	II	1
1	STATE OF MICHIGAN	
2	DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS	
3	BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL LICENSING	
4		
5	PUBLIC HEARING	
6	TUESDAY, MAY 2, 2023	
7	AT ABOUT 9:00 A.M.	
8		
9	OTTAWA BUILDING	
10	611 W. OTTAWA STREET, UL-5	
11	LANSING, MICHIGAN	
12		
13	RE: Barber Examiners - General Rules	
14	(MOAHR #2022-29 LR)	
15	Cosmetology - General Rules (MOAHR #2022-19 LR)	
16		
17	HEARING FACILITATOR:	
18	DENA MARKS	
19	Bureau of Professional Licensing 611 W. Ottawa Street	
20	Lansing, Michigan 48909	
21	ALSO PRESENT: Kerry Przybylo Stephanie Wysack	
22		
23	REPORTED BY: Lori Anne Penn, CSR-1315	
24		
25		
23		

ĺ	II	2
1	<u>INDEX</u>	
2	Opening Statement - Dena Marks	4
3	<u>COMMENTS</u> :	PAGE
4	NATASHA LAWSON - Douglas J	6
5	DEMETRIA WILLIAMS - Michigan College of Beauty	8
6	CHRISTINA NEWMAN - Multi Media Makeup Academy	9
7	ASHLYN ALEXANDER	12
8	THERESE VOEVODSKY - BeauBien Holistic Care	13
9	JESSICA ABFALTER	14
10	PAUL CHIRCO - Alisa Marie Brows	16
11	DAVID DAGENAIS - Michigan College of Beauty	17
12	SUSAN KOLAR	21
13	NEKEYTA BRUNSON - Uncovered Beauty Studio	22
14	DeANNA HUIZINGA - Grand Pearl Spa	24
15	SYDNEY SHAW	26
16	MEAGAN McCOMBER - The Babe Company	28
17	ERIN DRESSER - Skin Deep Day Spa	30
18	DARYN PACKER - Face Foundrie	33
19	THERESE VOEVODSKY - BeauBien Holistic Care	37
20	JAMIE BURNS	38
21	SUSAN KOLAR	40
22	DARYN PACKER - Face Foundrie	41
23	NICOLE MAYNARD - Skin Deep Day Spa	42
24	JESSICA ABFALTER	47
25	CARLI HOLSTAD	48
	Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com	
ļ	II and the second of the secon	

ı	1	3
1	<u>I N D E X</u>	
2	Opening Statement - Dena Marks	48
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12 13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com	

Lansing, Michigan
Tuesday, May 2, 2023
At about 9:00 a.m.

_ _ _

MR. MacINTOSH: Good morning. My name is Dena Marks, and I am a Departmental Specialist in the Boards and Committee Section within the Bureau of Professional Licensing in the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs, and I will be conducting the hearing today.

This is a public hearing on proposed administrative rules entitled "Barbers - General Rules" and "Cosmetology - General Rules". We are conducting this hearing under the authority of the Administrative Procedures Act, Public Act 306 of 1969, on behalf of the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Professional Licensing.

We are calling this hearing to order at 9:00 a.m. on May the 2nd, 2023, at the Ottawa Building, UL-5, 611 West Ottawa Street in Lansing, Michigan. Publication of the notice of public hearing was in the Flint Journal and the Grand Rapids Press on April 9, 2023, and the Mining Journal on April 14, 2023. These papers are newspapers of general circulation. The notices were also published in the Michigan Register,

Issue #7-2023, on May 1, 2023.

We are here today to receive comments on the proposed rules. If you wish to speak, please make sure you have signed in and indicated you wish to speak. You may use the cards provided for this purpose. If you would like to speak and have not yet signed in, please do so now. For those of you who do not wish to sign in with a card, you may speak once we have exhausted all of the cards that have been submitted.

they relate directly to the proposed rules. If you have questions about the rules, please include your questions as part of your testimony for the Department's review.

If you have suggested changes to the proposed rules, please include the specific reasons why the changes would be in the public interest. Please note, if you have already submitted comments to the Department in writing or by email, those comments will be considered in the same manner as the comments made during the public hearing today.

For those making comments today, please clearly state and spell your name for the record; and if you are speaking on behalf of an organization, please identify that organization as well. So everyone has the opportunity to speak, please limit your comments to three

to five minutes. If you have additional comments, they 1 may be submitted in writing by emailing 2 3 BPL-BoardSupport@Michigan.gov. 4 The Department staff -- I'm sorry, I've 5 lost my spot. If you have written comments, you may 6 7 submit them directly to me. The Department will also accept written comments postmarked or emailed until 5:00 8 9 p.m. today. 10 The Department staff from the Bureau of 11 Professional Licensing attending today's hearing are 12 LeAnn Payne, Kerry Przybylo, Stephanie Wysack, and me. At this time, we will begin with comments 13 14 concerning the "Barber - General Rules." Are there any 15 comments concerning that rule set? (No response.) 16 Seeing none. Then we will now take comments on the "Cosmetology - General Rules". And the 17 18 first card I have, is for Natasha Lawson. 19 NATASHA LAWSON: That is me. So after 20 reviewing the --21 MS. MARKS: Would you please introduce 22 yourself and spell your name. Thank you. 23 NATASHA LAWSON: Natasha Lawson, and the 24 spelling is N-a-t-a-s-h-a L-a-w-s-o-n. I have two main 25 concerns with the proposed laws and rules. The first

concern, I do see that unassigned hours have been added in, however, it is two percent or less than two percent of these students' programs. There are many things in my 14 years of educating that I have found that don't neatly fit into any of these curriculum guidelines that are also integral to student success. For instance, shadowing at a salon, being able to have an experience where they're learning about color maybe from a mindset that's not hair related. So these things to me are really important. I propose that instead of it being two percent of their curriculum for all programs, that it is five percent of their curriculum for unassigned hours; that would mean that cosmetology would get 75 hours and all the 400 program, 400-hour programs like esthiology, electrology, and manicurists would get 20 hours instead of 10.

