

From: Erica B.
To: [Sen MonnesAnderson](#); sen.elizabethsteinerhayward@state.or.us; [Sen Beyer](#); Sen.JeffKruse@state.or.us; [Sen Knopp](#); [SHC Exhibits](#)
Subject: Regarding the -3 Proposed Amendments to HB 2303
Date: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 4:17:23 PM

To Members of the Senate Committee on Health Care,

I am writing to ask you to either remove the -3 Amendment to HB 2303, proposed by Sen. Steiner-Hayward, or kill the whole bill. My concern is with section 14. Since when are any of these professions a danger to the public? Very few states require any of these to be licensed--why would it be necessary or desirable here? What are the statistics regarding the harm caused by these professions? According to various insurers for allied health professionals, we are almost no risk, at all.

Most of the allied health professionals that this would effect have hundreds, if not thousands of hours of training; are members of professional organizations which require continuing education, upholding codes of ethics and standards of conduct, and carrying professional insurance; and have successfully helped hundreds of people in ways that professionals with more mainstream credentials aren't able to, whether from lack of time that can be allotted to each patient/client, restrictions imposed by insurers, lack of interest or training in the subject matter or technique, or other reasons.

But our training is extremely diverse--you can't come up with one test or set of criteria that will adequately represent every wellness coach or every unlicensed counselor. Any attempt to do so, will eliminate most of us. As will requiring "behavioral health practitioners" to only work for an agency or organization--there aren't that many jobs! Most of us work for ourselves. And we provide services which are in high demand, and not available from other professionals. Without us, the public will be left attempting self-improvement learned off the Internet. They will try to implement it without any support, and with no assurances about the accuracy of what they read (or watched). That would leave the situation far worse than whatever imagined problem you believe currently exists.

Unnecessary licensing laws only serve to protect territory--of big business, by eliminating opposing viewpoints, and of other professions that don't like the competition--while taking away the public's freedom of choice with regard to their person, their healthcare and the type of practitioner they want to see. They are not driven by public safety, but by economic and censorship agendas. Since when does the state need to regulate conversations about how to get your kids to brush their teeth regularly (parenting coaches) or how to talk to your housemate in a manner that engenders co-operation instead of antagonism (life coach, "behavioral health practitioner"), or any of the other millions of day-to-day topics, which neighbors and friends discuss all the time, but some of us get paid for? Regulating allied health professionals also raises profound First Amendment concerns regarding the right of individuals to speak on common topics such as food, personal care, hygiene, and exercise. These are not arenas in which the state needs to intrude, or needs to correct some public danger which doesn't exist.

Here's me: I am almost 51. I practice as an integrative healer (which of your categories does that belong to?), and have been in private practice for 27 years. And never injured anyone! My life passion has been the interface of mind and body (and now spirit). I designed my own major in Holistic Health (Oberlin College, 1988) which took 5 years to complete, and included two years at other institutions to get classes I couldn't get at Oberlin. I have been an LMT (1,000 hr training program, originally licensed in NY), since 1990. I specifically chose a massage school which taught about mind-body, including how to support clients who started having emotions come up while on the table. I started taking classes in counseling while still in massage school, and eventually (2000) became a certified Somatic Experiencing Practitioner (somatic method of working with trauma--body centered, but not a touch therapy)--a 3-year training program, but no official degree, since programs in somatic psychology did not exist yet, and the field of trauma physiology was still in its infancy. Are you going to consider that part of my practice somatic therapy or "behavioral health"?

I have been fascinated by food and nutrition since I was a child, am an excellent cook, and, as someone with an incurable health condition and multiple dietary restrictions, have read everything I could get my hands on regarding food and health, and food-mood-nutrition. Because of that, most people do not know I have a chronic illness. In (2009) I became a certified Nutritional Therapy Practitioner (NTP)--a 1 year training, to which I've added well over 1,000 hrs. of advanced study. I attend the same

conferences and training courses that the NDs and DCs do. I now have sub-specialties in nutritional mood support, and bio-sleuthing. Along the way I became a Sufi master teacher and a spiritual healer, studied posture and body mechanics, received training in Non-Violent Communication, and am now less than a year from completing a 4.5 yr. Masters of Divinity degree in Ministry. I am a member of professional associations in all of my fields, maintain access to consults/supervision where needed, and carry professional insurance for each area that I integrate into my clinical work. As someone who is chemically sensitive, I work from home, since that is the only way I can control the air I breath.

As you can see, I have thousands of hours of training, and even more thousands of hours of experience. I fill several niches of health support--mind, body, heart, spirit--which people are longing for, but often cannot find. Hundreds of people have better lives now, because of the support and help they received from me--and no-one has ever been harmed. But I have little that will do me any good if you pass this legislation. I can't work for an agency or large organization--I have to work from home. Nor can I reduce my practice back to only doing massage (the one part which is officially licensed)--my body won't take it anymore, and I would get bored. But its hard to say whether I would qualify for whatever random criteria a new licensing board is going to implement for all the other parts of my profession(s) or even which of your categories an integrative practitioner would belong to. Is that what you really want to do? Prevent highly qualified, cutting edge alternative and allied health professionals from working? What is behind this? Why is this even on the table?

Please do not pass section 14 of the proposed amendments. It is completely unnecessary, will force many highly qualified individuals to have to seek other means of supporting themselves and their families (good luck with that), and will rob the public of their freedom of choice.

Thank you,
Erica Bolliger, NTP, LMT, CSEP, Sufi teacher

"The people who cast the votes decide nothing. The people who count the votes decide everything." ~ Josef Stalin

"Facism should be more properly be called Corporatism since it is the merger of state and corporate power." ~ Benito Mussolini

EARLY WARNING SIGNS OF FASCISM

1. Powerful and continuing nationalism
2. Disdain for human rights
3. Identification of enemies as a unifying cause
4. Supremacy of the military
5. Rampant sexism
6. Controlled mass media
7. Obsession with national security
8. Religion and government intertwined
9. Corporate power protected
10. Labor power suppressed
11. Disdain for intellectuals and the arts
12. Obsession with crime and punishment
13. Rampant cronyism and corruption
14. Fraudulent elections

[editorial: leaders typically have a giant chip on their shoulder about "not being enough" (e.g., small stature, from wrong side of the tracks)]

--By Laurence W. Britt, a result of his research of 7 fascist regimes

"The people who cast the votes decide nothing. The people who count the votes decide everything." ~ Josef Stalin

"Facism should be more properly be called Corporatism since it is the merger of state and corporate power." ~ Benito Mussolini

EARLY WARNING SIGNS OF FASCISM

1. Powerful and continuing nationalism
2. Disdain for human rights
3. Identification of enemies as a unifying cause
4. Supremacy of the military
5. Rampant sexism
6. Controlled mass media
7. Obsession with national security
8. Religion and government intertwined
9. Corporate power protected
10. Labor power suppressed
11. Disdain for intellectuals and the arts
12. Obsession with crime and punishment
13. Rampant cronyism and corruption
14. Fraudulent elections

[editorial: leaders typically have a giant chip on their shoulder about "not being enough" (e.g., small stature, from wrong side of the tracks)]

--By Laurence W. Britt, a result of his research of 7 fascist regimes