



BUSINESS, CONSUMER SERVICES, AND HOUSING AGENCY – GOVERNOR Edmund G. Brown JR.  
**BOARD OF BARBERING AND COSMETOLOGY**  
P.O. Box 944226, Sacramento, CA 94244-2260  
P (800) 952-5210 F (916) 575-7281 [www.barbercosmo.ca.gov](http://www.barbercosmo.ca.gov)



**CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD  
OF  
BARBERING AND COSMETOLOGY**

**BOARD MEETING  
MINUTES OF JANUARY 22, 2017**  
Courtyard Marriott Santa Ana Orange County  
8 MacArthur Place  
Santa Ana, CA 92707

The off-site meeting location for teleconference:  
2405 Kalaniana'ole Ave PH-11  
Hilo, HI 96720

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Dr. Kari Williams, Vice President  
Mary Lou Amaro  
Bobbie Jean Anderson  
Polly Codorniz  
Andrew Drabkin  
Richard Hedges (via teleconference)  
Coco LaChine  
Lisa Thong

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT**

Kristy Underwood, Executive Officer  
Rebecca Bon, Legal Counsel  
Tami Guess, Board Project Manager  
Marcene Melliza, Board Analyst

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Joseph Federico, President

**1. Agenda Item #1, CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM**

Dr. Kari Williams, the Board Vice President, called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00 a.m. and confirmed the presence of a quorum.

**2. Agenda Item #2, BOARD PRESIDENT'S OPENING REMARKS**

Dr. Williams did not have anything to report.

**3. Agenda Item #3, ANNUAL ELECTIONS OF OFFICERS**

Dr. Williams asked for nominations for president of the Board for 2017.

Mr. Hedges made a motion, seconded by Mr. LaChine, that the Board elects Dr. Kari Williams as president for 2017.

Ms. Amaro made a motion, seconded by Ms. Codorniz, that the Board elects Andrew Drabkin as president for 2017.

## **Public Comment**

Jerry Tyler, the Director of the Los Angeles County Apprenticeship Council, spoke in favor of electing Dr. Kari Williams as president for 2017.

Delane Sims, the Owner of Delane's Natural Nail Care, asked the nominees to provide background on their length of service.

Fred Jones, the Legal Counsel for the Professional Beauty Federation of California (PBFC), spoke in favor of electing Mr. Drabkin as president for 2017.

Mr. Drabkin withdrew his nomination for president but stated he would like to be considered next year.

**MOTION:** Mr. Hedges made a motion, seconded by Mr. LaChine, that the Board elects Dr. Kari Williams as president for 2017. Motion carried 8 yes and 0 no per roll call vote.

The following Board Members voted "Yes": Amaro, Anderson, Codorniz, Drabkin, Hedges, LaChine, Thong, and Williams.

Dr. Williams asked for nominations for vice president of the Board for 2017.

Dr. Williams made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hedges, that the Board elects Lisa Thong as vice president for 2017.

Ms. Amaro made a motion, seconded by Ms. Codorniz, that the Board elects Andrew Drabkin as vice president for 2017.

Lisa Thong withdrew her nomination for vice president and stated Mr. Drabkin brings greater experience to the position.

**MOTION:** Ms. Amaro made a motion, seconded by Ms. Codorniz, that the Board elects Andrew Drabkin as vice president for 2017. Motion carried 8 yes and 0 no per roll call vote.

The following Board Members voted "Yes": Amaro, Anderson, Codorniz, Drabkin, Hedges, LaChine, Thong, and Williams.

## **4. Agenda Item #4, PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

Wendy Jacobs, the Founder of the California Estheticians Facebook Group, stated a question that comes up every day among her Facebook group members is regarding the lifting process of lashes and whether or not keratin lash/lifts can be performed by licensed estheticians in California. She stated non-licensed estheticians actively offer these services.

Richard Kendall, the Director of Education and Product Development for Dermaflash, a company that has made a home-use exfoliating device for retail sale inspired by dermaplaning, stated while dermaplaning is currently prohibited in the state of California by estheticians, in other states it is available. His company receives many requests from spas and salons asking to use Dermaflash in their establishments as an alternative to dermaplaning. He requested that the Board approve its use by estheticians. He asked to be invited back to speak further about this product.