My second concern is the change in verbiage around scope of practice for cosmetology and esthiology. I was looking through the Regulatory Impact Statement, and there is a statement in here that I would just like to point out. I disagree with -- so there's a piece that says: Do these rules exceed standards in other states around the Great Lakes region? I would say that these do not correlate with other states around us. For instance, Wisconsin specifically says that you can utilize microdermabrasion and chemical peel machines as

long as you're only exfoliating the upper surface of the skin, where the Michigan state law clearly states that you cannot use any sort of microderm or product, so that's concerning to me. Illinois, they also allow cosmetology and estheticians to utilize chemical peels and microdermabrasion within a specific scope of practice, and they do not have to be under medical license or under a doctor. And Ohio as well also allows any chemical, mechanical, or electrical service to exfoliate cells as long as they're within those first few layers of the skin. So I'm proposing that Michigan take some time to really look at those other laws and rules of the states around the area and really clearly define what is within the scope of practice and without the scope of practice for an esthetician. So that's it.

MS. MARKS: Thank you for your comments. For the next person, we have Demetria Williams.

DEMETRIA WILLIAMS: Demetria Williams,
D-e-m-e-t-r-i-a, Williams, W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s, and I am here
on behalf of Michigan College of Beauty. I really just
want more clarification on the things that it does say
where it says cosmetologists or estheticians, because a
lot of things, even as far as the tinting of the eyebrows
and rearranging of the hair, it does not say a
esthetician, it still doesn't that say an esthetician can

17 18 19

16

21 22

20

23

24

25

do it. It just basically says, the way I read it, it only falls under cosmetologists, so I would like that to be clear on the (inaudible) because as far as the law goes, only a cosmetologist can change or rearrange anything that has to do with hair.

Another one of my things that I was going to ask about was the spelling out of anything that has had to do, that a esthetician versus a cosmetologist, and then in some of the rules making amendments, so they were talking about field trips and how that needs to be spelled out, like what can we do as a field trip, what those guidelines would go, how many hours would be allowed for a field trip outside of school and what it would entail; like are they allowed to go to another state, does the instructor have to be there, what entails a field trip?

And then another question that we had was about the cosmetologists being able to use a razor to like shave hair on the face. So can they use a straight razor, because I know a razor is big thing as far as a blade goes in this portion? That's it.

MS. MARKS: Thank you so much. And the next person is Christina Newman.

(Multiple speakers, inaudible comments.)

CHRISTINA NEWMAN: Hi, I'm Christina Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Newman, C-h-r-i-s-t-i-n-a N-e-w-m-a-n, on behalf of Multi Media Makeup Academy. So my comment is regarding verbiage, and I was part of the work group meetings that took place at the end of last year, and I think we made a lot of headway, but there's still some things that I feel are unclear regarding some of the proposed changes.

Under (j) Performing services that are limited to the scope of practice of a licensed healthcare profession regulated under 15 of the Public Code, just including, but not limited to microdermabrasion, dermaplaning, hydrodermabrasion, Botox injections, it looks like we're trying to eliminate unless he or she is performing a service that is delegated under the Section 162 -- 16015 of the Public Health Code. So I've been fielding a lot of comments and questions from estheticians in the State of Michigan on social media since Friday, believe it or not. There's a lot of concern that eliminating that sentence makes it so that estheticians who are under the guidance of a licensed healthcare professional cannot perform some of these services. Yes, they should never perform Botox, but by lumping that in with something like dermaplaning, which is technically removal of the hair with a razor, people are going to be able to lose their livelihood, a large portion of us. So I think that needs further clarity.

And then I had a couple laser hair removal techs reach out to me because they see just user possess a laser or an ultrasound for any purpose, and that needs clarity. If you are working within a facility, again, under a licensed healthcare professional and you've been properly trained and you're under the guidance of them, I don't understand why that would be worded like that, so more clarity on that.

And then I'm also proposing under (r) Use any color, tint, or chemical preparation on the eyelashes or eyebrows of a patron that is intended to last longer than six weeks after application, or use any color, tint, or chemical preparation on the eyelashes that -- or eyebrows of a patron that is not specifically intended for that use, I think there's some extra ambiguity there by having the or statement in the front of that. You could potentially have anybody use any sort of demi-permanent hair color on lashes because it lasts less than six weeks and it's not necessarily meant for the brows and lashes, that needs to be eliminated and it just needs to state plainly, use any product that is not intended for brows and lashes according to the manufacturer's label. And that was it.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Ashlyn Alexander.

ASHLYN ALEXANDER: Hi. My name is Ashlyn

Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

22

23

24

25

Alexander, A-s-h-l-y-n A-l-e-x-a-n-d-e-r. I am a State of Michigan esthetician, licensed esthetician. And my two biggest concerns would be, first off, I feel like this is an attack on women in our livelihood. It's sad to be a Michigan woman today. As lots of estheticians, most of it, as a woman-dominated industry, we are able to provide for ourselves without the help of anyone else by providing these services and helping out our public. Taking away of lot of these services that we provide livelihood for ourselves would put us in a far better or worse situation as far as the economy goes and finances and taking care of ourselves. We're already dealing with a tough situation with the economy right now, and then this is going to further push us below. This is not helping lift women up today, and that's disheartening to have to say right now.

So to the State of Michigan, I would really want to add two questions. Are you able to provide and prepare for that lost income that tens of thousands of women are probably going to face when these services would be taken away from if that does carry through? So I have a question. How would that impact our economy?

And then our biggest thing, too, is that we deal with -- the skin is a largest organ, which is a Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

regulatory system; taking away these services that we help people with with this organ, which is our first defense to the world, diseases, illnesses, you're taking away providers that can help with causes of the public health. So that would be my comment. Thank you.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Therese, I apologize ahead of time, Vouvodsky.

THERESE VOEVODSKY: Hi, I'm Therese

Voevodsky, T-h-e-r-e-s-e V-o-e-v-o-d-s-k-y. I represent

BeauBien Holistic Care in Grand Rapids, Michigan, I'm the

owner and managing partner. I feel like I was remiss in

not learning about this until a couple days ago, but

quite honestly, it totally freaked me out when I read it.

