

# Washington State Cosmetology, Hair Design, Barbering, Esthetics, and Manicuring Advisory Board meeting transcript

April 7, 2025

Sylvia Garcia (00:00):

I am Sylvia Garcia. I am the vice chair of the Washington State Cosmetology Hair Design, Barbering, Esthetics and Manicuring Advisory Board. Please forgive my voice today. I'm about eight days out from COVID and feeling much better but sounding funny. It is now 10:00 on Monday, April 7th, 2025. I'm calling this meeting to order. This meeting is open to the public. We will take time at the end of the meeting for a brief public comment period. Participants will have no more than three minutes to address the board. As a reminder, board members are not to engage in conversation during public comments.

(00:50):

And I always like to add here that any of those comments are taken back to the subcommittees and discuss thoroughly. So I don't want anyone to feel like their comments aren't being heard. And then lastly, as a courtesy, we ask that all participants keep themselves on mute to reduce background noise. So if everybody could take a second and check to make sure they are on mute. When a board member would like to comment on a topic, please use the raise hand feature in teams. Once I've called on you, unmute yourself and state your name before sharing your comments. Please remember to mute yourself again after you finish speaking. Thank you. And I didn't know this, but if you click on that raise hand again, it'll go away.

(01:46):

And then program specialist Sandy Baur, will now roll call confirming board member attendance. Once your name has been called, please respond, stating here or present.

Sandy Baur (02:00):

All right, thank you. Chair Trieu. I see that you're present. Vice Chair Sylvia Garcia?

Sylvia Garcia (02:12):

Yes.

Sandy Baur (02:14):

Board Member Cooper Deaton.

Erika Cooper Deaton (02:18):

Present.

Sandy Baur (02:20):

Board Member Hildebrand.

Siobhan Hildebrand (02:24):

Present.

Sandy Baur (02:27):

Board Member Martin. Board Member Martin. Board Member Switalski. I see you're muted but are present. Board Member Thomas.

Travis Switalski (02:56):

Present.

Sandy Baur (02:57):

Thank you, Board Member Switalski. Board Member Thomas. Board Member Thomas. And Board Member Williams.

Jin Mi Williams (03:19):

Present.

Sandy Baur (03:23):

We do have a quorum. Back to you, Vice chair.

Sylvia Garcia (03:28):

Thank you. Next is approval of the agenda. Is there a motion to approve today's agenda as presented?

Frank Trieu (03:41):

I'll go ahead and make that motion. This is Frank Trieu here?

Sylvia Garcia (03:45):

Thank you, Chair Trieu. Is there a second?

Travis Switalski (03:53):

I second. This is Travis Switalski, board member.

Sylvia Garcia (03:57):

Thank you, Travis Switalski. I tripped up on that name. Sorry. Is there any discussion on this topic? Hearing no discussion, we'll take a vote. All those in favor say aye.

Frank Trieu (04:14):

Aye.

Jin Mi Williams (04:15):

Aye.

Sylvia Garcia (04:17):

Any opposed-

Travis Switalski (04:18):

Aye.

Siobhan Hildebrand (04:18):

Aye.

Sylvia Garcia (04:22):

Any opposed, nay? And are there any abstentions? And it looks like the motion is approved. Next, we have approval of the minutes. Is there a motion to approve the October 7th, 2024, minutes as presented? And that's under tab four in your packet. I'll give everyone a moment to look those over and if we could get a motion to approve.

Frank Trieu (05:12):

And I'll go ahead and I'll make a motion to approve. This is Chair Trieu here.

Sylvia Garcia (05:22):

Thank you, Chair Trieu. And do we have a second?

Siobhan Hildebrand (05:27):

This is Siobhan Hildebrand. I'll second.

Sylvia Garcia (05:30):

Thank you, Board Member Hildebrand. Is there any discussion on this topic? Seeing no discussion, we can take a vote. All those in favor say aye.

Siobhan Hildebrand (05:47):

Aye.

Frank Trieu (05:48):

Aye.

Travis Switalski (05:48):

Aye.

Jin Mi Williams (05:48):

Aye.

Sylvia Garcia (05:52):

Any opposed, nay? Any abstentions? And the minutes are approved. Number five is awards and recognition and there are no awards or recognition to discuss today. Next is old business under six and Ms. Baur is going to give us an overview on Pro Metrics.

Sandy Baur (06:28):

Thank you, Vice chair. At the October meeting last year, there were several issues that were raised concerning testing procedures. The department has been meeting with Pro Metric representatives to improve that process and we will continue to do so. We're looking for solutions to some of these ongoing issues. If there are any further complaints or suggestions, please email them to the [dolboards@dol.wa.gov](mailto:dolboards@dol.wa.gov) inbox. The board staff will forward those comments, questions and concerns to the appropriate team working on those issues. Thank you.

