

Dear Representative Salinas,

I am writing concerning proposed House Bill 2493.

I am an Oregonian, long standing community member, and a Certified Reiki Practitioner.

**The problems with HB2493 as I see it:**

- It has the potential to set back certain practitioners who've developed & maintained honest business practices and services, by imposing unwanted systems, obstacles and regulations that are not wholly conducive to improving an otherwise currently supported community.
- The idea of a registry and professional accountability for a broader group of personal advisors than covered by existing law makes intuitive sense, but the scope of coverage for this proposal in sections 1a and 1b is too broad, leaving the distinction between religious lay counseling and professional spiritual advice covered by this law blurry, which is concerning to me as a practitioner.
- While it is a great idea for all practitioners who might be mistaken for licensed psychologists or psychotherapists, to tell that to their clients, this bill covers only a few of the indicated groups and does not require the rest of the provisions of this bill.
- The distinction between covered advice and social counseling is clear on paper but due to its broad nature will be exceedingly difficult to distinguish in practice and case law.
- The proposed restriction on controlled substances is clumsy in that it impinges on traditional religious practices of some Native American groups (e.g., peyote ritual) which are explicitly provided for under other law.
- Additionally, while this proposed law is designed to catch bad players, if this is intended to remain voluntary most of the folks who will violate its precepts and potentially harm the public will not register. So if its voluntary nature is intended as a transitional step to mandatory registration and obligations under this law, it is applied to too broad a group of practitioners, and the scope is poorly defined.

**In Summary:**

1. The range of this HB 2493 is too broad, vague, and likely ineffective while creating new procedures and administrative burdens.
2. The regulations propose establishing standards of practice for registered alternative practitioners, which discredit existing standards of practice held in place by the respectful communities at large. This creates unnecessary complexity, and does not wholly protect the public addressed.
3. The bill is problematic when including spirituality and religion as part of who the term Alternative Practitioners is defined in a way that may encompass non-licensed spiritual advisors associated with churches and other houses of worship. Spirituality or spiritual practice, is different then religion in that it refers to a persons inner experience, skills, and resources. Thus these two should be carefully addressed in this bill.

Thank you for listening.

In respect,

Gaelan Andrade Booker

7535 N Fenwick ave.

Portland, OR 97217

[gaelan.zab@gmail.com](mailto:gaelan.zab@gmail.com)

503-544-6619