



DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING  
BOARD OF BARBERS AND HAIRDRESSERS

CONDENSED MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AUGUST 20, 2025

By the authority of AS. 08.01.070(2) and AS08.86.030 and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.64, Article 6, a scheduled board meeting was held via teleconference/Zoom, August 20, 2025.

**August 20, 2025:**

**Attendance**

**Members Present:** Chair Kevin McKinley, Willie Mae Canady, Jessica Pestrikoff, Jennifer (Jenn) Lombardo, Shannon Thompson, Danielle Desarae Hager

**Staff Present:** Cynthia Spencer, Barbara Denney, Damen Bennett Licensing Examiners, Lacey Derr, Program Coordinator, Sara Chambers, Boards and Regulations Advisor

**Public Present via Zoom:** There were 3 members of the public present via Zoom

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

The board was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Chair Kevin McKinley.

**2. Review Agenda**

Chair Kevin McKinley asked if there were any amendments to the agenda; hearing none he requested a roll call to approve the agenda.

**By Roll Call – NO Board Members Objected to the Meeting Agenda as Written**

**3. Ethics Disclosure**

Chair McKinley stated board member Shannon Thompson works out of his Anchorage 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue shop as a “booth renter”; Chair McKinley clearly stated Ms. Thompson is not an employee.

No other board member in attendance had any ethics violations to report.

**4. Strategic Planning and Prioritization Processes.**

Ms. Chambers greeted the board and public participants, expressing appreciation for their engagement in the strategic planning process. She emphasized the importance of public involvement and the board’s commitment to thoughtful, forward-looking governance.

Ms. Chambers outlined that this session is part of an ongoing strategic planning process, which will unfold over several meetings. The goal is to help the board define:

- Core functions
- Values
- Mission and vision
- Strategic goals for a defined planning period

Ms. Chambers reviewed the purpose and structure of mission and vision statements; discuss and weigh the board’s activity list and begin categorizing priorities for future planning. Ms. Chambers clarified that the board would not be drafting mission or vision statements during this session, as such work is better done individually before being synthesized. Instead, members were encouraged to reflect on examples and submit their ideas as homework.

Ms. Chambers emphasized the importance of a mission and vision was emphasized as a “North Star” for the board’s work. She stated that without a shared sense of purpose, board work can become a checklist rather than a meaningful regulatory function.

She shared examples from other boards, such as the Board of Veterinary Examiners, which reads its mission into the record at each meeting to reinforce regulatory identity and purpose.

Ms. Chambers acknowledged the activity list submitted by board members and stated although the

information provided was not compiled into a single document due members not submitting the information to her by the August 18 deadline. She informed board members that LE Spencer had uploaded the submissions to OnBoard for reference during the session.

Ms. Chambers reviewed the board's enabling statute, highlighting three key sections:

- Section A: Establishes the board's general authority to exercise control over the regulated professions.
- Section B: Contains "shall" statements—mandatory duties the board must perform under state law.
- Section C: Outlines discretionary powers, such as conducting hearings, suspending licenses, and adopting regulations.

Ms. Chambers emphasized that the mission statement should reflect the board's statutory authority, particularly Section A, while Sections B and C can provide additional context and depth. She shared mission statements from other boards to inspire the group:

- Alaska Board of Nursing:  
*"Actively promote and protect the health of the citizens of Alaska through transparent, sound governance of the practice of nursing."*
- Alaska Board of Veterinary Examiners:  
*"Protect the health, safety, and welfare of Alaskans by ensuring that veterinary practitioners possess and maintain a level of skill and knowledge necessary to provide safe, competent, professional veterinary services to consumers, and protect the public from veterinary practitioners who pose a risk."*
- Washington State Cosmetology Board:  
*Mission: Protect consumers and address licensees' legal concerns by giving recommendations to the director.*  
*Vision: Promote safety through education and professionally competent practices.*
- California Board of Barbering and Cosmetology:  
*Mission: Ensure the health and safety of consumers by promoting ethical standards and enforcing the laws of the industry.*  
*Vision: Enforce the highest level of safety standards and provide an environment where consumers obtain services with confidence and security.*

Ms. Chambers noted that some boards combine mission and vision elements into a single statement, while others separate them.