Mr. Jones invited everyone to the 17<sup>th</sup> Annual Welcome to Our World (W.O.W.) event on May 1<sup>st</sup>, held on the south steps of the Capitol building from 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., which provides the industry an opportunity to showcase what it does by offering complementary services to legislators and their staff, administrators, officials, and the public.

## 5. **Agenda Item #5, EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

- Licensing Statistics
- Examination Statistics
- School Statistics
- Disciplinary Review Committee Statistics
- Enforcement Statistics
- Budget Updates
- Outreach Updates

Ms. Kristy Underwood, the Executive Officer, reviewed the statistics and budget charts and the list of industry events attended since the last Board meeting, which were included in the meeting packet. She highlighted that staff will attend the International Salon and Spa Expo (ISSE) in Long Beach on January 28-30. She stated the Board presence at the expo provides a good opportunity to answer questions and disseminate information.

Ms. Thong asked if there is a process in place to address schools with high fail rates. Ms. Underwood stated the Board does not address this, but the Bureau of Private for Private Postsecondary Education may.

Mr. LaChine asked about schools that have small numbers of one to five students taking the test. Ms. Underwood stated the statistical report does not differentiate between initial and repeat exams. The small numbers may be those students who retook the exam, not the full graduating class. She stated staff is more concerned with particularly high numbers and is currently looking into that.

Mr. Drabkin noted that the Korean barber written examination pass rate results should be 60 percent, not zero percent. Ms. Underwood agreed and stated it will be corrected.

Mr. Drabkin asked if statistics reflect the solution to the low pass rates for Spanish cosmetologists. Ms. Underwood stated the vocabulary list suggested by the Board was implemented this month. Spanish pass rates have been around 34 percent for a long time. The Board can monitor the effectiveness of the vocabulary list in future statistical reports.

Mr. Hedges stated concern about the low barbering exam pass rates for all languages. The numbers of overall licensees have increased by 20 percent over the past ten years. He stated the need to work with the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) to significantly increase the number of inspectors. Ms. Underwood agreed and stated the Agency and the DCA are supportive. Staff will submit a Budget Change Proposal for this in April.

Mr. Hedges stated there are high fail rates for some schools. He asked if the Board can encourage the Board of Postsecondary Education to look into that. Ms. Underwood stated she would inquire about it.

### **Public Comment**

Mr. Jones stated the concern that there are schools that sell hours to students who receive no formal instruction. The PBFC supports one organization that is responsible for holding schools accountable, not the dual regulatory oversight that is currently in place. The license is what makes the industry, and if the license credibility and integrity are questioned, the industry will be eroded. Neighboring states are beginning to question the efficacy of the California State Board license.

## **6. Agenda Item #6, APPROVAL OF BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

- November 14, 2016

**MOTION:** Mr. Hedges made a motion, seconded by Ms. Anderson, that the Board approves the November 14, 2016, Meeting Minutes as presented. Motion carried 8 yes and 0 no per roll call vote.

The following Board Members voted “Yes”: Amaro, Anderson, Codorniz, Drabkin, Hedges, LaChine, Thong, and Williams.

## **7. Agenda Item #7, REVIEW AND APPROVAL ON THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE “HEALTH AND SAFETY FOR HAIR CARE AND BEAUTY PROFESSIONALS CURRICULUM.”**

Ms. Underwood referred to the 583-page Health and Safety for Hair Care and Beauty Professionals Curriculum, included in the meeting packet, and stated it is the first time it has been updated since 1992 and has taken two years to update. It will be translated into multiple languages upon approval.

Tami Guess, the Board Project Manager, stated the hope to put each of the units in a tutorial version posted online. The printed version will be provided for students without Internet access.

Ms. Thong asked how updates will be handled in the future. Ms. Underwood stated the Health and Safety Advisory Committee will partner with other agencies to ensure accuracy and that it is kept current.

Mr. LaChine suggested changing out some of the photos to include more diversity.

