

**Oregon Health Licensing Agency
Board of Cosmetology
Minutes of January 9, 2006**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mike Snook, Chairperson
Deely Klarr
Linda Bergmann
Debora Masten
Judith Petersen

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Patricia Hall

STAFF PRESENT

Susan Wilson, Director
Larry Peck, Regulatory Operations Manager
Samantha Patnode, Board Liaison

GUESTS

Donna Blake, Dynatronics
Brenda Foster, Air Brush Tanning Salon Owner
Susan Graham, Beaumonde Academy of Cosmetology

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Michael Snook called the meeting of the Board of Cosmetology to order at 9:07 a.m. on January 9, 2006, at the Oregon Health Licensing Agency in the Rhoades Conference Room, 700 Summer Street NE, Suite 320, Salem, Oregon.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION

Ms. Klarr made a motion and Ms. Bergmann seconded to approve the agenda. The motion passed with Mr. Snook, Ms. Masten, Ms. Bergmann, Ms. Klarr and Ms. Petersen voting aye.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION

Ms. Petersen made a motion and Ms. Klarr seconded to approve the minutes of November 7, 2005. The motion passed with Mr. Snook, Ms. Masten, Ms. Bergmann, Ms. Klarr and Ms. Petersen voting aye.

REPORTS

Revenues & Expenditures

Mr. Riggs explained the two main categories of interest. **Personal Services** are employee compensation and related benefits. **Services and Supplies** are non-personnel expenses for agency operations. Charges are divided into two types – direct and indirect – for each program. Indirect costs for agency operation include office supplies, rent, telephones, data processing hardware and software, etc. and costs are distributed by a prorate. Direct charges include attorney general counsel, postage, instate travel or investigative costs, etc., and are distributed at actual rates. He provided the Board with two charts noting expenditures, revenues and cash balance for the last four years. Ms. Wilson explained that a historical baseline will be developed with numbers of practitioners renewing licenses under the newly separated field of practice provisions. To date OHLA has only six months of data. She advised the current fee structure will be reviewed and if inadequate, adjustments will be recommended to ensure core groups of licensees are generating sufficient revenue to correspond with their percentage of use of OHLA resources.

Enforcement

Mr. Tryon reported the percentage of complaints received from January 1 through November 30, 2005 for the Board of Cosmetology:

January 1, – November 30, 2005
Total Number of Licenses – 80,010
Total Number of Complaints –151
Overall Percent of OHLA Complaints – 64%

Mr. Tryon presented a breakdown of complaints received, and the ratio of complaints per licensee base per month from January through November of 2005.

Mr. Tryon reviewed a comparison for 2001 through 2004, noting that in 2003 there were 249 complaints, and in 2004 there were 202 complaints, noting a difference of 47 complaints received between those years. He clarified questions from the Board.

Mr. Tryon drew the Board's attention to a summary report of complaints that were closed in 2004 and 2005. In reference to the report, Mr. Snook asked how a practitioner would be fined if practicing with an expired license following the separated fields of practice change. Mr. Tryon explained it would depend on what services were being performed, and clarified a civil penalty would be assessed against the license in expired status under which services were provided. Ms. Klarr asked if enforcement officers do follow-up inspections on a facilities found in violation of health or safety issues like nail fungus. Mr. Tryon responded that it varies; depending on the seriousness of the situation, number of facility violations, and what corrective measures were taken.

Licensing

Ms. Murphy pointed out a status count report and a comparison report for the years 2002, 2003, and through September 2004 and 2005.

Status Counts:

28,024 – Active Licensees (Practitioner)
68,281 – Licenses (Authorization to Practice)

Practitioner Certificates – Original Issued:

870– Increase of Original Certificates Issued – 41% increase
321– Increase of Licensees (original issued licenses) - 15% increase

Reciprocity

25 – Increase of Reciprocity Issued – 4% increase
14 – Increase of Licensees – 2% increase

Practitioner Certification Renewed

3,944– Increase of Certificates Renewed – 34% increase
269 – Decrease of Licensees – 2% decrease

Practitioner Certificate – Late Renewals

302 – Increase of Late Renewals – 13% increase
131 – Decrease in Individual Renewals – 6% decrease

Certificate of Identification

23 – Increase of Certificates Issued – 15% increase

Facility Licensure:

12 – Decrease of Late Renewals – 4% decrease

Independent Contractor Licensure:

28 – Decrease of Late Renewals – 10% decrease

Ms. Murphy explained the next two reports indicates the monthly activity within the year.

