

Mary Nielsen
7894 SW Hansen Lane
Tigard OR 97224

March 16, 2021

Oregon House Healthcare Committee

Dear Congressperson,

In 2015 Margaret Doherty was one of the sponsors of House Bill 2642, establishing the Board of Advanced Estheticians, creating a second tier of licensure for estheticians who wished to further their careers by receiving education and training to use lasers and other high powered energy devices for aesthetic purposes.

The purpose of this board was to keep the aesthetic consumer safe by creating standards for education and training. Multiple burns and severe injuries had occurred due to inadequate and shoddy training. The Forever Young medspas and the media attention it drew brought the awareness that Oregon Health Licensing regulations had not kept up with technology. Margaret Doherty, Val Hoyle and John Huffman cosponsored this bipartisan effort to elevate the field of esthetics by creating a new job market and protect the consumer. The advanced standards created required the use of FDA registered high energy devices, such as lasers. Oregon's OSHA regulations require adherence to ANSI Z136.1 standards. Eliminating that requirement would be a conflict of an OSHA requirement for the practice of advanced esthetics.

In 2018 the Board of Cosmetology appointed a Rules Advisory Committee which met five times and made the recommendation to the Board of Cosmetology that it adopt similar language, requiring the use of FDA registered devices in the practice of standard esthetics. Unfortunately, this language limited the practice of standard esthetics, because most standard esthetics devices are NOT FDA registered. They have been used safely for years and are often available without a license to the consumer. FDA registered devices for Advanced esthetics adds a layer of consumer safety in addition to meeting Oregon Radiation Protection Services requirements, ANSI and OSHA standards.

I fully support a standard esthetician's ability to use microdermabrasion, galvanic current, microcurrent, and light-emitting-diode devices while performing skincare services.

I want this committee to ensure that the language within this bill cannot be challenged for its precedence: The Board of Certified Advanced Estheticians is determining the scope of practice with device use for authorization holders that are governed under the Board of Cosmetology. Can one board determine the scope practice for another board?

Estheticians have struggled with anxiety and fear about their scope of practice due to their own Board adopting language that limited their scope of practice. New regulations must ensure ALL skincare professionals have the ability to safely perform the services they have been trained for.

In full disclosure, I serve on the Board of Certified Advanced Estheticians. I own an esthetics school in Tigard, Oregon. I am speaking as a citizen of Oregon and both a licensed esthetician and licensed advanced esthetician.

Sincerely,

Mary Nielsen