Mr. Drabkin noted a typo under Production/Design/Typesetting

### **Public Comment**

Ms. Sims spoke in support of the approval of the curriculum.

Lisa Fu, MPH, the Program and Outreach Director at the California Healthy Nail Salon Collaborative, agreed with Mr. LaChine about diversifying the images and spoke in support of the approval of the curriculum.

Patti Glover, an Instructor at Citrus College, spoke in support of the approval of the curriculum. She stated she teaches from the 1992 Handbook. Having an updated version will not only benefit instructors but will provide students with a workbook to follow along with and be tested on after the course is completed. She thanked the Board for their hard work.

**MOTION:** Mr. Hedges made a motion, seconded by Mr. Drabkin, that the Board approves the Health and Safety for Hair Care and Beauty Professionals Curriculum as revised and allows the executive officer to make non-substantive changes, if necessary. Motion carried 8 yes and 0 no per roll call vote.

The following Board Members voted "Yes": Amaro, Anderson, Codorniz, Drabkin, Hedges, LaChine, Thong, and Williams.

**8. Agenda Item #8, UPDATE AND PRIORITIZATION OF BOARD'S EDUCATIONAL TUTORIAL SERIES FOR LICENSEES, ESTABLISHMENT OWNERS, UNLICENSED INDIVIDUALS, AND APPRENTICES.**

Ms. Underwood stated this agenda item is an update from the last meeting where the Board requested that staff prioritize the proposed Board-created Educational Tutorial series subject areas for the tutorials that will be available online in multiple languages.

**Public Comment**

Dr. Washington, with the San Bernardino County Adult School and the Southern California Barbering Apprenticeship Program, stated the concern that some individuals will abuse the tutorial series. He spoke for himself and his colleagues that he is against taking this out of the public's hands because there is no way to control who is going to be taking the exam on the other side of the computer.

Mr. Tyler stated supervising the 39 pre-apprenticeship program hours is an important part of the Los Angeles County Apprenticeship Council's role. He asked if the Council will be able to continue their work when the tutorial series is implemented. Ms. Underwood answered in the affirmative.

**11. Agenda Item #11, PRESENTATION FROM THE CALIFORNIA HEALTHY NAIL SALON COLLABORATIVE**

Dr. Williams moved Agenda Item number 11 up so the Board could hear the presentation from the Healthy Nail Salon Collaborative.

Ms. Fu provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the background, addressing nail salon worker health concerns, the Collaborative's approach, policy advocacy, the steps a salon must take to be recognized as a healthy nail salon, program requirements, staff training, recognition of salons, and expanding the program of the California Healthy Nail Salon Recognition Programs.

Mr. Drabkin asked if the training to salons provided by the Healthy Nail Salon Collaborative conflicts with Board rules and regulations. Ms. Fu stated the training follows the rules and regulations.

Mr. Hedges suggested inviting Board members to staff training sessions. He stated he has attended several meetings and offered his assistance to Ms. Fu.

Mr. Drabkin asked if materials are available in other languages. Ms. Fu stated materials are currently only available in English and Vietnamese. She stated they have not had requests for other languages, but as they receive requests, they will try to make them available.

Mr. LaChine asked if there is a disclaimer on the decal window stickers that the Board has not necessarily endorsed the salon and if salons pay a fee to be part of the collaborative. Ms. Fu stated the decal is a recognition from the salon's city or county. The collaborative is voluntary and does not charge a fee.

### **Public Comment**

Ms. Sims addressed Mr. Drabkin's question about training. She stated the training is complementary to Board standards and touches on areas that are helpful to consumers and staff.

Jaime Schrabec, of Precision Nails, stated the concern that requiring salons to improve ventilation may be unnecessary. Employee health and safety laws are already in effect. She stated the need to work more closely with organizations to help create higher standards for ethical business practices in the industry.

