

**TITLE 16. DENTAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

HEARING DATE: November 22, 2011

SUBJECT MATTER OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS: Sponsored Free Health Care Events

SECTION(S) AFFECTED: Title 16, Division 10, California Code of Regulations, sections 1023.15, 1023.16, 1023.17, 1023.18, and 1023.19.

INTRODUCTION:

Health care practitioners, including physicians and surgeons, osteopathic physicians, dentists, nurses, and dental hygienists must be licensed in the State of California in order to practice and provide health care services to patients. Existing law, Business and Professions Code (Code) Section 900, provides an exemption to this rule when health care practitioners provide care during a state of emergency upon request by the Director of Emergency Medical Services Authority. The Dental Practice Act (Act), which contains provisions related to the practice of dentistry, does not provide for any additional exemptions from the licensure requirements to practice dentistry in the State of California.

The Remote Area Medical (RAM) Volunteer Corps, a non-profit organization that coordinates medical clinics in the United States and worldwide, held a health care event in August 2009 in Los Angeles County. The event provided medical services to more than six-thousand uninsured and underinsured residents. RAM held a second event in Los Angeles County in 2010 in which thousands of residents sought care, however many had to be turned away because there was a shortage of volunteer health care practitioners. RAM indicated that the shortage of volunteer health care practitioners hampered their effort, and if existing law allowed for an exemption for health care practitioners at these types of event, then additional volunteers could have been recruited.

On September 23, 2010, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Assembly Bill 2699 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 2010), enacting Business and Professions Code Section 901 ("Section 901"), which took effect January 1, 2011.

Section 901 provides an exemption for a health care practitioner, licensed or certified in another state, from the licensing and regulatory requirements of the applicable California healing arts board. To be exempted from California licensure requirements, a health care practitioner must provide services at a sponsored healthcare event to uninsured or underinsured people on a short-term, voluntary basis. Section 901 requires the out-of-state health care practitioner to seek authorization from the applicable healing arts board in California and provides the regulatory framework for the approval of an out-of-state health care practitioner and a sponsoring entity to seek approval from the applicable healing arts boards. However, each individual healing arts board is responsible for promulgating regulations to specify the requirements for the approval of an out-of-state practitioner and a sponsoring entity.

SPECIFIC PURPOSE OF EACH ADOPTION OR AMENDMENT:

The Board currently regulates a total of 72,866 licensees; consisting of 37,508 dentists, 34,084 registered dental assistants, and 1,277 registered dental assistants in extended functions. The Board's highest priority is the protection of the public when exercising its licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions. The primary methods by which the Board achieves this goal are: issuing licenses to eligible applicants; investigating complaints against licensees and disciplining licensees for violating the Dental Practice Act ("Act" – Business and Professions Code sections 1600 et seq.); monitoring licensees whose licenses have been placed on probation; and managing the Diversion Program for licensees whose practice may be impaired due to abuse of dangerous drugs or alcohol.

Business and Professions Code Section 1614 authorizes the Board to adopt, amend, or repeal, such rules and regulations as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Board to carry into effect the provisions of the Act.

These proposed regulations would implement, interpret and make specific the provisions of Section 901, as it pertains to licensed dentists, including the application and registration requirements, disciplinary actions, recordkeeping requirements and provisions for termination for the exemption of an out-of-state licensed dentist who wishes to participate in a sponsored free health care event. The Registration of Sponsoring Entity Form DBC-901-A (02/2011) and the Request for Authorization to Practice without a License Form DBC-901-B (02/2011) are incorporated by reference. The Board's proposed regulations are intended to implement Section 901 in a manner that will provide the greatest protection for the people of California.

The Board is proposing the following changes:

Adopt Article Article 8 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations (Sponsored Free Health Care Events – Requirements for Exemption)

This proposal would add a new Article 8 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations specific to “Sponsored Free Health Care Events – Requirements for Exemption”.

Adopt Section 1023.15 of Article 8 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations (Definitions):

This proposal would add a new section 1023.15 of Article 8 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to define specific terms that are listed but are either not currently defined in statute or require clarification.

Section 1023.15(a):

This proposal adds subsection 1023.15(a) to define a “Community-based organization” for the purposes of Section 901. This term has not been previously defined in statute.

