

Senate Executive Departments and Administration Committee

Ben Mickens 271-1403

SB 567-FN, relative to the composition of the board of dental examiners and relative to temporary licenses for out-of-state professionals.

Hearing Date: January 21, 2026

Time Opened: 1:22 p.m.

Time Closed: 1:37 p.m.

Members of the Committee Present: Senators Gannon, Altschiller, Reardon and Pearl

Members of the Committee Absent : Senator McGough

Bill Analysis: This bill:

I. Mandates that one member of the board of dental examiners be a general dentist.

II. Extends the rulemaking authority of the office of professional licensure and certification as it relates to the issuance of temporary licenses for out-of-state professionals from health care professionals to any profession regulated by a board or the office.

Sponsors:

Sen. Rochefort
Sen. Pearl

Sen. Innis

Sen. Gannon

Who supports the bill: Senator David Rochefort, Senator Dan Innis, Dr. Andrew Albee (NH Dental Society),

Who opposes the bill:

Who is neutral on the bill: Steven Rancourt (ECBA), Nik Frye (OPLC).

Summary of testimony presented in support:

Senator David Rochefort

- Two parts to this bill. One, every member of the dental examiner's board is a specialist. This bill would require one member to be a generalist. Some issues arise when the problem brought to the board is a general dentistry issue.

- Second part is a request from OPLC. It would address some temporary out-of-state license issues.
- The effective date was selected to line up with the next vacancy on the board.

Dr. Andrew Albee

- I am representing the New Hampshire Dental Society in support of SB 567-FN.
- General dentists respect and admire specialists; however general dentists have a unique relationship with the industry and their communities. I believe, if asked, the specialists would agree that including a generalist would be good.
- My father, Dr. Chuck Albee, was the former chair of this board. He agrees with this change.

Senator Pearl asked if Sep. 1st, sounded correct for the effective date.

Dr. Albee agreed it sounded correct.

Summary of testimony presented in opposition: None.

Neutral Information Presented:

Steven Rancourt, ECBA

- We have some concerns about Part II that may need to be addressed.
- Specifically, regarding where the rulemaking authority actually lies and whether we are covered by the language.
- There may need to be broader changes to address all the questions we have about authority here.
- We want to stay out of temporary licensure, but perhaps language should be added saying the applicants need to meet requirements of the endorsement. The bill would still need some clean up.

Nicholas Frye, OPLC

- We actually agree that the current law is a mess. We need something more universal and should not require an attorney at every step. We are trying to bring everything under RSA 310:6.
- The rule itself deals with healthcare boards.
- When one applies for temporary licensure, they also apply for full licensure.
- The goal is to make 310:6 universal and apply to all boards.

Senator Pearl asked if we need to look at repealing other parts of statute to make clear where the authority lies.

Mr. Frye said it was possible but there may be ramifications to a full repeal which aren't immediately obvious. It would require some research to ensure there are not affects outside of licensing.

Senator Pearl asked if there was a path for veterans looking to obtain licensure and how this bill might impact that.

Mr. Frye said it should not impact the veterans, and they would still have two paths to take.

BM

Date Hearing Report completed: January 26, 2026