## **9. Agenda Item #9, PROPOSED REGULATIONS UPDATES**

Dr. Williams deferred to Ms. Underwood to provide updates on the regulations updates. Ms Underwood provided a brief summary of the proposed changes to the following sections:

- **Review and Possible Adoption of Amendments to Title 16, CCR Sections 904 and 905, Regarding the Health and Safety Poster.**

Mr. Drabkin asked if technical changes include font and font size. Rebecca Bon, Legal Counsel, stated the language does not necessarily create the proposed poster by following the language in regulation, but, if the Board approves the proposed poster, it can be incorporated by reference into the regulations. She suggested the motion be to modify the text to reflect the incorporation by reference and that the Board delegates the authority to adopt that language, assuming there are no adverse public comments during the 15-day public comment period.

Mr. LaChine suggested spacing the layout of the poster differently for easier reading, such as moving "barbering" to the next line so that "barbering and cosmetology" stands out and also removing the word "or." He stated he will work with staff offline.

Ms. Underwood suggested giving the poster to the DCA to align the design to other Board materials and bring it back to the Board for approval at the next meeting.

### **Public Comment**

Ms. Schrabec stated the concern that consumers may think the poster is the license for establishments.

Ms. Jacobs suggested including a small area on the poster for salons to incorporate their logo and also making the poster in downloadable PDF format. Ms. Underwood stated salon owners cannot add their logo to the poster because it is a state form.

Ms. Glover suggested putting the logo behind the words and adding “void if copied” on the poster. She suggested switching the places on the poster for the “to file a complaint” sentence and the “laws and regulations” sentence. That way, the repeated website addresses can be removed.

- **Review and Approval of Proposed Amendments to Title 16, CCR Section 904, Enforcement, to Add Definitions.**

**Public Comment**

Dr. Washington asked why an inspector would be required to inspect an office. Dr. Williams stated there are licensees who have tried to conceal products in offices and storage rooms. Allowing inspectors access to all areas of establishments is part of a full inspection.

Ms. Schrabek stated it would be difficult for booth renters to turn over the key to access a private room or secured cabinet to anyone.

Ms. Cordorniz agreed that that would be a problem.

Dr. Williams stated owners of establishments may have to take the risk of being fined if independent contractors are unavailable to allow inspectors to their secured locations.

Ms. Underwood reminded the Board that inspectors do not know who is an independent contractor. To them it is establishment owners and licensees.

Mr. Hedges stated the job of this Board is to protect the consumer and to ensure the salons are free of illegal items.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Tyler stated 75 to 90 percent of establishments in the state of California are independent contractor booth rental spaces and one out of two licensees in the United States is no longer traditionally employed but is self-employed. He suggested that the Board recognize establishments as employer/employee or independent contractor establishments and fine accordingly. He offered his assistance to the Board.

Mr. Jones stated the concern for potential unlawful searches by including the term “all” rooms. He suggested instead adding “where barbering, cosmetology, or electrolysis are being performed” after “to inspect all areas within the establishment.” He stated he will submit further suggestions as the process moves forward.

Ms. Jacobs stated the concern that independent contractors may only be in the salon two or three days out of the week. Also, consistency in inspections is important.

Ms. Underwood stated this proposal, along with today's feedback, will be given to the Legislative and Budget Committee.

**MOTION:** Mr. Drabkin made a motion, seconded by Dr. Williams, that the Board defers this item to the Legislative and Budget Committee for review. Motion carried 7 yes and 1 no per roll call vote.

The following Board Members voted "Yes": Amaro, Anderson, Codorniz, Drabkin, LaChine, Thong, and Williams

The following Board Member voted "No": Hedges.

- **Review and Approval of Proposed Amendments to Title 16, CCR Sections 901, 902, 903, 910,914, 919, 931 and 937, to Update Application Forms.**

Ms. Bon summarized several options the Board can take to amend these regulations. Ms. Underwood stated it would be easier to reference the form number and date as opposed to a form provided by the Board. She asked the Board not to vote on this recommendation.

**MOTION:** Mr. Hedges made a motion, seconded by Mr. Drabkin, that the Board defers this item to the Legislative and Budget Committee for review. Motion carried 8 yes and 0 no per roll call vote.

The following Board Members voted "Yes": Amaro, Anderson, Codorniz, Drabkin, Hedges, LaChine, Thong, and Williams.