I spent all day yesterday on it, and I read all of the

regulations, I read the Regulatory Impact Statement, I

really tried to understand this. But it looks to me as

if you are taking away an entire class of services from

tens of thousands of women in this State, and thousands

of women-owned businesses are going to go under because

of this.

And I'm getting a little upset because, like I said, I just learned about this yesterday. And the way that this is written, this even includes -- so anything that takes away any layer of skin, that takes away exfoliation, peels, it takes away everything.

There's no way -- we might as well close up shop, because if my estheticians can't even do an exfoliation or a peel, we're done.

I have four estheticians, two doctors, and a nurse that work for me. The doctors and the nurses are not going to want to provide these services, and they're not trained in it. So not only will we be taking away the livelihood of thousands of women, we'll be putting it on doctors and nurses that are already overloaded, and essentially no one is going to be able to provide these services anymore. They don't know how to do this. We'll have more injuries, if there are any, and that was my first point in my email that I sent. Show me the studies that people are getting injured, that Michiganders are getting hurt by training licensed professionals providing these services. I just, I don't understand it. So you have my written comments.

MS. MARKS: Thank you for your comments.

Jessica Abfalter.

JESSICA ABFALTER: Hello. My name is

Jessica Abfalter, spelled J-e-s-s-i-c-a

A-b-l-f-a-l-t-e-r. First, I'd like to echo all the

statements that have come before mine. Everything these

women have said, I completely agree with.

There are many issues that I have with Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

these proposed changes, including, but not limited to, there's contradiction regarding the use of sanitation of makeup brushes, vague language, like the word beautifying, elimination of the word chemical from the esthiology curriculum, lack of clarity with regards to the use of exfoliant products, and lash and brow dye, and unnecessary regulation of blades, clippers, and scissors that potentially disallow estheticians, barbers, and cosmetologists from simple acts like trimming eyebrows or cleaning up a neckline. And while those are many issues, what I find the most concerning is the transfer of some advanced esthetic treatments to the realm of the physician, specifically microdermabrasion, hydrodermabrasion, and similar treatments like chemical peels.

Don't misunderstand; I love doctors, they're the reason I'm able to be here today, but that doesn't change the fact that I can personally attest to the fact that adding an M.D. to a spa does not make it safer. On the contrary, what I and other colleagues in the medical esthetics field have observed is that many so-called med spas don't have their doctor on site, and even more are operated by physicians who do not specialize in anything related to skincare. Even worse, some of these doctors do not hire estheticians to do this

work. While it may seem logical that requiring medical supervision over advanced treatments would improve their safety, this rule change does nothing to protect the public. Given the chance to choose between a licensed esthetician and a medical assistant who was trained on the job, I'm going to choose the esthe every single time.

The policy also takes income from a highly specialized group of professionals and puts it in the hands of physicians who already have high earning potential, and possess a greater degree of risk to the public because of the reasons I have already mentioned.

Not only that, this rule change takes the power of regulation away from the Board of Cosmetology and puts it in the hands of doctors and the Public Health Code. We have seen an influx of medical spas and doctors' offices offering anti-aging therapies over the past 10 to 15 years, and skin rejuvenation technology will only continue to grow, so there is no doubt that regulatory policy will have to change to keep up.

Personally, I would like to see the governing body of our industry do more to protect our interests than those of -- and not those of physicians who already have their own representation. Thank you.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Paul Chirco.

PAUL CHIRCO: Hi. Paul Chirco, P-a-u-l
Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

C-h-i-r-c-o. I'm here on behalf of Alisa Maria Brows.

My objection is to paragraph (r), which has a six-week

limit on a tint, color, or chemical prep on eyebrows and

eyelashes. The six weeks, in my opinion and many

opinion, is that this is arbitrary, pulled out of a hat,

it's not based on any kind of science. By setting this

arbitrary number, you're subject to constitutional

standards. A reg can't be arbitrary or capricious.

Numerous products specific to the eyebrows last 6 to 8

weeks, can last up to 12 weeks. These products are safe

and effective. No health professional will perform these

services because, as was pointed out before, estheticians

have been doing this service for many years. You're

potentially taking away the livelihood of hundreds of

women on a number pulled off of a hat.

My question is, what is your objection of -- objections -- on what are your objective on this:

Is it permanency? Is it invasiveness? Is it health and safety? None of these apply or are changed by the six-week limitation there. I would ask to change this limitation to 12 weeks since most of the products that are out there, if not all, last less than 12 weeks.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. David, I'm sorry, I'm not even going to try your last name.

DAVID DAGENAIS: Yes. David Dagenais,
Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

spelled D-a-g-e-n-a-i-s. I'm with the Michigan College of Beauty, I'm the owner of Michigan College of Beauty in Troy, Michigan, it was incorporated in 1973, I'm the second generation owner, my son, Drew, is currently being trained to be the third generation owner.

Michigan College of Beauty has branch campus licenses for approximately 30 years. We currently hold four branch campus licenses. In 2018, the cosmetology rules committee started revamping the rules that regulated the cosmetology industry. We attended these negotiations and were told the statute did not allow for the issuance of branch campus licenses. As a result, the 2018/19 rules committee agreed to create R 338.2127 with language to allow for more than one premises, and described the conditions under which the existing schools could have not a branch campus, but a more than one premises. This was all agreed upon.

In January 2022, during the school's biannual inspection, the State Board inspector asked me if I was planning on renewing my cosmetology branch campus licenses, and assured me that she thought it was not necessary given the language in the newly amended R 338.2127 allowing for more than one premises. In early 2022, an entirely new rules committee started once again revamping the rules pertaining the cosmetology industry.

Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

In the spring they decided to eliminate the concept of more than one premises because there was no objection to removing it and no one on the committee had the frame of reference as to why the previous committee had added the more than one premises language. The changes to rule R 338.2127 will not allow for a school after their branch campus license expires to have more than one premises.

