State Board of Massage Therapy February 14, 2023

10

11

12

13

14

16

1

BOARD MEMBERS:

7 Nancy M. Porambo, MS, LMT, CNMT, NCTMB, Chair, 8 Professional Member 9

Arion R. Claggett, Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs

Linda A. Chamberlain, MS, BSN, RN, CNDLTC, Secretary of Health designee - Absent

Jessica A. Nelson, Office of Attorney General designee - Absent

Dana J. Douglas, LMT 15

Vickiann Hicks, LMT, BCTMB, CCCA

17 Jennifer A. Keth, LMT, CNC

18 Imelda Alumbro Shade, LMT

Bryan Strawser, LMT, Vice Chair 19 20

Ellyn Jo Waller, Ed.D., Public Member - Absent

21 22 23

BUREAU PERSONNEL:

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

37 38

39

40

41

42

43 44

45

46

Thomas M. Davis, Esquire, Board Counsel Dean F. Picarella, Esquire, Senior Counsel in Charge Jacqueline A. Wolfgang, Esquire, Regulatory Counsel Andrea L. Costello, Esquire, Board Prosecution Liaison

Colby B. Widdowson, Esquire, Board Prosecutor Christina Townley, Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs Health Licensing Division, Department of State

Paul Keller, Board Administrator

Carolyn A. DeLaurentis, Esquire, Executive Deputy Chief Counsel, Department of State

Andrew LaFratte, MPA, Executive Policy Specialist, Department of State

Amanda Richards, Acting Fiscal Chief, Bureau of Finance and Operations, Department of State Danie Bendesky, Director of Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of State

Ryan Dumbroff, Student Intern, Office of General Counsel

Deena Parmelee, Legal Office Administrator 1, Department of State

47 48

49 50

State Board of Massage Therapy February 14, 2023

ALSO PRESENT:

Edward Portley Jr., LMT, Just This Side of Heaven Massage & Continuing Education for Massage Therapists

Camille Baughman, MA, BSed, LMT, Camille Baughman & Associates

Natalie Cook, Associate, McNees-Winter Group LLC, representing the American Massage Therapy Association Pennsylvania Chapter

Nina M. Kottcamp-Long, LMT, NCMT, Director of Holistic Health and Wellness, Harrisburg Area Community College

William Mullen, LMT, Manager, Massage Therapy Program, Montgomery County Community College MTR.MET

Brandon Arosi Doreen Rigani Kelly L. Dunn

* * *

State Board of Massage Therapy
February 14, 2023

* * *

[Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act, at 9:00 a.m. the Board entered into Executive Session with Thomas M. Davis, Esquire, Board Counsel, for the purpose of conducting quasi-judicial deliberations and to receive advice of counsel on the matters upon which the Board will later vote. The Board concluded executive session at 10:30 a.m.]

* * *

The regularly scheduled meeting of the State
Board of Massage Therapy was held on Tuesday,
February 14, 2023. Nancy M. Porambo, MS, LMT, CNMT,
NCTMB, Chair, Professional Member, called the meeting
to order at 11:22 a.m.

* * *

19 [Thomas M. Davis, Esquire, Board Counsel, noted the
20 meeting was being recorded, and those who continued
21 to participate were giving their consent to be
22 recorded.

Mr. Davis also noted the Board entered into

Executive Session prior to the Board meeting for the

purpose of conducting quasi-judicial deliberations

```
5
   and to receive advice of counsel on the matters upon
1
2
   which the Board would later vote.
3
   Introduction of Board Members/Attendees
4
5
   [Chair Porambo requested an introduction of Board
6
   members and attendees.
7
                              * * *
8
   Approval of minutes of the November 15, 2022 meeting
9
   CHAIR PORAMBO:
10
                  Let's continue on with the approval of
                  the minutes from November 15.
11
12
                       Are there any changes to the
13
                  minutes?
                              * * *
14
15
   [The Board discussed corrections to the minutes.]
   CHAIR PORAMBO:
16
17
                  Are there any other changes? none.
18
                       May I have a motion to accept the
                  minutes as amended?
19
20
   MR. STRAWSER:
21
                  I make the motion.
22
   MS. DOUGLAS:
23
                  I second the motion.
24
   CHAIR PORAMBO:
25
                  Thank you.
```

Porambo, aye; Claggett, aye; Douglas, aye; Hicks, aye; Keth, aye; Alumbro
Shade, aye; Strawser, aye.

* * *

5 [The motion carried unanimously.]

Appointment - Prosecution Division Annual Report
Presentation

9 [Carolyn A. DeLaurentis, Esquire, Executive Deputy
10 Chief Counsel, Department of State, informed Board
11 members that she is now the executive deputy chief
12 counsel for the Department of State but is presenting
13 to the Board on behalf of the prosecution division in
14 her former role to provide the presentation.

Ms. DeLaurentis presented to the Board to provide a summary of the prosecution division's role and present annual numbers for 2022. She informed Board members that the Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs provides administrative and legal support to all 29 licensing boards and commissions with the mission to protect the health and safety of the public and the integrity of the profession.

