

Steven Sepe

From: mrey130@aol.com
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 4:40 AM
To: House Health and Human Services Committee; repbaginski@rilegislature.gov; policastrogroup@gmail.com
Subject: Subject: HR5351:An Act Relating to Health Safety, Medical AestheticPractices Safety Act {LC1015/1}

Donna Reynolds
71 Superior View Blvd
North Providence, RI 02911
(401) 451-4476
2/27/25

I am writing to formally request your support for House Bill No. 5351, entitled, An Act Relating to Health and Safety, Medical Aesthetic Practices Safety Act {LC1015/1}. I would also like to reference the ability of licensed Registered Nurses, under appropriate supervision, to continue performing facial aesthetics procedures within the scope of their professional duties. Registered Nurses have long been an integral part of medical aesthetics, contributing significantly to patient care, safety, and outcomes, particularly in non-surgical cosmetic procedures.

Registered Nurses, particularly those with advanced training and certification in aesthetic procedures, are fully qualified to perform treatments such as Botox, dermal fillers, chemical peels, and laser therapies. They operate under established safety protocols, ensuring patient well-being and complying with all regulatory requirements.

Their roles are vital in helping provide patients with access to skilled, knowledgeable professionals who are not only trained in aesthetic procedures but also well-versed in patient care, anatomy, and potential side effects. Registered Nurses in this field are required to complete comprehensive education programs, participate in continuous professional development, and follow the supervision of licensed medical directors as necessary.

I believe that allowing Registered Nurses to continue their work in facial aesthetics enhances patient care, accessibility, and overall satisfaction. The skills and expertise they bring to these procedures are invaluable to ensuring safe, effective, and patient-centered treatments.

Lastly, it is concerning that the recent reinterpretation of this law has led to the closure of several long-standing businesses in the field, especially when these businesses have been operating legally and ethically for years. It seems unfair that such a significant change would not include provisions to grandfather existing businesses and workers who have built their practices based on the previous understanding of the law. These businesses have invested time, resources, and trust in the regulatory framework that was in place, and it feels unjust to disrupt their operations without any form of consideration or transition period. A more equitable solution would have been to allow these businesses to continue operating while adapting to the new regulations over time.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna Reynolds