- **Review and Approval of Proposed Repeal of Title 16, CCR Section 950.10, Regarding the Transfer of Credit or Training.**

**MOTION:** Mr. Drabkin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hedges, that the Board approves the proposed regulatory language for noticing and delegates the executive officer to make any non-substantive changes as needed and to move forward with the rule-making package. Motion carried 8 yes and 0 no per roll call vote.

The following Board Members voted "Yes": Amaro, Anderson, Codorniz, Drabkin, Hedges, LaChine, Thong, and Williams.

- **Review and Approval of Proposed Amendments to Title 16, CCR Section 974, to Update the Administrative Fine Schedule.**

Ms. Underwood stated 7313 and 904(e) are off the table until the next meeting. She asked the Board to update the fine schedule for 7349, 7353.4, and 7404(l).

Dr. Williams suggested, as the Board works on the language and defining access, also helping establishment owners understand access to the establishment. Ms. Underwood stated that information is available in several ways. She suggested adding that information to one of the tutorials.

### **Public Comment**

Mr. Jones stated he supported the 7349 change. He asked about the difference between access in 7313 and 7404. Ms. Underwood stated 7313 is blocking inspectors from entering the establishment and 7404 is a personal blockage.



Mr. Washington asked that the Board post a notice on the website when the labor commissions implement the new labor poster.

**MOTION:** Mr. Drabkin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hedges, that the Board approves the increased fine schedule for 7349, 7353.4, and 7404(l), will revisit the fine schedule for 7313 and 904(e) once the term “access” is defined by the Board, and delegates the executive officer to make any non-substantive changes as needed and to move forward with the rule-making package. Motion carried 8 yes and 0 no per roll call vote.

The following Board Members voted “Yes”: Amaro, Anderson, Codorniz, Drabkin, Hedges, LaChine, Thong, and Williams.

- **Review and Approval of Proposed Amendments to Title 16, CCR Section 974.1, to Revise the Membership Requirements for Serving on the Disciplinary Review Committee.**

Mr. Drabkin asked if Committee Members would be required to fill out a Form 700. Ms. Bon stated the language creates that standard and brings up the issue of who might be on the Committee. She spoke about the need to track cases for recusal purposes if Board Members were part of the DRC.

Dr. Williams suggested including at least one Board Member on the DRC. Mr. Hedges agreed and suggested including past Board Members. He suggested that DRC Members go through conflict-of-interest training for consistency. Ms. Bon agreed and discussed other options for consistency and tracking issues.

### **Public Comment**

Mr. Jones stated the tension is industry wants more timely, local DRC locations and that is the intent behind this change. He spoke in support of that but stated the other side is having a Board structure because it provides greater public accountability and opportunities for industry to connect to Board Members as opposed to Board staff. He suggested including at least one Board Member in each DRC.

Mr. LaChine agreed that the DRC should be made up of a combination of Board and non-Board Members. He also agreed with the importance of consistency, especially with multiple DRC Committees in different geographic areas.

Ms. Thong agreed that the DRC should be made up of at least one Board Member, because the other DRC Members may not attend Board meetings or have knowledge about issues the Board is currently discussing. A Board Member on the DRC would make that connection and add to the consistency.

**MOTION:** Mr. Drabkin made a motion, seconded by Dr. Williams, that the Board defers this item to the Enforcement Committee for review and delegates the Committee to research how other DCA Boards handle this issue. Motion carried 8 yes and 0 no per roll call vote.

The following Board Members voted “Yes”: Amaro, Anderson, Codorniz, Drabkin, Hedges, LaChine, Thong, and Williams.

- **Review and Approval of Proposed Regulation to Add Title 16, CCR Section 974.3, to Establish when a Fine will be Issued to an Owner and an Individual Licensee.**

Ms. Bon suggested laying out the standard in the regulation to clarify the determination that establishment owners knew or should have known about a violation.

Mr. Hedges suggested training for consistency. He also stated the need for more specificity. He suggested giving this to the Enforcement Committee. Ms. Underwood agreed but stated the law came into effect on January 1<sup>st</sup> and the Enforcement Committee will not meet for several months. She suggested that the Board begin the regulatory process today rather than defer it to a Committee.

