

SESSION OF 2009

**SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE ON
SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 2075**

As Recommended by House Committee on
Insurance

Brief*

Sub. for HB 2075 would require the Kansas Health Policy Authority (KHPA), in collaboration with the Insurance Commissioner, to conduct a study on the impact of providing coverage for colorectal cancer screening in the State Employee Health Care Benefits Program, the affordability of such coverage in the small business employer group, and the high risk pool. The KHPA would be required to submit a report on its findings to the Senate Committee on Financial Institutions and Insurance and the House Committee on Insurance on or before February 1, 2010. All departments, boards, agencies, officers and institutions of the state will be required to cooperate with KHPA in carrying out the duties outlined in the bill.

Background

The House Committee on Insurance recommended the introduction of a substitute bill. The original bill would have enacted new law to require individual and group health insurance policies, issued or renewed on and after January 1, 2010, include coverage for all colorectal cancer examinations and laboratory tests specified in current American Cancer Society (ACS) guidelines.

The original bill was introduced by Representatives K. Wolf, Benlon, Bowers, Brookens, Burgess, Burroughs, Carlin, Colloton, Craft, Crow, Feuerborn, Frownfelter, Furtado, Garcia,

*Supplemental notes are prepared by the Legislative Research Department and do not express legislative intent. The supplemental note and fiscal note for this bill may be accessed on the Internet at <http://www.kslegislature.org>

D. Gatewood, S. Gatewood, George, Goyle, Grange, Grant, Hawk, Hill, Hineman, Horst, Huntington, Kleeb, Lane, Loganbill, Lukert, Maloney, McCray-Miller, Menghini, Moxley, Neighbor, Otto, Palmer, Pauls, Phelps, Pottorff, Prescott, Proehl, Quigley, Rardin, Ruiz, Sawyer, Sloan, Spalding, Svaty, Swanson, Swenson, Tietze, Trimmer, Vickrey, Wetta, Williams, Winn, B. Wolf, and Worley. Proponents of the bill, as introduced, included Representatives K. Wolf and Benlon and representatives of the American Cancer Society, and the Kansas Department of Health and Environment. Representative Pottorff submitted written testimony in support of the bill at the House Committee hearing. Proponents of the bill generally indicated that having comprehensive coverage for colorectal cancer could be part of the effort to increase screening rates and saves lives at a minimal cost to insurance companies and the State. A representative of the Kansas Health Policy Authority provided information about the State Employee Health Plan coverage for colorectal cancer screenings.

Opponents of the bill included the Kansas Association of Health Plans (KAHP) and the Kansas Chamber (written testimony). The KAHP representative indicated that KAHP believes all health insurance plans operating in the state are offering coverage for colon screenings and the real issue with the screenings is that some individuals are not seeking this service.

The fiscal note prepared by the Division of the Budget on the introduced version of the bill indicates that the Kansas Insurance Department states that the passage of the bill would require the Department to review and approve all new and previously approved accident and health policy forms that would be submitted by all insurers in this market. The agency indicates, however, that the bill could be implemented within current budget and staffing resources. The Kansas Health Policy Authority (KHPA) states that the State Employee Health Plan (SEHP) currently covers colonoscopy screenings when provided by a network provide at no cost to the member. Other colorectal tests are covered, subject to the same plan benefits

as any other services. The KHPA indicates the bill could be implemented with its existing staff and resources and would have no fiscal effect to the SEHP. The fiscal note assigned to the Kansas Insurance Department would no longer apply under the substitute bill. A cost estimate specific to study costs was not available when the Committee took action on the bill.