Sylvia Garcia (07:20):

Next is new business and scope of practice and Board Member Williams has a presentation on this.

Sandy Baur (07:27):

We have a question.

Sylvia Garcia (07:27):

Sorry.

Frank Trieu (07:30):

No. Just a quick question on my end. So I know that the Department of Licensing has been meeting with Pro Metrics. I was just curious, how has the proper spin on adding more seats and making more seats available? I mean, could you give us a quick update on that?

Sandy Baur (07:47):

We're working really hard to increase the seats available and not only increase the seats available, but also the times available. At this point, we're meeting with them on a regular basis, trying to get everything ironed out. I don't have a whole lot more information for you at this time, but I will have more information at our next meeting.

Frank Trieu (08:14):

Okay, thank you.

Sylvia Garcia (08:22):

Next is new business. If there are no further questions ... Sorry, I jumped down on that. And Board Member Williams is going to talk about scope of practice, lead a discussion on scope of practice and how they relate to the RCWs.

Jin Mi Williams (08:39):

Good morning. My name is Jin Mi Williams and I'm just going to read something that I wrote down. Hopefully, I'll have a presentation for the next meeting. But I'm both an educator and licensed professional in the field of aesthetics. I'm here on behalf of not only my students, my coworkers, but also my peers as well. And of course, on behalf of the growing number of professionals across Washington state who are seeking clear direction from the regulatory language that governs our work. So I'm sure all of you're familiar with the RCW point ... I'm sorry, 18.16020. So I'd like to address that. So accompanying the guidance around estheticians and the use of devices. Now, while these documents are helpful in some ways they do have

significant gaps as I'm sure some of you are already aware. Particularly when it comes to clarifying what is legally allowed for basic estheticians and mass estheticians.

(09:29):

So basically, really defining those scope of practice. These ambiguities present real risks for professionals, for clients, for schools, and of course, for public trust. So my goal today is to highlight several key areas where clarification is needed and to propose a realistic professional solution that aligns with what other leading states are currently doing. So of course one of them I want to address is lack of clarity on common procedures. So I want to begin with common procedures and tools found in almost every aesthetic school and spa setting. Some of you familiar with dermaplaning. It's common, so recognized, it's used in a lot of different spas, but it's not really mentioned in the RCW and it involves a surgical blade.

(10:10):

Most states recognize it as outside of scope of practice for basic aesthetics, but that's not really clearly stated here and it leaves room for legal and educational confusion. Also, another thing is high-frequency machines, galvanic tools, non-laser electrical devices, which are staples of traditional facial treatments. And they're not explicitly referenced either. They may be included under any device, electrical or otherwise specified on the RCW, but that language is very vague and it does little to guide schools or licensees confidently. More advanced series or services like microneedling, microdermabrasion, LED light therapy and radiofrequency are also not itemized, but only medical grade devices like lasers and IPLs are mentioned in RCW.

(10:53):

Without a device-by-device breakdown, professionals in schools are left to make really risky assumptions. And of course, there's the broader issues with the current document of the RCW. These are several overarching problems with how the law and the scope of practice within this document are structured. One of them is the broader language. Terms like any device, electrical or otherwise, leave too much open for interpretation and it leaves the professionals relying upon the FDA, the regulations and their definitions. So basically professionals are expected to determine if the device is over-the-counter or prescriptive using the FDA databases and their definitions and putting regulatory research on the shoulders of the practitioner and not the state itself.

(11:34):

There's also no enforcement of the framework, so there's no mention of what happens if someone practices outside the scope. So no citations, no fines, no outline consequences. And this of course lacks of clarity, which invites a lot of inconsistencies. Accessibility to barrier, and excuse me if I'm going too fast, I'm just kind of reading off my notes. These documents are written in technical legal language. They're difficult for new graduates, educators and many licensees to digest and I properly apply it correctly. It leaves a risk for both the professional and of course, public safety. Without those clear guidance schools, may unknowingly teach outside the basic aesthetic scope.

(12:15):

Estheticians may unintentionally perform services that violate their license, putting their careers and businesses at risk even when it comes to insurance companies and what insurances are insuring them. Most importantly, clients are exposed to services performed by individuals who may not have the proper training, which of course is a public and poses a public safety issue. The justification of those broader laws, and what I'm proposing is I do understand and respect the technology evolves and it's difficult to update what's acceptable or what needs to be written via language and pass through legislation. I understand those challenges, but broad laws without structure support lead to misinterpretation, inconsistencies and compliance issues.

(12:55):

And we can and should maintain flexibility, but we're also giving professionals the clarity they need to work responsibly. So something that I was thinking that other states are currently doing, Texas, Florida and Utah being one of them, is offering or developing a published Washington State aesthetic scope of practice reference guide that includes a treatment specific chart outlining what procedures and devices fall under each license, under a basic, under masters. Examples of permitted services like LED, dermaplaning, high frequency chemical peels, medium-depth chemical peels and so on. And more of a frequently asked question style format that's written clear, professional and there's no legal language so it's easy for anybody to understand.