During MCB's summer inspection of

August 2022, the inspection notified us that we would not
be able to use these branch campus facilities after the
branch campus licenses expired. The news was a complete
surprise to us as we understood that the concept of more
than one premises was established and accepted by LARA.

Upon the news, we began attending each and every new
rules meeting as we looked into the whole concept of more
than one premises being removed from the rules. The new
committee had not -- the new committee, who had not been
there during the 2018/19 negotiation, had decided with no
opposition to remove the entire more than one premises
language.

Why does the concept of more than one premises need to be reexamined? What would closing four out of the five locations that MCB currently operates do to jobs, current students, training in the cosmetology field, staffing resources for local salon owners who have Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

relied on us for decades, our local economy, and State tax revenue? During a time of economic uncertainty, the effect would be detrimental.

These locations, which are strictly used for extra classroom space, are not part of the student clinic floor, are within a quarter mile of our main campus, two of them we actually share a common parking lot. We often walk back and forth between the facilities daily. There is no language in the statute to indicate where a cosmetology training needs to be performed as long as it's supervised by a licensed instructor following the school's curriculum. The elimination of more than one premises would restrict the school's ability to quickly, inexpensively, and flexibly expand to meet the industry ever-changing needs. This would harm both salon owners that rely on schools for newly licensed staff and the access that future hair stylists have to training.

Being a small business, and our schools are, it is difficult to stay viable as is. Restricting the school's ability to quickly respond to changes and demands does not make sense and will inevitably be detrimental to the industry. MCB does not believe that Governor Whitmer's administration would put into regulation laws that would seek to stifle growth in the

cosmetology industry and to create job loss. This regulation implementation would do exactly that and give Michiganders one more reason to seek education, careers, and opportunities in other states.

In closing, we are requesting to maintain the option for more than one premise as presented in R 338.2127 Section 10. Thank you.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Susan Kolar.

SUSAN KOLAR: My name is Susan Kolar,
S-u-s-a-n K-o-l-a-r. I concur with everyone's comments
so far. I think the saddest thing is this started a long
time ago. The rules committee that would be open with
comments that you could give your ideas. Being a
licensed for special, and as a retired instructor, I
stayed abreast of everything because I'm just nosy and
it's my passion. As I've trained -- I've been teaching
for over 45 years. I was an examiner for the State of
Michigan. I've worked for three very good schools. And
I just -- it's our livelihood that we're overthinking the
statements in these rules that we're taking away the crux
of what they do. All right.

I guess I agree that maybe some of these need to be under guidance or, you know, directed by a medical licensee, I get some of that, I almost agree with that, but to the point where we can't do exfoliation,

we're limited to six weeks on a tint, we can't do lash lifts, which are intended for that use, I think we need to simplify some of the work verbiage and be specific on other verbiage, such as the field trips. It used to be there, and it was fine, everybody was clear, an instructor had to be there, you were limited to so many hours, and they took it away. I guess that's pretty much it in a nutshell. Thank you.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Nekeyta Brunson.

NEKEYTA BRUNSON: My name is Nekeyta

Brunson, N-e-k-e-y-t-a B-r-u-n-s-o-n. I'm a licensed

esthetician, I own Uncovered Beauty Studio, which is in

Lansing. Over the past six years, I became a licensed

esthetician because I help women who are going through

hair loss, and even when you lose your hair, we all have

skin. And so I've gone through school, I completed all

the requirements, I've paid all the monies to have an

establishment.

My comment would be on who's enforcing these things, because as someone who's gone through these last six years and trying to figure out what we can do and what we can't do, it was already very difficult to figure out. I want to do what's right to have the establishment, have it be done right for these women; it was already confusing on who to call, who to say what.

I'm calling LARA; they don't know. I'm asking them what it's in the scope; they don't know.

So as we are doing all these different changes with the wording and the verbiage, the other thing that us licensed professionals are having issues with is social media and those who aren't licensed are already doing these things from home or from their places, and so who's protecting us when we pay all the money to go to school, we're paying all this money for these equipments, these licenses, these insurances, and we've done all of that, and then social media, people from home can, or from different places can just come in and do it, they're not doing it right, nobody's regulating it, nobody's shutting them down. There are places that are not following the rules that you already have in place, and they're not getting shut down. So I feel like it's just causing more and more trouble.

I agree with the professionalism, I agree that these things should be more clear, because we do take our industry professionally and we are trying to help women in a very safe way, women and men, because 40 percent of my business is men, they'll just come if they want to. But either way, like the goals for the people who are following the rules is to follow the rules, and we want them to be clear, yes, we want them to

be safe, yes, we also want to be protected as a professional to say if there are people not following those rules, we expect for them to have the, the repercussions happen, and we're not, we're already not seeing that our industry is being protected in that way. So as you update the rules, also update like the workers who are going to be able to go behind and find out who is not following these rules that there are going to be so many people trying to now continue to implement into their business to figure out how to continue to provide for their families.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. DeAnna Huizinga.

DEANNA HUIZINGA: I was in the other room. My name is DeAnna Huizinga, D-e-a-n-n-a H-u-i-z-i-n-g-a. I'm representing myself, along with my coworkers. I work at Grand Pearl Spa in Grand Rapids, Michigan. I have been a licensed cosmetologist for over 30 years now, I've worked at our practice for 26 years.

work with a group of plastic surgeons. I am a cosmetologist, so there are occasions where physicians say we work under their medical license, but I'm not risking my cosmetology license for anyone. So I worked really hard to get where I am, continue education, continue going to classes, and I'm not going to have

1 so

somebody come in and say you can't do that now because these rules and regulations are not clear and clarified.

I agree with everything that everybody

has said here, everybody has definitely proved their point; but in my case, I look forward to going to work every single day, otherwise I wouldn't be there for 26 years. I am a previous breast cancer survivor, and if it wasn't for my coworkers exfoliating my skin and giving me facials, I wouldn't have the confidence to come back to work. If it wasn't for them exfoliating my breasts after radiation, I wouldn't have the confidence to actually show people. I'm proud of my breasts now. So for me, to have that ability to then do that to someone else, I'm proud of that. So for you guys to have that ability to take that away from me and my coworkers is really disheartening.