Factual Basis/ Rationale:

“Community-based organization” is listed in the statute as one type of sponsoring entity. There is no existing definition of such an entity in state statute. The proposed definition of this term therefore is derived from federal law (Title 20 USC Section 7801(6) related to education law) that contains a definition of “community-based organization.” This definition provides much-needed clarity to the term and guidance to applicants regarding qualifications for registration.

Section 1023.15(b):

This proposal adds subsection 1023.15(b) to define “out-of-state practitioner” for the purposes of these regulations to provide clarification as to which practitioners the proposed regulations are intended to affect.

Factual Basis/ Rationale:

Section 901 defines “health care practitioner” as any person who engages in acts subject to licensure under Division 2 of the Code. The proposed regulations, along with the operative provisions of Section 901, however, specifically relate to health care practitioners licensed to practice dentistry in other states and territories. To provide notice regarding the intended purpose and scope of these regulations, “out-of-state practitioner” is specifically defined according to the criteria set in Section 901.

Section 1023.15(c):

This proposal adds subsection 1023.15(c) to specifically define “in good standing”, which is listed as a requirement in Section 901(b).

Factual Basis/ Rationale:

Section 901 requires that a practitioner be licensed or certified “in good standing” in another state or territory to qualify for an exemption from the licensing requirements, but does not provide a definition or specifics as to what is meant by this term. This section provides specificity regarding eligibility criteria for authorizations granted by the board per Section 901 for both applicants and staff affected by the proposed regulations.

Section 1023.15(c)(1):

This proposal adds subsection 1023.15(c)(1) to specify that “in good standing” means that a practitioner is not currently the subject of any investigation by a governmental entity or has not been charged with an offense for any act substantially related to the practice of dentistry by any public agency.

Factual Basis/ Rationale:

Section 901(b) requires that a practitioner be licensed or certified “in good standing,” but provides no definition or specifics as to what is intended by these terms. This proposed section provides that specificity which is lacking as well as public protection from practitioners who may be under investigation but not yet charged with an offense. This provision is also consistent with the Board’s current authority in Section 480 of the Business and Professions Code to deny an applicant for licensure who has committed any act substantially related to the qualifications or functions of a dentist.

Section 1023.15(c)(2):

This proposal adds subsection 1023.15(c)(2) to specify that a practitioner may not have entered into any consent agreement or been subject to an administrative decision that contains conditions placed by an agency upon the person’s professional conduct or practice in order to be considered “in good standing”. This text provides specificity for applicants, sponsors of events governed by Section 901, and staff regarding eligibility criteria for authorizations granted by the board per Section 901.

Factual Basis/ Rationale:

Section 901(b) requires that a practitioner be licensed or certified “in good standing,” but provides no definition or specifics as to what these terms mean. This proposed subdivision further defines the meaning of “in good standing” to include a requirement that the applicant may not have been subject to an administrative decision or any consent agreement that would place conditions upon the applicant’s professional conduct or practice. An applicant may hold a current and active license that contains restrictions or conditions that might place patients at risk or limit the care that they may receive. This text provides public protection by stating that those conditions or restrictions would preclude the applicant from volunteering to practice upon patients at sponsored events.

Section 1023.15(c)(3):

This proposal adds subsection 1023.15(c)(3) to specify that to be considered “in good standing”, an applicant may not have been the subject of an adverse judgment resulting from the practice of dentistry that constitutes evidence of a pattern of incompetence or negligence, as determined by the board. This proposed text provides public protection against practitioners who may have numerous incidents resulting in an adverse judgment that do not result in disciplinary action against the dental license.

Factual Basis/ Rationale:

Section 901(b) requires that a practitioner be licensed or certified “in good standing,” but provides no definition or specifics as to what these terms mean. This proposed subdivision further defines the meaning of “in good standing” to include a requirement that the applicant may not have been the subject of an adverse judgment resulting from the practice of dentistry that the board determines constitutes evidence of a pattern of incompetence or negligence. A practitioner may hold a license “in good standing”, however be the subject of an adverse judgment or judgments that reflect a pattern of practice that the board determines to be incompetent or negligent. The board intends to protect the public from these practitioners by including this prohibition in the regulatory proposal.

Adopt Section 1023.16 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations (Sponsoring Entity Registration and Recordkeeping Requirements)

This proposal would add a new section 1023.16 of Article 8 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to specify the registration and recordkeeping requirements of sponsoring entities.

Section 1023.16(a) - Registration:

This proposed subsection establishes a timeframe for submission of a sponsoring entity's registration form and prescribes the registration form to be used and incorporates the form by reference.