Examinations

Ms. Murphy reported that fee adjustments will be implemented for applicants taking the national examination, noting the examination fees increased from \$10 to \$25, as a pass through to the national testing vendor and to offset administrative costs.

Ms. Murphy reported on the full year and monthly comparison report from 2003 through November 2005, that the number indicates examinations conducted and the pass/fail percentages for the following examination categories -- Oregon Laws & Rules, Hair Design, Barber, Facial Technology, Nail Technology, and Certificate of Identification.

Mr. Snook referenced the pass / fail rate and reported students who have taken all examination sections on the first attempt will often fail the last examination section, but when retaking the single section they do much better even without additional studying. He attributed this to the "burnout" factor and stated it would be interesting to compare statistics of fail rates when all sections are taken together, against how the student does on the retake examination.

Committee Updates

Product Safety / Public Protection:

Ms. Klarr reported that the Product Safety/Public Protection Committee met on December 2, 2005 to review vacuum massage and that Synergy by Dynatronics was the specific machine presented to the committee. Ms. Klarr reported the committee concluded that if the Synergy System's intended use was for weight loss and inch loss and not for the purpose of beautifying the skin, it was not within the purview of ORS 690. However if the Synergy System used by a licensed esthetician is for beautification of the skin then the use would be regulated. She stated that the Oregon Board of Massage Therapy (OBMT) is currently reviewing the Synergy System to determine relevance for massage therapy. Discussion focused on esthetician use for skin care services using the Synergy System. The Board concurred if the tool is used in conjunction with an esthetic service on the skin, then an esthetician may provide the service, under a regulated service in ORS 690. If an individual is providing Synergy services, whether in a spa or a health club setting, with the intended use of inch loss or cellulite reduction the service would not fall within esthetics scope of practice.

Ms. Masten stated that it is important to not exclude devices and procedures that fall within the scope of practice for esthetics for the purpose of public protection.

MOTION

Ms. Klarr made a motion and Ms. Masten seconded that vacuum massage systems used in the scope of practice of esthetics will be regulated under ORS 690. Any system that is considered a vacuum massage

system used for cellulite reduction and inch loss will not be regulated under ORS 690. The motion passed with Mr. Snook, Ms. Masten, Ms. Bergmann, Ms. Klarr and Ms. Petersen voting aye.

Legislation

Mr. Matt Markee, Markee & Associates, reported on the scheduled appearance on January 17 before the Joint Legislative Committee on Information Management Technology (JLCIMT). He stated the Agency will report on its plans for implementing electronic commerce technology for offering on-line renewal services on the Web site. He explained his role in coordinating efforts at the state capitol and contact with JLCIMT committee members to provide information and answer questions in preparation of the hearing. Ms. Wilson clarified that all electronic data provided to the public through the Oregon.gov portal must have a consistent look and meet state standards for information technology services. She stated that the agency may return for increased expenditure authority at a later date to complete the on-line license renewal function. She explained that OHLA is continuing to work through residual issues that occur from migrating from one database system to another. She noted that the agency would report to the JLCIMT but would not appear before the full Emergency Board until a later date near completion of the IT project.

Enforcement:

Mr. Snook stated he had no report at this time.

Scholarship / Education:

Ms. Petersen stated she had no report at this time.

Industry Liaison:

Members stated there were no reports at this time.

Item Writing:

Ms. Murphy stated the first meeting will be April 17, 2006.

Legislation / Rules:

Ms. Patnode pointed out two letters on air brush tanning, one received from Debbie Ethell of Illumination and a second letter from Laura Glass regarding new airbrush tanning regulation.

Public Comment

Public Comment – Airbrush Tanning

During public comment, the Board acknowledged Ms. Brenda Foster, who addressed regulation of “airbrush tanning” under the esthetics scope of practice. Passage of HB 2105 by the 2005 Legislature removed the C7 vertebrae restrictions for delivering skin care services. Airbrush tanning was determined to be part of the esthetics scope of practice based on the application of a cosmetic tanning solution on the client’s skin by use of a mechanical device for skin care / beautification purposes.