(13:38):

States right now in Texas, Florida and Utah, they're able to update the practice reference guide on an annual basis. So if there's new technology, if there's new services, you don't have to wait for legislation. Having that reference guide helps give students and professionals an idea of what's under their scope of practice. And not only that, but these documents help maintain regulatory flexibility without sacrificing clarity and safety. More importantly, because of legislation, it offers a non-legislative solution which also lowers administrative burden. And so, just to let you guys know, this isn't off of the Washington State site, but this is off of another state which reported that 75% of complaints and cosmetology were directly tied to professionals working outside of the defined scope.

(14:23):

I know that most professionals, they work confidently, and I can say this. That they're all thinking they're doing the right things and everything is good intentions, but sometimes we don't know what devices that we may not be able to use. And I wholly believe that Washington State can strengthen the integrity of our profession, protect clients and support schools by providing much more clearer, more accessible guidelines. And having a scope of practice reference guide where we're not always depending on legislation would provide much needed clarity without altering the laws themselves. And it would align us with the industry-leading practices already in place elsewhere in other states that is currently working. And again, that could be changed annually. So that's my proposition.

Sylvia Garcia (15:09):

Jin Mi, I would really appreciate if you would send your presentation to Frank and I, and maybe your footnote so that we can do a little bit of discussion and have further discussion in our

subcommittees. I totally hear where you're coming from and I agree this could use some further discussion.

Jin Mi Williams (15:35):

I'll send it over to you, for sure.

Sylvia Garcia (15:38):

Thank you. Thank you. And you can send it through Sandy or directly, however it works best. Do any other board members have any comments?

Sandy Baur (15:49):

Board Member Cooper-Deaton has her hand up.

Erika Cooper Deaton (15:53):

Hi. I would really love to see that as well. And also, if I could as part of, Master Aesthetics help in any way or even join with you, that would be great.

Sandy Baur (16:08):

Absolutely, I'd love that.

Erika Cooper Deaton (16:10):

Yes.

Sylvia Garcia (16:14):

Very good. Any other questions or comments?

Sandy Baur (16:18):

And Chair Trieu has his hand up as well?

Frank Trieu (16:21):

Yeah, well first and foremost, I really want to thank board member Williams for sharing those thoughts. I thought those were some really great points that were made and having the alternative of a reference guide or an FAQ style chart, I think that that's going to add a lot of clarity for the industry, right? And then on how the department ... Specifically the inspection team is evaluating and interpreting some of these RCWs. I think that would just be able to help guide people quite a bit. I know that Board Member Williams is on the education subcommittee, but based on scope of practice, I don't know what your thoughts are, but I'm thinking that it might be good to be able to pull it over to the Business Professions Subcommittee. And what we can do is that we could invite Board Member Williams and also board Member Cooper here too, to be able to join in that upcoming meeting.

(17:17):

I think we have one scheduled, goodness, is it next week or so? I can't remember. It's on our calendar, this upcoming Friday. Okay. But maybe for ... Sandy, if you could include both of them

in the invitation and if they're both available, they could join us for that meeting and that way we can-

Sandy Baur (17:38):

We do have to be very careful about not having a quorum in the subcommittee meeting.

Frank Trieu (17:44):

That's right. So then that would ... Right now, that would bring us up to five board members, is that right. We just can't cross over six, is that correct?

Sandy Baur (17:51):

Correct?

Frank Trieu (17:52):

Correct. Okay. So I think that with Williams and also, Erica here or for Cooper-Deaton will be at five. So that will still keep us under the six number. Yeah, if those are available, come join us.

Sandy Baur (18:06):

I'll forward those.

Frank Trieu (18:08):

Yeah.

Sandy Baur (18:08):

Thank you.

Erika Cooper Deaton (18:10):

I am available and I would love to join. Thank you.

Sylvia Garcia (18:14):

Excellent. Do we have any other comments on this? Thank you Board Member Williams. We appreciate your work on this and bringing it to the forefront.

Frank Trieu (18:29):

The only other thing I want to make sure that we have noted in the minutes is that it appears as though Board Member Martin has joined us as well. So I just want to make sure that's reflected in the minutes.

Sylvia Garcia (18:42):

Thank you Frank. Our next topic of discussion as an in-person meeting and Ms. Baur is going to explain about that for us.

Sandy Baur (18:55):

All right, thank you so much. At the board meeting last year, the October meeting last year, we approved the following dates for 2025, April 7th, which is today. July 14th, which was to be our



in-person option. And October 6th. However, Governor Inslee implemented a spending freeze that was effective on December 2nd, 2024 and is still in effect that spending freeze effects, hiring, travel, contracts. Anything that has to do with spending has been placed on hold at this time. So we are not able to plan for an in-person meeting this year. We are not able to actively plan for the NIC annual conference at this time either as this evolves or if there are any changes, we will keep the board informed of any future endeavors that we may or may not be able to start planning for. Are there any questions?