Factual Basis/Rationale:

Sponsoring entities are required under Section 901(d) to register with the board if they will have out-of-state practitioners participating in their sponsored event. The proposed regulation implements the statute by providing a form that a sponsoring entity can use to meet this requirement (DBC-901-A)(02/2011). The form includes space for all of the required information to be submitted under the statute. Form DBC-901-A would include the following:

- Provide filing requirements and disclosures regarding qualifications for registration as well as deadlines for filing a completed application 90 days in advance of the event.
- Part 1 – Requires the applicant to disclose organization name, organization contact information, type of organization, the organization's tax identification number and if the organization is community-based, disclose its mission, goals and activities.
- Part 2 – Requires the applicant to provide a list of responsible organization officials that includes the name, address, title, phone number and email address of each responsible official.
- Part 3 – Requires the applicant to disclose event details including: name of the event, date(s) of the event, location(s) of the event, a description of the intended event, a list of all out-of-state health care practitioners the organization currently intends to apply for the event (name, profession and state of licensure required), and disclose each licensing authority that will have jurisdiction over an out-of-state licensed health care practitioner.
- Provide a notice regarding collection and use of personal information given on the application.
- Provide notice regarding requirements for each out-of-state practitioner practicing at the event, including submission of the required Form DBC-901-B in advance of the event.
- Provide notice of the requirements for the maintenance of records for 5 years in California and for filing a report with the Board within 15 calendar days of the completion of the event.

- Require the applicant to certify their statements under penalty of perjury and attest that the individual is authorized to sign on behalf of the organization.

The foregoing form is necessary to create a process for the Board for review of sponsoring entities, to implement the requirements of Section 901, and to assist with providing detailed information to sponsoring entity applicants regarding the requirements for seeking and maintaining registration. The certification and disclosure requirements also assist in ensuring accurate, timely and complete information is being provided to the board prior to making a decision to grant or deny registration.

The proposed text also requires that sponsoring entities submit the registration form no later than 90 days prior to the date of the sponsored event. This will allow for sufficient time for staff review of the registration information and to have the registration in place prior to receipt of participation authorization requests from out-of-state practitioners.

Section 1023.16(b) – Determination of Completeness of Form:

This proposed subsection allows the Board to, by resolution, delegate to the Department of Consumer Affairs the authority to receive and process Form DBC-901-A on behalf of the board. This proposed text also specifies that the board shall inform the sponsoring entity within 15 days of receipt that the form is either complete and the entity is registered or that the form is deficient and what specific information or documentation is required to complete the form and be registered. The proposed section allows the board or its delegates to reject the form if all of the identified deficiencies have not been corrected at least 30 days prior to the event.

Factual Basis/Rationale:

Sponsoring entities are required under Section 901(d) to register with the board. The proposed regulation will allow delegation to the Department of Consumer Affairs, which will avoid duplication of effort for healing arts boards when a sponsoring entity wishes to conduct a health fair with practitioners of various health care fields. The regulation will streamline the process for approval of such health fairs under the Department of Consumer Affairs, the umbrella agency over all healing arts boards.

The proposed regulation also sets out specific timelines for written notification to the sponsoring entity that their application was received and whether the application is deemed complete and the entity registered, or of the specific deficiencies and means of correction. This provides the sponsoring entity with clear timelines and

requires that the Department or the board give adequate notice to the entity and specific information as to how to correct any deficiencies in a timely manner. The proposed regulation specifies 30 days prior to the event as the date of rejection if all identified deficiencies have not been corrected, so the event sponsor is informed of the final date that deficiencies must be corrected before rejection of the application. The regulation allows for staff time to process completed applications, while giving event sponsors written notification of deficiencies and a deadline.

Section 1023.16(c) – Recordkeeping Requirements:

This proposed subsection implements and makes specific the recordkeeping requirements of sponsoring entities set forth in Section 901(g).

Factual Basis/Rationale:

Section 901(g) specifies certain records that sponsoring entities must maintain and requires entities to furnish these records upon request to the board. In order to implement these requirements, the proposed regulation specifies that these records must be kept both at the physical premises of the sponsoring event and at a location in California for the statutorily required five-year period. Having these records available at the event and thereafter, at a location in California, is necessary in order to provide the board with the ability to inspect and have easier access to the records. The proposed regulation specifies that the records may be kept in either paper or electronic form and that the sponsoring entity shall notify the board upon registration of the form of its records. This provision makes it clear that the board will accept either form of records.