Ms. DeLaurentis explained that the Office of Chief Counsel is under the Governor's Office of

```
General Counsel and assigned to the Department of State, noting the prosecution division is one division under the Office of Chief Counsel. She noted the prosecution division works with the Bureau of Enforcement and Investigation (BEI), along with the Professional Compliance Office (PCO).
```

Ms. DeLaurentis stated BEI, PCO, and prosecution are all tasked with receiving complaints, investigating complaints, ensuring public safety, and enforcing compliance with the acts and regulations that govern the 29 licensing boards and commissions.

Ms. DeLaurentis stated the prosecution division has five senior prosecuting attorneys because the division is broken into five teams. She stated Karl Geschwindt is now the acting senior counsel in charge of the team that handles the Massage Therapy Board. She also noted Heather McCarthy, Paul Jarabeck, Ray Michalowski, and William Newport are senior counsel for other boards.

She mentioned there are currently 32 prosecuting attorneys serving under the senior attorneys, including liaisons.

Ms. DeLaurentis addressed the complaint process, noting that complaints may be received in any manner the aggrieved party sees fit, but noting that the

preferred method of submission is through the
Pennsylvania Licensing System (PALS) at pals.pa.gov
because it is the most efficient. She noted
prosecution also accepts complaints from sibling
agencies, federal agencies, law enforcement, and
through media reports.

- Ms. DeLaurentis discussed levels of review, including jurisdiction checks, noting administrative assistants review every complaint to see if it falls under one of the 29 boards and commissions. She mentioned complaints are referred to the appropriate agency if prosecution does not have jurisdiction.
- Ms. DeLaurentis stated that prosecution works with BEI inspectors and investigators to determine whether there is a violation. She noted BEI interviews witnesses, gathers documents, and reviews social media evidence.
- Ms. DeLaurentis addressed the various levels of review and how prosecution division determines whether there was a violation. She explained that matters could be closed if there is not a violation of the act or regulation which allows prosecution to devote resources
- Ms. DeLaurentis discussed the post-investigation process, where attorneys may need to make charging

decisions based on evidence by filing an "order to show cause" or a citation. She noted there is a hearing process, which is like a regular trial but slightly less formal, where both sides can present evidence and arguments.

Ms. DeLaurentis noted that if the matter is heard by a hearing examiner, the hearing examiner usually issues a proposed adjudication and then it goes to the boards and commissions for their final decision because they have the ultimate authority for discipline. She addressed consent agreements, where the parties negotiate a resolution which is then presented to the Board, allowing the Board to accept or reject the agreement.

Ms. DeLaurentis addressed the prosecution division's role at Board meetings, including presenting consent agreements and listening to concerns of the Board. She pointed out that prosecution has a confidentiality statute that applies to their files, where all the contents within their files is confidential under the law unless presented publicly as part of a proposed consent agreement and is why prosecution's files are kept confidential except for the final disciplinary action.

Ms. DeLaurentis stated BEI conducts
investigations and interviews, gathers evidence, and
conducts inspections for certain boards. She noted
the role of the investigators is fact gathering and
serving subpoenas, orders, and letters. She
mentioned that prosecution has subpoena authority,
but BEI does not have search warrant authority.

She noted BEI also testifies to the results of their investigations and inspections. She also noted they have inspection authority for six boards but do not have statutory authority and cannot remain at that location if asked to leave.

Ms. DeLaurentis addressed post-investigation, where BEI is gathering facts and present it to the legal office for review. She stated BEI is not determining whether or not a law has been violated or determining whether discipline should be issued because that is the role of the prosecution division. She noted prosecuting attorneys work with legal analysts to determine whether there was a violation to decide whether to close the matter or file charges.

Ms. DeLaurentis addressed "immediate temporary suspensions," where a licensee is an immediate danger to the health and safety of the public, but the

licensee may request a hearing within 30 days, and explained that immediate temporary suspensions are different than the typical disciplinary process in which prosecution files an order to show cause, and the license remains active until the case is resolved. She noted automatic suspensions include involuntary mental health commitments, orders for examination, and drug act violations. She also noted "petitions for appropriate relief" are filed when prosecution believes a licensee has violated a board order.

Ms. DeLaurentis stated that levels of discipline include revocations, suspensions, probations, reprimands, fines, remedial education, and cost of the investigation. She mentioned that some cases could have more than one type of discipline and can be found in more than one category in the report.

Ms. DeLaurentis referred to the confidentiality statute under 63 Pa.C.S. § 3109, where prosecution and investigative files are deemed privileged and confidential under the law. She explained that Department of State investigative files are deemed noncriminal investigative records under the Right-to-Know Law.

Ms. DeLaurentis stated the information could be

shared with other licensing boards, law enforcement, and other agencies in furtherance of investigative efforts, but only their final action could be shared publicly, including final adjudications and orders, final consent agreements, and final letters.

Ms. DeLaurentis provided data as of January 3, 2023, where the number of open cases for the prosecution division was 13,154, which is down from 2022 at 15,141. She stated 16,084 cases were opened in 2022 and is down from 2021 at 18,363 cases. She reported closing 17,826 files in 2022 and is up from 2021, where 15,994 cases were closed. She thanked the prosecution division, counsel division, hearing examiners, BEI, and the Board for their group effort.

Ms. DeLaurentis informed Board members that an annual report is issued to the General Assembly, which includes a breakdown of case categories, and would notify Counsel when the report is available.

