

**From:** [Quinn Berry](#)  
**To:** [OBLPCT Updates](#)  
**Subject:** Re: [OBLPCTeNews] Notice- Proposed Board Rulemakings  
**Date:** Monday, June 16, 2025 10:57:56 AM

---

Hi, I have worked with a number of people with ID/DD as a LPC, in OR. Will this rule assume that all licensed Counselors have competency to work with people with ID/DD? Would denying a person services based on lack of competency to treat them be acceptable under this rule? Obviously, anyone denying services based on their own competency and scope would have a professional obligation to refer the person seeking services to another professional who was prepared to treat them.

Thank you,  
Quinn Berry

On Wednesday, June 11, 2025 at 01:15:52 PM PDT, OBLPCT Updates  
<oblpctenews@omls.oregon.gov> wrote:

## **NOTICE: BOARD PROPOSED RULEMAKING, PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OPEN**

Please find attached three rulemaking notice documents from the Board of Licensed Professional Counselors and Therapists.

**Rule Caption #1: Implements SB 1557, prohibiting licensees from denying services on basis of intellectual/developmental disability.**

### Rule Summary

- Adopt OAR 833-110-0061: Prohibits Board licensees, registered associates, and temporary practitioners from denying any individual access to mental health assessment, treatment or services on the basis that the individual also has an intellectual or developmental disability.

### Need for the Rule(s)

The Board must implement Senate Bill 1557, which passed during the 2024 Short Legislative Session and added a requirement (at Section 5) for mental/behavioral health licensing agencies to adopt rules that prohibit licensees from denying “any individual under the age of 21 years access to mental health assessment, treatment or services on the basis that the individual also has an intellectual or developmental disability.” Senate Bill 729 Enrolled (2025) amends the law created by SB 1557 by removing “under the age of 21 years,” and this proposal conforms with that change.

**Rule Caption #2: Implements Servicemembers Civil Relief Act via new servicemember portability application method and licensure requirements.**

### Rule Summary

- Amend OAR 833-020-0021: References new servicemember portability application method for licensure applicants.
- Adopt OAR 833-020-0202: Establishes new servicemember portability application process and requirements for licensure as a professional counselor (LPC) and marriage and family therapist (LMFT). Includes definitions, items required for application, criteria for initial and continued licensure, license duration, and scope.

### Need for the Rule(s)

The Board must implement the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA) as amended- federal law that

allows servicemembers and their spouses to continue practicing their professions in new jurisdictions without completing the typical licensing requirements when they relocate due to military order and provided they meet specified criteria.

### **Rule Caption #3: Registered associate supervisor requirements.**

#### **Rule Summary**

- Amend OAR 833-130-0050: Allows licensees that hold an accredited doctoral degree in Counselor Education and Supervision to qualify as Supervisor Candidates on the Supervisor Registry. Allows and specifies the criteria for supervision experience and supervision of supervision completed in other states to satisfy the requirements for Approved Supervisor registry placement.
- Amend OAR 833-130-0070: Clarifies the requirement that supervisors of registered associates who are not on the Supervisor Registry must hold licenses based on graduate degrees.

#### **Need for the Rule(s)**

The Board's Education / Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee has been exploring ways to strengthen and expand the pool of qualified supervisors to guide Oregon's future counselors and therapists through the final supervised clinical supervised experience requirements for independent practice. Allowing licensees with advanced doctoral training and experience in counselor education and supervision to qualify for the registry before reaching two years of licensure was identified as a sensible opportunity to remove barriers and balance enhanced support of the workforce with strong consumer protection standards. Recognizing supervision experience already completed in other states also meets these goals. The Committee determined that the rule could be clearer regarding the graduate degree requirement for supervisors not on the registry.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The agency requests public comment on whether other options should be considered for achieving the rule's substantive goals while reducing negative economic impact of the rule on business. Please email your comments to [laree.stashek@mhra.oregon.gov](mailto:laree.stashek@mhra.oregon.gov) or mail them to the Board's office at 3218 Pringle Road SE, Ste. 120, Salem, OR 97302. All comments must be received no later than 5:00 p.m. on July 23, 2025.

### **FILED RULE NOTICE**

*On June 10, 2025, the Board filed a Permanent Administrative Order for the following rule amendment (effective July 1, 2025):*

#### **Implements Senate Bill 1552, petition for predetermination based on criminal conviction, fee, and definitions.**

- Amend OAR 833-010-0001: Removes unused terms and adds new and clarifying definitions, including "petitioner" for licensure predetermination based on criminal history. Updates the definition of regionally accredited institution (accrediting agency) to conform with a July 2020 change to federal rule that removed the distinction of "regional" versus "recognized" accrediting agencies.
- Adopt OAR 833-020-0300: Establishes procedures for filing of petition for licensure predetermination based on criminal conviction. Sets forth filing requirements, expiration, disclosure requirements, review process, reconsideration, and other provisions.
- Amend OAR 833-070-0011: Establishes petition for licensure predetermination fee of \$125.