Section 1023.16(d) – Requirement for Prior Board Approval of Out-of-State Practitioner:

This proposed subsection clarifies that the board's authorization must be provided before a sponsoring entity may allow an out-of-state practitioner to participate in a sponsored event.

Factual Basis/Rationale:

Section 901 provides for authorization requirements for out-of-state practitioners and for registration requirements of sponsoring entities. This proposed regulation connects the two requirements by clarifying that a sponsoring entity may not permit an out-of-state practitioner to participate in its event unless and until it receives authorization from the board.

Section 1023.16(e) - Report:

This proposed subsection specifies the information to be provided in the report required under Section 901(f).

Factual Basis/Rationale:

Section 901(f) requires a report to be filed with the board by a sponsoring entity within 15 days after a sponsored event and sets forth the minimum information to be included. The statute provides no information as to the form of the report. The proposed regulation makes clear that the report may be in a form of the entity's choosing, however must contain certain specific information to ensure compliance with registration requirements. This information would include: the date(s) of the sponsored event, the location(s) of the sponsored event, the type(s) and general description of all health care services provided at the sponsored event; and a list of each out-of-state practitioner granted authorization who participated in the sponsored event. The proposed regulation would also include a requirement that the license number for each participating out-of-state practitioner be included in the report. This information is necessary for the board to identify the participants involved and verify compliance with the minimum standards adopted by the board.

Adopt Section 1023.17 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations (Out-of-State Practitioner Authorization to Participate in Sponsored Event)

This proposal would add a new section 1023.17 of Article 8 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to specify the requirements for an out-of-state practitioner to participate in sponsored events.

Section 1023.17(a) – Request for Authorization to Participate:

This proposed subsection provides the mechanism by which an out-of-state practitioner may request authorization to participate in a sponsored event, which would include submission of fingerprint clearances, a completed application and \$100 processing fee to the board .

Factual Basis/Rationale:

Code Section 901(b) requires an out-of-state practitioner to request authorization from the board in order to participate in a sponsored event. The statute specifically requires the board to prescribe a form and set a processing fee for this purpose. The proposed regulations implements Section 901(b) by incorporating proposed FORM DBC-901-B (02/2011) to be submitted by the out-of-state practitioner to the board to request authorization to participate in a sponsored event. The form provides space for the applicant to include all of the information required by the statute. Form DBC-901-B would include the following:

- Part 1 – Requires the applicant to provide: a completed application, a \$100 processing fee to the board (or \$151 fee if using “ink on cards” to have fingerprints made), a copy of each current license authorizing the applicant to engage in the practice of dentistry in another jurisdiction, a copy of a valid photo identification issued from another jurisdiction, copies of certificates of completion of at least 50 units of continuing education, any documents or statements requested on the application, and fingerprints.
- Part 2 – Requires the applicant to disclose: name, social security number, contact information, employer, and employer’s contact information.
- Part 3 – Requires the applicant to respond regarding: current licensure in another state, district or territory of the United States; continuing education; any pending investigations by any governmental entity; any past or pending charges against a dental license; disciplinary actions taken against any healing arts license; surrender of a dental license; malpractice settlements or judgments; criminal convictions; permits to prescribe controlled substances from the federal Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA); current physical or mental impairment related to drugs or alcohol; and, mental incompetency or conservatorship.
- Part 4 – Requires the applicant to provide: name of non-profit or community-based organization hosting the event, name of event, date(s) and location(s) of the event, date(s) and location(s) applicant will be performing healthcare services, the healthcare services the applicant intends to provide, and the name and phone number of the contact person with the sponsoring entity.
- Part 5 – Requires the applicant to acknowledge and certify the following: (1) agree to comply with applicable practice requirements and regulations of the board; (2) agree to practice only within the scope of his/her licensure; (3) agree to provide services only to uninsured or underinsured persons at no cost; (4) agree to provide services only in association with the sponsoring entity and the event(s); (5) agree to be responsible for knowing and complying with California law and practice standards; (6) agree to permit the board to notify the licensing authority of the applicant’s home jurisdiction of any potential grounds for discipline associated with the event; (7) acknowledge that practice without proper licensure may subject the applicant to administrative, civil and/or criminal penalties; and, (8) certify that the

applicant has read the questions in the application and that all information is true and complete to the best of the applicant's knowledge.

