

Re: HB 2493

Dear Committee Members:

My name is Kelli Brewer, and I am a certified Eden Energy Method practitioner and teacher, a formerly certified HypnoBirthing instructor, and a certified hypnotist. I provide this brief background because I am not against licensing or regulation of alternative health modalities. Rather, I have serious concerns with the way this bill is written. Consumer protection is of paramount importance to me.

The Eden Energy Method already provides a two-year basic certification program with two additional years of optional advanced training. Students must successfully pass a rigorous practical exam, written exam, and ethics exam to obtain certification. As in medicine, nursing, massage, acupuncture, etc, continuing education is required every two years as is professional liability insurance. It is important for you to realize that several energy healing modalities share this rigorous type of training, such as Healing Touch, the Brennan School, etc. I am urging you to vote against this bill for the following reasons:

1) Why is there suddenly an "emergency?" Where are the facts and statistics to back this up? As the bill mentions, Oregonians have enjoyed these alternative therapies for many decades, but suddenly there is an emergency that is unspecified. This makes no sense.

2) Per Section 3, page 3, number 3: "An individual who provides alternative well-being care is not required to apply for listing, or be listed, on the alternative practitioner registry." This is problematic as written. If an individual who provides alternative well being care is NOT required to apply for listing, what exactly is the purpose of this bill? How is consumer protection assured?

3) With a broad spectrum of alternative well-being care modalities, how will specific oversight be administered when there is such a plethora of programs, trainings, continuing education requirements, liability insurance requirements, etc.? (or not, as is the case for some modalities)

This is applying a "one size fits all" solution in an erroneous fashion and, in my opinion, is not feasible or even reasonable.

4) While there will be a Director of the Health Licensing Office will there be a Board of Directors made up of alternative well being care practitioners involved? I believe the interface a board can provide between the Oregon Health Authority and the Director of the Health Licensing Office is of the utmost importance. Healthcare professions such as medicine, nursing, massage, etc. have a board. This bill fails to address this.

5) The wording in this bill is deceptive. It begins by using the term "registered alternative practitioner", but then it will be directed by the Health Licensing Office. Is this a registry, or a licensing agency? This must be clarified.

6) There is no ethics requirement in this bill. Ethics training is required in the licensed healthcare professions. It is one form of consumer protection.

7) Finally, how is consumer protection ensured? While there is a lengthy list of possible infractions, how does a consumer REALLY make an informed choice? In conventional healthcare, for example, in order to be initially licensed, and then board certified in a specific specialty, there are certain professional standards that must be met. An example of this would be that a consumer who wishes to have a procedure such as a knee replacement done should be able to obtain at least a baseline, equal standard of care by an orthopedic surgeon regardless of the county or state in which they reside. Consumers need to be able to make a similar informed choice of alternative practitioner, and while a "disclosure" is listed, this does not go far enough to allow for consumer protection.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kelli S Brewer  
Portland, OR