Frank Trieu (20:03):

So just a quick question from me here is that I know that the legislative session is ongoing right now and do you think we'll have more clarity after session ends and budgets are assigned or it's going to take more time-

Sandy Baur (20:15):

I certainly hope so.

Frank Trieu (20:16):

Okay.

Sandy Baur (20:17):

I certainly hope so. Because we have a new gubernatorial team in place. I don't know what to expect.

Sylvia Garcia (20:33):

Next is Sandy Baur is going to introduce Ms. Gilmore?

Sandy Baur (20:40):

Yes. Thank you so much.

Sylvia Garcia (20:43):

Sorry.

Sandy Baur (20:44):

We're super excited. I'm actually going to turn it over to management analyst Taylor Hughes who is going to give us an update on the 2025 legislation section. Ms. Hughes.

Taylor Hughes (20:59):

Thanks Sandy. Hey you all. As mentioned, my name is Taylor Hughes and I work with the operational support services team. Cosmetology is in my portfolio, so I'm going to share updates on the two bills that are on the screen, Congress House Bill 1874 and Substitute House Bill 1023. So we can start with 1874. It's requiring training for cosmetologists, barbers, estheticians and care designers on the care styling and treatment of texture care. It's currently in the Senate Rules Committee and a short little bill summary, it ensures the cosmetology industry has the skills to work with texture care clients while maintaining health and safety standards. It defines

texture care, which means care that rather than lying straight naturally has a distinct shape or pattern such as coils, curls, kink, spirals or waves.

(21:48):

And it requires DOL to establish curriculum for training cosmetology students and apprentices including cosmetologists, barbers, estheticians, and hair designers on texture, hair care, styling and treatment. And this bill will go into effect 90 days sine die. And then if we go to 1023, which is the cosmetology component, it is also in the center of this committee. And a brief little bill summary, as brief as I can make it, because the cosmetology compact is a very large bill, it creates the cosmetology licensure compact commission consisting of one delegate from each member state. It requires that licensees pass a competency exam, complete educational or training requirements, and submit a criminal history or background check.

(22:32):

It requires multi state license applicants to first hold an active and unencumbered stable state cosmetology license in their home state, before they can actually get a multi-state license. It limits licensees to hold one multi state license at a time. It requires active military members and spouses to designate a home state where they have a current license to practice cosmetology. And it also allows them to retain that designation during any time when they're on an active duty event. It creates a database and a reporting system that assigns each multi state applicant and identifier. It mandates that the state where services are provided as responsible for disciplinary action. A licensee's home state has sole power over adverse actions on a licensee's multi state license.

(23:20):

And the commission's rules will be law in each member state unless there is a conflicting state law that establishes the scope of practice for cosmetology. Another important info that came from an amendment, the department shall track and manage revenues and costs generated by each license separately and then, it goes into effect June 1st, 2028. Does anyone have any questions? Yeah, Chair Trieu.

Frank Trieu (23:48):

So my question was on probably the second sentence at the end, you said that each of the licenses will be tracked separately. How are we defining that only this specific license is going to be ... The multi-state license can be tracked differently or is this ... Are we breaking down to cosmetology aesthetics nails? I mean, because when I was reading it, I was reading the fiscal note and I was a little ... I just want to get some clarity on it

Taylor Hughes (24:15):

Yeah, and Lauren, you can jump in here too, but with the department ... So this is making sure that the multistate license costs is not going to fall on the cosmetology license and hair designer license on estheticians and so forth. But Lauren, you can jump in if you have anything else to add.

Lauren Gilmore (24:36):

That sounds really good. Are there any further specific questions?

Frank Trieu (24:42):

So just for clarity, so what I heard is that the multistate license will be funded by itself, by those licensees, but for all the other licenses they're not going to ... They'll continue at the same rate that they ... or they'll have the same rate for all the other licenses, right? So this rate, when I was reading the fiscal note, it said that it gave the ten-year note and it said that the licenses ... the estimates are going to range anywhere from no less than 500, but no more than a thousand. Is that right?

Lauren Gilmore (25:15):

Yes.

Frank Trieu (25:15):

Okay.

Lauren Gilmore (25:17):

There's a new fiscal note routing through our agency this morning and for new amendments that were made and the new amendments for this next fiscal note, do specify that this license and its fees be self-contained within that license.

Frank Trieu (25:36):

Got it. All right. All right, thank you. Noted that. That sounds good to me. Appreciate it.

Lauren Gilmore (25:41):

Thank you.