Ms. Chambers reviewed the next steps members will be taking.

- Board members will review the examples and submit draft mission and vision statements as homework.
- The board will continue refining its activity list and begin categorizing strategic priorities for future sessions.
- Ms. Chambers will distribute a reference document with mission/vision examples and California's strategic plan for inspiration.

Ms. Chambers continued the session by distinguishing between mission and vision statements. She stated that a mission statement reflects what the board is *statutorily empowered* and *required* to do; and a vision statement reflects what the board *aspires* to achieve—what success looks like for licensees, consumers, and the public. She encouraged the board to think about:

- What outcomes they want for licensed professionals.
- What the public should experience when receiving services.
- How the board's work can promote competency, professionalism, public safety, and confidence in the regulated industries.

Ms. Chambers highlighted a few examples to illustrate how other boards approach vision and mission development.

- Mississippi’s Board included a detailed mission aligned with statutory duties and a “philosophy” that functions like a vision—emphasizing public welfare, competency, sanitation, and professionalism.
- Boards of Engineers and Educators in other states also focus on integrity, confidence, and quality outcomes for the public.

Ms. Chambers emphasized that boards can choose how detailed or aspirational they want their vision to be. The key is that it should serve as a guiding star for decision-making and help board members stay grounded in their regulatory role. Ms. Chambers asked members if they had any thoughts, questions, or feedback. She reiterated that there was no pressure to finalize anything during this session; the goal was to introduce the concepts and begin the process of reflection and contribution.

Chair McKinley expressed appreciation for the variety of mission statement examples provided, noting that they demonstrated the flexibility and creativity possible—even within a structured, regulatory context.

Ms. Thompson echoed Chair McKinley’s sentiments, sharing that the examples broadened her perspective. She appreciated seeing how other states approach their mission and vision—even those with different levels of authority—and found it inspiring. She emphasized the importance of making the board’s mission and vision personal and goal-oriented, rather than just a checklist.

Ms. Chambers acknowledged the feedback and reiterated that reviewing examples is a helpful way to spark ideas and avoid the challenge of starting from a blank page. She confirmed that the examples and reference materials would be shared with board members and staff for further reflection.

Ms. Chambers introduced the concept of “goal buckets”—broad categories that organize the board’s strategic priorities. She shared examples from the California Board of Barbering and Cosmetology’s strategic plan, noting its polished design and public-facing clarity. While acknowledging that Alaska’s plan doesn’t need to be as elaborate, she emphasized the value of a clear, accessible document for:

- Onboarding new board members
- Guiding board discussions
- Demonstrating transparency to the public

Ms. Chambers reviewed California’s Goal Areas (Buckets):

1. Board Administration
2. Licensing
3. Inspections
4. Enforcement
5. Outreach

Ms. Chambers encouraged the board to consider adopting similar categories and to begin thinking about how their own activities and priorities might fit into these buckets. She also previewed that the next phase of strategic planning would involve defining goal statements for each bucket, identifying specific activities that support those goals, and ensuring alignment with the board’s mission, vision, and statutory authority. Ms. Chambers thanked Jessica Pestrikoff for stepping in to help maintain momentum on the strategic plan as Ms. Chambers transitions out of the facilitation role.

Ms. Chambers introduced the next phase of the strategic planning process: organizing the board’s activities into goal areas (or “buckets”) and assigning priority levels to each activity.

Examples from Other Boards

- Alaska Board of Nursing uses goal areas such as:
  - Licensing
  - Practice
  - Education
  - Governance
  - Communication
  - Organization

She stated each area includes a statement of purpose and a list of activities aligned with that goal. She emphasized how this structure helps boards stay focused, track progress, and align meeting agendas with strategic priorities. She noted that the Board of Nursing's top priority (Activity 1A)—advocating for the Nurse Licensure Compact—has remained consistent for six years and is strategically timed around the legislative calendar.

Ms. Chambers guided the board through the process of reviewing and ranking their previously submitted activity list, which had been uploaded to OnBoard by Cynthia.

