

MINUTES
SENATE HEALTH & WELFARE COMMITTEE

DATE: Thursday, March 26, 2026

TIME: 2:00 P.M.

PLACE: Room WW54

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair VanOrden, Senators Harris, Bjerke (Bjerke), Lenney, Shippy, Blaylock, Keyser, and Wintrow

ABSENT/ EXCUSED: Senator Zuiderveld

NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENED: **Chair VanOrden** called the meeting of the Senate Health and Welfare Committee (Committee) to order at 2:01 p.m.

NOTE: **Chair VanOrden** stated the Committee would consider **H 935** before **H 913**.

MINUTES APPROVAL: **Senator Wintrow** moved to approve the Minutes of March 04, 2026. **Senator Shippy** seconded the motion. The motion carried by **voice vote**.

MINUTES APPROVAL: **Acting Senator Bjerke (Bjerke)** moved to approve the Minutes of March 05, 2026. **Senator Shippy** seconded the motion. The motion carried by **voice vote**.

H 935 **DENTURITRY - Amends and adds to existing law to consolidate provisions regarding denturistry licensure.** **Senator Lakey** explained this legislation would consolidate the regulatory oversight of denturistry within the Idaho State Board of Dentistry by transferring authority from the existing independent Board of Denturistry. Under this model, denturistry would remain a distinct licensed profession with its own scope of practice and licensure requirements, but would be regulated under a unified dental board structure, similar to successful approaches adopted in other states. This structural realignment promoted administrative efficiency, fostered interprofessional collaboration, and strengthened regulatory consistency across oral health professions in Idaho.

TESTIMONY: **Amanda Rowe Bronson**, Idaho Denturist Association, **Robbert van Giffen**, **Heidi van Giffen**, Denturist, **Angelo Giovanini** and **Annalisa Tilmant**, Intern, testified in opposition to **H 935**. They voiced concerns that the Board of Dentistry could not responsibly oversee the practice of denturistry due to conflicting interests.

Elizabeth Criner, Idaho State Dental Association, testified in support of **H 935**. She explained this legislation ensured public health and safety, preserved denturists' independent legal practice, maintained a clear scope of practice in code, reduced government size, and made licensure fees reasonable. She stated this bill was an efficient, well-regulated approach without competitive concerns.

DISCUSSION: The Committee members had a lengthy discussion with testifiers regarding the concerns about conflicting interests and how those concerns could be remedied.

In closing, **Senator Lakey** emphasized **H 935** did not devalue the dentist profession, which provided an important service, but consolidated oversight under the State Board of Dentistry for efficiency. Scope of practice and educational requirements remained well defined by Idaho Code and only the Legislature could alter the scope of practice, not the Board. With only 23 licensed denturists in the state, independent regulation was unsustainable, while consolidation reduced costs, preserved access and quality of care, maintained legislative oversight, and ensured representation on the Board.

MOTION: **Senator Blaylock** moved to hold **H 935** in Committee. **Senator Harris** seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: **Senator Blaylock** acknowledged the board was operating at a deficit. She stated the hope was that a compromise could be reached during the interim, and if not, the bill could be revisited next year, allowing the Board to temporarily continue operating in the red while a satisfactory solution was developed.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: **Senator Lenney** moved to send **H 935** to the floor with a **do pass** recommendation. **Acting Senator Bjerke (Bjerke)** seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION: **Senator Wintrow** acknowledged the significance of the 1982 ballot initiative that created denturist licensure in Idaho and the profession's concerns. She noted the limited number of licensees and the need for an oversight mechanism. She stated she was leaning toward supporting the bill. She also emphasized the difficulty of the decision and the care taken in considering all perspectives.

Senator Shippy acknowledged concerns raised by the denturists about the Board potentially creating disadvantages in the market. However, he noted the Legislature reviewed administrative rules annually, giving denturists the opportunity to raise concerns and address any imbalances should they arise. He challenged the Committee and future committees to remain vigilant in maintaining that balance. He stated given the small number of denturists, he believed supporting the substitute motion was appropriate, provided the Legislature ensured fairness going forward.

ROLL CALL VOTE: **Senator Lenney** requested a roll call vote on the substitute motion to send **H 935** to the floor with a **do pass** recommendation. Senators **Lenney, Shippy, Wintrow,** and **Acting Senator Bjerke (Bjerke)** voted aye. **Senators Harris, Blaylock,** and **Chair VanOrden** voted nay. The motion carried.

H 913 **MEDICAID - Amends existing law to revise provisions regarding Medicaid eligibility expansion.** **Representative John Vander Woude** explained this legislation required the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW) to implement Medicaid work and community engagement requirements no later than December 31, 2026, as outlined in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act (OBBBA) passed by the U.S. Congress in 2025. This legislation directed IDHW to verify participant work requirement compliance for the three months preceding enrollment or at eligibility redetermination.

DISCUSSION: **Senator Wintrow** asked whether the federal government had issued guidance for IDHW under OBBBA, and if not, why the State was moving ahead of federal directives—particularly given potential differences in requirements—and whether there was urgency to implement requirements. **Representative Vander Woude** explained that acting ahead of the federal government allowed Idaho to shape implementation, as Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) had not yet issued complete guidance. Discussions with IDHW leadership and upcoming talks with CMS aimed to influence how the program would be implemented. **Senator Wintrow** asked why a three month look-back period instead of the one month other states implemented. She questioned whether the three months would add administrative complications. **Representative Vander Woude** explained three months would ensure people in the program were continually meeting eligibility requirements. **Senator Wintrow** was concerned that acting before federal guidance could lead to wasted resources if federal requirements differed from Idaho's implementation. She emphasized her concern that a three month timeline, instead of one month, would create potential administrative inefficiency and unnecessary expenditures. **Representative Vander Woude** stated starting early allowed participants to determine eligibility and correct deficiencies before losing coverage, providing a better opportunity to maintain participation compared to waiting until later in the year.

Senator Blaylock asked whether current Medicaid recipients would be notified about the upcoming work requirement and the three month look-back period, and how the process would be implemented. **Representative Vander Woude** explained all Medicaid recipients would receive advanced notice of the work requirement and the three month look-back period, with ongoing correspondence throughout the process, similar to post-pandemic re-determinations. **Senator Blaylock** asked how this look-back would impact IDHW and if three months would cost more in comparison to only one month. **Representative Vander Woude** said IDHW had budgeted resources to implement the work requirement in the next fiscal year and planned to manage notifications and processing the review in phases, similar to other look-back approaches.

TESTIMONY: **Mark Hand**, Social Worker, **Brian Whitlock**, Idaho Hospital Association, and **Niklas Kleinworth**, Paragon Health Institute, Director of the State Health Reform Initiative, testified in support of **H 913**. **Mr. Hand** stated it was a fiscally responsible bill that would encourage individuals to be less dependent on the government and create a productive community. **Mr. Whitlock** stated getting the process started early was responsible. He asked the sponsor and Committee to consider changing the three month look-back period to one month.

Hillarie Matlock, Idaho Voices for Children, testified in opposition to **H 913**. She explained there were concerns that the three month look-back would increase administrative costs and strain Idaho's Medicaid system, which already faced long call wait times and resource-intensive application and renewal processes. She stated implementing extensive CMS guidance and community engagement requirements by July might be challenging, and recommended a look-back period of one month.

DISCUSSION: **Senator Wintrow** asked what the financial and health implications would be to implement a three month compared to a one month look-back period for work reporting. **Mr. Whitlock** explained the three month look-back would burden IDHW with eligibility determinations and increase constituent inquiries to legislators. Additionally, providers could face higher uncompensated care starting January 1, 2027.

Senator Wintrow asked Ms. Matlock to explain the eligibility process. **Ms. Matlock** explained the process was already quite extensive and administratively burdensome.

In closing, **Representative Vander Woude** addressed the debate that a one or three month look-back would be more appropriate by emphasizing the three month review promoted sustained employment. A three month period encouraged ongoing work rather than temporary employment, and verifying three months of documentation was not significantly more burdensome than one month. He stated the approach this legislation proposed also aligned with outreach requirements to notify Medicaid recipients in advance.

Senator Blaylock asked whether work requirements must be reported continuously each month like unemployment, or if the look-back only applied at initial enrollment. **Representative Vander Woude** explained OBBBA required a six month re-evaluation, during which IDHW must verify that individuals continued to meet the eligibility conditions, allowing for a staggered review rather than all at once.

MOTION: **Senator Shippy** moved to send **H 913** to the floor with a **do pass** recommendation. **Senator Keyser** seconded the motion.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: **Senator Wintrow** moved to send **H 913** to the 14th Order of Business for possible amendment. The motion failed for lack of a second.

DISCUSSION: **Senator Wintrow** commented that she was concerned a three month look-back period for work requirements could unintentionally disenroll eligible individuals, increasing administrative costs, errors, and barriers to coverage. A one month requirement was considered sufficient to maintain coverage and aligned more closely with practices in other states. She emphasized that the three month requirement may cause administrative errors leading to Medicaid disenrollment, increased reliance on emergency care, higher costs for hospitals and insurers, and poorer health outcomes, which was contrary to voter intent for Medicaid expansion.

VOICE VOTE: The motion to send **H 913** to the floor with a **do pass** recommendation carried by **voice vote**. **Senator Wintrow** requested to be recorded as voting nay.

ADJOURNED: There being no further business at this time, **Chair VanOrden** adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

Senator VanOrden
Chair

Madyson Crea
Secretary