Ms. Foster stated that regulating airbrush tanning under “esthetics” would create a hardship for her small independent business that has leased business space, established a clientele and sold reoccurring treatment packages, purchased equipment and materials, and contracted for advertising. She offered that her business would have to close because services cannot be interrupted for six months while a business owner gets into compliance. She stated becoming an esthetician is not something she wants to do. Ms. Foster explained that she does not touch the client’s skin and noted airbrush tanning requires

knowledge about the types of chemical solutions, equipment safety, understanding potential skin reactions, ventilation requirements, insurance and business issues.

Ms. Foster requested she and others providing airbrush tanning services be grandfathered under a separate licensing category. It was explained that HB 2105 did not create a separate field of practice for airbrush tanning, and that full body skin care included airbrush tanning within the scope of practice for esthetics. Ms. Foster reported that she had been enrolled in cosmetology courses years before but had discontinued her training to pursue other interests, and that before starting her airbrush tanning business and purchasing equipment, she did contact the agency to check on tanning requirements and was told it was unregulated. Ms. Foster provided an overview of her research regarding cosmetology schools. She questioned the need for an esthetician license to practice airbrush tanning since it specifically is not part of the core training in cosmetology schools and alleged estheticians do not know anything about airbrush tanning upon completing the training. She emphasized no interest in other segments of esthetics like waxing or other skin care services. Ms. Wilson explained the statute doesn't allow grandfathering for special procedures and the 2005 law change regulates skin care to include the entire body.

Ms. Klarr responded that several cosmetology schools are competency based so Ms. Foster may be given credit for her previous training after passage of an examination required to determine placement at Oregon cosmetology schools. She emphasized that completion of training and passage of the examination is required for licensure and explained that Oregon cosmetology schools have both an hourly based curriculum and a competency based program. Ms. Foster countered that completing an esthetics training program would not teach airbrush tanning, and asked why she is being forced to complete training that has no bearing on what she does.

Ms. Klarr emphasized safety training is required from the company from which equipment is purchased or by other means. Airbrush tanning requires using masks, protective goggles, and other precautions with a separate area for applying the solution. She agreed with Ms. Foster that not every esthetician could do airbrush tanning. Ms. Klarr asked Ms. Foster whether individuals doing an airbrush tanning service were able to recognize a skin disease or other precautions prior to applications of spray. Ms. Foster responded probably not, but if she recognized something she wouldn't spray.

While Ms. Masten empathized with Ms. Foster's position, she reiterated regulation was needed to safeguard the public, and if the esthetician is unfamiliar with airbrush tanning they are now required to have additional training. The Board recapped business opportunities and ways of reducing the time and cost of acquiring the needed training. Mr. Snook pointed out the relevance of esthetics training to airbrush tanning, stating there are common factors, such as chemical use and storage, safety and infection control standards, skin disease / disorder recognition, and client records / business practices that are included in the 500 hour baseline training program.

Mr. Peck clarified that the agency would phase in airbrush tanning regulations. A phase-in period allows individuals to become licensed or make other arrangements to continue business operations by hiring trained licensed practitioners to perform tanning services. Mr. Peck provided an overview of the timeline during 2006—with public outreach getting the message out about airbrush tanning regulations. Board members agreed there was sufficient time to obtain the necessary training which could be completed in two to four months depending on the method – competency based training or by means of the traditional 500 hour based program. Members recommended various avenues to pursue to meet licensing requirements. Ms. Petersen stated that the Department of Education sets the standards and requirements for training. Ms. Petersen reiterated baseline training requirements and the need for

practitioners to acquire additional training if they are going to offer expanded or new services, noting licensees must make those decisions in their business practice.

Following lengthy discussion, the Board thanked Ms. Foster for presenting her issues.

Outreach and Communication

Mr. Bohot reported that "*Nail Salon*" will be airing a segment during media sweeps. He stated that Fox 12 television is going to air a special "hidden camera" news segment on "*nail salons*" during February "*sweeps*". He reported that Fox 12 went undercover with a hidden camera in a Portland-area nail salon, and then asked OHLA's enforcement officers to review the tape to pinpoint if there were any violations. Fox 12 is also planning to accompany an enforcement officer to see if a salon is cited for violations. He stated that this is great way to educate consumers on what to look for when choosing a nail salon. The Board will be notified of the date and time the segment will air. He also reported KEZI 9 from Roseburg aired a segment on nail salon safety on November 27, 2005 and the agency will get a copy of segments to present at subsequent board meetings.

