

## POLICY AND ADVOCACY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

**DATE** April 21, 2022

**TIME** 9:00 a.m.

**ATTENDEES**

**Members Present:** Max Disposti, Chair, Public Member  
Wendy Strack, Public Member

**Members Absent:** John Sovec, LMFT Member

**Staff Present:** Steve Sodergren, Executive Officer  
Rosanne Helms, Legislative Manager  
Christina Kitamura, Administrative Analyst  
Sabina Knight, Legal Counsel

**Other Attendees:** Public participation via WebEx video conference/phone  
conference and in-person at Department of Consumer Affairs

---

1 **I. Call to Order and Establishment of Quorum**

2  
3 Max Disposti, Chair of the Policy and Advocacy Committee (Committee) called  
4 the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. Roll was called, and a quorum was  
5 established.

6  
7 **II. Introductions**

8  
9 Committee members introduced themselves.

10  
11 **III. Consent Calendar: Discussion and Possible Approval of January 21,**  
12 **2022 Committee Meeting Minutes**

13  
14 Motion: Approve the January 21, 2022 Committee meeting minutes.

15  
16 Wendy moved; Disposti seconded.

17  
18 Public Comment: None

19  
20 Roll call vote:

Member	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent	Recusal
Max Disposti	x				
John Sovec				x	
Wendy Strack	x				

21  
22 Motion carried: yea - 2, nay - 0

23  
24 **IV. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Assembly Bill 646**  
25 **(Low) Department of Consumer Affairs: Boards: Expunged Convictions**

26  
27 AB 646 would require Department of Consumer Affairs' (DCA) boards, within  
28 90 days upon a licensee's or former licensee's provision of a certified copy of  
29 expungement, to update their online license search system with notification of  
30 the expungement order or to remove the posting of revocation and previously  
31 posted arrests, charges, and convictions.

32  
33 AB 646 is a two-year bill, which is expected to move this year. Last year, the  
34 Board took a "support if amended" position on a previous version of this bill.  
35 The Board supported the intent of the bill but expressed concerns about the  
36 requirement to remove the revoked posting for an individual who is not  
37 currently licensed and does not reapply for licensure. The concerns were  
38 related to the individual practicing in exempt settings, in another state, or within  
39 a similar practice (i.e., life coaching).

40  
41 The Board requested an amendment to Business and Professions Code (BPC)  
42 §493.5(a)(2). It believed public protection would be better served by requiring a

1 notification of the expungement order and the corresponding date be posted  
2 instead of requiring deletion of a license revocation from the website if there is  
3 an expungement and the person does not reapply for licensure.  
4

5 Staff submitted the above position and concerns to the author's office; however,  
6 amendments to address the concerns have not been made.  
7

8 Motion: Recommend the Board support AB 646 if amended, making suggested  
9 amendments to BPC §493.5(a)(2).  
10

11 Disposti moved; Strack seconded.  
12

13 Public Comment:

14 Ben Caldwell: Encouraged the Committee to recommend a position of support.  
15

16 Roll call vote:

Member	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent	Recusal
Max Disposti	x				
John Sovec				x	
Wendy Strack	x				

17 Motion carried: yea - 2, nay - 0  
18

19  
20 **V. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Assembly Bill 988**  
21 **(Bauer-Kahan) Mental Health: 988 Crisis Hotline**  
22

23 AB 988 would implement a statewide 988 mental health crisis hotline system.  
24

25 At its July 2021 meeting, the Board took a "support" position on this bill. It  
26 failed to move any further in 2021.  
27

28 AB 988 is now a two-year bill and is eligible to move this year. The sponsor  
29 indicates that they are requesting funding in the Governor's budget. They will  
30 likely wait until the final budget is released in order to move the bill and make  
31 any further amendments.  
32

33 Motion: Recommend the Board support AB 988.  
34

35 Disposti moved; Strack seconded.  
36

37 Public Comment:

38 Jennifer Alley, California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists  
39 (CAMFT): CAMFT supports AB 988.  
40

1 Rebecca Gonzales, National Association of Social Workers - California Division  
2 (NASW-CA): NASW-CA supports AB 988.  
3

4 Roll call vote:

Member	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent	Recusal
Max Disposti	x				
John Sovec				x	
Wendy Strack	x				

5  
6 Motion carried: yea - 2, nay - 0  
7

8 **VI. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Assembly Bill 1635**  
9 **(Nguyen) Suicide Prevention: Mental Health Provider Educational Loan**  
10 **Repayment**

11  
12 AB 1635 creates a new account in the Mental Health Practitioner Education  
13 Fund. The fund would provide grants to repay education loans for specified  
14 Board licensees and associates. These licensees/associates must commit to  
15 providing direct patient care for at least 24 months in an organization that  
16 provides mental health services to individuals who have been referred by a  
17 suicide prevention hotline.