Instructions for the Board

- Board members were asked to pull up their homework (activity rankings and comments).
- The group would assign priority levels using a 1–2–3 system:
  - 1 – Immediate Priority: Urgent, high-impact, to be addressed in upcoming meetings.
  - 2 – High Priority: Important, but not urgent.
  - 3 – Standard Priority: Necessary, but not time-sensitive.

Ms. Chambers clarified that:

- The goal was to build consensus, not finalize decisions.
- Silence would be interpreted as agreement for the sake of efficiency.
- If clarification was needed on any activity, board members were encouraged to ask.
- Those familiar with a particular activity were invited to provide a brief one-liner explanation to help newer members understand.

She reminded the board that this is a living document—priorities can be adjusted as needed in future meetings.

Board members had no questions.

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 1, AS 08.13.030**, add a regulation to request the removal of a board member if they miss a certain number of meetings with unexcused absences. Ms. Chambers stated that this regulation would provide a formal mechanism for the board to recommend the removal of inactive members to the Governor's Office. While the Governor retains sole authority to appoint or remove members, this regulation would support the board's position and help address long-standing issues with non-participating members who do not formally resign.

Chair McKinley asked whether this regulation would alter the Governor's authority.

Ms. Chambers clarified that it would not. The regulation would simply provide documentation and justification to support a recommendation for removal. She emphasized that this tool has been helpful for other boards in similar situations, especially when members become unresponsive.

LE Spencer noted that this recommendation stems from years of experience with board members who "ghosted" the process, leaving seats inactive and unfillable.

Ms. Thompson stated she initially ranked the item as a 3, but after discussion, revised her ranking to a 2, citing the importance of maintaining quorum and board functionality.

The board agreed this is an important structural safeguard, though not an immediate crisis. It supports long-term board effectiveness and accountability.

*Ms. Chambers stated this was now ranked as a 2 and noted If members change their minds at the end of the day and want to come back to this, you certainly can.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 2, AS 08.13.080(d)**, remove all license requirements from AS 08.13.080(d). This subsection limits testing for body arts and may block the board from adopting NIC tattooing and permanent cosmetic coloring (PCC) theory written exams. Ms. Chambers stated subsection (d) of the statute contains outdated and overly specific requirements that limit the board's flexibility to adopt modern, nationally recognized exams (such as NIC theory exams for tattooing and PCC). Moving these requirements from statute to regulation would allow the board to respond more quickly to changes in industry standards and practices. This change would also align with the board's

broader goal of maintaining relevance and responsiveness in a rapidly evolving field.

Ms. Lombardo explained that having detailed requirements in statute makes it difficult to update licensing standards in response to industry changes. She cited the esthetics program as an example of how outdated statutory language has hindered progress. Ms. Lombardo emphasized that placing such requirements in regulation instead of statute would allow for more timely updates and better alignment with current practices.

Ms. Thompson asked whether the NIC exams could be written into regulation as a compromise. Jennifer responded that because the limitations are currently in statute, the board would need legislative action to make such changes, highlighting the rigidity of the current structure.

Ms. Chambers confirmed that this proposal would remove statutory barriers and allow the board to adopt exams and standards through regulation, which is more adaptable.

Desarae Hager sought clarification, asking whether the proposal would allow the board to set training requirements via regulation rather than statute.

Ms. Lombardo confirmed that was the intent and noted that a similar proposal had been drafted by a previous board.

Chair McKinley shared that he had previously discussed this concept with legislators. While some were open to it, there was concern about potential regulatory overreach. He emphasized the importance of maintaining a balanced, “right-touch” regulatory approach.

Ms. Chambers summarized the goal: to increase the board’s agility by moving specific licensing requirements from statute to regulation, while still ensuring accountability and alignment with industry standards.

Ms. Hager suggested referencing “industry standards” in the regulatory language to help maintain credibility and avoid excessive or insufficient requirements.

Ms. Canady reminded the group to consider unintended consequences and the importance of clearly communicating the rationale behind any changes.

The board agreed that this is an important structural reform that would enhance flexibility and responsiveness, though it may require careful legislative engagement and stakeholder communication.

