

Representative Prusak and members of the Committee,

My name is Olivia Nelson and I have been an Esthetician in Oregon for 17 years. I am writing this letter in support of HB2970 and HB2971. There seems to be a lot of misunderstanding and misinformation coming from some Certified Advanced Estheticians (CAE) and others who are affiliated with them, and I would like to set the record straight, based on facts and laws.

The intention of Oregon Estheticians for Fair Licensing (OEFL) is not to alter the scope of CAE nor to remove the FDA registration requirement for devices and equipment. According to Administrative Rule 817.010.007 our industry must observe all local and federal regulations, which is based on ORS 690.165, ORS 690.205, ORS 690.055 & ORS 676.615. This Rule applies to all of us in the cosmetology field, including CAE. By law, becoming an Esthetician is a prerequisite to any CAE program and licensure, therefore CAE must observe the Rules directed toward Estheticians under the Board of Cosmetology, as they are applicable to CAE. CAE also have their own Rules and Statutes that must be followed relating to local and federal regulations, so no matter what, all of us in our industry must adhere to FDA regulation requirements.

Our intention with HB2970 is to create a fair and clear distinction between Estheticians and CAE, and allow Estheticians to continue using devices that we have used safely for decades in our industry. This doesn't take away from the CAE scope, it only restores the scope of Estheticians. It doesn't have to be one or the other, it is possible to safely have devices that fall into both scopes. Barbers and Stylists are separate scopes, yet they share many tools and skills between the two. Stylists and Natural Hair Care are separate scopes, yet they both can apply hair extensions, the service and products fall into both scopes. HB2970 allows Estheticians to continue using FDA registered devices that work within the epidermis, which is the layer of skin we are trained and licensed to safely work within. Estheticians are not interested in working with lasers or advanced devices that work beyond the epidermis, which is why we are keeping the CAE scope as it is, as CAE are trained to work beyond the epidermis.

Passing HB2971 is equally as crucial. As I stated previously, obtaining an Esthetician license is a prerequisite to a CAE program and license. Once you become a CAE, you are then governed by both the Board of Cosmetology and the Board of CAE, are required to pay fees to both the Board of Cosmetology and the Board of CAE, and must adhere to the Administrative Rules and Statutes for both the Board of Cosmetology and the Board of CAE. There is a separation of the two Boards that is unnecessary and unhelpful. Having two Boards is the reason this problem with devices happened in the first place. If the two Boards were merged there would no longer be this lack of communication. HB2971 requires a CAE and a medical professional to be on the Board of Cosmetology once the Board of CAE is abolished and essentially the two Boards merge. Having the requirement of a medical professional on the Board of Cosmetology will uphold the intention of providing a medical perspective for CAE. Requiring the addition of a CAE on the Board of Cosmetology will create unity, equity, and a voice for all fields of practice.

I strongly support HB2970 and HB2971 and ask that you pass these Bills to restore our scope of practice and create a united voice for thousands of Estheticians in Oregon.

Thank you,

Olivia Nelson