18  
19 County Behavioral Health Directors Association (CBHDA) opposed AB 1635.  
20 They expressed concern that the bill solely extends the loan repayment  
21 programs to private, for-profit facilities not located in a mental health shortage  
22 area. CBHDA expressed that this could make the shortage worse for public-  
23 funded agencies and nonprofit organizations.

24  
25 Public Comment:

26 R. Gonzales: NASW-CA did not take a position on AB 1635. NASW-CA is  
27 watching it because the bill only refers to individuals who have been referred by  
28 a suicide prevention hotline. This bill appears problematic in its application.  
29

30 Motion: Recommend the Board support AB 1635 if amended to include a  
31 budget application to avoid impacting existing programs, to broaden support to  
32 include nonprofit and public systems, and to not limit where the referrals are  
33 coming from if they are related to suicide prevention.  
34

35 Strack moved; Disposti seconded.  
36

37 Public Comment: No further public comment.  
38

1 Roll call vote:

Member	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent	Recusal
Max Disposti	x				
John Sovec				x	
Wendy Strack	x				

2  
3 Motion carried: yea - 2, nay - 0

4  
5 **VII. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Assembly Bill 1662**  
6 **(Gipson) Licensing Boards: Disqualification from Licensure: Criminal**  
7 **Conviction**

8  
9 AB 1662 allows a prospective applicant with a criminal conviction to request a  
10 preapplication determination from a DCA licensing board to determine if they  
11 may be disqualified from licensure.

12  
13 Staff Comments

- 14  
15  
16  
17  
18
- The bill appears to require a prospective applicant seeking a predetermination to self-report their criminal convictions. It does not indicate whether the Board would be able to verify the convictions. Doing so would likely result in additional costs to the Board.

19  
20  
21  
22

There is the possibility that relevant information may be missing when an applicant reports their convictions. Incorrect or incomplete information would result in an inaccurate predetermination.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27

Other factors that could affect the accuracy of the predeterminations are rehabilitation efforts, the age of the conviction, and additional convictions taking place between the time of the predetermination and the application for licensure.

- 28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35
- AB 1662 does not permit the Board to charge a fee to make predeterminations. The Board would need two full-time positions to process these requests.
  - The Board has developed an outreach document to help applications with a post condition or past disciplinary process, and to understand how it will affect the application process.

36 Public Comments:

37  
38  
39  
40  
41

J. Alley: CAMFT does not have a formal position. CAMFT has concerns regarding additional workload on Board staff and where funding for those positions would come from (Would licensure fees potentially be utilized to fund this?). Would BBS have authority to charge the potential applicant for this background check?

1 B. Caldwell: Does not have a recommendation on the bill. He shared his  
2 experience of students who have criminal convictions, ask if it is worth pursuing  
3 licensure and paying for the education to obtain a degree. Suggested  
4 addressing some of those concerns through very strong disclaimer language  
5 provided on a predetermination letter.  
6

7 R. Gonzales: NASW-CA does not have a position on this bill. The bill is well  
8 intended, but it is flawed. NASW-CA is watching the bill and expecting  
9 amendments. NASW-CA is concerned about the unintended use of pre-  
10 application by schools and training programs requiring potential applicants to  
11 go through this predetermination process.  
12

13 Staff will watch this bill and provide updates to the Board. No action taken.  
14

15 **VIII. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Assembly Bill 1733**  
16 **(Quirk) State Bodies: Open Meetings**  
17

18 AB 1733 would modernize the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act requirements  
19 for state bodies conducting a meeting to include a teleconference component.  
20

21 The author's office indicate that they were negotiating amendments and would  
22 provide updates. There have been no updates at this time.  
23