Ms. DeLaurentis addressed specific information for the State Board of Massage Therapy, noting 149 cases were opened in 2022 and 175 in 2021. She noted 160 cases were closed in 2022 and 222 in 2021. She noted 127 open cases as of January 3 and 137 at the same time last year.

Ms. DeLaurentis referred to disposition of closed

- 1 cases, including discipline and non-discipline. She
- 2 reported 23 Act 48 fines in 2022 and 18 in 2021, 16
- 3 regular fines and 15 in 2021, 3 probations in 2022
- 4 and 0 in 2021, 6 revocations, and 18 voluntary
- 5 | surrenders. She noted revocations and voluntary
- 6 surrenders were consistent at 14 last year and 12 the
- 7 prior year. She reported 17 suspensions in 2022 and
- 8 12 in 2021.
- 9 Ms. DeLaurentis addressed closed cases without
- 10 discipline and referred to "Z codes" used when
- 11 closing cases, when prosecution is not warranted.
- 12 Ms. DeLaurentis addressed warning letters, noting
- 13 warning letters are not discipline but help maintain
- 14 the integrity of the profession by attempting to
- 15 correct any behavior that may become an issue and are
- 16 given for de minimis (minor) violations.
- 17 Chair Porambo thanked Ms. DeLaurentis for the
- 18 presentation.]
- 19 ***
- 20 Report of Board Prosecutors
- 21 | [Andrea L. Costello, Esquire, Board Prosecution
- 22 Liaison, presented the Consent Agreement for Case No.
- 23 21-72-006891.1
- 24 MR. DAVIS:
- 25 Based on the Board's discussions in

14 Executive Session, I believe the Chair 1 2 would accept a motion to approve the 3 Consent Agreement in the following matter: Case No. 21-72-006891. 4 5 CHAIR PORAMBO: Do I have a motion? 6 7 MR. STRAWSER: 8 I'll make the motion. 9 CHAIR PORAMBO: 10 Do we have a second? MS. DOUGLAS: 11 I second the motion. 12 13 MR. KELLER: 14 Porambo, aye; Claggett, aye; Douglas, 15 aye; Hicks, aye; Keth, aye; Alumbro 16 Shade, aye; Strawser, aye. 17 [The motion carried unanimously. That is 18 Commonwealth BPOA v. Lawrence T. Ford, LMT.] * * * 19 MR. DAVIS: 20 21 Number 10 on the Board's agenda. I 22 received an email from the Board 23 prosecutor, Colby Widdowson, this 24 morning asking that it be tabled. * * * 25

1 Report of Board Regulatory Counsel

2 [Thomas M. Davis, Esquire, Board Counsel, noted the

3 | Board currently has five active regulations with

4 | movement on three of those between the last meeting

5 and now. He referred to 16A-726 regarding massage

6 therapists in cosmetology and esthetician salons and

7 | informed Board members that the Office of Attorney

8 | General approved the proposed regulation on January

9 31, 2023, and the next step would be publishing it in

10 the Pennsylvania Bulletin. He noted the regulation

11 is being jointly promulgated with the Cosmetology

12 | Board regulations and the Board may hold off until

13 that regulation is also approved.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

Mr. Davis informed Board members that he received feedback from regulatory counsel for Act 41 regarding licensure by endorsement. He noted the former Chairperson was also on the Applications Committee and took issue with the fact that sometimes the Board would receive an application, where the individual took the national exam 20 years ago which would then

21 beg the question, how does the Board know the

22 | individual has current competency.

Mr. Davis noted a suggestion was made to amend the regulations to add the requirement that the applicant for original licensure by examination have

passed the MBLEx within the past five years. noted the Board voted to remove this particular proposed amendment from the general revisions regulation but noted the language is still in Act 41. He mentioned a previous Board discussion where the Board discussed licensure by endorsement under Act 41 if the person tries to obtain licensure by endorsement, being that they have a license under another jurisdiction, but they do not check all the boxes under Act 41, oftentimes the Board has been able to consider the application under licensure by examination.

Mr. Davis stated that adding the five-year stipulation to the regulations would make it more difficult to license some individuals, those who have a license in another jurisdiction but do not qualify for licensure by endorsement, and suggested the Board remove that from the Act 41 regulations. He informed Board members that he would remove it after hearing no opposition to removing it.

Mr. Davis referred to 16A-729 regarding virtual supervision, noting the Board voted to release an exposure draft at the November 15, 2022 meeting and received one comment from Nicole Campbell, Division Chief, Division of Law Enforcement Education and

Trade Schools at the Pennsylvania Department of

Education. He stated the regulation concerns the

possibility of allowing a certain number of the 600

hours of in-class education hours to be obtained via

computer-based, synchronous videoconferencing.

- Mr. Davis noted Ms. Campbell suggested clarifying that the contact hours be "in-person residential instruction." He stated the Board already defined contact hours as in person but would look into whether the definition needs to be extended. He noted the regulations currently read, a certain number of hours must be earned through contact hours and the other number must be through whatever means necessary.
- Mr. Davis noted Ms. Campbell suggested clarifying all three items under both the hours required for in person and hours related to online. He offered to look into it but believed the Board's intent is clear.
- Mr. Davis referred to another question asking whether the State Board of Massage Therapy is opposed to asynchronous instruction for the initial 600 hours of education. He noted prior Board discussion of synchronous online instruction, where the individual can converse with the instructor simultaneously

because of Act 100 of 2021, which strongly suggested
boards develop regulations to allow more online
instruction.