*Ms. Chambers stated this was now ranked as a 2*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 3, AS 08.13.080**, to add hair braiding to the scope of barbering and non-chemical barbering.

Board members agreed this was due to a statutory oversight, barbers and non-chemical barbers are currently not authorized to perform hair braiding, despite it being a common and historically accepted practice within the profession. This omission has created a regulatory gap that unintentionally restricts practitioners. The proposed amendment would restore this authority and align the statute with industry norms and expectations.

Ms. Canady explained that the exclusion was an unintended consequence of prior legislative changes. She initially ranked it as a 3, but acknowledged it deserves a higher priority.

Ms. Chambers encouraged board members not to worry about how many items are ranked at each level, but to focus on what feels important. She noted that if the board pursues a broader statutory rewrite, this item could be included as part of a comprehensive package.

Ms. Lombardo strongly supported priority 1 ranking, emphasizing that the board had effectively taken something away from barbers that they previously had the right to do.

Ms. Thompson and Ms. Canady both agreed with priority 1 designation.

The board agreed that this is a high-impact correction that should be addressed in the next legislative opportunity.

*Ms. Chambers stated this was now ranked as a 2 and stated if the board wanted to revisit this they could.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 4, AS 08.13.082**, to allow apprenticeship hours and other apprenticeship specifications to be set in regulation rather than statute. She stated that this proposal mirrors the earlier discussion on licensing requirements. By moving apprenticeship details—such as hours and program structure—from statute to regulation, the board would gain greater flexibility to adapt to industry changes and training needs without requiring legislative action.

Ms. Lombardo initially ranked this as a 3 but noted it should likely be treated the same as the licensing item previously discussed.

Ms. Hager and Ms. Canady supported a priority 2 ranking.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed that, for consistency, this item would be marked as a 2, with the understanding that it could be revisited later.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 5, 08.13.082**, include an apprenticeship pathway for advanced manicurist training.

LS Spencer stated that currently, there is no apprenticeship option for advanced manicuring. This gap was created when the 12-hour manicuring course was removed and replaced with a 250-hour advanced endorsement. The change inadvertently eliminated the ability to complete this training through apprenticeship, despite strong interest and need from the public and industry.

Board members confirmed that no apprenticeship pathway currently exists for advanced manicuring.

Chair McKinley and Ms. Canady noted that this is a frequent question from the public, and that restoring this option would improve accessibility and training quality.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 2.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 6, AS 08.13.082**, to remove training timelines and allow training requirements to be set in regulation.

The board agreed this proposal would eliminate rigid statutory timelines for completing apprenticeship training programs, allowing the board to establish more flexible and equitable standards through regulation. The current structure may unintentionally disadvantage apprentices, especially in rural areas—by requiring longer completion times than traditional school-based programs, despite apprentices often working more days per week.

Chair McKinley stated he had initially ranked this as a 3, noting it doesn't take anything away from licensees but could expand access for training.

Ms. Canady also supported a ranking of 3.

Ms. Thompson and Ms. Hager advocated for a 2 ranking, with Ms. Hager emphasizing that apprenticeships should be on par with school-based programs in terms of flexibility and access.

Ms. Chambers agreed with the rationale and noted that since the board is already reviewing this section of statute, it makes sense to include this item in the broader review.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 2.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 7, AS 08.13.120** to update and clarify language related to temporary licenses, temporary shop licenses, and the allowance of conventions.

Ms. Lombardo shared that the board previously sought legal clarification on this issue and received confirmation that the language was contradictory and unclear. Draft revisions were developed but never advanced.

Chair McKinley noted that the current language has long been problematic, especially regarding conventions. He supported crafting a tailored solution rather than continuing to work around statutory gaps.

Both Ms. Lombardo and Chair McKinley agreed that while this isn't the most urgent issue, it affects a large number of stakeholders and has already received significant board attention.

The board agreed this section of statute contains confusing, outdated, and contradictory language that affects the issuance of temporary licenses and the board's ability to support conventions. The inconsistencies between statute and regulation have created legal ambiguity, limiting the board's ability to respond to industry needs and public events. Clarifying this section would improve transparency, consistency, and operational efficiency.