- Notification that completion and submission of the application grants permission to the board to verify and investigate any information provided.
- Notification regarding collection and use of personal information given on the application.
- Notification that the applicant's signature on the application authorizes the National Practitioner Data Bank (NPDB) and the DEA to release any and all information required by the board.
- Notification that authorization will not be issued until clearance has been received from the California Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The board has determined that the processing fee of \$100 is sufficient to cover the cost of processing the request of the health care practitioner. Additionally, the regulation's form requires the applicant to submit additional material not specifically listed in the statute. First, the applicant must submit personal identifying information including contact information, the individual's social security number, employer's contact information and either a full set of fingerprints or a Live Scan inquiry. These requirements are reasonably necessary in order for the board to verify that an applicant is "in good standing" as required by Section 901, including the requirement of Section 901(b)(1)(B)(i) that the applicant has "not committed any act or been convicted of a crime constituting grounds for denial of licensure or registration under [Code] Section 480." Section 480 authorizes a board to deny licensure based on an applicant's conviction of a substantially-related crime or the commission of an act substantially-related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensed dentist. A criminal background check cannot be effectuated if the board does not have the appropriate personal identifying information. Further, the board is authorized to require applicants to furnish fingerprints for criminal background checks under Business and Professions Code Section 144 and to require disclosure of Social Security Numbers for all other applicants under Section 30 of the Business and Professions Code. Further, Section 901(b)(1)(B)(iii) requires a health-care practitioner to agree to comply with all applicable practice requirements set forth in Section 901 and the board's applicable regulations. This form, with its accompanying attestation provisions, would provide the mechanism to effectuate such an agreement.

Section 901(b) also provides that applicants seeking authorization to participate must meet the educational and experience requirements determined by the board. The board has determined that the applicant must have a current valid license to engage in the practice of dentistry issued by a state, district or territory of the United States and submit Certificates of Completion showing at least 50 units of continuing education within two years of the date of application. It is the opinion of the board that these are the minimum requirements necessary to protect the public from inexperienced or unqualified practitioners who have not met the board's full requirements for licensure.

Section 1023.17(b) – Response to Request for Authorization to Participate:

This proposed subsection sets forth the standard timeframe in which the board shall grant or deny the authorization request.

Factual Basis/Rationale:

Section 901(b) (1)(A) provides that the board shall notify the sponsoring entity within 20 days of receiving a request for authorization to participate whether that request is approved or denied. The proposed regulation sets forth this statutory requirement and clarifies that such a response is due only after a "completed" request is received and requires the board to notify both the applicant and the sponsoring entity. These additional requirements are necessary to ensure a seamless processing of the application and to provide proper notice to all affected parties.

Section 1023.17(c) – Denial of Request for Authorization to Participate:

This proposed subsection sets forth the criteria under which the board must or may deny a request for authorization to participate in a sponsored free health care event.

Factual Basis/Rationale:

Section 901 provides that the board must authorize the participation of out-of-state practitioners in sponsored events, but does not list specific criteria for denial of authorization other than if a practitioner "fails to comply with the requirements of this section or for any act that would be grounds for denial of an application for licensure." Therefore it is necessary to provide at some specific detail as to the criteria the board will use beyond the general authorization to deny an application.

The board has determined that the failure of an applicant to respond to a request for additional information within seven days will result in an automatic denial of a request. Because the board has only 20 days in which to grant or deny a request, timing is critical and the board's opinion is that failure of an applicant to respond

within seven calendar days will sufficiently jeopardize the board's ability to effectively review a completed application within the allotted time.

Further, a failure to meet any of the specified requirements determined by the board and discussed under Section 1023.17(a) of these proposed regulations will constitute an automatic denial of the application. The board has determined that these criteria are necessary to protect the public from inexperienced or unqualified practitioners who have not met the board's full requirements for licensure.

The proposed regulation also sets forth discretionary reasons for denying a request. The first of these is that the application is not received within 20 days prior to the event. Section 901(b)(1)(A) provides that the board shall use reasonable efforts to notify the sponsoring entity within this time. The proposed regulation provides needed clarity to the statute that if the statutorily required reasonable efforts are not sufficient to review the application in advance of the event, the board may deny the request. It would be contrary to the board's mission of consumer protection to require it to grant authorization to an individual whose request is submitted in such a short timeframe prior to the scheduled event that it cannot adequately be reviewed.

