



Board of Behavioral Sciences



1625 North Market Blvd., Suite S-200  
Sacramento, CA 95834  
(916) 574-7830  
www.bbs.ca.gov

Gavin Newsom, Governor  
State of California

Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency  
Department of Consumer Affairs

## POLICY AND ADVOCACY COMMITTEE MINUTES

An archived recording of this Board of Behavioral Sciences meeting held on October 24, 2025, are available for viewing at the following link:

[BBS Policy & Advocacy Committee 10.24.2025](#)

### DATE

October 24, 2025

### TIME

9:00 a.m.

### LOCATIONS

#### Primary Location

Department of Consumer Affairs  
Hearing Room  
1747 North Market Blvd., #186  
Sacramento, CA 95834

**Alternative Platform** WebEx Video/Phone Conference

### ATTENDEES

#### Members Present at Remote Locations

Christopher Jones, Chair, LEP Member  
Kelly Ranasinghe, Public Member  
John Sovec, LMFT Member  
Wendy Strack, Public Member

#### Staff Present at Primary Location

Steve Sodergren, Executive Officer  
Shelley Ganaway, Legal Counsel  
Rosanne Helms, Legislative Manager  
Christina Kitamura, Administrative Analyst  
Syreeta Risso, Special Projects and Research Analyst

#### Other Attendees

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

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

2  
3 Christopher Jones, Chair of the Policy & Advocacy Committee (Committee),  
4 called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. Roll was called, and a quorum was  
5 established.  
6

7 **2. Introductions**

8  
9 Committee members introduced themselves during role call; staff and public  
10 attendees introduced themselves.  
11

12 **3. Consent Calendar: Discussion and Possible Approval of July 31, 2025**  
13 **Committee Meeting Minutes**

14  
15 Motion: Approve the July 31, 2025 Policy and Advocacy Committee meeting  
16 minutes.  
17

18 M/S: Strack/Sovec  
19

20 Public Comment: None  
21

22 Motion carried: 4 yea, 0 nay

Member	Vote
Christopher Jones	Yes
Kelly Ranasinghe	Yes
John Sovec	Yes
Wendy Strack	Yes

23  
24 **4. Discussion and Possible Action to Make Recommendations Regarding**  
25 **Possible Amendments to the Required Notice to Consumers (Business and**  
26 **Professions Code (BPC) §§4980.32, 4989.17, 4996.75, 4999.71)**  
27

28 SB 1024, enacted in 2025, revised requirements for providing license or  
29 registration information to clients, prompted by the rise in telehealth. Physical  
30 license display is now required only at the primary place of practice for in-person  
31 services. Licensees must provide written notice to clients before initiating  
32 psychotherapy services, including their full name (as filed with the Board), license  
33 or registration number, type, and expiration date.  
34

35 Since the law's enactment, implementation concerns have emerged:

36 1. Safety Concerns for Those Working with Incarcerated Populations

37 Licensees working with incarcerated populations expressed concerns  
38 about disclosing full names and license numbers due to potential  
39 harassment or retaliation. Staff committed to bringing this issue to the  
40 Committee for discussion.

1                   2. Scope of the Disclosure Requirement

2                   The law states that the required notice must be provided before “initiating  
3                   psychotherapy services.” However, confusion exists about whether the  
4                   notice applies only to psychotherapy or also to other activities such as  
5                   assessments, consultations, or supervision.  
6

7                   **Board of Psychology Requirements**

8                   The Board of Psychology’s disclosure requirements are similar. However, the law  
9                   includes an exemption for certain facilities licensed under Health and Safety  
10                  Code §§1250 and 1265, such as general acute care hospitals, psychiatric  
11                  hospitals, correctional treatment centers, and nursing facilities.  
12

13                  Discussion

14                  Sovec: Requested to hear public comment regarding this matter before  
15                  committee discussion.  
16