Ms. Canady confirmed support for a priority 2 ranking.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 2.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 8, 08.13.130** amend to specify that practitioners must display a "current Alaska license."

Ms. Lombardo explained that this issue was flagged by a former investigator and had been previously discussed by the board. She described it as a "no-brainer" fix that could be easily added to a legislative package.

Chair McKinley supported a priority 2, while Ms. Canady and Ms. Lombardo supported priority 1.

Ms. Chambers noted that this type of simple, non-controversial amendment could be bundled into a single-subject legislative bill if the board moves forward with one this year.

Ms. Hager suggested marking such items as "easy" or "no-brainer" in the document for future reference.

Board members agreed with Ms. Chambers and Ms. Hager's suggestions.

The board agreed that the current statute requires licensees to display their license but does not specify that it must be a current or Alaska-issued license. This ambiguity has caused enforcement challenges and confusion. Clarifying the language would strengthen compliance and align with standard regulatory expectations.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 1 – Immediate Priority (No-Brainer) as a low-complexity amendment suitable for inclusion in a future legislative package.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 9, AS 08.13.130**, amend by eliminating the 12-hour manicurist license and require all manicurists to complete a 250-hour training program.

Ms. Chambers provided historical context, noting that the board previously implemented the 250-hour requirement, which was later reversed due to confusion, lack of grandfathering provisions, and industry resistance.

Ms. Lombardo and Ms. Canady recalled the challenges and fallout from the earlier attempt, emphasizing the need for careful planning and stakeholder engagement.

Chair McKinley supported the concept but expressed concern about political sensitivity and the need for strong legislative support. He ranked it a 4, citing the complexity and potential for controversy.

Ms. Hager ranked it a 1, citing public health concerns and the inadequacy of 12-hour training for modern nail services.

Ms. Canady ranked it a 3, supporting the goal but acknowledging the need for a thoughtful approach.

The board agreed this proposal would standardize training requirements for manicurists by eliminating the 12-hour license and requiring all practitioners to complete a 250-hour program. The intent is to ensure adequate training in sanitation, safety, and advanced techniques, and to reduce health risks associated with undertrained practitioners. However, this issue has a complex legislative history, including prior implementation and subsequent reversal due to unintended consequences and industry pushback.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus as undecided and marked this matter for further discussion due to the wide range of perspectives and the complexity of the issue.*

The board concurred and agreed to revisit this item in a future meeting for deeper discussion and potential refinement.

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 10, AS 08.13.160(d)(2)**, amend to define “licensed healthcare professional” more specifically.

Chair McKinley raised this as a long-standing concern, noting that the vague language has allowed individuals such as dentists, EMTs, and massage therapists to perform services like piercings and tattooing without board oversight.

Ms. Hager asked whether the original legislative intent was to allow services in healthcare settings (e.g., nursing homes), but it was clarified that the statute, as written, allows healthcare professionals to perform services in any setting.

Ms. Lombardo provided an example of surgeons performing areola tattooing post-mastectomy without formal tattooing or permanent cosmetic coloring training.

Ms. Thompson Shannon emphasized the public health risk, supporting a priority 1 ranking.

Other board members, including Ms. Hager, Ms. Canady, and Chair McKinley supported priority 2, acknowledging the importance but recognizing the complexity of legislative change.

The board agreed that the current statute allows any “licensed healthcare professional” to perform services regulated by the board without holding a license under this chapter. However, the term is undefined, leading to ambiguity and potential misuse. This has raised public safety concerns, particularly in cases where individuals without proper training in aesthetics, tattooing, or body art perform services under the broad umbrella of being a “healthcare professional.”

The board also agreed that this issue poses significant safety concern and warrants legislative attention, though it may require careful drafting and stakeholder engagement.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 2.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 10, AS 08.13.160**, amend to clarify that a person licensed under this chapter to practice barbering or non-chemical barbering is also licensed to practice hair braiding under the same license.

Ms. Chambers confirmed this item is directly related to the earlier hair braiding discussion.