Sandy Baur (25:46):

Does anyone else have any other questions? No. All right, well, thank you all.

Sylvia Garcia (25:56):

Thank you very much. Next on our agenda is subcommittee reports and I think that I'm going to handle those and then, I think Board Member Martin and I know Frank is here, Chair Trieu, if you have any pieces you'd like to add, please do. For the business subcommittee, the main conversation that we've been having has been testing difficulties and for metrics and how can we handle that better, how can we make it easier for licensees graduates that are trying to get licensed? And that's where the comment from Mrs. Baur came from. And I think that we're going to continue to research and try to improve that situation. The education committee has been spending a lot of time on discussing the current legislation that we just heard about, so that was kind of recapped.

(27:04):

We also have been talking about the toxic cosmetic new law and I was able to attend the rule hearing that took place, I think it was April 1st. And I wanted to make sure everyone knew that you have until April 11th to make comments, recommendations, give your feelings, but after the 11th then the EPA will move on to actually making those rules. And I feel like that law has been a little bit confusing for our industry. They clarified in the hearing that this was specifically in

regards to formaldehyde releasers and really focusing on hair care for people of color. A lot of these products are being used predominantly by people of color and there's harm that's happening.

(28:10):

There were two people who testified at the hearing and both of them were hairstylists who had been doing the keratin straightening process and had had some injuries because of that and lung damage and that sort of thing. So this set of rules are being made right now are just focusing on those formaldehyde releasers. And surprisingly, if you go to the EPA, you'll be able to see all of the ingredients and the products that we use and they're in a lot of products that you might not even realize. So I highly recommend if you have any input, any concerns that you reach out to EPA and make those comments. And if you search the toxic cosmetic chemicals, just search that. You'll find it very easily.

(29:07):

And then the other two things that we talked about a little bit, and Frank you can probably address these better than I can, is the certification change of licensing to certification in Arizona and Utah. Can you speak to those a little bit, Frank?

Frank Trieu (29:27):

Yeah, no, absolutely. I was actually ... This last weekend, I served on a panel down in to speak to about 50 or 60-ish aesthetic schools throughout the whole country. And we were talking about regulations that are happening across the states here specifically in there's always re-regulation or efforts towards deregulation. But one thing that I think is important for the board here to understand is there were some legislative movements in Utah specifically where they ended up exploring a concept of microlicensing. It was a discussion that took place throughout the whole year, but where they ended right now and what they expect an effective date in January of 2026 is that they're actually removing the aesthetics license from Utah, right?

(30:21):

There's a variety of different changes that are happening, but that's probably the biggest movement is that they've shifted the statics license from a 600-hour license down to a 200 and a 200-hour safety permit. And so, a lot of the discussions that were happening was really about fragmentation of licenses across the country. And I think that in Washington State, it's not something that's been brought up in this legislative session, but it's important for us to recognize what's happening across the country because what happens in one state, it is not uncommon for it to transfer to other states as well. And so the statics one is probably the one that got the most discussion, hence me being at an aesthetic school conference.

(31:11):

But they also moved down to safety permits for facial hair to 50 hours, right? They introduced a hair chemical safety permit too. And they also lowered the number of hours too for cosmetology and goodness, it was hair design, right? And then they introduced a master bar license. So there was a lot of movement down there and it's just things for us to be able to make sure that we're aware of. I think there were some other bills that we were talking about in Maryland, they did update the scope of practice, which is to be able to get greater clarity. I do like board

Member Williams' solution more than updating state statute is by just having guiding documents. But those are a few things that are happening that pertain to the profession.

Sylvia Garcia (32:03):

Thank you Chair Trieu. Are there any board members that have any comments or questions? Seeing none, we can move on to 8.2. And this is Central Investigations and Audits Unit or the CIAU regulatory compliance, UCC and Firearms or RCUF and Licensing and Customer Services Support, customer support services or LCSS and Ms. Baur is going to talk about that.

Sandy Baur (32:44):

Hi. Yes. So every meeting, we have been giving complaint data information and licensing data information. And on a quarterly basis, that information is just not changing from meeting to meeting very much. So what we would like to do is moving forward, we would like to move from getting a report out on this information at every meeting. We'd like to move to an annual state at the program report at the beginning of each year. As I said, this quarterly data just doesn't change that much and it's really difficult to see any trends when the data just doesn't change that much. We think that an annual report would be more meaningful and I think it would probably identify trends just a little bit faster.

(33:33):

If we could see the data pulled out a little bit and see it as a whole, we would still like to put the quarterly data in the packet and staff would be available to answer any questions just in case we did have a spike or a decline. But we don't feel like presenting the data is the best use of your time. So how would you feel about moving forward to having a state of the program report on an annual basis, but having the quarterly data still in the packet with staff just available to answer any questions after you've just seen the packet?

Sylvia Garcia (34:17):

Do any board members have any concerns or truth?