24 Staff will watch this bill and bring any updates back to the Board. No action  
25 taken.  
26

27 **IX. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Assembly Bill 2123**  
28 **(Villapudua) Bringing Health Care into Communities Act of 2023**  
29

30 AB 2123 creates the Bringing Health Care into Communities Act of 2023, which  
31 would provide housing grants to specified health professionals, to be used for  
32 mortgage payments for a permanent residence in a health professional  
33 shortage area for up to 5 years.  
34

35 Motion: Recommend the Board support AB 2123 if amended to identify a new  
36 funding source and to better define "mental health providers" and "behavioral  
37 health providers".  
38

39 Strack moved; Disposti seconded.  
40

41 Public Comment:

42 R. Gonzales: NASW-CA supports AB 2123 and agrees with the proposed  
43 amendments.  
44

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

Roll call vote:

Member	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent	Recusal
Max Disposti	x				
John Sovec				x	
Wendy Strack	x				

Motion carried: yea - 2, nay - 0

**X. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Assembly Bill 2222 (Reyes) Student Financial Aid: Golden State Social Opportunities Program**

AB 2222 creates the Golden State Social Opportunities Program, which would provide grants of up to \$20,000 per year for qualifying students enrolled in a postgraduate program. Qualifying students must commit to working in a California-based nonprofit setting for their required post-degree hours of supervised experience as an associate registered with this Board or the Board of Psychology.

Staff Comments

- AB 2222 states that the Board would be responsible for certifying that a grant recipient either failed to obtain an associate registration or failed to work at a California-based nonprofit setting.

It would be feasible for the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) to verify that a grant recipient obtained his/her associate registration and maintained a current registration by utilizing the Board’s online license verification feature. Any requirement that the Board must track and ensure maintenance of a registration for grant recipients would have a significant fiscal impact.

It would not be feasible for the Board to report on an associate’s commitment to work in a California-based nonprofit setting, because the Board does not track associates’ work settings. This information should be verified by CSAC.

- The language in AB 2222 is unclear if a student grant recipient can begin to fulfill their two-year commitment while still in school completing practicum, or if they must first graduate and be registered as an associate. Because trainees/interns in school are working under the jurisdiction of their school and are not yet registered, the Board would not be able to verify their student status. This information would need to be verified by the school directly to CSAC.

- The language regarding repayment exception is unclear. It states that a grant recipient does not have to repay their grant for failing to meet the program’s requirements if “the Board of Behavioral Sciences deems the grant recipient to have fulfilled the grant recipient’s licensing requirements.” The statement implies that the grant recipient does not have to complete their two-year commitment in a nonprofit setting if they have not yet done so.

CSAC should verify a grant recipient’s licensure using the Board’s online license lookup feature. Requiring the Board to track grant recipients and their license/registration statuses would create a fiscal impact due to the need for additional staff and funding.

Public Comment:

Adrienne Shilton, California Alliance of Child and Family Services: Supports AB 2222.

R. Gonzales: NASW-CA supports AB 2222; however, she recommended a support if amended position to include Board staffs’ suggested amendments.

Kim Lewis, California Coalition for Youth (AB 2222 sponsor). Will take the points raised back to the author’s office and hopes to work with the Board on this.

Motion: Recommend the Board support AB 2222 if amended to include the comment items of the analysis, numbers 2, 3, 4 and direct staff to reach out to author’s office to provide technical support.

Disposti moved; Stack moved.

Public Comment: No further comment.

Roll call vote:

Member	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent	Recusal
Max Disposti	x				
John Sovec				x	
Wendy Strack	x				

Motion carried: yea - 2, nay - 0

**XI. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Assembly Bill 2666 (Salas) Behavioral Health Internship Grant Program**

AB 2666 would require the Department of Health Care Access and Information (HCAI) to establish and administer a grant program. This program would provide stipends to students in behavioral health fields of study and practice



1 who are interning or completing licensure hours at federally qualified health  
2 centers (FQHCs) and who are unpaid.