The other discretionary reasons for denial are based upon the past actions of the board with respect to that particular individual. The board believes that if an applicant has previously had a request denied or an authorization terminated, this alone may be cause for a subsequent denial. Because the time for review of the authorization is only 20 days, the board may not have time to revisit the case of an individual who has already been determined by the board as unfit to participate. The board feels that it is reasonable to consider this a discretionary decision that may be used on a case-by-case basis to re-evaluate a particular individual's circumstances as appropriate, if sufficient time exists to do so without compromising public protection. The board has also determined that it would be against the public interest to permit an applicant to practice, even temporarily for a limited purpose, in this State without a license for more than 3 sponsored events per year (maximum of 30 calendar days per year). As a result, the board has specified that grounds for denial of authorization to practice to an out-of-state practitioner would include that an applicant had participated in three sponsored events during the 12-month period immediately preceding the current application.

Section 1023.17(d) – Appeal of Denial:

This proposed subsection provides an appeal procedure for an applicant who has had a request for authorization to participate denied by the board.

Factual Basis/Rationale:

Section 901 allows for the denial of a request for authorization to participate, but does not provide any appeal procedure for the denied individual. In order to provide adequate due process, the board feels that applicants should have access to the same appeal procedure available for an out-of-state practitioner who has had his or her authorization terminated. The proposed regulation references the appeal procedure in Section 1023.18 of these proposed regulations, discussed below. This provides consistency in the two appeal processes.

Adopt Section 1023.18 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations (Termination of Authorization and Appeal)

This proposal would add a new section 1023.18 of Article 8 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to specify the procedures for termination.

Section 1023.18(a) – Grounds for Termination:

This proposed subsection provides the grounds upon which the board may terminate the authorization to participate in a sponsored free health care event previously granted to an out-of-state practitioner.

Factual Basis/Rationale:

The first two grounds for termination in the proposed regulation are consistent with Section 901(j)(1), but are also necessary to provide guidance to the regulated practitioner that failure to comply with the board's requirements or commission of an act that would constitute grounds for discipline against a California licensee would similarly be grounds for disciplining the out-of-state practitioner. As an additional ground for termination, this proposed regulation adds the receipt of a credible complaint indicating that the practitioner is unfit to practice at the sponsored event or has otherwise endangered consumers of the practitioner's services. This provision is necessary in order for the board to act consistently with its mandate that protection of the public is its highest priority. Because of the permissive and temporary nature of the licensure exemption granted under Section 901 and the limited time in which the board has to review and verify the qualifications of the out-of-state practitioner, the board feels that it is essential to act immediately to terminate the authorization to participate when a credible complaint of endangerment is received.

Section 1023.18(b) – Notice of Termination:

This proposed subsection specifies that written notice of termination, including the basis for the termination, shall be given to both the sponsoring entity and the out-of-

state practitioner. If the written notice is provided during the sponsoring event, then this proposal would permit the board to provide notice to any representative of the sponsored event on the premises of the event.

Factual Basis/Rationale:

The statute provides that written notice of termination shall be given both to the sponsoring entity as well as to the individual practitioner. This proposed regulation is necessary to clarify that in the event that a termination is issued during the course of a sponsored event, the board may provide the written termination notice to any representative of the sponsoring entity on the premises of the event. This provision is necessary because the most effective way to notify the entity in a manner that protects the public is at the event itself so that the practitioner will be instructed to cease practice immediately. Further, satisfaction of the board's notice obligations through service upon any representative at an event would more easily ensure rapid notification to the sponsoring entity of the termination and prevent possible avoidance of service of this notice by the sponsoring entity if service on a specific contact person were required.

Section 1023.18(c) – Consequences of Termination:

This proposed subsection sets forth the consequences of a termination of authorization to participate and how the board will report the fact of such termination to the national practitioner data banks and the licensing authority of each jurisdiction in which the out-of-state practitioner is licensed.

Factual Basis/Rationale:

Section 901(j)(3) provides that out-of-state practitioners shall not provide services under this statute following a termination of authorization. The proposed regulation specifies that the practitioner shall "immediately" cease participation in the event. The board believes that this clarification is necessary in the event that a termination is issued during the course of an event. This section prevents any confusion as to when the termination becomes effective and removes any doubt that the practitioner must immediately cease his or her participation as soon as the termination is received.