Mr. Bohot reported the national publication "*Nails Magazine*" plans to feature OHLA in two upcoming articles in February 2006, focusing on regulatory operations and the top violations in nail salons. He reported a new Vietnamese translated edition called "*Mong Tay*" will be featured later this year.

Mr. Bohot reported on the following methods that OHLA will use to educate and inform practitioners and consumers:

- *Facial Forward* will help clarify esthetics scope of practice and will offer guidelines on vacuum massage and airbrush tanning and other subjects.
- *Northwest Stylist & Salon "Oregon Regulatory News"* page will describe the differences and similarities between esthetics and massage to clarify scope of practice issues with a Question and Answer section to provide additional information.
- OHLA web site at <http://www.oregon.gov/OHLA/>

He recapped an exchange with the Board of Nursing, stating that because of the emerging technologies such as photo facial and vacuum massage, the Board of Nursing will establish a task force to study the issue.

Administrative Rules – Extended Comment Period

Ms. Patnode recapped the Rules Advisory Committee meeting held on December 2, 2005. She stated that Oregon Chapter of the American Massage Therapy Association, with Oregon Board of Massage Therapy in concurrence, petitioned to have the public comment period for cosmetology rules extended.

Ms. Patnode noted that the following comments were received during the extended comment period:

- Increased educational hours to include full body skin care
- Change the definition of "manipulating" to "manipulated" to correspond with the law and add "for the purposes of providing skin care" to the definition and remove human body.

She stated the other discussion focused on terminology such as kneading and massage which attendees agreed could relate to massage therapy, esthetics, athletic trainers, physical therapy or other professions depending on the intent.

Ms. Patnode stated that the agency filed Notice of Rulemaking / Hearing, rescheduled the rule hearing date and extended the comment period to January 23, 2006. Rules will become permanent and effective on March 15, 2006.

Mr. Snook reported that the December 2, 2005 meeting was successful with most parties agreeing with the changes requested at the Rules Advisory Committee meeting. He explained that discussion focused on estheticians providing massage therapy which was not the intent of the law change. He stated that any esthetician providing massage therapy for therapeutic purposes would be referred to the Oregon Board of Massage Therapy.

Oregon Private Career Schools in attendance were recognized as providing significant input relating to terminology, history and intent of the core curriculum requirements and education provided by schools. Staff clarified further questions from the Board.

ITEMS FOR BOARD ACTION

Revision for Proposed Rules

Ms. Allbritton summarized the current rulemaking history noting that proposed rules were filed in November following board approval on October 11, 2005. The public comment period was scheduled to close on November 21, 2005, however a request to extend the comment period was received from Oregon Association of Massage Therapy and Oregon Board of Massage Therapy and further extended the date to January 23, 2006. Ms. Allbritton stated that following the extension further fact finding was held on December 2 at which time several comments were received.

Ms. Allbritton gave an overview of the recommendations made by the Rules Advisory Committee and other outside sources.

OAR 817-005-0005(41) Definitions

Revised proposed definition for "manipulation"; changing term to coincide with statutory wording in ORS 690.005(7) for esthetics. Term should be "manipulating" as a result of passage of HB 2105. Replace phrase "use on the human body" with *for the purpose of providing skin care*.

(41) "Manipulating" means, as referred to in ORS 690.005(7) articulation or massage, pressure, friction, stroking, tapping or kneading by manual or mechanical means, with or without lubricants such as salts, powders, liquids or creams, for the purpose of providing skin care.

OAR 8917-010-0065 Requirements & Standards

Subsection (2) text has been revised to link with criteria contained in OAR 817-005-0005 definitions for (34) low level disinfectants and (39) high level disinfectants

Subsections (9) through (13) and NOTE detail. Provisions were rewritten to add clarity to mitigate confusion and ambiguity in the types of devices and equipment that may be used in cosmetology and the type of documentation licensees are required to maintain and be subject to inspection by the agency. Recommendations were received from licensees, Mr. David Suzuki and OHLA staff and consulting with legal counsel. The rules are consistent with FDA standards and other resource materials.