Mr. Davis noted the Act defines virtual platform as live-stream synchronous videoconferencing or similar virtual presence technology. He noted that if the Board is going to lean on Act 100 to allow any portion of the initial education to be online, he believed the Board is empowered as long as it is synchronous and not asynchronous.

Mr. Davis stated the Practice Act specifically states 600 hours of in-class supervision and Act 100 talks about virtual supervision, where it must be done in a virtual platform defined as livestream synchronous videoconferencing or similar virtual presence.

Mr. Davis addressed continuing education (CE), noting the Board was previously not interested in allowing more online education. He noted the statute requires 24 hours of continuing education biennially, and the Board decided a minimum of 16 hours of those 24 must be earned through contact hours. He suggested having a discussion regarding additional online hours to the continuing education requirement to the next agenda.

Chair Porambo commented that the Board would also be revisiting the initial education one more time to look at the hours for baseline education programs and will now be looking at both at the next meeting.

Mr. Davis addressed the proposed fee regulation, noting the Bureau of Finance and Operations (BFO) discussed the Board's current financial state at the last meeting and suggested fees be raised moving forward. He referred to option 1 on the agenda, where BFO asked whether they could have a fee regulation in place for the February 2025 renewal cycle, but Mr. Davis felt that promulgating a fee reg before the 2025 renewal was unlikely to happen, and the Board only discussed option 2, which is not putting anything new into effect until the 2027 renewal cycle.

Mr. Davis stated that in the time since the last meeting, Mr. Davis reviewed BFO's proposal, and he now believes that, should the Board wish to increase fees, the Board would be better off going with the first option because in option 1, the highest/ultimate renewal fee is \$260, whereas the highest/ultimate renewal fee in option 2 is \$305. He noted the current renewal fee is \$175. He discussed the Board's controlling statute which specifically

states that if the revenues raised by the fees,

fines, and civil penalties imposed under the act are

not sufficient to meet expenditures over a two-year

period, the Board shall increase those fees by

regulation so the projected fees will meet or exceed

the projected expenses.

Mr. Davis referred to the Board's finances from the current period, where the \$175 renewal fee was implemented and the projections, stating the expenses do not eclipse revenue. He explained that there is no requirement to increase fees when expenses do not eclipse revenue, but he reminded the Board of the Professional Licensure Augmentation Account (PLAA), which holds all funds for each of the BPOA licensure boards. He mentioned that when a new board comes to be, it draws start-up funds from that account in order to operate, and section 49 of the practice act requires that the board repay those funds within three years. He noted it is passed three years, and the Board is in the red approximately \$1.7 to \$2 million to that account.

Mr. Davis noted that when the fee increase was implemented in 2019 and BFO discussed the fee increase, they were discussing repayment to PLAA. He explained that increasing fees at a time when revenue

meets or exceeds expenses becomes a policy decision, rather than a legal decision, especially if the prevailing opinion is that raising fees will mean losing licensees.

Amanda Richards, Chief of Fiscal Management,
Bureau of Finance and Operations, Department of
State, commented that the Board has had drastic drops
in license counts and expenses are currently not
exceeding revenue, but every time licensees drop, it
also means revenue would drop as well. She reported
checking the numbers this morning and that the Board
is in the process of a renewal but are already down
1,472 licenses from November.

Mr. Davis provided data showing 4,400 licensees from 2011 and 2012, 7,798 in 2013, and around 9,000 in 2013 and 2014 and every year after that. He stated BFO provided three choices, including increasing all application fees and not increasing renewal fees and increasing application and renewal fees but by different amounts, and beginning at different renewal cycles.

Mr. Davis explained that the application fees could be raised to the level it costs BPOA to process the applications. He suggested the Board raise the application fees to match BPOA's cost to process

applications at the very least. He noted the
application fee for initial licensure is currently
\$100, and BFO suggested the Board increase it to
\$113, followed by \$118, and then \$123, which would be
a 23 percent increase as of 2031.

Mr. Davis commented that according to BFO's estimates, once the renewal fee reaches \$175, revenue is expected to meet or exceed expenses. He mentioned that a renewal fee of \$175 was meant to generate enough revenue to pay back the PLAA in a period of approximately 10 years but according to BFO's current estimates, it does not look like \$175 will be enough to repay the Board's debt to the PLAA.

Ms. Richards explained that the \$175 fee would chip away at the Board's debt to the PLAA, but any unanticipated expense would derail that repayment.

Mr. Davis reminded the Board it received over 400 comments from the licensure community about how upset they were when the Board last increased fees in 2018. He noted concern with raising fees to \$260 or \$305, saying that to do so would almost certainly lower the total licensee count.

Mr. Davis commented that the Board has around 9,000 licensees and only 120 applications received every year, and it would not be feasible to increase

only application fees and expect to repay the Board's debt to the PLAA. He explained that application fees cover the cost to process applications, whereas renewal fees pay for the workings of the Board.