And how am I supposed to pay my bills if you take that away from me? I am in a large amount of debt, and now you're going to take this away. I won't be able to dermaplane somebody, I won't be able to do a hydrofacial, I won't be able to help somebody. That's just ludicrous, and I just feel like you are taking such a big chunk of benefit away not just from us providers, but from people that come in and want to feel better and feel good about themselves.

So my public comment is you have to make the wording more accurate, more specific, and you also have to make a difference between medical spas and what's at cosmetology locations, hair salons, and schools, because there is no clear definition to what you can do at a medical spa versus what you can do at a hair salon versus what you can do at a medical practice. And if it was me, I'd rather have somebody that has 26 years' worth of experience treating skin than somebody that was just trained as an MA.

I mean like they they've always said to me, there's somebody that came in last at medical school and there's always somebody that barely passed the bar in law school; who do you want working on you, the one that graduated top of their class or the one that barely passed? So that's my public comment.

MS. MARKS: Thank you.

DEANNA HUIZINGA: Sorry for being

emotional.

MS. MARKS: No problem. Sydney Shaw.

UNIDENTIFIIED: Congratulations.

DEANNA HUIZINGA: Thank you.

SYDNEY SHAW: My name is Sydney Shaw S-y-d-n-e-y S-h-a-w. I've been a esthetician for over six years now.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm for these changes in the cosmetology setting, but I'm not for these changes within a medical setting, especially with the medical team on site. I certainly don't agree that Botox should be administered by an esthetician or a cosmetologist; that is just unethical, in my opinion. We should be able to dermaplane and perform these services with blood-borne pathogen annual training and certification. I certainly believe there should be more regulation on the certifications that are required, but we should be able to laser, hydrofacial, chemical peel, et cetera, with proper certification and training, which the verbiage is unclear whether these rules are pertaining to estheticians or cosmetologists. Because as an esthetician, our governing board is the Board of Cosmetology, it is unclear whether -- who these rules are pertaining to exactly, because from my understanding, this is essentially limiting people even if they have medical oversight.

So my question is, are you trying to rule out these services in salons, because, in my opinion, on behalf of the opinion of many others, with medical oversight and continued hours of education on these services, excluding injections, should be allowed under specific circumstances in medical facilities? My biggest

concern is clarity on what is pertaining to cosmetologists and estheticians, and what services will be taken away and what will be continued to be performed with direct medical supervision? Thank you.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Meagan McComber.

MEAGAN McCOMBER: Sorry, I'm very new to
this process. My name is Meagan McComber, M-e-a-g-a-n
M-c-C-o-m-b-e-r. I'm a licensed esthetician, I'm
representing The Babe Company, a licensed skincare
facility.

I have spent countless hours that have been dedicated to my continuing education and learning and making me an expert in my profession of skincare.

Many of the services in question, such as general exfoliation, is extensively covered in esthetic school where we also learn to provide proper skin analysis and make treatment recommendations, however, I understand that many of the services that I offer and provide for my clients on a day-to-day basis in my esthetic studio, which I own and operate, are not covered in the general education required by the State of Michigan to obtain a esthetics license, however, I, like many of the other estheticians that are concerned about the possibility of these new prohibitions to be put into effect have gone above and beyond the general requirements. I've spent

24

25

plenty of time taking -- plenty of time and money taking courses and training outside of my general education, making me knowledgable and proficient specifically regarding dermaplaning, microneedling, chemical peels, lash lift and tint, eyebrow laminations and tint, hydrodermabrasion, and permanent makeup, dedicating myself, just like our license requires us, to be of good moral character to provide these services. Many of these services people would attempt to provide for themselves in their own home settings and will continue to do so, especially if we are not permitted to perform them -- for them in a professional and regulated setting. Most all of the materials required to perform most of the services that the State wishes to prohibit are readily available for the general public to purchase and not regulated by any markets to be sold only to professionals.

If I am not permitted to provide the services the State wishes to prohibit for my clients any longer, my business will most likely fail, as I specialize in skin rejuvenation renewal, specifically curing acne. If I have to send my clients to a medical specialist for what I normally provide for them, they're not going to receive the same standard of care. In my experience, medical professionals rarely have interest in caring, they will more than likely focus only on

extreme or unnecessary force, never caring to find what the root cause of the problem is. More than likely, medical professionals will also have little to no interest providing services that the State wishes to prohibit us from providing, which, as I stated earlier, will lead clients to perform the services at home themselves, which is extremely dangerous.

education regarding the services they wish to prohibit, they should make it a part of the curriculum that the State requires to obtain an esthetics license. So many estheticians will suffer from client loss, as well as loss of income, if the State does choose to go ahead with these limitations that they wish to put into effect.

It is my hope as a well-educated professional and as somebody who cares deeply about the wellbeing of my clients that the State will reconsider what they are about to do. Thank you.

MS. MARKS: Erin Dresser.

ERIN DRESSER: Hi. My name is name is

Erin Dresser, D-r-e-s-s-e-r, and I am a licensed

esthetician and have been in this industry for 23 years,

I'm also a medical assistant. I own a spa and have owned

it for 17 years in, and I do have a medical director that

Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

oversees our medical supervision.

So the part that concerns me is the prohibition section regarding hydrofacials, microdermabrasions, chemicals peels. I do agree with the Botox being only administrated by professionals, however, hydroabrasion, microdermabrasion, chemical peels I do not think needs medical supervision; most states don't require that. I have been licensed in California and in Michigan, so I have a lot of experience with that.

I also have been a medical assistant, and when I first started this career, I worked for plastic surgeons and dermatologists and they would delegate chemical peels and microdermabrasions to me with no prior knowledge of skincare, so when I did obtain licensed esthetician, when I did go to school for that, I did learn more about that, and I would much rather have a licensed esthetician perform those services on me.