17                  Liaina Claytor, LCSW: Requested the board to consider amending SB 1024.  
18                  While the requirement to disclose full name and license number promotes  
19                  transparency in traditional clinical settings, it poses safety risks in correctional  
20                  and forensic environments. Ms. Claytor works in a county jail and inpatient  
21                  psychiatric unit with felony defendants found incompetent to stand trial. These  
22                  individuals often have severe mental illnesses and legal instability, creating  
23                  potential danger if clinicians’ personal information is accessible. She emphasized  
24                  that anonymity is a critical layer of protection outside secure facilities, citing past  
25                  threats against staff. As a solution, she proposed using existing in-house  
26                  grievance systems in locked facilities, which allow patients to file complaints  
27                  anonymously while enabling investigators to access clinician details as needed.  
28                  This approach balances patient rights with clinician safety. She expressed  
29                  commitment to collaboration on a thoughtful implementation of the law.  
30

31                  Committee members asked questions to better understand a mental health  
32                  clinician’s role in a correctional facility.  
33

34                  Ranassignhe: This is a complex and large discussion. Recommended moving this  
35                  to the full board for a more in-depth discussion with more public comment and  
36                  perhaps invite a representative from the Department of State Hospitals.  
37

38                  Committee members noted that this is an area where they lack expertise or  
39                  knowledge and would like to receive more public comment from clinicians and  
40                  various agencies; but acknowledged the importance of balancing consumer  
41                  protection and clinician safety.  
42

43                  Public Comment

44                  Shanti Ezrine, California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists  
45                  (CAMFT): 1) Acknowledged concerns about requiring full name and license

number disclosure for providers working with high-risk populations. Noted the complexity of balancing consumer protection with provider safety and stated that CAMFT has no firm position yet on exemptions or alternative disclosure methods. Feedback from staff and stakeholders was appreciated and will be reviewed further. The CAMFT team plans to return at the next meeting with additional input. 2) Regarding the scope of disclosure requirement, agreed with staff that the law is clear: notice must be provided prior to initiating psychotherapy services. Suggested clarifying this in existing FAQs if needed. Confirmed that CAMFT has not received member inquiries on this issue and found no consumer protection concerns related to scope.

#### Further Discussion

Sovec: Recommendation was made for staff to prepare a more detailed presentation, including input from experts and witnesses from various programs such as state hospitals and incarceration settings. This would help the committee make a more informed decision. Emphasized the need to balance clinician safety concerns with the fact that incarcerated individuals retain their consumer protection rights, which is central to the board's work.

Ranasinghe: Expressed concern that incarcerated individuals are also consumers and emphasized a lack of confidence in grievance processes controlled by law enforcement agencies overseeing the incarcerated population. Stressed the need for an external grievance mechanism and requested additional information on this issue.

Jones directed staff to bring this topic back to a future Committee meeting.

#### **5. Discussion and Possible Action to Make a Recommendation Regarding Possible Amendments to Add Additional Members to the Board of Behavioral Sciences (BPC §4990)**

The Board is considering whether to sponsor legislation to increase its membership from 13 to 15 members by adding one LPCC member and one public member. This recommendation follows a review of comparable DCA boards and reflects growth in the LPCC licensee population.

Current law sets the composition of the Board as follows:

- 2 California-licensed LCSWs
- 1 California-licensed LEP
- 2 California-licensed LMFTs
- 1 California-licensed LPCC
- 7 public members

1 The last expansion occurred in 2009 via SB 788, which introduced the LPCC  
2 license and increased membership from 11 to 13. Originally, SB 788 proposed  
3 adding four members, but this was reduced due to fiscal concerns.  
4

5 Key Points from Comparative Review:

- 6 • Other boards of similar size (e.g., Accountancy, Dental, Medical) have 15  
7 members.
- 8 • Most boards maintain an odd number of members to avoid tie votes.
- 9 • No clear correlation between licensee population size and board size.
- 10 • This Board regulates four distinct practice acts, unlike many boards that  
11 oversee one or two.

12  
13 Licensee Population Growth (Past 10 Years):

- 14 • AMFT: ↓14%
- 15 • ASW: ↑24%
- 16 • APPC: ↑274%
- 17 • LMFT: ↑44%
- 18 • LEP: ↑7%
- 19 • LCSW: ↑73%
- 20 • LPCC: ↑250%

21  
22 Discussion

23 Jones: Requested staff to confirm that there is no required threshold or ratio  
24 between the number of licensees and the number of licensed members serving  
25 on our Board.