Acting Commissioner Claggett commented that increasing the application fee would not be enough and is why it was not an option.

Mr. Davis stated the most common comment the last time the Board raised fees was that the Board should lower their salaries and informed everyone that the Board receives \$60 for their attendance at the meeting may receive \$60 the prior day to review materials. He stated this per diem rate is set by statute, and the Board has no control over it. He noted the bulk of the Board expenses go toward prosecution and counsel fees.

Mr. Davis reviewed the Board's four options, including not increasing the fees at all; increasing just the application fees to cover the cost of processing applications; adopting the proposed fee increase that starts in 2025 and ultimately peaks at \$260; and the increase that starts in 2027 and peaks at \$305.

Mr. Davis explained that one of the hurdles is the Independent Regulatory Review Commission (IRRC)

2.4

- 1 because they review potential regulations on behalf
- 2 of the legislature to see if it benefits the public.
- 3 He stated one topic that has been discussed in recent
- 4 years is IRRC has opined there really is not a
- 5 requirement to back PLAA.
- 6 Mr. Davis stated he does not recall a time where
- 7 | a board presented a proposed fee package to IRRC when
- 8 | a board's income meets or exceeds expenses. He
- 9 explained that if he takes this fee package before
- 10 IRRC, he would have to say that it is being
- 11 promulgated just to pay back the PLAA and he believes
- 12 that under these circumstances, it may be difficult
- 13 to convince IRRC that it is needed.
- Mr. Strawser commented that the Board was
- 15 previously told by someone within the finance world
- 16 that it would take about 10 years for the Board to
- 17 | repay its debt to the PLAA and asked what happened
- 18 from then until now.
- Mr. Davis explained that legal costs have
- 20 | increased, and the licensee count decreased in the
- 21 time since the last fee increase.
- 22 Ms. Richards informed Board members that the cost
- 23 for prosecution and counsel increased in FY18-19.
- 24 Mr. Davis stated Counsel Division has added a
- 25 regulatory counsel to help promulgate regulations,

1 and there have been a lot of regulations the last 2 couple of years.

Mr. Strawser asked whether his understanding of the Board's current financial situation - that revenue currently meets expenses - and the Board just started its two-year renewal cycle for licensure, noting they received most of the revenue for the next two years.

Ms. Richards noted Mr. Strawser to be correct and there may be a renewals that may come in, but that most of the Board's revenue would be in January and February.

Mr. Strawser noted the importance of figuring out how to balance the budget and keep the licensees in the state interested in the profession.

Ms. Hicks commented that the Board sometimes spends thousands of dollars trying to suspend or revoke a license and asked whether the Board is ever reimbursed for those expenses.

Mr. Davis explained that the Board oftentimes collects "costs of investigation," but reminded the Board that costs, fees and fines are a small percentage of the Board's revenue. The Board relies on renewal fees for costs of operation. He further explained that when the Board enlists the aid of the

Office of Attorney General (OAG) to enforce civil penalties and costs of investigation, the OAG is paid a percentage of the monies collected.

Ms. Douglas commented that it makes sense to increase the application fee to cover the cost to process an application because the salary of the person processing the application increases every year. She commented that massage therapy is not a rich profession, so either one of the proposed escalations over the next four renewals is terrifying and suggested something smaller to continue to chip away. She also mentioned taking the route of not doing anything at all if the Board could get away with that without any consequences.

Chair Porambo asked whether the Board could take a look at the numbers after the first year and determine where they stand at that time.

Mr. Davis agreed that it would make sense to wait one more renewal cycle to see if the Board is still in the black; however, the renewal fee may increase even more the longer the Board waits.

Chair Porambo commented that she had no problem with increasing the initial application fees to cover the expenses of what it costs to process those but believed it was a little early to make the

determination on renewals because the Board would have a better idea by the November meeting.

Mr. Davis explained that a lot of paperwork goes into regulations and suggested the fee increase on applications and renews should be done all at once. He recommended tabling the fee discussion for a period of one year until after BFO's next presentation.

Ms. Richards explained that the fee increase would be higher the longer the Board waits. She reported a significant drop in licensees from FY18-19 at 9,104 licenses and 8,044 in 2021. She noted the Board would be looking at the third option of the higher incremental increase if they wait until after October.

Mr. Davis commented that each of the options has a goal in mind, and the two options where renewal fees are going up are with the implicit goal of repaying the PLAA ahead. He noted it is a policy decision and comes down to how BPOA wants Boards to treat PLAA, whether it wants to make sure that each board is paying its own way within the PLAA or does it want to recognize that there is some fluidity when it comes to established license categories, where the licensees can afford higher renewal fees compared to

the some of the newer, less established licensure categories.

Chair Porambo commented that massage therapy is a physical job and most work part-time with an average yearly salary of around \$36,000, so the proposed fees are exorbitant and is a concern.

Mr. Davis stated the Massage Therapy Act has a section that says the funds for the initial startup and running of a Board that come from the PLLA will be repaid within a period of three years. He noted not being sure whether they can justify saying that empowers the Board to continuously increase fees in perpetuity in order to accomplish that goal.