3  
4 Staff Comments

- 5 • It may be helpful to further specify qualifying criteria for the stipends,  
6 including the type of registration or profession the student is working toward,  
7 the required length of service, and the number of years eligible for the  
8 stipend.  
9
- 10 • AB 2666 is dependent on appropriation of funds by the Legislature;  
11 however, a funding source is not identified.  
12

13 Public Comment:

14  
15 J. Alley: CAMFT supports AB 2666  
16

17 A. Shilton: The California Alliance of Child and Family Services supports AB  
18 2666 but requested an amendment to expand placement to include community-  
19 based organizations.  
20

21 R. Gonzales: NASW-CA supports AB 2666.  
22

23 Motion: Recommend the Board support AB 2666 if amended and provide  
24 technical support to the author's office regarding inclusion of community-based  
25 organizations, identifying new funding sources, and specifying qualifying  
26 criteria.  
27

28 Disposti moved; Strack seconded.  
29

30 Public Comments:

31 A. Shilton: Expressed support for the motion.  
32

33 Roll call vote:

Member	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent	Recusal
Max Disposti	x				
John Sovec				x	
Wendy Strack	x				

34  
35 Motion carried: yea - 2, nay - 0  
36

37 **XII. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Senate Bill 964**  
38 **(Wiener) Behavioral Health**  
39

40 SB 964 addresses the current behavioral health workforce shortage though the  
41 following:

- 1 • Tasks the University of California (UC) education system with conducting an  
2 analysis of the scope of practice laws for behavioral health workers, as well  
3 as license and training requirements and renewal requirements for an  
4 expired license, and an analysis of health plan hiring guidelines and  
5 practices for behavioral health certification and license types, and to provide  
6 recommendations.  
7
- 8 • Tasks the state’s public postsecondary education institutions with  
9 developing accelerated programs of study related to degrees in social work.  
10
- 11 • Requires the Department of Health Care Access and Information to  
12 establish a stipend program for students pursuing a master’s degree in  
13 social work with a specialized focus on public behavioral health.  
14
- 15 • Requires the Department of Health Care Access to request the University of  
16 California to contract with them to provide a landscape analysis of the  
17 current behavioral health workforce and the state’s workforce needs.  
18
- 19 • Requires the Department of Health Care Services to establish a certifying  
20 body and provide for a statewide certification for peer support specialists. It  
21 must also amend its Medicaid state plan to include certified peer support  
22 specialists as a provider type.  
23

#### 24 Staff Comments

- 25 • SB 964 tasks the UC system to conduct an analysis and make  
26 recommendations regarding the scope of practice laws for “behavioral  
27 health care workers,” as well as license and renewal requirements for  
28 “behavioral health professionals.” SB 964 also defines “behavioral health”  
29 as including both mental health and substance use disorder. To obtain a  
30 complete analysis, it would be helpful to specify exactly which types of  
31 mental health professionals are intended to be included.  
32
- 33 • SB 964 establishes a stipend program for students pursuing a master’s  
34 degree in social work with a specialized focus on public behavioral health  
35 but does not include other behavioral health students.  
36

#### 37 Public Comment:

38 J. Alley: CAMFT does not have a formal position on SB 964. Anticipates some  
39 amendments and anticipates additional scholarship money (later in the bill) for  
40 licensed marriage and family therapists (LMFT), psychologists, licensed  
41 professional clinical counselors (LPCC) and other groups. The current draft  
42 only has money for social workers right now.  
43

44 R. Gonzales: NASW-CA supports SB 964. She believes that the stipend is  
45 only for social workers, initially, because it is attempting to reinstitute a stipend

1 program that ended a few years back, which was administered by the California  
2 Social Work Education Center, utilizing Proposition 63 funds.

3  
4 Motion: Recommend the Board support SB 964, and direct staff to provide  
5 technical support to the author's office to request a better definition of  
6 behavioral health care workers and professionals in Health and Safety Code  
7 §127815.

8  
9 Disposti moved; Strack seconded.

10  
11 Public Comment: None

12  
13 Roll call vote:

Member	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent	Recusal
Max Disposti	x				
John Sovec				x	
Wendy Strack	x				

14  
15 Motion carried: yea - 2, nay - 0

16  
17 **XIII. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Senate Bill 966**  
18 **(Limon) Federally Qualified Health Centers and Rural Health Clinics:**  
19 **Visits**

20  
21 SB 966 would allow Medi-Cal reimbursement for covered mental health  
22 services provided by an associate clinical social worker (ASW) or an associate  
23 marriage and family therapist (AMFT) employed by a federally qualified health  
24 center or a rural health clinic.