26 Helms: Confirmed that there is no statute required ratio.

27  
28 Strack: Noted that there is not a significant difference in the number of licenses  
29 held by LPCCs compared to LEPs and asked what the justification is for adding a  
30 second LPCC seat if the Board is not considering the same for LEPs. Finds it  
31 difficult to find substantive justification to support this.  
32

33 Sovec: What are the budgetary implications or overall impact of adding two  
34 board members?  
35

36 Sodergren: The primary costs would be per diem and travel expenses, which  
37 would be minimal and likely absorbable within the current budget. The main  
38 impact would be administrative — managing two additional members adds some  
39 complexity.  
40

41 Sovec: Currently, representation on the Board is quite proportional when  
42 considering the number of registrants and licensees. Additionally, with the  
43 crossover of individuals who hold dual licenses, it seems there is already more  
44

1 than adequate representation for this license. Sides against adding another seat  
2 to the Board for this reason.

3  
4 Kitamura: Noted that since July 2023, the Board has not been fully seated. A  
5 suggestion was made to prioritize efforts on filling these vacant seats.

6  
7 Strack: Agreed that adding additional members would be challenging while the  
8 Board is not fully seated. Questioned the need for adding a new LPCC seat,  
9 noting that the problem to be addressed has not been clearly defined. Asked  
10 what specific representation issues exist within the LPCC licensing community  
11 and whether those concerns can be outlined.

12  
13 Helms: Noted that the upcoming sunset review in approximately four years  
14 would provide an opportunity to reassess the LPCC population. If significant  
15 growth occurs by then, the sunset process could be an appropriate time to  
16 consider adding a new seat, should the Board choose to pursue it.

17  
18 Jones: Raised the question about whether there should be a defined process  
19 and threshold for adding board seats. Noted that simply stating the need for  
20 additional representation is insufficient without identifying the problem being  
21 addressed. The member questioned whether LPCCs feel underrepresented and  
22 pointed out that LEPs have similar license numbers but only one seat. Suggested  
23 this discussion may highlight a broader issue: how to fairly determine  
24 representation for each license type. The proposal raises more questions than  
25 answers for the committee.

#### 26 27 Public Comment

28 Dr. Ben Caldwell: Noted that he does not feel strongly either way but offered  
29 points for consideration. 1) Historically, about 25% or more of APCC registrations  
30 are delinquent at any given time, a higher proportion than other registration  
31 types. This suggests fewer APCCs ultimately become LPCCs, possibly due to  
32 dual registration and faster licensure pathways for MFTs. 2) Emphasized that the  
33 primary factor in adding board members should be workload management. If  
34 responsibilities such as disciplinary hearings and committee service are  
35 becoming burdensome and discourage board participation, that would be a clear  
36 indicator for adding members, regardless of license type.

#### 37 38 Further Discussion

39 Sovec: Recommend deferring this until the Board's sunset bill comes up in four  
40 years.

41  
42 Helms: Offered to contact the Senate Business and Professions Committee to  
43 inquire about the rationale for adding members and to clarify any established  
44 thresholds for such changes.  
45

1 Jones: Suggested getting more information from board member Dr. Boyd or the  
2 California Association for Licensed Professional Clinical Counselors regarding  
3 whether they feel underrepresented on the Board, what specific needs they  
4 have, and how adding a seat would support their licensees.  
5

6 **6. Discussion and Possible Action to Make Recommendations Regarding**  
7 **Proposed Amendments to the Business and Professions Code: Amend**  
8 **BPC §§4980.43.2, 4996.23.1, and 4999.46.2 Regarding Supervisor**  
9 **Assessment for Supervision via Videoconferencing; and Amend BPC**  
10 **§§4990.26.1 and 4990.26.2 Regarding Training in Human Sexuality and**  
11 **Child, Elder, and Dependent Adult Abuse Assessment and Reporting**  
12

13 Staff has identified amendments that the Board may wish to consider including in  
14 the 2026 Omnibus Bill.  
15

- 16 1. Amend Business and Professions Code (BPC) §§4980.43.2, 4996.23.1,  
17 4999.46.2: Supervisor Assessment for Supervision via Videoconferencing  
18