I think that eliminating this and the clarification in the rules is very confusing and it, the interpretation of it would only be limited to licensed physicians and nurses to perform these services. Our healthcare system is already overwhelmed, and I don't -- a lot of the clients and patients that already get this care would not be able to get the care as easily as they would need.

2

4

5

7

8

9

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I think that the delegation part is unclear. I see that that's crossed off, so does that mean that licensed estheticians will no longer be able to be employed by physicians or to perform these services over -- under medical supervision? In this case, I think that a lot of estheticians would lose their jobs and small businesses would have to close their doors.

I've personally owned my business for 17 years, and the majority of the services that we provide are dermaplaning and hydroabrasions and chemical peels, so if we were not able to provide these services, then it would really have an effect on our revenue that comes in from these services. I do employ ten people, five of them which are estheticians, they're highly trained. think that a better approach would be to require more certifications and more education and put this on the curriculum for estheticians to require that to obtain a license. And I -- if you are going to eliminate this and only have medical supervision, I think estheticians should be able to perform these services under medical supervision. They are invasive treatment -- they are non-invasive treatments, and I don't believe that they should be taken away from estheticians to perform.

Also, I think that this would increase unemployment, estheticians losing their jobs, it would Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

decrease sales tax that the State gets from estheticians 1 who retail products. A lot of small businesses have 2 3 invested in equipment, and this equipment is very 4 expensive, so they would be stuck with this equipment, 5 some of them are still paying on loans to pay this 6 equipment off, so it would have a very detrimental effect 7 on all business owners who have invested in this equipment. Would the State be able to provide 8 9 reimbursement for this equipment and this loss? 10 So in conclusion, I don't think 11 eliminating the practice of hydrodermabrasion, 12 microdermabrasion, and dermaplaning would be something 13 that would be a good effect on our State. Thank you. 14 MS. MARKS: Thank you. Daryn Parker. 15 DARYN PACKER: Hello. My name is Daryn 16 Packer, not Erin Parker. I represent Face Foundrie. 17 MS. MARKS: Could you spell the last 18 name, please? 19 DARYN PACKER: Yes. P-a-c-k-e-r. 20 MS. MARKS: And is the first name 21 D-a-r-y-n? 22 DARYN PACKER: Yes. 23 MS. MARKS: Okay. 24 DARYN PACKER: I represent Face Foundrie, 25 a focused facial bar in Birmingham, Michigan. I went to Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

the University of Michigan, I've spent the past six years living in Washington, D.C., California, and Colorado. I finally found my way back to the place I grew up to help my mother start a business. We opened our business, Face Foundrie, in December and we were most recently scouting our second location last week right here in Lansing, in a place where there have been dozens of storefronts that have gone vacant as a result of the COVID epidemic.

After years spent in other frankly progressive places, I was always proud to be from Michigan where I felt innovation and entrepreneurship were at the cornerstone of our culture. These rules place that in jeopardy for thousands of independent estheticians and small business owners.

At Face Foundrie, our primary goal is the accessibility and providing quality skincare services to women of all skin types and socioeconomic backgrounds.

We are licensed and insured, we follow the current guidelines and the laws that are in place. All of our estheticians are licensed, and they receive further training from our corporate partners, and each esthetician must have had our services before they are able to perform them on clients.

I want to further emphasize how these rules changes are not just detrimental to thousands of Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

estheticians who have spent thousands of dollars and hours to learn and perform services to help people feel better about themselves, it's also detrimental to thousands of clients that estheticians have helped in their skincare journeys. Rules like these present barriers to access. Not all women need medical-grade treatments. There are dozens of processes that are already reserved in the medical field. Individuals who need those more invasive treatments are usually encouraged to do so by their estheticians.

So just as a consumer has to choose what food they put in their body or how to treat the common cold, they should be able to choose their best path for skincare treatment and who provides it to them. For some that would mean spending thousands of dollars at a medi-spa, but for a great deal of others, it's building a skincare plan with an esthetician because it's more cost-effective and it might work better for their skin. These changes will discredit the professionals that have spent their careers perfecting these crafts.

There are bad actors, every person in the room I was just in would probably agree. Any respected licensed esthetician would tell you they approve of enforcing rules that eliminate bad actors. A nursing degree or a medical license does not ensure that there

Ι

will be no bad actors. I think you all know this.

hope you all know this.

I did not come here to only highlight the problems, I would also like to suggest some solutions which I think everybody has kind of already highlighted. Modify the process, ensure there's more training in schools, cover things more thoroughly like dermaplaning, ensure that salons and service providers are adhering to the current rules. I mean what good are rules if they are not enforced. Making more rules does not ensure that rules will be enforced. Slapping more rules into the system does not change anything, especially if the current rules are not being enforced. Quite frankly, it's a joke.

I just lived in Colorado and I was on a town board, so I know what you guys are sitting here listening to, but just adding the more and more verbiage and more rules to something does not create a solution. I ask you today to do what you were chosen to do, defend and properly represent the industry, the professionals you were chosen to represent, hear all of these concerns and don't let these revisions as they stand go through. Thank you.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Greg Packer.

Greg Packer. Doesn't look like he's stayed.

Are there any other comments at this time about either the "Barber - General Rules" or the "Cosmetology - General Rules?

THERESE VOEVODSKY: I would like to add a few more things. I kind of skipped over everything, and everyone else was more prepared than I was. Can I add a few more things?

MS. MARKS: Sure.

THERESE VOEVODSKY: Okay. Therese Vouvodsky, again, T-h-e-r-e-s-e V-o-u-v-o-d-s-k-y. I'm owner and managing partner of BeauBien Holistic Care in Grand Rapids.

A couple of the things that I forgot to mention are, and I'm not trying to be inflammatory here, but I'm wondering whether or not you are taking away barbers' ability to use a blade, because, to me, barbers and estheticians have both really good training in these areas. So if we're not taking it away from barbers, we should not be taking it away from estheticians. This is institutional, and, again, I'm not trying to be inflammatory, this is institutional sexism. If barbers can use blades, estheticians should be able to use blades.

