

May 13, 2010

Susan E. Manheimer, President
California Police Chiefs Association
P.O. Box 255745
Sacramento, CA 95865

Dear Susan Manheimer:

Proponents of Assembly Bill 1822 have cited a random/regional sample of California Massage Therapy Council (CAMTC) applicants, compiled by your organization, as evidence of the CAMTC's ineffectiveness in screening out illegal operators.

In your letter, dated Feb. 21, 2010, to Assembly Member Sandre Swanson, you claim: "We recently did a random/regional sample of CAMTC applicants and found that 57% were known prostitutes, 32% were of unknown legitimacy and required further inquiry, and only 11% were legitimate operators."

When *Massage Today* asked to see this data of applicants, lobbyist John Lovell stated that he could not provide the compiled data in the form of a spreadsheet or summary. He described the process of compiling the data as simply organizing applications into three piles: known prostitutes, unknown legitimacy and legitimate operators.

Lovell also stated that a summary of this data was sent in the form of a letter to Assembly Member Swanson. Swanson has stated in an interview with *Massage Today* that he "questions" this data's legitimacy.

Again, we are asking for you to please send us a copy of the random/regional sample data (if necessary, with any sensitive information blacked out) that includes the following:

- Complete list of applications (names blacked out)
- Number of applicants in each of the following categories: known prostitutes, unknown legitimacy and legitimate operators
- List of which applicants (names blacked out) that were actually credentialed by CAMTC that are known prostitutes or of "unknown legitimacy"
- A definition of how someone can be of "unknown legitimacy"

It should also be mentioned, that completely absent from your letter is any data describing the CAMTC's actual performance in *certifying* applicants. However, your organization continues to claim the CAMTC is ineffective at screening out illegal operators. In a May 3 letter written by Lovell, he writes: "The state board's own track record of vetting candidates has been spotty at best, with persons with outright prostitution convictions receiving their certificate."

In April, when *Massage Today* asked to see any data of CAMTC-certified persons with criminal backgrounds, Lovell stated that the data is incomplete and that not all police departments in the state have submitted their information. Has this data been completed? If so, *Massage Today* would like to see a copy of this data.

Certainly, even if the data is incomplete, you can please provide the following information about how your data was collected and analyzed:

- How did you determine the amount of data required to establish a meaningful outcome?
- Who actually collected the data?
- What method did you use to verify which individuals were actually CAMTC applicants and which were certified?
- From which jurisdictions do you currently have samplings?
- What was considered an acceptable sampling quantity from each jurisdiction and how did you establish these quantities?
- Please provide a description of the sampling methodology in detail.
- You state specific percentages without any relevant confidence levels. What is the level of confidence statistically for each of these percentages?
- What is the name of your principal investigator on this project?

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Christie Bondurant". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being more prominent.

Christie Bondurant, Associate Editor
Massage Today

CC: California State Assembly Appropriations Committee
Beverly May, Chair of California Massage Therapy Council