Mr. Davis stated the only specific authority within massage therapy is based on two-year renewal periods; however, the Commissioner's Office has separate authority to raise fees. He commented that it sounds like the Board is not prepared to make a decision at this meeting.

Acting Commissioner Claggett noted the importance of Board members being more open about who they grant licensure to in Pennsylvania and rethink certain ideals to attract people to work in Pennsylvania.

Ms. Hicks asked what happens if the Board cannot pay the debt.

Mr. Davis stated that, to the best of his knowledge, nothing happens. He mentioned they might ultimately see some legislation that directs each board to pay their fair share within the PLAA, which would ultimately force the Board to increase fees.

Ms. Hicks asked whether other boards are in similar situations.

Ms. Richards stated their Board is the only Board that has not repaid their money for their startup from PLAA that she is aware of but other boards are in the process of fee increases because of revenue not being enough to cover their expenses.

Mr. Davis asked Ms. Richards to provide information regarding other boards that are in the red between now and the next meeting.

Ms. Richards explained that other boards are in the red but not for the same reason, noting the Board is in the red due to not being able to pay back their startup money. She reported that quite a few fee increases that have gone through have allowed other Boards to begin repaying their debt to the PLAA.

Ms. Richards offered to provide an update on licensees and plug the new licensee numbers in to give an idea of where the Board would be based on that number at the April meeting.

Mr. Davis commented that this is a new Board and most of the other boards are established and have been able to pay off their initial startup fees.

Chair Porambo commented that the Board is one of the last boards established, noting massage therapy is also very different as far as fitting into the health care world with insurance and a variety of other things and programs that are appealing and affordable to the practice.

Mr. Davis suggested tabling the fee increase discussion.

Chair Porambo thanked Ms. Richards.]

13 * * *

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

Report of Board Counsel - Act 35 of 2022 - Military 14 15

and Veterans' Licensure

[Thomas M. Davis, Esquire, Board Counsel, noted Acting Commissioner Claggett has been introducing the 17 18 boards to Act 35 of 2022.

Acting Commissioner Claggett informed Board members that Act 35 provides expedited application review for service members, veterans, and military spouses. He stated that application types included in the expedited review are initial applications, renewal applications, and reactivation applications.

25 Acting Commissioner Claggett noted Act 35 gives them the ability to waive the initial application fee for spouses when they are required to move due to military orders. He mentioned that the fee waiving functionality in PALS is not available and that refunds would be issued.

Acting Commissioner Claggett noted Act 35 also has directed them to create a military crosswalk explaining how military experience transfers over to licensure and is available on the Board web pages.

Acting Commissioner Claggett stated that Act 35 also gives them the ability to provide temporary permits for applicants whose military experience may be lacking something needed for licensure.

Mr. Davis also addressed Act 35, noting it allows for a temporary license to be issued while the military applicant completes additional requirements for license in the commonwealth. He noted the temporary license would be valid for six months or until conditions are met and provided an example. He mentioned it is similar to Act 41 of 2019 on certain issues but a new way for veterans and their spouses.

Mr. Davis asked the Board to think about whether there was anything the Board could regularly waive or not have an issue with waiving, like some of the hour

requirements for education or possibly
cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) requirements or
something along those lines. He mentioned they could
bring military licenses before the Applications

Acting Commissioner Claggett noted that expedited applications would come through the Board. He mentioned an additional question for people applying for their initial application, renewal, and reactivation that will identify them as a service member.]

12 **

Committee as a possibility.

13 Report of Board Counsel

14 Record for Deliberation

15 MR. DAVIS:

Moving on to number 8. This is a matter that was discussed in Executive Session, so I know how the Board is considering voting on this one, and I will read a prepared motion.

Based on the Board's discussions in Executive Session, I believe the Chair would entertain a motion to grant the Motion to Deem Facts Admitted and Enter Default and direct Board Counsel to

