

February 23, 2015

The Honorable Mary Pilcher-Cook, Chairperson
Senate Committee on Public Health and Welfare
Statehouse, Room 441-E
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Senator Pilcher-Cook:

SUBJECT: Fiscal Note for SB 49 by Senate Committee on Public Health and Welfare

In accordance with KSA 75-3715a, the following fiscal note concerning SB 49 is respectfully submitted to your committee.

SB 49 would add a new class of licensees called registered dental practitioners to the Kansas Dental Practices Act. Currently, the Kansas Dental Board licenses and regulates dentists and dental hygienists. To practice as a registered dental practitioner, a person would be required to the following qualifications:

1. Be a licensed dental hygienist who is also a graduate of a registered dental practitioner education program of not more than 18 months that is provided by an accredited postsecondary institution with a curriculum approved by the State Board of Regents;
2. Pass a comprehensive, competency-based clinical examination that is approved by the Kansas Dental Board and administered independently of an institution which provides registered dental practitioner education;
3. Have practiced under direct supervision of a supervising dentist for at least 500 hours before practicing under general supervision; and
4. Obtain a policy of professional liability insurance and show proof of the insurance as required by rules and regulations.

The Board would be required to adopt rules and regulations regarding the licensure of registered dental practitioners. The bill would also specify the terms and conditions under which licenses may be suspended or revoked and make several amendments relating to references to registered dental practitioners and the practice of dental therapy.

SB 49 would permit the Board to collect fees related to the licensure of registered dental practitioners. The maximum limit for these fees would include \$25 for certificates; \$200 for biennial license renewals; \$150 for examinations; and \$100 for subsequent examinations. The bill would also change the structure of the Kansas Dental Board by requiring the Governor to appoint two registered dental practitioners to the Board, which would increase Board membership from nine to 11.

Finally, the bill would add registered dental practitioner services to the list of services the Kansas Department of Health and Environment may provide as a charitable health care provider.

| Estimated State Fiscal Effect | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| | FY 2015 SGF | FY 2015 All Funds | FY 2016 SGF | FY 2016 All Funds |
| Revenue | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Expenditure | -- | -- | -- | \$48,583 |
| FTE Pos. | -- | -- | -- | 1.00 |

The Kansas Dental Board indicates that enactment of SB 49 would result in additional administrative duties from implementing a new group of licensees and supporting expanded Board membership. These tasks would require added expenditures of \$48,583 from the Dental Board Fee Fund and 1.00 Senior Administrative Assistant FTE position in FY 2016. Currently the Kansas Dental Board has 3.00 FTE positions. Of the additional expenditures, \$41,803 would be for salary and wages for the new position; \$1,000 would be for one-time office space set-up costs; and \$5,780 for other operating expenditures, including developing and publishing new regulations, conducting sanitation inspections and investigations, and database upgrades. In FY 2017, total expenditures of \$47,583 would include \$41,803 for ongoing salary and wages costs for the new position; \$4,480 for the salary and reimbursement expenses for the two additional board members; and \$1,300 for other operating expenditures. The Kansas Dental Board would also receive additional revenue from the new Registered Dental Practitioner fees. However, the agency cannot estimate the additional revenues to its fee fund because the number of dental hygienists who might seek to become registered dental practitioners is unknown.

The Kansas Department of Health and Environment estimates that any fiscal effect resulting from the bill would be negligible and could be handled within current Department resources. Any fiscal effect associated with SB 49 is not reflected in *The FY 2016 Governor's Budget Report*.

Sincerely,



Shawn Sullivan,
Director of the Budget

cc: Charity Carlat, Dental Board
Aaron Dunkel, Health & Environment