American Dental Hygienists' Association

Michigan

Representative Gail Haines
N-892 House Office Building
Lansing, MI 48933

Dear Representative Haines and Members of the Committee,

I am writing you today to express some concerns the Michigan Dental Hygienists' Association (MDHA) have with some of the language in the Mobile Dentistry Bill 4865.

First, under definitions "operator" Page 3 line 11 (i) An individual with a valid, current license to practice dentistry/**dental hygiene** in this state.....Adding dental hygiene is more Inclusive and clearly states that we are licensed, and hold a permit. It also keeps the wording consistent since in (ii) it states dental hygienists.

Second, page 8 line 13 (6) a dentist licensed under this act shall be present in a mobile dental facility at any time comprehensive dental services are performed on a patient**, with the exception of imagery services.**

page 8 line 16 following dental services and add **/or**

page 8 line 18 following imagery services add **without the dentist present.**

Imagery services are considered comprehensive services by definition on page #2 so by adding this language it provides clarity.

The memorandum of agreement has many PA161 hygienists (hygienists who hold a permit to practice preventive services on the underserved without a dentist present, but have a collaborative agreement with a dentist) concerned due to the fact of the wording of the memorandum "legal and binding" may cause fear for the dentist that they have the collaborative agreement with now. We do not want to hinder or demolish the current PA161 programs from providing those preventive services that are much needed to the underserved population of our great state of Michigan.

Thank you for taking the time to consider these concerns.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Bentley, RDH
MDHA President