A couple of things that other people said that I want to highlight again are this is just going to Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

cause more people to go underground and unlicensed people to be providing these services. The honest people will follow the rules and go out of business; dishonest people will continue to provide these services.

And lastly, in your Regulatory Impact
Statement, Item No. 32: Explain how these proposed rules
will impact business growth and job creation (or
elimination) in Michigan. The rules are not expected to
have an impact on business growth, job creation, or job
elimination in Michigan. That's ridiculous. This is
going to have a huge impact. So that statement needs to
be redone, and there needs to be a lot more impact
studies or something to go beyond this. I don't think
that there was enough research or analysis put into this.
That's it. Thank you.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Are there any other comments at this time about either the Barber Rules or the Cosmetology Rules?

JAMIE BURNS: I do have a quick comment, if I could?

MS. MARKS: Certainly. Can you introduce yourself and spell your name, please?

JAMIE BURNS: Is Jamie Burns, J-a-m-i-e B-u-r-n-s. I'm an instructor for a small school out of northern Michigan, we are very brand new.

24 25

And reading all over all of this and hearing everyone's comments with all of this is kind of hard to -- we're trying to rebuild our curriculum. Obviously with all of the changes, it's pretty hard to do that when nobody really knows what's going on. We come from a very small community, so we are trying to give our students a big-city education in a very small town, and hearing all of your voices, we're trying to give that to our students, what they have, and when they don't even know if they're going to be able to do all the things they love to do makes it really hard for teachers like me and many others really to know what's going on. And when we had our agent come in to inspect our school, it's very disheartening when they don't even know what's going on and they don't have straight answers for us on what we're supposed to be doing. So I just really hope that we can get to a point where those rules and regulations are adhered so that I can give to my students and my co-workers and I and everybody else can give our students the best chance to excel in what I call a very wonderful career field.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Are there any other comments at this time?

(Inaudible comments.)

MS. MARKS: Okay. Please introduce Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

yourself again.

1

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 SUSAN KOLAR: Susan Kolar, last name K-o-l-a-r. I also since this, I started this found out 3 4 that if someone were to register a complaint, because so 5 many people are doing things that they're not licensed for and it's all over social media, I understand, and I 6 7 believe this is correct, I have a friend that did 8 complain about a salon that was not licensed, was in 9 business, and when she filed a complaint of that person 10 is known to the -- in other words, I get it if you want 11 to list a name, but how does the owner find, or the 12 business owner that's not licensed find out who the complainant is, which she was later bashed on social 13 14 media for getting someone in trouble when we all 15 obviously are here, you want to stay licensed, you want 16 to do it the way, you know, the laws, you know, 17 pertaining to us, and I guess I was, I did want to 18 comment on that, that why can't that be not revealed to 19 the --

UNIDENTIFILED: (Inaudible.)

(Multiple speakers.)

MS. MARKS: I'm sorry, one at a time.

UNIDENTIFIIED: Oh, I'm sorry.

SUSAN KOLAR: That they, pretty much the girl that find the complaint was bashed on social media

Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

because she filed the complaint that they were not licensed, and I think that's a -- it should be anonymous to the, you know, to the person getting in trouble or not following the laws. And that was it.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Are there any other comments? (No response.)

Hearing none, will take a short recess.

Please remember the recording will remain in progress, so if you want to have conversation, please exit the room to have a conversation. We'll start back in about 10 or 15 minutes.

(Recess from 10:01 a.m. until 10:16 a.m.)

MS. MARKS: We're back on the record at 10:16. There was an additional comment from Daryn Packer.

DARYN PACKER: Sorry, I just forgot to add one thing. I just wanted to comment on how like what this speaks about trade schools. Trade schools, just like cosmetology, have been a home for people who choose that route or do not have access to higher education. These rule changes are classist and elitist in nature, and it's now going to require a medical degree on top of services that have been a main source of income for people who have chosen the trade school route. It kind of causes me to question whose best interest all of these

are in, all of these new rules are in. And I strongly feel that it's a greedy industry, that it found more money upfront in providing cosmetic procedures where they don't have to deal with insurance carriers. Just please consider what these rules, what these rule changes would say about trade schooling and its place in our economic and education system.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Nicole Maynard.

NICOLE MAYNARD: Hi, I'm Nicole Maynard,

N-i-c-o-l-e M-a-y-n-a-r-d. I am a licensed esthetician

in the State of Michigan, I've been -- this is going on

my eighth year. I've worked at a med spa, Skin Deep Day

Spa, in Jackson, Michigan, for the last now eight years

this May. We do a variety of treatments, and including

microderms, chemicals peels, hydrofacials, dermaplaning,

all the things that are being taken into consideration

today.

I do agree with everything that everybody has been talking about today and speaking of, everyone has done a phenomenal job at educating all of you that are taking notes for whoever is making this law happen. This is our livelihood, this is our career, this is something we've all worked so hard for, just like anybody else that has gone to school for any career that you're in.

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

So the treatments, I do want to say that the treatments that we offer as estheticians do change lives whether anybody believes that or not. If you take our right away from being able to do all these things, like I said, dermaplaning, microderms, hydrofacials, chemical peels, it will not only affect our livelihoods, our business, our economy, because all the tax dollars that we bring into the State of Michigan are huge, it will affect, what I'm more concerned about -- yes, I'm scared to lose my job, lose everything that we've all worked for -- but also our clients, our patients, who is going to be treating their skin conditions that we are? Not only there's not enough doctors or nurses, the doctors and nurses, they are -- they are there for medicine. There are some that go into the esthetics world, but who is going to train the doctors and nurses that are going to have to cover all these patients and clients, because if you take our license away, how are we going to train them, I mean who is going to is my question.

But another thing is with skin, it is the first thing, one of the girls had said this, this is the first thing that you see when you meet somebody, and with mental health on the rise, a lot of people don't keep into consideration your health, meaning your skin health.