19 Background: Current law requires LMFT, LCSW, and LPCC supervisors to  
20 assess the appropriateness of videoconferencing within 60 days of starting  
21 supervision, even if supervision is conducted entirely in person. This  
22 requirement is unnecessary in cases where videoconferencing is not used.  
23

24 Recommendation: Amend the law to clarify that the assessment of  
25 appropriateness is only required if supervision is conducted via two-way, real-  
26 time videoconferencing.  
27

- 28 2. Amend BPC §§4990.26.1 and 4990.26.2: Training in Human Sexuality and  
29 Child, Elder and Dependent Adult Abuse Assessment and Reporting  
30

31 Background: The Board requires applicants for licensure as marriage and  
32 family therapists, clinical social workers, and professional clinical counselors  
33 to complete training in human sexuality and abuse assessment/reporting.  
34 While statutes define the scope and content of these trainings, some  
35 provisions are outdated or overly broad.  
36

37 Recommendation: Amend BPC §4990.26.1, related to human sexuality  
38 training, to remove outdated and unnecessary language.  
39

40 Amend BPC §4990.26.2 pertaining to child, elder and dependent adult abuse  
41 assessment and reporting training as follows:  
42

- 43 • Clarification is needed to ensure the required 7-hour course in child abuse  
44 assessment and reporting is California-specific.  
45

- Remove the provision that allows the required course to be taken from a professional association or a local, county, or state health or mental health department. The Board does not accredit these sources. Coursework should only be accepted from accredited or Board-recognized providers.
- Eliminate the exemption that allows applicants to waive the abuse assessment and reporting coursework by demonstrating it is not relevant to their current practice. Requiring this training for all applicants supports consistent public protection.

#### Discussion

Sovec: Emphasized the importance of maintaining strong and clear California-specific language in requirements, particularly in anticipation of potential future transition to national testing. Stressed the need to carefully review and preserve California-specific elements.

Motion: Direct staff to make any discussed changes, and any non-substantive changes, and to pursue as a legislative proposal.

M/S: Sovec/Jones

#### Public Comment

Shanti Ezrine, CAMFT: CAMFT has no concerns regarding the proposed amendments.

Motion carried: 4 yea, 0 nay

Member	Vote
Christopher Jones	Yes
Kelly Ranasinghe	Yes
John Sovec	Yes
Wendy Strack	Yes

### **7. Update on Board-Sponsored and Board-Monitored Legislation**

Ms. Helms provided a brief status update on the following bills. A full update on board-sponsored and board-monitored legislation was provided in the meeting materials.

#### **Board-Sponsored and Board-Supported Legislation**

SB 775 (Ashby) Board of Psychology and Board of Behavioral Sciences:  
Signed into law by the Governor



## Board-Supported Legislation

- AB 489 (Bonta) Health Care Professions: Deceptive Terms or Letters: Artificial Intelligence: Signed into law by the Governor.
- AB 742 (Elhawary) Department of Consumer Affairs: Licensing: Applicants who are Descendants of Slaves: The Governor vetoed AB 742.
- SB 497 (Wiener) Legally Protected Health Care Activity: Signed into law by the Governor.

## Board-Monitored Legislation

- SB 641 (Ashby) Department of Consumer Affairs and Department of Real Estate: States of Emergency: Waivers and Exemptions: The Governor vetoed SB 641.

Discussion/Public Comment: None

## 8. Update on Board Rulemaking Proposals

**Disciplinary Guidelines:** Submitted to Office of Administrative Law (OAL) for final approval September 17, 2025

**Telehealth:** Approved by OAL, takes effect January 1, 2026

**Continuing Education:** To Agency for review October 15, 2025

**Advertising:** Submitted to DCA final review process October 6, 2025

**English as a Second Language:** Submitted for DCA production phase review August 14, 2025

**Fee Regulations:** Noticed to the public on September 19, 2025; public hearing requested and to be held November 6, 2025

**AMFTRB National LMFT Examination:** Staff preparing documents for production phase review

**Licensed Educational Psychologist Experience:** Staff preparing documents for production phase review

Discussion/Public Comment: None

## 9. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items

None

1   **10.   Public Comment for Items no on the Agenda**

2  
3       None

4  
5   **11.   Adjournment**

6  
7       The Committee adjourned at 11:22 a.m.