(814) 536-8908

```
1
                  prepare and Adjudication and Order in
2
                  accordance with the discussion in
3
                  Executive Session in the matter of
 4
                  Commonwealth BPOA v. Heather Renee
5
                  Caldwell, LMT, Case No.21-72-014970.
   CHAIR PORAMBO:
6
7
                  I need a motion?
8
   MR. STRAWSER:
9
                  I'll make the motion.
10
   CHAIR PORAMBO:
11
                  A second, please?
   MS. DOUGLAS:
12
13
                  I'll second the motion.
14
   MR. KELLER:
15
                  Porambo, aye; Claggett, aye; Douglas,
                  aye; Hicks, aye; Keth, aye; Alumbro
16
17
                  Shade, aye; Strawser, aye.
18
   [The motion carried unanimously.]
                              * * *
19
20
   Report of Acting Commissioner
21
   [Arion R. Claggett, Acting Commissioner, Bureau of
22
   Professional and Occupational Affairs, informed
23
   everyone of new functionality being added to the
24
   Pennsylvania Licensing System (PALS) sometime around
25
   May to notify licensees their actual license has
```

```
34
   expired. He stated that anyone whose license expires
1
2
   now would receive an email notification alerting them
3
   the license expired.]
 4
5
   Report of Board Administrator
6
   Applications
7
   MR. DAVIS:
8
                  Numbers 11 through 17. I do have
9
                  prepared motions in relation to each of
10
                  these.
                       Based upon discussions in Executive
11
                  Session, for number 11, this was
12
13
                  discussed, and the Board administrator
14
                  will be reaching out to the applicant,
15
                  so there is no vote necessary there.
16
17
   MR. DAVIS:
18
                  Number 12. Based on the Board's
                  discussions in Executive Session, I
19
20
                  believe the Chair would entertain a
21
                  motion to provisionally deny the
22
                  Application for a License as a Massage
23
                  Therapist of Tricia Flagg.
24
   CHAIR PORAMBO:
25
                  Is there a motion?
```

```
35
1
   MR. STRAWSER:
                  I'll make the motion.
2
3
   CHAIR PORAMBO:
                  Second?
4
   MS. DOUGLAS:
5
                  I'll second the motion.
6
7
   MR. KELLER:
8
                  Porambo, aye; Claggett, aye; Douglas,
9
                  aye; Hicks, aye; Keth, aye; Alumbro
10
                  Shade, aye; Strawser, aye.
11
   [The motion carried unanimously.]
12
13
   MR. DAVIS:
14
                  Moving on to number 13. Based on the
15
                  Board's discussions in Executive
16
                  Session, I believe the Chair would
17
                  entertain a motion to provisionally
18
                  deny the Application for Licensure as a
19
                  Massage Therapist of Sara Schmieder.
20
   CHAIR PORAMBO:
21
                  Is there a motion?
22
   MR. STRAWSER:
23
                  I'll make the motion.
24
   CHAIR PORAMBO:
25
                  Second?
```

36 1 MS. DOUGLAS: I'll second the motion. 2 3 MR. KELLER: 4 Porambo, aye; Claggett, aye; Douglas, 5 aye; Hicks, aye; Keth, aye; Alumbro 6 Shade, aye; Strawser, aye. 7 [The motion carried unanimously.] 8 MR. DAVIS: 9 10 Moving to number 14 on the Board's 11 agenda. Based on the Board's discussions in Executive Session, I 12 13 believe the Chair would entertain a 14 motion to approve the following 15 continuing education course: Rules and Regulations in Pennsylvania presented 16 17 by Frank J. Pileggi, LMT. 18 CHAIR PORAMBO: Do I have a motion? 19 20 MR. STRAWSER: I'll make a motion. 21 22 CHAIR PORAMBO: 23 Second? 24 MS. DOUGLAS: 25 I'll second the motion.

```
37
1
   MR. KELLER:
2
                  Porambo, aye; Claggett, aye; Douglas,
3
                  aye; Hicks, aye; Keth, aye; Alumbro
 4
                  Shade, aye; Strawser, aye.
5
   [The motion carried unanimously. Counsel has been
6
   directed to tell Mr. Pileggi that he must inform each
7
   class that while the course has been approved by the
   Board, the views and opinions taught therein are that
   of the course provider and are not specifically
10
   endorsed by the Board.]
                              * * *
11
   MR. DAVIS:
12
13
                  Moving to number 15. That was tabled.
14
                   The Board administrator will be
15
                  reaching out.
16
17
   MR. DAVIS:
18
                  Moving on to number 16. Based on the
                  Board's discussions in Executive
19
20
                  Session, I believe the Chair would
21
                  entertain a motion to approve the
22
                  Application for Licensure as a Massage
23
                  Therapist of Devorah Kran.
   CHAIR PORAMBO:
24
25
                  Motion?
```

38 1 MR. STRAWSER: I'll make the motion. 2 3 CHAIR PORAMBO: Second? 4 MS. DOUGLAS: 5 I'll second the motion. 6 7 MR. KELLER: Porambo, aye; Claggett, aye; Douglas, 9 aye; Hicks, aye; Keth, aye; Alumbro 10 Shade, aye; Strawser, aye. 11 [The motion carried unanimously.] 12 MR. DAVIS: 13 14 Number 17 on the Board's agenda. Based 15 on the Board's discussions in Executive 16 Session, I believe the Board Chair 17 would accept a motion to issue a 18 provisional license, and this Applicant 19 must successfully pass the MBLEx in the 20 next year. 21 CHAIR PORAMBO: 22 Do I have a motion? 23 MR. STRAWSER: 24 I'll make the motion. 25 CHAIR PORAMBO:

39 Second? 1 2 MS. DOUGLAS: 3 I'll second the motion. 4 MR. KELLER: 5 Porambo, aye; Claggett, aye; Douglas, 6 aye; Hicks, aye; Keth, aye; Alumbro 7 Shade, aye; Strawser, aye. 8 [The motion carried unanimously.] 9 10 Correspondence 11 Waiver Requests MR. DAVIS: 12 13 Numbers 18 through 46 are Waiver Requests for continuing education. 14 15 the Board's last meeting, we recognized we got down to the 60-day time frame, 16 17 in which the Board would be denying 18 requests for continuing education 19 waivers, so the Board empowered the 20 Applications Committee to make the 21 decision based upon discussions with 22 Board Admin and Board Counsel. 23 What we are doing now is we are asking the Board to ratify the decision 24 25 of the Applications Committee.

Discussion on these matters happened during Executive Session and the Board now will now be able to vote.

