

MINUTES OF THE SENATE HEALTH CARE STRATEGIES COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Susan Wagle at 1:30 P.M. on March 17, 2008 in Room 136-N of the Capitol.

Committee members absent: Senator David Haley- excused
Senator Mark Gilstrap- excused
Senator Peggy Palmer- excused

Committee staff present: Ms. Emalene Correll, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Mrs. Terri Weber, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Ms. Nobuko Folmsbee, Revisor of Statutes Office
Ms. Renae Jefferies, Revisor of Statutes Office
Ms. Margaret Cianciarulo, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Senator Chris Steineger
Mr. Alan Cobb, Americans for Prosperity
Mr. Kenneth Daniel, Volunteer Lobbyist,
Kansas Small Businesses

Others in attendance: Please see attached Guest List

Hearing on SCR 1618 - a concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to allow states greater flexibility in the use of federal health care funding.

Upon calling the meeting to order, the Chair said that the hearing today would be on **SCR1618** sponsored by Senator Steineger who is here today to explain the bill and testify in support. Senator Steineger stated this is just a resolution, and this is just his personal opinion, but if we could ever get Congress to do this it would be a revolution in our country. He went on to say that if passed, we would be the first state to ask Congress to consolidate all of the federal programs that spend health care dollars today including Medicaid, Medicare, the VA, SCHIP, etc. and give the dollars to the state in the form of one big block grant and let Kansas and any other state that would want to do this, have the authority to decide how we want to spend those same health care dollars. He stated that two years ago, Post Audit was asked to do a study of health care spending in Kansas and the round number for government health care dollars was \$3.5 billion that is being spent in Kansas right now by federal government and state government sources. Lastly, he cited the three inspirations that he had for this idea. A copy of his testimony is ([Attachment 1](#)) attached.

The Chair asked the Committee for questions which came from Senators Journey, Barnett, and Wagle including:

- the Veterans Administration was mentioned a couple of time, but don't see it in the resolution. Felt the real benefit in this is increased efficiency and better spending of the dollars, but how much are we spending on overhead to appropriately allocate the dollars when if we had the block grant we could do what we needed to do?
- Americans have a voracious appetite for health care, how are you going to control it, is it going to be a single payer system, and what is the model that you see?
- there is going to have to be some practical way for this state to come to a resolution as to what we think is policy for handling the block grant and what is your thinking?
- would the legislature determine what services are provided and how much to pay for these services?
- how do you envision that meshing with employer based systems and would the state procure through competitive bids?
- regarding line 32, "Employees Retirements Investment Security Act", what is this?

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE Senate Health Care Strategies Committee at 1:30 P.M. on March 17, 2008 in Room 136-N of the Capitol.

Page 2

- is this \$3.5 billion only federal dollars and not state?

Chairperson Wagle asked Mrs. Weber for a copy of the Post Audit Senator Steineger referred to.

As there was no more discussion or questions for Senator Steineger, the Chair called on Mr. Alan Cobb, Americans for Prosperity who stated that the current Medicaid system encourages increased and unsustainable spending as it did with the new defunct welfare program. (The federal government matches at least 100 percent of every dollar a state puts towards its Medicaid program with no limit.) He went on to say that putting states in charge of their Medicaid system would force more fiscal responsibility with the best solution being stopping the federal government from taking the money from the states in the first place, since Washington only doles the funds back out to the states with rules and restrictions attached, all the while creating “donor” states and “beneficiary” states. Also, he said, with these blocks of predetermined size, the states could not obtain additional federal funding by expanding their programs, they would have to allocate the set amount.

And lastly he offered the pros of the resolution (ex. dollars saved \$1.1 trillion in over 10 yrs., states could experiment with new policy proposals and the poverty rate could decrease as when Congress established similar reforms with federal welfare. A copy of his testimony is ([Attachment 2](#)) attached.

The Chair then called the next proponent conferee, Mr. Kenneth Daniel, Volunteer Lobbyist, Kansas Small Businesses, who stated that when our own restrictive laws on health care and health insurance are melded with those of the federal government, most of the most promising solutions are blocked. Mr. Daniel offered several alternatives (ex. Redesign our Medicaid and other programs to rid ourselves of obstacles, could have programs for low-income families that allow all members to be insured together, etc.) And lastly, he said we could design a system to fit our state without trying to make it fit all other states too. A copy of his testimony is ([Attachment 3](#)) attached.

The Chair referred the Committee to written testimony from KHPA and called on Senator Schmidt who said she had the opportunity to read and is a little confused asking if it was neutral, for, or against, who wrote it, as it usually has someone’s name on it. Is it coming from the Board of Directors, or where is it coming from? Someone from KHPA was in the audience and stated that Dr. Nielsen did write the paper but could not say if it was neutral, for or against. The Chair asked him to pass it along to Dr. Nielsen that the Committee would like to know where she sits on this resolution.