Ms. Bon suggested looking at the intent of the law to approve what the law is trying to achieve. The statute mandates that the Board shall regulate when one or both individuals should be cited and gives the consideration to use, which is the egregiousness or repeated violation. The second subsection deals with how to set the amount, but the Board already has a schedule of fines for that.

Mr. Hedges suggested approving the concept in general and delegating Ms. Underwood to work with legal on the proper language. Ms. Bon agreed but stated the Board should be clear on what the statute intends to achieve.

Mr. LaChine suggested ending the sentence after “sole responsibility for the violation.”

Ms. Bon suggested the reverse – rather than stating what they could not have been expected to know, (a) talks about what can be assumed that they did know or would know and (b) talks about whether it is serious or repeated should affect the amount of the fine as opposed to when to apply the fine. She suggested “the Board may cite and fine both the establishment owner and an individual working in that establishment for the same violation, if the establishment owner knew or should have known of the violation; the Board could presume they knew or should have known if it is egregious or repeated.”

Ms. Underwood asked how to determine what an establishment owner should know. Ms. Bon distinguished between an establishment owner not knowing every safety detail that the individuals working in the establishment have been trained in and egregious and repeated violations.

### **Public Comment**

Mr. Jones, as a co-sponsor of the bill, provided clarity and background for the Board. He stated the problem is that the Board does not recognize booth rental. The intent of the bill was to address the injustice of the booth renter, if they are truly an independent contractor having to pay twice for the same fine, but the bill was also to send a message to those booth renters that they need to be truly independent. He suggested moving slower on this regulation update and creating a regulation that separates the booth renter from the establishment owner.

Ms. Underwood stated, although she agrees with Mr. Jones, this is not booth rental license legislation – it is chaptered legislation that the Board is required to implement.

The Board does not have the authority or the staff to determine if individuals are booth renters or independent contractors.

Mr. LaChine stated one of the most common phrases that comes out of the DRC is "I did not know." The intent of legislation is to say the authorized representative may determine that one or both will be fined, but it is ultimately up to the Cite and Fine staff because the representative would not know at the time of inspection if there were repeat violations.

Ms. Underwood suggested removing (a). Ms. Bon agreed but stated it needs further clarity, such as removing "who are cited" and adding "in considering those factors, the establishment owner could be cited as well."

### **Public Comment**

Ms. Schrabec suggested removing (b), removing "duly authorized representatives determine," adding "unless the Board determines," and ending the sentence as Mr. LaChine suggested, at "responsibility for the violation."

Ms. Bon stated the need to state when one or both will be cited.

Mr. Hedges suggested (b) remain as is. He suggested that staff bring back standards to the next Board meeting.

**MOTION:** Mr. Drabkin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hedges, that the Board approves the suggested changes, initiates a rule-making process, and delegates the executive officer to make non-substantive changes. Motion carried 6 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain per roll call vote.

The following Board Members voted "Yes": Amaro, Anderson, Drabkin, Hedges, Thong, and Williams.

The following Board Member voted to abstain: LaChine.

- **Review and Approval of Proposed Regulation to Add Title 16, Section 974.4, to Establish an Installment Payment Plan for Fines.**

Mr. LaChine suggested a greater percentage for the first payment and the balance stretch out accordingly.

Ms. Bon agreed and suggested adding "in no more than twelve monthly payments." She suggested harmonizing this section with 125.9 and changing the term "approval" to "request." She noted a typo at the end of (c). She stated the need to incorporate the form by reference using a title and date in (a)(1).

**MOTION:** Mr. Drabkin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hedges, that the Board approves the proposed regulatory language for noticing and sets it for hearing. Motion carried 8 yes and 0 no per roll call vote.

The following Board Members voted "Yes": Amaro, Anderson, Codorniz, Drabkin, Hedges, LaChine, Thong, and Williams.

- **Review and Approval of Proposed Amendments to Title 16, CCR Sections 978, 979, 980, 980.4, 981, 982, 984 and 989, to Update the Board's Health and Safety Regulations.**

Ms. Bon noted a typo in 978(a)(4).

### **Public Comment**

Mr. Jones stated the word “covered” is problematic. He asked how much more assurance an inspector will have that something is sanitized because it is covered.