The board agreed to apply the same priority ranking as the previous hair braiding item.

The board agreed that this proposal is a companion to the earlier hair braiding amendment and would ensure that hair braiding is explicitly included in the scope of barbering and non-chemical barbering. This correction addresses a statutory oversight and aligns with industry expectations and historical practice.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 1 – Immediate Priority (No-Brainer) as a low-complexity amendment suitable for inclusion in a future legislative package.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 11, AS 08.13.180** amend to correct terminology used for “apprentice” for beauty services and “trainee” for body arts, instead of the generic term “student permit.”

Chair McKinley, Ms. Lombardo, and Ms. Thompson all supported the change, emphasizing the need for consistency.

All board members agreed this was a low-complexity, semantic correction.

Board members agreed that the current statute uses inconsistent terminology when referring to individuals in training. Regulations distinguish between “apprentices” (beauty services) and “trainees” (body arts), but the statute uses the term “student,” which creates confusion. This amendment would align statutory language with regulatory definitions and improve clarity.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board’s consensus to rank this as a 3.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 12, AS 08.13.183**, amend to remove the reference to “nail technician.”

Ms. Chambers confirmed this was likely an oversight when the 12-hour license was reinstated.

Ms. Lombardo initially ranked it a 3, but suggested it qualifies as a “no-brainer” and should be included in any legislative cleanup package.

Ms. Canady and other board members agreed.

Board members agreed the term “nail technician” remains in statute despite the fact that Alaska no longer issues a license under that title. The current licensing structure includes manicurists and advanced manicurists, making the reference to “nail technician” outdated and misleading.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board’s consensus to rank this as a 1 – Immediate Priority (No-Brainer) as a low-complexity amendment suitable for inclusion in a future legislative package.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 13, AS 08.13.220(10)(B)(i)** amend to remove the exclusion of “massage treatment” from the definition of services provided by manicurists.

Ms. Chambers stated that the statute currently excludes “massage treatment” from the scope of manicuring services, despite the fact that hand, forearm, and lower leg massage is a standard and expected part of manicures and pedicures. This outdated language creates a legal contradiction and places many practitioners in technical violation of the law.

Ms. Thompson emphasized that massage is a core part of nail services and training, especially in holistic and international beauty standards.

Ms. Hager noted that the current language puts many practitioners unknowingly out of compliance.

Chair McKinley, Ms. Canady, and others agreed that this is a high-priority correction to align statute with industry norms and public expectations.

Ms. Chambers clarified that this change would not trigger enforcement but would modernize the law to reflect actual practice.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board’s consensus to rank this as a 1.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 14, AS 08.13.220(16)** amend by removing microneedling from the definition of tattooing.

Ms. Chambers proposed preemptively assigning this item a “No-Brainer” 1 ranking, given the board’s long-standing agreement on the issue.

The board agreed that the inclusion of microneedling in the definition of tattooing has long been a point of confusion and contention. The board has discussed this issue extensively over the years, and there is consensus that microneedling should not be regulated as tattooing under this statute.

Board members unanimously agreed, with no further discussion needed.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 1 – Immediate Priority (No-Brainer) as a low-complexity amendment suitable for inclusion in a future legislative package.*

Ms. Chambers concluded the statute review portion of the meeting by encouraging board members to continue contributing ideas. If any board member thinks of additional statutory changes or corrections, they are encouraged to email her directly. She emphasized the activity list is a living document, and new items can be added for future discussion and prioritization.

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 15, 12 AAC 09.002**, application checklist regulation, remove or streamline.

LE Spencer explained the historical purpose of the checklist and its current limitations. The checklist regulation was originally created to provide staff with clear standards for issuing licenses without board review. However, the same requirements are already repeated in license-specific regulations (e.g., 12 AAC 09.082, 084, 085, 090, 095). She stated that maintaining this checklist separately has become cumbersome, especially when statutes or other regulations are updated. She stated that streamlining or removing this section could improve clarity for staff, licensees, and the public, and reduce the administrative burden.

Ms. Chambers noted that while standards must still exist, the regulation could be rewritten or reorganized for clarity and efficiency.