(9)(a) All manual or mechanical devices and equipment used in the practice of cosmetology must meet all product registration requirements imposed by any federal, state, county, or local authority.

(9)(b) All manual or mechanical devices or equipment used in the practice of cosmetology must be used in accordance with the product safety requirements imposed by any federal, state, county, or local authority.

(10) The holder of a facility license or independent contractor registration must verify, maintain, or be able to access documentation related to any device classified by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) as a "Class I" or "Class II" manual or mechanical device that is used in the practice of cosmetology, including the practice of barbering, esthetics, hair design, and nail technology, as defined in ORS 690.005. Required documentation includes:

(a) Verification of establishment registration of manufacturer on FDA Registration Database;

(b) Verification of "FDA device registration" for Class I devices on FDA Device Listing Database (Form 2891, required under 21 CFR Part 807.20 and, if applicable FDA Form 2892);

(c) FDA 510K number for Class II devices, including the Intended Use Statement put forth by the FDA;

(d) Certification issued by International Organization for Standard ISO 13485:1996 and ISO 9001:2000;

(e) Safety certification issued by Underwriters Laboratories (UL) or Canadian Standard Association (CSA); and

(f) Certification or acknowledgement from the manufacturer or from a trainer approved by the manufacturer that each practitioner who uses any Class II device has been trained in the safe and effective use of the Class II device by the manufacturer or by a trainer approved by the manufacturer.

(11) Practitioners may not use any manual or mechanical device or equipment unless the use is consistent with client health and safety. In determining whether the use of any manual or mechanical device or equipment is consistent with client health and safety, the agency will consider the information provided in the documentation required by section (10) of this rule.

(12) In the provision of cosmetology services, practitioner may use Class II devices only for the use or uses intended by the manufacturer.

(13) Practitioners must permit any representative of the agency to inspect any manual or mechanical device or equipment used in the practice of cosmetology or the documentation required by section (10) of this rule, upon demand.

NOTE: Class I devices are typically exempt from a 510(k) submission to the FDA because of their low risk and non-invasive nature, but are still registered with the FDA using Form 2891 and 2892. A Class II device has more potential for risk if the device is not designed

properly, does not meet strict standards, or is not used properly. Class II devices may require additional controls such as special labeling, mandatory performance standards and post market review. Practitioners may use only those Class II devices intended by the manufacturer for use in providing cosmetology services. Only practitioners who have been trained in the safe and effective use of the device or equipment may use the device or equipment. Verification of establishment registration is necessary; FDA standards and regulations may be accessed at www.fda.gov/cdrhdevadvice.

The documentation requirements described in section (10) of this rule apply to specialized items used in the practice of cosmetology, and may not apply to those items used in the delivery of basic services, which have been defined as an "article", equipment", or "materials and supplies" in OAR Chapter 817, division 005, such as scissors, combs, orangewood sticks, shampoo bowls, styling chairs or nail files.

OAR 817 – Division 090 Civil Penalties

Wording was revised throughout division 090 to coincide with the agency's statutory authority for administrative oversight and for assessment of civil penalties, including replacing the phrase "be brought before the Board for", to state "*be subject to*". This adjusted wording is located in the schedule of penalties for specific 3rd offenses.

OAR 817-090-0045(3) modifies verbiage regarding issuance and maintenance of the inspection certificate. With migration towards a paperless system for recording data regarding on-site facility inspections, the issuance and posting of inspection certificates in public view was discontinued during last rulemaking. However the licensee was not left with a record of the inspection and was unable to reference the action and outcome. The agency's enforcement officers will now leave an inspection certificate for maintaining on the facility premises, but it will not have to be posted in public view.

(3) Failing to **maintain the most recent** inspection certificate **on** the facility **premises** or at the work station of an independent contractor, **or to make the document available upon request** is a violation of OAR 817-035-0110 **(5)** and shall incur the following penalties:

- (a) For 1st offense: \$50.
- (b) For 2nd offense: \$100;
- (c) For 3rd offense: \$200.

OAR 817-090-0105(8) adds "esthetics" to the civil penalty for failing to maintain client records.

(8) Failing to maintain client records for each client receiving **esthetics or** nail technology services, maintain client records on the premises of the facility or allow an enforcement officer access to review client records upon request is a violation of **OAR 817-015-0065** and shall incur the following penalties:

- (a) For 1st offense: \$50;
- (b) For 2nd offense: \$100;
- (c) For 3rd offense: \$200.