Dr. Washington agreed with Mr. Jones that covering electrical tools is not realistic and creates an unnecessary problem.

Ms. Schrabec stated the most common electrical tool in a nail salon is a drill or file with disposable tips and those are not addressed here. She suggested taking 982 a step further to say if the standard of sanitation used in salons is misrepresented by using sterilization packages but not having the equipment to sterilize them. Using sterilization packages without the equipment is misleading to consumers.

Mr. Hedges stated the Board received negative comments from the barbering community when this regulation was implemented. This update restores the regulation to the way it was before where licensees hang their soiled shears and disinfect them just prior to use or store them away clean.

Ms. Jacobs stated the need to talk about duration along with storage. She gave the example of fines for sanitized tools that were just set out in between clients in preparation for the next client. She stated the need for consistency in the inspection process.

**MOTION:** Mr. Hedges made a motion, seconded by Dr. Williams, that the Board approves the proposed regulatory language for noticing and sets it for hearing. Motion carried 7 yes and 1 no per roll call vote.

The following Board Members voted “Yes”: Amaro, Anderson, Drabkin, Hedges, LaChine, Thong, and Williams.

The following Board Members voted “No”: Codorniz.

## **10. Agenda Item #10, REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON HAIR STYLIST LICENSE REQUIREMENTS IN OTHER STATES**

Ms. Underwood stated staff was asked to research offering a hairstylist license. The staff report was included in the meeting packet.

Mr. Hedges stated moving forward with this today would be premature. Also, the Board rejected making a subcategory for makeup artists, so doing that for hairstylists may create conflict within the industry.

### **Public Comment**

Mr. Tyler suggested the Board watch a video by Luxury Brand Partners called “The Reset.” He stated cosmetology as it exists in the United States does not exist anywhere else in the world without a master’s degree to do facial, hair, and nail arts. He stated there is no need to have a comprehensive license that waters down the industry. 1,600 hours does not make anyone a master of anything. He

suggested going back to the occupational analysis to find out what hairstylists do not do and relating it to cosmetology.

Dr. Williams stated the Board is currently doing an occupational analysis, which will provide solid information to move forward to determine if there is a need for it. She agreed with Mr. Hedges that it may create conflict and it is premature to do anything today.

Karen Barras agreed with Mr. Tyler. She stated she was the international trainer for a large company and has watched many hairdressers leave the industry within the first three years because they were trained in only one thing.

**11. Agenda Item #11, PRESENTATION FROM THE CALIFORNIA HEALTHY NAIL SALON COLLABORATIVE**

Agenda Item number 11 was heard earlier in the meeting.

**12. Agenda Item #12, ANNUAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF BOARD GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURE MANUAL**

Ms. Underwood summarized the changes made to the Annual Board Guidelines and Procedure Manual.

**MOTION:** Mr. Hedges made a motion, seconded by Mr. Drabkin, that the Board approves the Annual Board Guidelines and Procedure Manual as updated. Motion carried 8 yes and 0 no per roll call vote.

The following Board Members voted "Yes": Amaro, Anderson, Codorniz, Drabkin, Hedges, LaChine, Thong, and Williams.

**13. Agenda Item #13, WEBSITE REVIEW**

Ms. Underwood stated hard copies of updated website screens were included in the meeting packet.

**14. Agenda Item #14, AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Drabkin stated a New York Times article on December 15 was about a bill that was passed in Illinois requiring hair stylists to go through domestic violence training. He requested looking at that law.

Mr. Hedges suggested that the executive officer and legal counsel meet prior to each meeting to discuss possible legal issues.

**Public Comment**

Ms. Schrabec stated Ohio offers classes in human trafficking that relate to domestic violence, as well.

Mr. Tyler suggested a program titled "Cut it Out" that gives training to recognize potential domestic violence.

Mr. Kendall requested time on the next agenda to demonstrate and discuss Dermaflash as an alternative to dermaplaning.

**15. Agenda Item #15, PUBLIC COMMENT**

No members of the public addressed the Board.

**16. Agenda Item #16, ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.