Ms. Lombardo suggested reorganizing regulations by license type to make it easier to navigate.

Ms. Hager and others supported consolidating references and avoiding duplication.

Chair McKinley emphasized the importance of making staff workflows more efficient and supported a higher priority.

The board agreed that streamlining or potentially eliminating this regulation, which duplicates requirements already outlined in license-specific sections. The goal is to reduce redundancy, improve clarity, and support the division's ability to issue licenses more efficiently, especially if legislative changes grant broader authority to staff.

The board agreed this is a valuable cleanup effort that supports broader goals of modernization and efficiency, especially if paired with legislative changes.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 2.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 16, 12 AAC 09.004**, remove subsections (E) and (F) regarding courtesy hairdresser and esthetician licenses.

LE Spencer stated that despite this intent, no applications have been received, and the provision has never been used. She asked the board to consider removing the regulatory provisions for courtesy licenses, which were originally created to accommodate temporary, on-site services (e.g., for film and television productions). Since their creation, no courtesy licenses have ever been issued, raising questions about their necessity.

Chair McKinley stated the regulation was intended to support Alaska-based productions needing temporary hair and makeup services.

Some board members expressed concern that removing the regulation could eliminate a tool that might be needed in the future.

Others noted that the lack of enforcement or awareness may explain the lack of use, and that the regulation still serves as a deterrent or reference point for compliance.

Ms. Lombardo and Ms. Canady noted that while the regulation is unused, it may still serve a purpose and could be needed later.

Ms. Hager emphasized the value of retaining the regulation as a compliance tool, even if rarely enforced.

Ms. Thompson agreed that keeping the regulation does no harm and may be more beneficial than removing it.

Ms. Chambers suggested that if the board ever wanted to revisit the concept, it could consider creating a narrow exemption for closed sets or internal company services.

The board agreed that this item is not urgent and should remain on the books unless a compelling reason arises to remove it.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 4.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 17, 12 AAC 09.020**, remove outdated language related to board-administered exams.

LE Spencer stated the board no longer administers any exams directly and all theory written exams are handled by PROV, which has its own identification and security protocols. She stated the regulation is outdated and redundant, and its removal would be a regulatory cleanup effort. She explained that if the board ever chose to reinstate practical exams in the future, new regulations would need to be drafted at that time. She confirmed that no exams are currently administered by the board or the state.

Ms. Chambers noted this appears to be an oversight from the transition to third-party testing.

Ms. Desarae Hager asked whether the board might ever return to practical exams; it was clarified that if so, new regulations would be required.

Chair McKinley and Ms. Canady agreed this is a straightforward cleanup item.

Board members agreed that eliminating references to board-administered or state-administered exams, as all theory written exams are now administered by PROV and are fully computerized. The regulation is no longer applicable and appears to be a holdover from a previous licensing model.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 1 – Immediate Priority (No-Brainer) as a low-complexity amendment suitable for inclusion in a future legislative package.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 18, 12 AAC 09.025**, conduct for examinations.

Ms. Chambers stated this was another section the board could remove as it is no longer applicable. All theory written exams are now administered by PROV, which has its own conduct and identification protocols. This regulation is a holdover from when the board administered exams directly and removing it would be part of a broader regulatory cleanup effort.

Board members unanimously agreed with Ms. Chambers

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 1 – Immediate Priority (No-Brainer) as a low-complexity amendment suitable for inclusion in a future legislative package.*

Ms. Chambers noted the board had 5 minutes remaining for this meeting and noted that they would probably not complete reviewing their strategic planning review and that they'd not created buckets. She stated that their buckets could be a homework task. She emphasized this wouldn't be hard and that she'll give members items to consider which may assist the board towards a path to refine and make any changes. She stated whatever strategic planning items are left from this meeting will be reviewed during their September strategic planning meeting.

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 19, 12 AAC 09.106**, amend to include non-chemical barbering to the list of professions eligible for instructor licensure.

Ms. Canady explained that the omission was an unintended consequence of earlier changes.

Ms. Lombardo clarified that this is a regulatory fix, not a statutory one.