*On June 10, 2025, the Board filed a Permanent Administrative Order for the following rule amendment (effective June 10, 2025):*

- Adopt OAR 833-001-0030: Creates new rule to set Board member compensation equal to ORS 171.072(9) for performance of official duties, which is in addition to other allowable reimbursement for travel or other expenses. Allows members to decline compensation or reimbursement of

expenses.

**WEBSITE**

The above documents, along with rule text, are available on the Board [Rulemaking Webpage](#).

---

You are receiving this email because you are either a licensee, applicant, registered associate, or an interested person who has requested to be on the Board's mailing list. **This listserv does not allow replies.**

Thank you,

BLPCT Staff

Mental Health Regulatory Agency

3218 Pringle Road SE, Suite 120 | Salem, OR 97302-6309

Data Classification: Level 1, Published

**From:** [Rose Mary A. Colorafi](#)  
**To:** [STASHEK LaRee \\* MHRA](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Rulemaking  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 11, 2025 7:01:39 PM

---

You don't often get email from [rose@roseclifegoals.com](mailto:rose@roseclifegoals.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello. I read in the listserv about the Proposed Rule-making to be made consistent with Oregon state law about practitioners not denying service to those with Intellectual or Developmental disabilities. As someone who, over my career, did serve people differently-abled in those ways, I applaud the effort to expand services in this way and avoid discrimination. However, I do wonder if it might result in potential clients or their guardians, perhaps sometimes unrealistically, seeking access for services when the ID or DD is so severe or limiting that the person might not benefit from counseling or therapy, e.g. due to lack of comprehension or verbal skills. Further, how would the practitioner always know if the person has an ID or DD if not disclosed nor records provided? Lastly, I am a solo practitioner, licensed, in a business set up under an LLC and this seems not to apply to businesses, so I am not sure if it would apply to me as a licensee. I did read some of the links referred to in the listserv but, of course, I am not an attorney and somewhat unfamiliar with legal terminology.

Respectfully,

**Rose Mary A. Colorafi, M.A., Owner**

**Rose C Life Goals LLC**

Counseling\*

650 NE Holladay St., 16th Fl.

Portland, OR 97232

(503) 427-9543

[Rose@RoseCLifeGoals.com](mailto:Rose@RoseCLifeGoals.com)

[www.RoseCLifeGoals.com](http://www.RoseCLifeGoals.com)

\*Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC - Oregon) # C4267

\*Licensed Mental Health Counselor (LMHC - New York) #001466

\*National Certified Counselor, National Board for Certified Counselors # 22374

CRC/Retired [former Certified Rehabilitation Counselor, through 9/30/2021]

Please note: *This e-mail is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete it, e-mail me back immediately to inform me, and do not forward, retain, or copy it. Also, while I use a paid HIPAA compliant e-mail, you may want to avoid including private or confidential information in your e-mails to this address since no technology is 100% hacker-proof.* If you are in need of immediate emergency assistance, call 911 or go to the nearest emergency room. If you are having **thoughts of suicide you may call Lifeline at 988 or 1-800-273-8255.**

**From:** [Abby Messer](#)  
**To:** [STASHEK LaRee \\* MHRA](#)  
**Subject:** Implements SB 1557, prohibiting licensees from denying services on basis of intellectual/ developmental disability.  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 23, 2025 2:37:41 PM

---

[You don't often get email from messerab@outlook.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

Hello Laree!

I wanted to share my thoughts as a mere Registrant, but someone who has great experience and sees many IDD impacted folks at our clinic and in previous employment roles.

I have gotten feedback from those impacted personally by IDD, service coordinators supporting those with IDD, and therapists in my office.

I would love to see supporting verbiage in this rule that requires some specificity that if someone feels that lack of training or client care ability is a reason to deny services, there should be an additional rule or stipulation making IDD-specific therapy counseling skills a requirement in licensure.

Aside from my employment experience, I was given one week in a “culturally diverse” course in my graduate degree on counseling individuals with IDD. That is simply not enough. I would love to see board requirements for training and CEU’s around this, given that a majority of the population is neurodivergent and ID is in fact mental health!

That’s my soap box and thoughts.

I appreciate your time and efforts on this!

Best, Abby

**From:** [Barb Smith](#)  
**To:** [STASHEK LaRee \\* MHRA](#)  
**Subject:** comment on impact of proposed rule change  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 11, 2025 3:16:54 PM

---

You don't often get email from smithba@yamhillcounty.gov. [Learn why this is important](#)

I have a concern as a provider regarding OAR 833-110-0061:

When a client's disability is such that I feel my training is not sufficient to adequately serve them (they are outside my scope of practice), this appears to forbid me from referring them elsewhere or letting them know my scope doesn't cover their needs. If this is the case, I have an ethical concern about the proposed rule. If not the case, please clarify how I am to proceed with a client who is outside of my scope of competence. Am I able to refer as with other issues where I believe my training/experience are not sufficient?

Thank you

Barbara Smith, MS, LMFT