The proposed regulation also provides that the board will consider a termination a disciplinary measure that is reportable to the national practitioner data banks and the individual's out-of-state licensing authorities. The board views these provisions as necessary and logical for public protection. The grounds for termination are those that the board would consider as disciplinary measures for its own licensees – Business and Professions Code Sections 475, 480 and violations of the Act.

Because the board does not have licensing authority over the out-of-state practitioner, its only disciplinary remedy is to report the conduct to the individual's home jurisdiction and applicable national practitioner data banks. If the conduct is such that it would lead to action against the practitioner's out-of-state license, then the board would have that information available to it in the event that the individual applied for either a subsequent authorization to participate in a future sponsored event or a license to practice in California.

Section 1023.18(d) – Appeal of Termination:

This proposed subsection provides the procedure for appealing denials of authorizations to participate in sponsored events and terminations of authorizations to participate in sponsored events.

Factual Basis/Rationale:

The statute allows for an out-of-state practitioner who has had his or her authorization to participate terminated by the board to file a written appeal to the board within 30 days of receipt of the termination notice. The proposed regulation specifies that this request for appeal shall be considered a request for an informal hearing under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) at Government Code sections 11445.10 and following. This informal appeals process is a potentially less costly system than the formal APA hearing procedure and is warranted for removal or denial of this type of authorization. Formal APA appeals can take an average of 1 year or more, based up on the complexity of the case, to prosecute from the time an appeal is requested. The board does not anticipate that the issues for a potential appeal of these denials or terminations would be complex (whether requirements of the application had been met or compliance maintained), and there would be a greater need to have such appeals resolved in a fairly short time frame given the needs of the sponsoring entity. As a result, the board believes that affording appellants with this informal process provides a simpler and more expeditious alternative to address their appeals while satisfying due process concerns.

Section 1023.18(e) – Informal Conference Option:

This proposed subsection provides an alternative to a hearing under the APA for appeals submitted by out-of-state practitioners.

Factual Basis/Rationale:

Section 901(j) allows for the filing of an appeal by an out-of-state practitioner. In addition to the APA procedure set forth in proposed Section 1023.18(d) above, this proposed regulation also offers the appealing out-of-state practitioner the option of an informal conference with the board's executive officer to try and resolve the

appeal. This proposed regulation is consistent with the board's practice for its own licensees who have been issued a citation (Business and Professions Code Sections 125.9, 148, and California Code of Regulations Title 16, Section 1023.5) and provides an inexpensive option to ensure the efficient resolution of appeals when possible.

Adopt Section 1023.19 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations (Termination of Authorization and Appeal)

This proposal would add a new section 1023.19 of Article 8 of Division 10 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations to specify the additional practice requirements for out-of-state practitioners authorized to participate in sponsored free health care events.

Section 1023.19(a):

This proposed subsection specifies that each out-of-state practitioner authorized to participate in a sponsored event must provide written notification to each prospective patient regarding the practitioner's license status and a disclosure about the scope of authorization to practice in California prior to performing any services, and the form of the notification. This proposal would require each out-of-state practitioner to provide this notice separate and apart from all other notices given to the patient and would require that the notice be retained by the patient.

Factual Basis/Rationale:

Statutory law makes no provision for notifying the affected public that out-of-state practitioners are not California licensed dentists in good standing. A member of the public would assume, unless this notice is provided, that dentists providing dental services in California would be duly licensed and regulated by the Dental Board. The requirement of written notification provides transparency to the public that individuals performing dentistry at the sponsored event are licensed in good standing by another state, district or territory, the license numbers, effective dates of each license and issuing agency, and the dates that the out-of-state practitioner is authorized to practice by the board. This proposed regulation further specifies a statement of disclosure that the Dental Board has only authorized the practitioner to provide services at the sponsored event and for a period not to exceed 10 days.

This proposed section provides disclosure to the public that practitioners are licensed by another governmental agency, provides specific information regarding those licenses, and informs the public that practitioners may only practice pursuant to the specific provisions of Section 901.

The Registration of Sponsoring Entity Form DBC-901-A (02/2011) and the Request for Authorization to Practice without a License Form DBC-901-B (02/2011) are incorporated by reference in these proposed regulations. It would be cumbersome, unduly expensive and otherwise impractical to publish the documents in the California Code of Regulations. These forms are available on the board's Web site and from the board upon request.