25  
26 Public Comment:

27 J. Alley: CAMFT is one of the co-sponsors of SB 966.

28  
29 A. Shilton: The California Alliance of Child and Family Services supports SB  
30 966

31  
32 R. Gonzales: NASW-CA supports 966.

33  
34 Motion: Recommend the Board support SB 966.

35  
36 Disposti moved, Strack seconded.

37  
38 Public Comment: No further comments.

39

1 Roll call vote:

Member	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent	Recusal
Max Disposti	x				
John Sovec				x	
Wendy Strack	x				

2  
3 Motion carried: yea - 2, nay - 0

4  
5 **XIV. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Senate Bill 1002**  
6 **(Portantino) Workers' Compensation: Licensed Clinical Social Workers**

7  
8 SB 1002 adds licensed clinical social workers (LCSW) as direct providers in the  
9 workers' compensation system.

10  
11 Staff Comment

12 LMFTs and LPCCs are not included.

13  
14 Motion: Recommend the Board support SB 1002, and direct staff to provide  
15 technical assistance to the author's office to include LMFTs and LPCCs.

16  
17 Disposti moved; Strack seconded.

18  
19 Public Comment:

20 J. Alley: CAMFT does not have a formal position on SB 1002 and has  
21 concerns regarding inclusion of LMFTs and LPCCs. Author's office did not  
22 agree to that change and indicated that it is a big change in workers  
23 compensation.

24  
25 R. Gonzales: NASW-CA supports SB 1002.

26  
27 Roll call vote:

Member	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent	Recusal
Max Disposti	x				
John Sovec				x	
Wendy Strack	x				

28  
29 Motion carried: yea - 2, nay - 0

30  
31 **XV. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Senate Bill 1229**  
32 **(McGuire) Mental Health Workforce Grants**

33  
34 SB 1229 creates a grant program under California's Student Aid Commission to  
35 increase the number of mental health professionals serving children and youth.  
36 It proposes awarding grants of up to \$25,000 to post-graduate students  
37 enrolled in an accredited social work program, a program designed to lead to

1 licensure as a marriage and family therapist, professional clinical counselor, or  
2 educational psychologist, or designed to provide a services credential with a  
3 specialization in pupil personnel services. The student must meet specified  
4 criteria, including agreeing to work in an eligible California-based nonprofit  
5 entity or a local education agency when gaining their required postgraduate  
6 supervised experience hours.

7  
8 Staff Comments

9 Staff recommends the following subsections be amended or clarified:

- 10  
11 • Education Code (EC) §69540(c)(1) – This subparagraph states that the  
12 student needs to be enrolled in a school program meeting the requirements  
13 for licensure as an LMFT, licensed educational psychologist (LEP), or LPCC,  
14 and specifies the sections containing the education requirements. However,  
15 it appears the bill intends to also include clinical social workers. Therefore,  
16 staff believes BPC §4996.18, which specifies education requirements for  
17 LCSW licensure, should also be listed here. Additionally, it may not be  
18 necessary to reference BPC §4989.20 (LEP licensure requirements) since the  
19 subparagraph already references EC §44266, which are the minimum  
20 education requirements for a pupil personnel services credential.  
21
- 22 • EC §69540(c)(2)(A) – This subparagraph references required supervised  
23 experience hours for LMFT, LEP, and LPCC licensure. However, it is  
24 referencing the incorrect sections for LMFT and LPCC experience  
25 requirements and does not reference LCSW experience hour requirements.  
26 The correct sections to reference are 4980.43 (LMFTs), 4996.23 (LCSWs),  
27 and 4999.46 (LPCCs).  
28
- 29 • EC §69540(c)(2)(C) – This subparagraph states that one condition of the  
30 grant program is for the recipient to ultimately achieve registration as an  
31 ASW, associate professional clinical counselor (APCC), or AMFT. Since  
32 LEPs are also being included in the program, either receipt of the LEP license  
33 and/or receipt of a pupil personnel services credential should also be included  
34 here.  
35
- 36 • EC §69540(h) and (m) require “the department” to certify nonperformance of  
37 an applicant’s commitment to work with an eligible California-based nonprofit  
38 or local education entity, and to also determine how to give priority in  
39 awarding grants to communities with the greatest need. However, the  
40 “department” being referred to in the context of this bill is unclear. It is likely  
41 that the Student Aid Commission should be performing both these tasks.  
42

43 Motion: Recommend the Board support SB 1229, and direct staff to provide  
44 technical assistance to the author’s office regarding the suggested  
45 amendments.  
46

1 Strack moved; Disposti seconded.

2  
3 Public Comment:

4 J. Alley: CAMFT supports SB 1229.

5  
6 A. Shilton: Will take the suggested amendments back to the author’s office.