It's the first thing that people are seeing. So many of my clients come in and they are, they are so distraught, they can't go in public, they've gone to doctor after doctor after doctor getting antibiotics, topical over-stripping products because they don't really have the knowledge and they don't find the -- they don't make the time because they don't have the time; like Erin, my boss, said, they are overly stressed with their workload already. Who is going to -- who's going to treat them?

So I would like clarification, as well as all of us, on why this act is happening, who is trying to do it; is it the doctors, is it the nurses, is it the State, or is it the colleges? I mean are we taking away from colleges, because I don't really see how that is because colleges are -- colleges, it's not for everybody. Trade schools, like the gal said before me, are huge, and this is our, this is what we went to school for. And with that being said, if you take all this away from us, what was the point in all of our schooling? What was the point of all of our education on skin?

Our human interaction with people, like our bedside manner with our clients is huge. You don't get that at a doctor's office. The doctors and nurses are still crucial to our world, to our, to our business, to our clients, but they are not the ones that are

treating them on an every-single-day basis, they are the ones referring them to see us. So that's what -- that's my say on it.

And then I, the other thing I'd like to say is there needs more clarification and separation from the esthetician world versus cosmetology.

Cosmetologists, when I was in school, for example, I, once I went into gamma and to the advanced, like I went through all my introduction of esthetician then I went

through all my introduction of esthetician, then I went to gamma where I was seeing clients, they pulled me because I was the top of my class to go and train the cosmetologists. They got two weeks of training, I got 600 hours of training. So a cosmetologist, in my opinion, should not have the same, the same laws as we do unless they go and do the advanced education. That's not that I'm saying take it away from cosmetologists, but have them get — have them get all the certifications that we do, all the licensing. And if you're wanting to make any laws, I would say add in more education to both cosmetologists and estheticians so that when estheticians

We all thought that we knew so much coming out of esthetic school until you get into a med spa, and we have months of training to learn everything.

And like my boss, she does an amazing job at making sure Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

leave school, they are prepared for the real world.

we are giving safe, safe treatments to our clients, so we 1 are -- so we're doing months and months of training and 2 3 having our reps come in all the medical procedures that 4 we're doing, we're doing all the blood-borne pathogens, 5 like Sydney said, all of those certifications, we're 6 doing the safest approach as possible and we're changing 7 peoples lives, and if you take this away from us, not are 8 you going to be taking away women-owned businesses, and woman dominantly own the career, but the mental health is 9 10 going to skyrocket with issues because people's skin 11 needs us. So that's it. 12 MS. MARKS: Thank you. 13 NICOLE MAYNARD: Thank you. 14 MS. MARKS: Are there anymore comments at 15 this time about the "Barber" or "Cosmetology - General 16 Rules"? 17 JESSICA ABFALTER: I'd like to add 18 another thought. 19 MS. MARKS: (Inaudible.) 20 21 22 23 sweeping law change was issued by a group of 24 25

JESSICA ABFALTER: My name is Jessica Abfalter, spelled J-e-s-s-i-c-a A-b-f-a-l-t-e-r. I'd like to put it on the public record that this broad, cosmetologists, and to double down on what the previous speaker said, there is a distinct difference between the Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

practice of cosmetology and the study of esthetics and practice of esthetics. Thirty years ago it might have made sense to have a board comprised completely of cosmetologists overseeing this entire industry, but that day has long passed. And I think that a lot of the issues with vagueness, language, lack of clarity, inability to match the states around us, these are all symptoms of having legislation or rules written by people who are not actually representative of the people they are governing and making decisions for. So I would like to see if more of this type of behavior is coming from the Board, that there's an actual licensed esthetician with experience sitting on that Board to help clarify the language before these things are even brought out into the public. Thank you.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Cani Holstad.

CARLI HOLSTAD: Carli Holstad.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. I'm sorry.

CARLI HOLSTAD: C-a-r-l-i H-o-l-s-t-a-d.

I'm here today, I think I'm probably one of the only people who is here not as an esthetician, but I'm here as a patient, a supporter of my sister and my best friend.

I have gone to every single doctor in the Lansing area for my acne. I struggled with horrible cystic acne, and everything a doctor has done, they've Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

gone, here's a pill and there you go, and then they say see your OB/GYN. I go to my OB/GYN, they put me on another birth control. I've had to be on probably four different birth controls in the past three years. The first thing that has helped me was the passion behind my esthetician to go with a more holistic approach and not just fill me with medications and pills. She has taken the time to assess my skin and give me an opportunity to actually feel beautiful in my skin, and I feel that estheticians are more passionate towards those issues than what a doctor can be sometimes, and I'm not saying doctors aren't passionate about that stuff, but you go to the medical field and a lot of times it's money driven. Estheticians, they are passionate about results, they want you to feel beautiful in your skin.

And skin takes a huge toll on mental health, and I have totally been a victim of that, and I am proud to say that I am the most confident I've ever been because of the help that my esthetician has put into my skin, and it would break my heart to think that girls put in, get that help from their esthetician.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Are there any other comments at this time? (No response.)

If there are no further comments, I declare the hearing closed. The record will remain open Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

until 5:00 p.m. today for any comments you may wish to share about the proposed rules by mail or email. Thank you for attending. We are off the record. (Public hearing concluded at about 10:29 a.m. Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

I	
1	STATE OF MICHIGAN)
2	COUNTY OF MACOMB)
3	I, Lori Anne Penn, certify that this
4	transcript, consisting of 50 pages, is a complete, true, and
5	correct record, to the best of my ability, of the captioned
6	matters held on Tuesday, May 2, 2023.
7	I further certify that I am not
8	responsible for any copies of this transcript not made
9	under my direction or control and bearing my original
10	signature.
11	I also certify that I am not a relative
12	or employee of or an attorney for a party; or a relative
13	or employee of an attorney for a party; or financially
14	interested in the action.
15	
16	
17	May 7, 2023 Date Lori Anne Penn, CSR-1315
18	Notary Public, Macomb County, Michigan My Commission Expires June 15, 2025
19	Hy Commission Expires ounce 13, 2023
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com