UNDERLYING DATA:

1. Assembly Bill 2699 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 2010)
2. Title 20 USC Section 7801
3. February 25, 2011 Dental Board Meeting Minutes
4. Form DBC-901-A (02/2011)
5. Form DBC-901-B (02/2011)

BUSINESS IMPACT:

The Board has made an initial determination that the proposed regulatory action would have no significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. This regulation will impact non-profit organizations sponsoring free health care events and practitioners licensed out-of-state who wish to volunteer at such events.

Sponsoring entities may incur nominal expenses associated with submitting the registration form to the Board, and complying with recordkeeping requirements, and reporting requirements. Sponsoring entities shall be responsible for submitting the registration Form DBC-901-A (02/2011) to the Board. Expenses associated with submitting the registration form include printing and mailing; these expenses are minimal and should not have a significant fiscal impact on sponsoring entities. Additionally, sponsoring entities shall be responsible for maintaining copies of all records required by Code Section 901, as well as the copy of the authorization for participation issued by the Board to an out-of-state practitioner at a physical location in California. The records must be maintained for a period of at least five years after the date the sponsored event ended; the records may be kept in electronic or paper form. The sponsoring entity shall also be responsible for maintaining copies of all records required by Code Section 901(g) at the physical location of the sponsored event. Expenses associated with these recordkeeping requirements are nominal and include storage and transportation of the required records; these expenses are minimal and should not have a significant fiscal impact on sponsoring entities. Finally, the sponsoring entity shall be responsible for providing a report to the Board summarizing the details of the sponsored event within fifteen days after the conclusion of such event. The report may be provided to the Board on a form of the sponsoring entity's choosing. Expenses associated with these reporting requirements are nominal and include printing and postage; these expenses are minimal and should not have a significant fiscal impact on sponsoring entities.

Out-of-state dentists seeking authorization from the Board to participate in a sponsored event will incur a \$100 fee for application processing. Additionally, applicants will incur costs associated with furnishing fingerprints for the purpose of the Board conducting a criminal history check. The cost for a person to get fingerprinted is approximately \$70.00. Of this fee, \$56.00 goes to the Department of Justice for conducting the background check and providing criminal record reports to the Board; an average of \$14.00 goes to the vendor for fingerprinting the individual. The vendor's fee ranges from \$5.00 to \$45.00 with the average fee being \$14.00. For those who are not able to submit fingerprints electronically via Live Scan, the fee for the board to process "ink on cards" fingerprints is \$51. These fees will have to be factored into the cost of the individual's volunteered services. The fees may be covered by sponsoring entities, who will also incur minor costs with respect to maintaining records for their volunteers, reporting to the board after the events and filing a registration. These costs are necessary for the protection of the public and to provide staff time and resources for registration of sponsored events and volunteer out-of-state practitioners in the short timeframes set in the statute..

This regulation will have a positive impact on the health of uninsured or under-insured Californians that are currently unable to receive dental care due to lack of funding and resources.

There may also be benefits to private businesses that are not able to provide dental care to employees. Many small businesses are legally required to provide health care, but are not required to provide dental care. Poor oral health can impact the total health of an individual. These regulations will benefit the health of Californians who attend sponsored events, in addition to providing public protection through registration of out-of-state volunteer dentists.

Businesses operated by licensees would not be affected by these regulations, as these businesses do not normally provide services at no cost. Businesses owned by small business owners may benefit from these regulations if their employees attend sponsored events and are thus provided dental care at no cost.

This proposed regulation may affect a federally funded State agency or program if that State agency or program is a nonprofit who conducts health fairs in California.

SPECIFIC TECHNOLOGIES OR EQUIPMENT:

This regulation does not mandate the use of specific technologies or equipment.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES:

No reasonable alternative to the regulation would be either more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulations. The board is directed by statute to develop these regulations and there is no other method of

developing the forms and procedure for registration of sponsoring entities and granting authorization requests by out-of-state practitioners to participate in sponsored events.

One possible alternative would be to delay or not promulgate these regulations. This is not reasonable because the statute provides a registration and fee process to be developed by the board to implement the statute. Failure to create a procedure would defeat the purpose of the statute, which intends to provide an opportunity for out-of-state licensed practitioners to participate in certain free health care events. A delay is unreasonable due to the sunset date of January 1, 2014. Because this statute is effective for only three years, the board must act to implement the required process as soon as possible.