7  
8 R. Gonzales: NASW-CA supports SB 1229.

9  
10 Roll call vote:

Member	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent	Recusal
Max Disposti	x				
John Sovec				x	
Wendy Strack	x				

11  
12 Motion carried: yea - 2, nay - 0

13  
14 **XVI. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Senate Bill 1237**  
15 **(Newman) Licenses: Military Service**

16  
17 SB 1237 would clarify the meaning of the term “called to active duty” with  
18 respect to the requirement in law that licensing boards under DCA waive  
19 renewal fees and continuing education requirements of a licensee or associate  
20 called to active duty as a member of the U.S. armed forces or California  
21 National Guard.

22  
23 Staff will watch this bill. No action taken.

24  
25 **XVII. Discussion and Possible Recommendation Regarding Senate Bill 1365**  
26 **(Jones) Licensing Boards: Procedures**

27  
28 SB 1365 requires boards under DCA to publicly post a list of criteria used to  
29 evaluate applicants with criminal convictions on its website. It also requires  
30 DCA to take steps to establish procedures for evaluating and assisting  
31 applicants with criminal convictions.

32  
33 Staff Comments

- 34 • SB 1365 requires that DCA develop a process to include procedures to  
35 expedite the fee-waiver process for a low-income applicant requesting a  
36 background check.

37  
38 Live Scan fingerprinting is required to complete a background check;  
39 however, the fee is collected by the Department of Justice at the site of the  
40 Live Scan – not DCA or its licensing boards.  
41

- SB 1365 would require boards to post a list of criteria used to evaluate applicants with criminal convictions. The Board has already developed an outreach document to help applicants with a past condition or past disciplinary process understand how that will affect the application process.
- SB 1365 would require applicants to provide court certified documents related to their convictions, instead of listing convictions on application documents. This requirement conflicts with current law, which prohibits a board from requiring an applicant to disclose any information regarding their criminal history.
- SB 1365 requires DCA to develop a procedure for informal appeals, to occur in between an initial license denial and an administrative law hearing. The bill suggests examining the model for informal appeals used by DCA's Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (BSIS). BSIS handles informal appeals by Disciplinary Review Committee, consisting of appointed members.

Public Comment:

R. Gonzales: NASW-CA does not have an official position on SB 1365 and has concerns. States that the bill fails to consider the existing laws and variation in boards under DCA.

Staff will watch this bill. No action taken.

**XVIII. Update on Board-Sponsored Legislation**

AB 1758: Supervision via Video Conferencing (urgency legislation)

Status: The bill has passed the Assembly Business and Professions Committee and is currently in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 1759: CE Requirements and Telehelath

Status: The bill has passed the Assembly Business and Professions Committee and is currently in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 1495: Omnibus Bill

Staff has been informed that the following portion of the proposal will not be included in the Health Committee's Omnibus bill:

*Amend Health and Safety Code Section 1374.72 and Insurance Code Section 10144.5 – Definition of a "Health Care Provider" in SB 855*

- 1 **XIX. Update on Board Rulemaking Proposals**  
2  
3 Continuing Education and Additional Training Requirements  
4 Status: Submitted to DCA for final review process  
5  
6 Examination Waiting Periods, Professional Corporations, Accrediting Agencies  
7 and Equivalent Degrees  
8 Status: Submitted to DCA for pre-review process  
9  
10 Enforcement Process  
11 Status: Preparation for Policy and Advocacy Committee review in July 2022  
12  
13 **XX. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items**  
14  
15 None  
16  
17 **XXI. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda**  
18  
19 None  
20  
21 **XXII. Adjournment**  
22  
23 The Committee adjourned at 12:15 p.m.