM F24 Committee on Amusement Rides and Devices apply.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the International Association of Amusement Parks and Attractions respectfully urges you to address these concerns before passing legislation. IAAPA would welcome the opportunity to be a resource on this important work.

Thank you for your attention and consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Erika Scheffer

Erika Scheffer
Director, State Advocacy
International Association of Amusement Parks and Attractions
1448 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
escheffer@iaapa.org
703-299-5755 - Office