OAR 817-090-0105(9) adds a new penalty for failing to maintain required documentation based on new rule proposed under OAR 817-010-0065.

(9) Failing to maintain required documentation of an FDA Class I or Class II manual or mechanical device or equipment, or to provide required documentation upon request is a violation of OAR 817-010-0065 (10) or (13) and shall incur the following penalties:

(a) For 1st offense: \$100;

(b) For 2nd offense: \$300;

(c) For 3rd offense: \$500.

Other Rule Adjustments – Secretary Of State

The Agency's official copy of filed permanent rules adopted on July 2004, were not the same as the official Secretary of State's copy. The corrections are listed below:

OAR 817-010-0040	Articles in Contact with A Client
OAR 817-010-0055	Materials in Contact with a Client
OAR 817, Division 015	Division title should read "Safety and Infection Control Rules: Practice Standards"
OAR 817-020-0011	Rule title should read "Facility License Criteria; Requirements".
OAR 817-040-0003	Fees
OAR 817-090-0105	Schedule of Penalties for Client Health and Safety Violations (warnings)

MOTION

Ms. Bergmann made a motion and Ms. Masten seconded to approve the proposed rule changes. Mr. Snook called for a discussion.

Board members asked for clarification relating to inspection certificates. Ms. Wilson stated that the businesses will be required to have a copy of the paper inspection certificate accessible to investigators if requested. Mr. Peck noted that currently paper inspections or citations are not being left on the facility premises; however in near future citations and inspection certificates will be given at the time of inspection. He stated that if multiple citations or if the owner is not available then the citation would be sent via mail. Mr. Snook asked what type of violations would go against the facility and not the practitioner. Mr. Peck stated that safety and sanitation issues would be against the facility; however if the practitioner is expired or unlicensed then the practitioner and the facility would be cited. Mr. Snook commented that it was helpful to consumers to see the inspection certificates in public view. He suggested that the agency provide outreach to consumers on how they can get information regarding licensees and facilities. Mr. Bohot interjected that OHLA is currently working on an aggressive outreach campaign.

MOTION

The motion to approve the rules passed with Ms. Bergmann, Mr. Snook, Ms. Masten, Ms. Petersen, and Ms. Klarr voting aye.

2006 NIC Annual Conference – Portland, Maine

Ms. Wilson stated that the 2006 NIC Annual Conference is August 26 – 28, 2006 and that the director and a board member attend the meeting. She explained the content and value of attendance is focused

on emerging technologies and commonalities among states nationwide regarding rules and regulation. With regard to travel, staff explained from the day of departure through the day of return when attending business meetings a payment of \$30 per day, registration, lodging fees, transportation and mileage to and from the hotel are reimbursed from the receipts received by the agency and meals will be reimbursed at the host state's recognized government rate. The standard government rate is \$39 per day unless otherwise specified. The meal reimbursement for Maine is \$44.00 per day. OHLA Director authorizes all out of state travel and approves expenditures in advance of travel. Ms. Masten expressed interest in attending the NIC conference as Oregon's Board representative.

MOTION

Ms. Klarr made a motion and Ms. Petersen seconded that Ms. Masten attend the 2006 NIC Conference in Portland, Maine. Mr. Snook called for a discussion.

Ms. Snook volunteered to be a backup if Ms. Masten is unable to attend.

The motion passed to have Ms. Masten represent the Oregon Cosmetology Board with Mr. Snook as the alternate with Mr. Snook, Ms. Masten, Ms. Petersen, and Ms. Klarr voting aye.

Ms. Klarr expressed concern regarding "temporary permits" for fundraisers, and complained that Oregon Health Licensing Agency's customer service representatives are unfamiliar with rules and with provisions governing water source of a temporary facility. Mr. Peck responded answers are given based on how the question is asked. Ms. Wilson stated that this question had been explained in the Northwest Stylist and will be revisited for clarification. Mr. Peck clarified that if makeup application which is done strictly for the sale of a product, where there is no charge to have makeup applied, and is only for the product demonstration, would not be regulated.

Board Interest File

Mr. Snook stated that the one item of interest in the board interest file is the barber shop in a kiosk. He stated that the Board will probably want to review the proposal in the near future.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Susan K. Wilson, Director