The Chair then asked for further questions which came from Senator Barnett for Mr. Cobb. Senator Barnett said it had been his review that the poverty level in Kansas is actually increasing and noticed in Mr. Cobb’s testimony he states that poverty rate is currently lower than it has been in 17 years. Senator Barnett asked, if Mr. Cobb knew if Kansas poverty levels are lower now or are they actually on the rise? For Senator Steineger, Senator Barnett asked, “Regarding these other nations that you base your resolution on, do they provide basic health care and about how much do they provide dollar wise?”

As there were no other questions or further discussion regarding **SCR1618**, the Chair said that they would hold this bill until the Committee hears from KHPA.

Staff Overview of HB2620 - an act concerning the State Board of Healing Arts; relating to non-disciplinary resolution fingerprinting and criminal history records checks.

The Chair stated their next item of business is an overview of **HB2620** with a hearing on it tomorrow. She then called on Ms. Emalene Correll, Kansas Legislative Research Department, who stated that the bill was considered by the Judiciary Committee in the House and came from this summer’s interim committee on Judiciary which had among its assigned proposals a hearing from the Kansas Board of Healing Arts on issues that were raised during the Post Audit Study of the KBHA. The Judiciary Committee had a hearing regarding the Board’s proposed responses to issues raised by Post Audit and agreed to introduce this bill before the Committee as amended by the House Committee of the Whole. She went on to state that:

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE Senate Health Care Strategies Committee at 1:30 P.M. on March 17, 2008 in Room 136-N of the Capitol.

Page 3

- the original bill appears as Section 1 which give the Board some additional tools to act in matters involving only licensees in the healing arts that would be below the level of disciplinary action but would still be a warning or alert to the licensee that the Board feels that changes or practices should be made. So what this section would do is allow the Board or a Committee of the Board or peer review committee of the Board to enter into as a non-disciplinary resolution by either:

- entering into a written agreement with the licensee for a professional development plan,

- or make written recommendations to a licensee,

- or to issue a written letter of concern to a licensee if the board committee or peer review committee determines that the licensee has engaged in one of the four listed actions.

- Subsection (b):

- provides that regardless of other provisions of law, any meeting of the Board, committee of the Board, or peer review committee (established according to the BHA Act) for the purpose of discussing or adopting a non-disciplinary resolution, would not be subject to the Kansas administrative procedures act, nor subject to the open meetings act.

- a non-disciplinary resolution authorized by this section would not be deemed disciplinary action or other order or adjudication. And,

- no failure to the applicable standard of care or violation could be implied by the adoption of a non-disciplinary resolution

- Subsection © would make whatever action taken by the Board Committee in terms of a non-disciplinary resolution confidential as provided already by the Healing Arts act and not admissible in a civil, criminal, or administrative action, except that such resolution shall be admissible in any disciplinary proceeding by the Board, so the Board could take into account any non-disciplinary action if in fact at a later time there was a disciplinary action against that licensee.

- Subsection (d) makes this section a part of and supplemental to the Kansas healing arts act.

- Section 2, added by the House Judiciary Committee, is basically the provision that was in **SB81** at it passed the Senate last year, but is now substantially changed by House Substitute and:

- would give the Board of Healing Arts, when there is an original application for a license or an application for reinstatement for a license or any registration, permit, or certificate or in connection with any investigation of any holder, the authority to require a person to be fingerprinted and submit to a state and national criminal history record check.

(She stated that last year the legislature had two bills before them, one which would have authorized fingerprinting of licensees in the healing arts and the other for licensees for Board of Nurses and both were held in the House Committee in Health and Human Services until they passed out the Substitute for SB81, so essentially Section 2 had already been passed last year by the Senate.)

- this section would be part of and supplemental to the Healing Arts Act and applicable to not all of the people that the Board regulates but just those three practitioners of the healing Arts.

- Section 3 was a floor committee amendment and authorizes the committee to adopt through formal rules and regulations, a formal list of graduated sanctions for violations of the Kansas healing arts act which specify the number and severity of violations for the imposition of each level of sanction. And this again was one of the things the Board indicated was its response to the Post Audit's issues raised when the Board appeared before the special committee on Judiciary last summer and that was they would be developing graduated sanctions for violation of the healing arts act which they believe would give them the ability to take actions

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE Senate Health Care Strategies Committee at 1:30 P.M. on March 17, 2008 in Room 136-N of the Capitol.

Page 4

of violations that did not rise to the level of a denying or restricting a license, but did authorize some type of action on the part of the Board in recognition of an activity that they felt perhaps did not meet the professional standards.

And lastly, she stated the bill passed the House 123-2.

The Chair asked for questions of the Committee which came from Senators Barnett and Wagle including:

- regarding page 2, line 31 regarding some discussion regarding juvenile, expungement, and nonconvictions, did this get changed in the House? And, can you give the Committee an idea, is that standard policy that we look at expungement and juvenile convictions, or do we not?

- are Sections 2 and 3 two different amendments?

Adjournment

As there were no further discussion or questions, the Chair announced that the hearing on **HB2620** would be tomorrow. The meeting was adjourned. The time was 2:30 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 18, 2008