

To the Ohio House Commerce and Labor Committee:

I am an African American citizen and esthetics school administrator, and I ask that you urgently oppose H.B. 58 as it stands because it has racist intentions and will put the public at harm regarding lack of infection control for service providers.

Removal of the Natural Hair Styling License would be a great discredit to our state and the public it serves. African American citizens have a right to be serviced by a licensed professional who fully comprehends how to care for curly, coily hair—this is not readily taught in a basic cosmetology course. I have racked my brain and cannot understand how removing this license would benefit our community. I am offended that it has been considered and find it an attack on the black population. Let's add to beauty education, not subtract from those who are already oppressed.

Deregulating lash extensions from the scope of esthetics is another point of error in the making. Infection and disease control is one of the largest and most in depth chapters in the esthetics curriculum. It thoroughly covers contraindications and possible dangers and issues with unsanitary services, including lash extensions. I'm unsure if you have read the horror stories or googled the images of lash extensions gone wrong, but I behoove you to do some scant research. You'll surely see that this is not a risk we should expose our public to. Private lash companies will argue that they educate students on lash services and safety when they are certified in a 3-hour or shorter class. This is simply not true. It's impossible to thoroughly cover proper safety, allergic reactions, diseases of the eye, and contraindications (which would make someone a bad candidate for lash extensions) in addition to proper practical procedure in that short of a time frame. There is also no measure of comprehension (like a test) that would prove understanding and retention of the knowledge. Lash extensions are currently taught in our schools and should stay that way. The Ohio State Cosmetology and Barber Board have taken a stance against this bill. Surely you could reconsider amending it to better serve the community.

Lastly, removal of the boutique license and installation of a salon boutique license is another conundrum that puzzles me. The boutique license as is, allows for those who are registered to be held accountable for safety and infection control when serving the public. License holders must also take continuing education in safety and infection control when renewing their license every 2 years. When this bill removes the boutique license and replaces it with the boutique salon license, the license will now longer be held by an individual, but held by a building—a residence even. Any unlicensed person would be able to come and go to the licensed location providing services of their choice with no accountability. If a client gets harmed receiving a service, how would the behavior be corrected? It's a literal free for all. I don't see the benefit of a salon boutique license—only consequences.

I hope I have presented some valid points that will allow you to reconsider changing some points in this bill.

Thank you,

Ciera Jacks