Frank Trieu (34:24):

So for me, I'm open to that. I think that at the end of the day is that we are looking for trends as also, the board members are able to see the updates. And this is where I know that we have a number of members of the public that are on here. I know that when I went to these meetings, that was something that I was just really interested in, was just seeing the flow because I just like to be able to track it. But I think I just encourage the members of the public, if you do have a sincere interest in it and you're like, I really want to see that data, please let us know and that way we can bring it out. I think the intention of what we're trying to do right here is to be able to make these meetings a lot more efficient and relevant to what's interesting for people, right?

Sandy Baur (35:06):

Exactly.

Frank Trieu (35:06):

I'm okay with it.

Sandy Baur (35:06):

Thank you

Frank Trieu (35:07):

But I was curious, in this packet right here, I didn't see the updated data. Was that included or did I just miss that?

Sandy Baur (35:17):

Yeah, the complaint, it was included. It's pages 21 and 22 in your packet.

Frank Trieu (35:25):

Got it. Okay. No, I'm looking at the annotated agenda here, that's why. Thank you.

Sandy Baur (35:29):

Yeah, we'll go ahead. We'll go ahead and continue to put this data in the packet and then instead of doing slide, slide, slide, slide, we'll just say the data is in the packet. Are there any questions from any board members?

Frank Trieu (35:43):

Got it. All right.

Sandy Baur (35:44):

And then seeing none, we'll move on to the next. We'll still provide it. We just won't do an official slideshow presentation on it.

Sylvia Garcia (35:53):

So good. Were there any other members-

Sandy Baur (35:57):

Thank you so much.

Sylvia Garcia (36:00):

Who had any concerns? I see Jay is highlighted, but I'm not sure if you're wanting to ask a question.

Sandy Baur (36:12):

Maybe not.

Sylvia Garcia (36:15):

Seeing no more questions. I'll move on to 8.3 which is boards, commissions and outreach or BCO and it is a review of the master item list and Ms. Baur will take us through that.

Sandy Baur (36:30):

Thank you again. That's me. So we do have two open recruitments and we are still recruiting for a public member and we're still recruiting for an apprentice salon representative. Both of those will be open until filled. So if you know of anyone who might be interested, please tell them to contact us and we'll get them the applications. The other action item was DOL was to provide any legislative updates on the bills that were affecting the industry. And that was on the agenda for today. So that's completed. Back to you vice chair.

Sylvia Garcia (37:13):

Thank you. Now, we're to number nine or public comments. I will now open the floor for the public to address the board and share their thoughts, concerns, and requests. Written comments may be submitted at least two days prior to the meeting by emailing [dolboards@dol.wa.gov](mailto:dolboards@dol.wa.gov). Members of the public, while you are addressing the board, please remember each member of the public is limited to one three minute comment. Comments submitted in writing count as your three minutes. Comments must be on matters within the board's jurisdiction. Board members are limited to directing staff to study the matter further or requesting the matter rescheduled for later discussion. Miss Baur do we have any comments submitted in writing?

Sandy Baur (38:08):

We have no written public comments.

Sylvia Garcia (38:10):

Thank you. Now, I will call on the members of the public to raise their hand and ask for any call-in members to speak. They can't use the hand raise function.

Sandy Baur (38:27):

We have a comment from Courtney Roberts. Go ahead please.

Courtney Roberts (38:36):

Hi, I am Courtney Roberts. I just wanted to speak on when Jin Mi was speaking about just saying that I myself am a master aesthetics instructor and I've been teaching for five years now. I've done two different beauty schools and I can't even express the amount of confusion that the students have had about the laws pertaining. And me even as an instructor and teaching for the five years being an aesthetician for eight years, I am still very confused on where that line is and what all they're allowed to do. And so, I think it would be great if there was, I don't know, a list or something of ... I know that we're constantly coming out with new modalities, but something in place to make it more concrete of what they're allowed to do.

Sylvia Garcia (39:36):

Thank you very much. Do we have any further comments or people who would like to make comments?

Sandy Baur (39:51):

We did have an ... There it is. Jackie Dragich has her hand raised. Please go ahead.

Jacqueline Dragich (39:59):

Hello, my name's Jacqueline. I just want to thank you for your time. I was looking ... I noticed I have I guess a proposal. It would go towards the education subcommittee about maybe issuing continuing education credits during license renewals in cosmetology. I noticed unlike other licensed professions, it's not a requirement. It would be great. It links into everything that was discussed today about keeping the professionals current on health safety and regulatory updates. It enhances consumer protection and professional accountability and it also offers a revenue stream for the DOL and the continuing education providers as well. I didn't know if that'd be something that has ever been brought up, but I don't know if you guys see that in that direction, moving towards that.

(40:54):

I also too, with the toxic free cosmetic laws, have you guys ever thought about doing ... Joining with people like the business and education to have a subcommittee with the ecological ... I can't say this word, ecology board, to just kind of have more of a say?

Sandy Baur (41:25):

The board isn't able to answer any questions.

Jacqueline Dragich (41:28):

That's right. That's right. Okay. All right, so that was just all I wanted to comment. Thank you for your time. Thank you so much.

Sylvia Garcia (41:35):

Thank you.

Frank Trieu (41:41):

Sandy and Sylvia, I wanted to bring up a couple of things too during the session is that ... I thought the comments made by Jackie and Courtney are really thoughtful and I think that one of the areas that we probably want to respond to, Sylvia is the conversation that we've been having in this education subcommittee about having listening sessions. We recognize the frustration sometimes in this format where we have these meetings and there are really great comments that are brought up, but because procedurally, we're not able to respond directly to the public, there's just a disconnect somewhere there. So what we have done is that we have set up hearing sessions and Sylvia, did you want to speak to that? I think we have one coming up.

Sylvia Garcia (42:29):

Yes, we have one scheduled for next Monday at two three. And I think Sandy can share out the information and if you need it Sandy, I can provide that. But the listening sessions, we have been in the audience ourselves before and we know that sometimes we have a great idea and we just like somebody to say something. And so we thought that listening sessions would be informal and they would allow us to have more of an opportunity for Jackie to share her ideas. Courtney maybe to expand on supporting some of board member chair's ideas ... William's ideas. And so, from 2:30 to 3:30 Monday, the first Monday of the month, we plan on having these listening sessions.



(43:25):

And they'll be in teams and we can share out that address and we would love to have some folks show up and it can be small groups. It doesn't have to be a big group. We are limited to having six or less board members there, but we would love to hear from the public and be able to have more conversation.

Sandy Baur (43:50):

We do have to be careful not to create a discussion around any public comments.

Sylvia Garcia (43:56):

Okay.

Sandy Baur (43:57):

Because this is not ... There we go. Thank you. And it looks like we have another public comment.

Sylvia Garcia (44:12):

Thank you.

Sandy Baur (44:17):

Courtney Roberts.

Courtney Roberts (44:22):

I just wanted to, how you mentioned there's a meeting Monday at 2:30. How we ... Is that a Zoom meeting, in person meeting and if it is like a Zoom meeting, how would we go about getting that link?

Sylvia Garcia (44:38):

It is a team Microsoft Teams meeting. And let me see. We can't chat. So Sandy, how can we get that information out?

Sandy Baur (44:52):

That information was sent out on Listserv, but we can send it out again.

Sylvia Garcia (44:57):

Okay, thank you. And does everyone.

Sandy Baur (45:05):

If anyone is interested, they can also email [dolboards@dol.wa.gov](mailto:dolboards@dol.wa.gov).

Sylvia Garcia (45:13):

Excellent. Thank you Sandy.

Frank Trieu (45:14):

And we probably should just note it real quick, what Sylvia just mentioned is that we do have a limit of no more than six, right? And so, if you are a board member, if you're a board member on the education staff committee, you're welcome to attend. But if you're not able to attend, why don't you go ahead and let us know, so we can make room for other board members if they would like to be able to attend.

Sandy Baur (45:39):

Thank you Frank. Any further public comments?

Sylvia Garcia (45:58):

Seeing no further comments, I'd like to thank you all for sharing. You had some great comments that give us lots to think about and please know that the subcommittees will be paying attention to those things and the floor is now closed. This is the conclusion of the meeting. Do we have any announcements from the staff or board members?

Sandy Baur (46:26):

The staff does have two announcements to make. First, my teammate Sandra Schaefer has left DOL and we wish her nothing but the best in her next opportunities. And as a result of that, we are still in the hiring freeze, spending freeze, contract freeze. So we are not able to fill her position at this time. Due to that, Program Specialist Alyssa Woods, who supports our regulatory boards. We'll step in and kind of help me out a little bit. So I'd like to introduce her really quick. She will be sending out some emails for me, some invitations, et cetera. So keep an eye out also. Secondly, I would like to introduce Inspection Supervisor Steve Baker, who will be introducing some new team members and I'll turn it over to him.

Steve Baker (47:25):

Hello everyone. Good to see you. Some of you again. Some of you for the first time. I've been with the inspection program for just a little over 10 years. Took, let's see, last year to work with a section called Prograde Fuel Tax. I do want to welcome four new investigators dedicated to the Cosmetology Inspection Program for Eastern Washington. We have Jessica Mayhew. We have Jose Flores and Jasminca Jucek over on the east side. Working in western Washington, new to the program we have Morgan Murray. So I just want to thank that group, welcome them to DOL and we are glad to have them. So thank you for that.

Sandy Baur (48:11):

Thank you. Thank you so much.

Frank Trieu (48:14):

If it's okay, just a quick question for Steve here. Steve, that's great that your team is growing here and to be able to help support the industry. Just on the question on the school side, these new inspectors, are they salon specific? And is Teresa Bartholomew the one designated for all schools or is she just Western Washington or how is that set up?

Steve Baker (48:36):

Right now, Teresa is the school inspector for all of Washington. So yeah, any school-related issues, inspections, all that programming is Teresa's area. So you're correct, Frank. Yeah.

Frank Trieu (48:49):

Thank you.

Sylvia Garcia (48:57):

Next we have 10.2 and this is request for future agenda items. Do we have any board members that would like to bring forward an agenda item? It seems that at our next meeting we'll need updates on legislative action. Things should be finished on that by then. Do we have any other agenda items other than the standing agenda items, no? None at this time?

Jin Mi Williams (49:45):

Sorry. Board Member Williams. Would the future agenda also include the thing that was talking about earlier today? I'm so sorry about that. For the language, for the RCW.

Frank Trieu (50:02):

You're referring to your presentation, is that right for the FAQ or the guidance document that you refer to? Yeah, so what we'll do is that we're going to have in the professionals, the business profession subcommittee. And then what happens at that moment is that after that discussion happens, I'll get elevated to a board discussion, right? So that's sort of the process, but I envision that we'll be having this discussion as a board in the next quarter meeting though, I think, clearly, there's an interest in it.

Jin Mi Williams (50:33):

Thank you for the clarification. Thank you.

Sylvia Garcia (50:36):

Definitely. You have my brain is spinning, thinking about the things we can do to clarify [inaudible 00:50:47]. Anything else that anyone feels like we need to add to the agenda. And this isn't the last time that y'all have the opportunity to install at later seeing nothing else.

Frank Trieu (51:02):

I think I see-

Sandy Baur (51:05):

Board Member Cooper-Deaton has her hand raised.

Erika Cooper Deaton (51:07):

Thank you. I wanted to clarify. Thank you, and thank you for letting me speak with what Ms. Williams is proposing and that we're going to be at this meeting on Friday. Would I reach out to Sandy or would I reach out directly to Ms. Williams to discuss it?

Sandy Baur (51:33):

It'll be discussed at that next subcommittee meeting. We have that down as an action item, which is 10.3 on the agenda review of action items that were captured from this meeting. And I can give some further clarification if you just want to move into that vice chair.

Sylvia Garcia (51:53):

Sure.

Sandy Baur (51:54):

All right. So moving on to the review of master of action items collected for this meeting. This is where Alyssa would step in, but since I'm already talking, I'll go ahead and cover this Alyssa. So the action items that we collected from this meeting are the RCW discussion, the scope of practice, and how it relates to RCWs has been forwarded to the business practices subcommittee. I am tasked with forwarding invitations to that next meeting to Ms. Williams and Ms. Cooper-Deaton. The public comment concerning continuing education has been added to the education subcommittee. So that will be discussed at their next meeting. And staff is also going to be sending out a follow-up listserv for the next listening session for the education subcommittee. Did I capture everything correctly?

Sylvia Garcia (53:11):

I believe so. And just so that Board Member Deaton-Williams understand, you can certainly have conversations between yourselves if you wish. There's nothing that prevents that. The only thing that's prevented is for more than six of us to have a meeting.

Erika Cooper Deaton (53:28):

Okay. That's what I was ... I didn't know-

Sylvia Garcia (53:28):

Yeah, I thought-

Erika Cooper Deaton (53:38):

It's okay, for me to email.

Sylvia Garcia (53:39):

Yes. You can send an email out to the entire board, but you can definitely email back and forth if you wish.

Erika Cooper Deaton (53:46):

Thank you for addressing that.

Sylvia Garcia (53:54):

And at this point, we can look ... We can turn the meeting, I thought I needed a motion. I apologize. Anybody have anything else to add before we end the meeting? I'll hand you back to Frank for the next meeting and he'll do a much more professional job. Yeah.

Frank Trieu (54:14):

Yeah. I got to talk to you about the next meeting. I'm actually going to be on a mission trip in Southeast Asia. I might hit you up again. Yeah.

Sylvia Garcia (54:26):

All right, so at this point, we can adjourn the meeting. We'll see some of the board members on Friday at our subcommittee meetings. And then please join us on Monday at the listening session. We would love to see more people show up and just have some conversation and we can bring that information back to the subcommittees as well. And then, we're hearing more than just us. We want to hear from the public. So if you have friends, coworkers, people that you're involved with, that you'd like to get involved in this discussion, please let them know about it. And everybody sign up for the listserv. And with that, thank you all very much

Sandy Baur (55:07):

And the time is now 10:55 and we can stop recording.

Sylvia Garcia (55:11):

Thank you.

Siobhan Hildebrand (55:13):

Thank you. I want to ...