Board members agreed this is a straightforward correction and when the non-chemical barbering license was created, it was inadvertently omitted from this section. This amendment would correct that oversight and ensure consistency across license types.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 1 – Immediate Priority (No-Brainer) as a low-complexity amendment suitable for inclusion in a future legislative package.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 20, 12 AAC 09.112**, add a subsection to clarify how multiple event locations are handled under temporary shop licenses. Currently, the regulation is ambiguous, and licensees are required to obtain a separate license for each event location—even when part of a single event series or organization.

Ms. Lombardo emphasized that this issue is tied to broader inconsistencies between statute and regulation regarding temporary shop licenses.

Chair McKinley, Ms. Thompson, and Ms. Canady acknowledged the impact on licensees' and supported prioritizing the issue for clarification.

LE Spencer stated that the current regulation lacks clarity on whether one temporary shop license can cover multiple locations within a defined time frame. This has led to confusion and inconsistent application, especially for recurring events or multi-city tours (e.g., tattoo conventions).

While some board members support requiring separate licenses for each location due to inspection and sanitation concerns. LE Spencer noted that DEC already provides location-specific approvals, which could support a more streamlined approach.

The board agreed that clarification is needed, even if the final outcome maintains the current practice. Board members also agreed that this is a complex issue that may require both regulatory and statutory review.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 2 and noted this board could reevaluate if they chose.*

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 21, 12 AAC 09.125(i)**, square footage requirements for 12-hour manicurist course. Ms. Chambers noted that the course was book only with no practical operation requirements.

Ms. Thompson and Ms. Canady supported removing the requirement, calling it a no-brainer.

Chair McKinley raised concerns about maintaining minimum standards for classroom environments, even for book-only instruction.

Ms. Hager argued that the current square footage requirement is disproportionate to the course content and limits access unnecessarily.

The board acknowledged that ACPE oversight and school licensing already provide safeguards regarding classroom capacity and conditions.

Board members agreed that this course is theoretical only, with no hands-on training or equipment use. The current regulation requires 300 square feet minimum and 7 square feet per student, which may be excessive and prohibitively burdensome for small schools. Board members also noted that the requirement appears to be a holdover from more intensive training models and may no longer be

relevant. Board members agreed that removing or revising the requirement could improve access and reduce unnecessary barriers for schools offering this limited-scope training.

The board agreed this is a meaningful cleanup item that could reduce regulatory burden while maintaining educational integrity.

*Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 2.*

Ms. Chambers closed the session by thanking the board for their thoughtful engagement and productive discussion. She noted the significant progress made in reviewing statutory and regulatory priorities and emphasized that the remaining items will be addressed in the next session.

Ms. Chambers stated she will compile the next steps summary, including mission and vision statement samples, and assign light homework to be completed before the next meeting.

Ms. Chambers stated that the homework deadline would be September 5, 2025, which will allow time to prepare meeting materials.

The board and Ms. Chambers confirmed the next strategic planning meeting is scheduled for September 10, 2025, and will run from 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM.

LE Spencer stated that due to timing, she would prepare a bare-bones packet (agenda, ethics, and worksheets) by the deadline and additional materials will be posted after the meeting as needed.

Ms. Chambers asked the board to consider scheduling additional strategic planning sessions or allocating time during a regular board meeting to complete the planning process. Ms. Chambers encouraged board members to email her with any additional ideas or overlooked items for inclusion in the activity list.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Chambers for her leadership and preparation, noting that the board's high level of engagement was a testament to her facilitation. He humorously added that she did a great job "herding a group of cats."

Ms. Chambers expressed appreciation for the board's commitment and reminded members to stay engaged and submit their homework on time to keep the process moving forward.

The board thanked Ms. Chambers for her time and assistance.

## 5. Adjourn

The chair declared the board off the record at 12:02 p.m.

DocuSigned by:  
**Cynthia Spencer**  
B3AB3FBE72ED4BD...  
Cynthia Spencer, Licensing Examiner III

DocuSigned by:  
**Kevin McKinley**  
965F57FBB7D0496...  
Kevin McKinley, Chairperson  
Board of Barbers and Hairdressers

Date: 11/6/2025