Based on the Board's discussions in Executive Session, I believe the Chair would accept a motion ratifying the Applications Committee's decision to deny the Request for Waiver of all or part of the continuing education requirements of the following individuals: Beverly Anderson, Vanessa Baker, Emily Brown, Jason DiCola, Amanda Evans, Jasmine Exume, Emily Fisher, Julie Geyer, Elizabeth Haufler, Lisa Hill, Rosemarie Hoffman, Shiela Konn, Jodie Machesky, Michelle Muth, Leona Oleaga, Svetlana Opalenek, Jacqueline Peters, Kalie Pierzga, Laura Pudloski, Heidi Puppo, Shawn Swank, Alma Trieu.

21 CHAIR PORAMBO:

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Do I have a motion?

23 MR. STRAWSER:

I'll make the motion.

25 CHAIR PORAMBO:

41 Second? 1 2 MS. DOUGLAS: 3 I'll second the motion. 4 MR. KELLER: 5 Porambo, aye; Claggett, aye; Douglas, 6 aye; Hicks, aye; Keth, aye; Alumbro 7 Shade, aye; Strawser, aye. 8 [The motion carried unanimously.] 9 10 MR. DAVIS: 11 Based on the Board's discussions in Executive Session, I believe the Chair 12 13 would accept a motion ratifying the 14 Applications Committee's decision to 15 approve the Request for Waiver of all or part of the continuing education 16 17 requirements of the following 18 individuals: Rebecca Cordell, Ann 19 Czajkowski, Joan Heim, Judith Hendin, 20 Kelly Sklodowski. 21 CHAIR PORAMBO: 22 Do I have a motion? 23 MR. STRAWSER: 24 I'll make the motion. 25 CHAIR PORAMBO:

42 Second? 1 2 MS. DOUGLAS: 3 I'll second the motion. 4 MR. DAVIS: 5 In accordance with the recommendation 6 of medical professionals and evidenced by letters from medical professionals, these licensees may obtain 100 percent 9 of their continuing education via 10 online computer-based continuing education. 11 MR. KELLER: 12 13 Porambo, aye; Claggett, aye; Douglas, 14 aye; Hicks, aye; Keth, aye; Alumbro 15 Shade, aye; Strawser, aye. 16 [The motion carried unanimously.] 17 18 MR. DAVIS: Based on the Board's discussions in 19 20 Executive Session, I believe the Chair 21 would accept a motion ratifying the 22 Applications Committee's decision to 23 deny the Request for Waiver of all or 24 part of the continuing education 25 requirements of the following

4.3 individuals at numbers 45 and 46, which 1 2 are Renee Wachter and Patricia 3 Wollschlager. CHAIR PORAMBO: 4 5 Do I have a motion? 6 MR. STRAWSER: 7 I'll make the motion. 8 CHAIR PORAMBO: 9 Second? 10 MS. DOUGLAS: I second the motion. 11 MR. KELLER: 12 13 Porambo, aye; Claggett, aye; Douglas, 14 aye; Hicks, aye; Keth, aye; Alumbro 15 Shade, aye; Strawser, aye. 16 [The motion carried unanimously.]

17

18 Report of Board Chair - No Report

19 ***

20 Miscellaneous - Proposed 2024 Board Meeting Date

21 [Nancy M. Porambo, MS, LMT, CNMT, NCTMB, Chair,

22 Professional Member, noted the remaining 2023 meeting

23 dates are June 7, August 1, September 18, and

24 November 14.

25 Chair Porambo also noted 2024 meeting dates are

44 February 13, April 2, June 4, August 13, September 1 2 24, and December 3.] 3 Miscellaneous - Approval for Board Administrator to 4 5 Attend the FSMTB Executive Summit CHAIR PORAMBO: 6 7 We are going to need a vote to approve the Board administrator to attend the 8 9 FSMTB Executive Summit April 27-28, 10 2023, in Denver, Colorado. I need a motion. 11 MR. STRAWSER: 12 13 I'll make the motion. 14 CHAIR PORAMBO: 15 Second? MS. DOUGLAS: 16 I'll second the motion. 17 18 MR. KELLER: 19 Porambo, aye; Claggett, aye; Douglas, 20 aye; Hicks, aye; Keth, aye; Alumbro 21 Shade, aye; Strawser, aye. 22 [The motion carried unanimously.] 23 24 Adjournment 25 CHAIR PORAMBO:

```
45
                   I'd like to entertain a motion to
 1
 2
                   adjourn.
 3
   MR. STRAWSER:
 4
                   I'll make the motion.
 5
   CHAIR PORAMBO:
                   Second?
 6
 7
   MS. DOUGLAS:
 8
                   I'll second.
 9
   CHAIR PORAMBO:
10
                   Thank you everyone for attending.
11
                   appreciate your attendance. Everybody
12
                   have a great day.
                               * * *
13
14
    [There being no further business, the State Board of
15
   Massage Therapy Meeting adjourned at 1:14 p.m.]
                                * * *
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
```

I hereby certify that the foregoing summary minutes of the State Board of Massage Therapy Meeting, was reduced to writing by me or under my supervision, and that the minutes accurately summarize the substance of the State Board of Massage Therapy Meeting.

CERTIFICATE

Kelly L. Dunn

Minute Clerk

Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc.