

Testimony concerning SB 560  
Senate Committee on Federal and State Affairs  
Presented by Alexandra Blasi, Executive Secretary  
On behalf of  
The Kansas State Board of Pharmacy  
March 16, 2022

Chairman Olson and Members of the Committee:

The Kansas State Board of Pharmacy respectfully submits this neutral testimony on SB 560. The Board licenses individuals and facilities in relation to the practice of pharmacy, with the mission of protecting the public health, safety, and welfare. The Board was able to identify 35 states (and D.C.) that allow the use of marijuana for medical purposes and wishes to provide testimony concerning two aspects of the bill.

Kansas Prescription Monitoring Program (K-TRACS)

The Board strongly supports inclusion of medical marijuana dispensations in K-TRACS, as well as the physician requirement to review patient K-TRACS reports to inform prescribing. The Board appreciates the inclusion of revenue transfers to cover costs associated with this addition to the K-TRACS program and has already worked with the K-TRACS vendor to receive an estimate of associated costs, as well as assurance that necessary program enhancements can be made to accommodate the statutory requirements. The Board is required to staff this program and any increase in duties or responsibility may require additional Board staff and agency resources to implement the new program and provide ongoing support.

Pharmacist Involvement

The Board appreciates the time and consideration that has been invested in crafting SB 560 and believes pharmacist involvement in retail dispensaries is imperative to patient safety. Arkansas and Louisiana require retail dispensaries to consult with a licensed pharmacist who is available during operating hours to assist with operations, develop policies, and provide patient counseling. Other states require a licensed pharmacist dispense the medical marijuana to the patient. Many states now require some form of pharmacist involvement at the retail dispensary.

The Board stands ready and willing to provide necessary registration for pharmacist consultants and adopt necessary regulations. However, the Board finds that SB 560 does not include any authority for the Board to charge a registration fee. While the Board has current processes and staff to support these functions, each added element of licensing and registration takes additional staff time and the Board would not be able to absorb these duties within existing staff resources. The Board anticipates total associated staff time could accumulate to 0.5 FTE per year to accommodate these responsibilities. Without a registration fee, no revenue is contemplated under the bill to offset these costs unless the Board can adopt a fee by regulation.

Respectfully submitted.