



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 SEPTEMBER 10, 2025

By the authority of AS. 08.01.070(2) and AS 08.86.030 and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.64, Article 6, a scheduled board meeting was held via teleconference/Zoom, September 10, 2025.

September 10, 2025:

Attendance

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

Member Excused Absence: Kevin McKinley

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 5 members of the public present via Zoom

LE Cynthia Spencer announced that Chair McKinley would not be able to attend this meeting; during his absence, Jenn Lombardo would be interim chairperson.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The board was called to order at 10:01 a.m. by Chair Jenn Lombardo.

2. Review Agenda

Chair Jenn Lombardo asked if there were any amendments to the agenda.

Motion: 1st Mae Canady– 2nd Desarae Hager

Approve September 10, 2025, meeting agenda as written.

Motion Approved by majority

3. Ethics Disclosure

Shannon Thompson stated she works out of Kevin McKinley's Anchorage 5th Avenue shop as a "booth renter" under her own business.

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

4. Strategic Planning and Prioritization Processes.

Ms. Chambers greeted the board staff, and thanked members of the public for attending. She noted the absence of Kevin McKinley, who was unable to attend.

Ms. Chambers recapped the previous strategic planning meeting noting the board previously ranked priority items from a brainstorming session. Ms. Chambers stated the goal for this meeting was to review draft mission and vision statements submitted by board members and assign priority items to strategic "buckets" modeled after the California Board's strategic plan.

Ms. Chambers expressed concern over limited board participation in submitting homework. Ms. Chambers informed the board that only one board member submitted input on time. She stated that this lack of engagement hinders progress and makes collaborative planning difficult. She emphasized that strategic planning cannot be effectively done in short, infrequent meetings without preparation. Ms. Chambers reiterated the value of strategic planning:

- Provides a North Star for the board's identity and direction.
- Helps prioritize efforts and manage competing demands.
- Supports communication with licensees and stakeholders.

- Demonstrates accountability and commitment to improvement.

Ms. Chambers warned against the “hand-to-mouth” approach of reacting to issues without long-term planning. Ms. Chambers asked the board to reflect on whether they are willing and able to engage in the strategic planning process. She clarified that while staff can support and guide, the board must lead the policy and regulatory work. Ms. Chambers stated that it would be inappropriate for staff to draft the strategic plan independently.

Chair Jennifer Lombardo invited each board member to share their thoughts on whether to continue with the strategic planning process and how they wish to proceed.

Mae Canady shared her experience on a previous board that was productive, though unsure if strategic planning was used in the same way. Acknowledged not submitting homework but expressed willingness to move forward and curiosity about what has changed since her prior service.

Shannon Thompson Admitted to being distracted but felt reenergized after a conversation with Chambers. Expressed appreciation for the guidance and support, and a desire to continue with strategic planning despite being new to the process.

Desarae Hager Supported strategic planning, drawing from her background in education. Emphasized the importance of follow-through and consistency. Acknowledged her limited experience on the board but expressed a willingness to participate and learn.

Jessica Pestrikoff Echoed others’ sentiments, admitting she didn’t complete her homework but had started drafts. As a public member, she felt unsure of her role but recognized the value of strategic planning in helping new members understand the board’s direction. Expressed willingness to contribute.

Chair Lombardo Reflected on her past board service (2017–2021) and the board’s productivity during that time. Explained that strategic planning is a more structured version of the board’s previous goal-setting practices. Encouraged all members to participate, regardless of experience, and emphasized that diverse perspectives strengthen the board.

Ms. Canady thanked Chair Lombardo for her encouragement and emphasized the importance of asking questions when unsure.

Chair Lombardo reiterated the value of open communication and acknowledged the challenges of virtual meetings compared to in-person interactions.

Ms. Chambers validated board members’ feelings of uncertainty and emphasized that strategic planning must lead to action. Shared that Ms. Pestrikoff has agreed to help track and align board actions with the strategic plan once it is in place. Chambers committed to sharing a draft document to help the board move forward and emphasized the importance of structure, accountability, and communication.

Board members agreed to continue with the strategic planning process, and a shared commitment was made to speak up when something is unclear, support one another in learning and contributing, and follow through on assignments and timelines.

Ms. Chambers reminded the board of the activity list developed at the previous meeting, which categorized items into:

- Top Priorities (No-Brainers): Items with broad agreement that require legislative or regulatory change due to outdated or problematic language.
- Tier 2 Priorities: Important items that need to remain on the board’s radar with a plan and timeline for future action.
- Tier 3 & 4 Items: Lower-priority or longer-term items.
- Controversial/Undecided Items: Topics requiring further board discussion (e.g., advanced manicurist requirements).
- Unaddressed Items: Items not yet reviewed or categorized.

Ms. Chambers proposed that the board continue working through the yellow-highlighted

Items (unaddressed or pending discussion) from the activity list.

Board Members agreed to resume where they left off at the last meeting.

Ms. Chambers and board members briefly discussed accessing the current statutes and regulations, which would be needed for the next phase of review.

Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 22, 12 AAC 09.127. Ms. Chambers introduced the item, explaining its origin as a regulation created to accommodate a now-closed UAF cosmetology program. She asked the board whether this regulation should be ranked for removal or further discussion.

Chair Lombardo invited Cynthia Spencer to provide historical context.

LE Spencer explained the regulation was created over 15 years ago to support a university-based program that ultimately closed due to lack of client interest. She stated no other university has since pursued opening a cosmetology school, largely due to the extensive internal approval process (Board of Regents, ACPE, and this board). She explained that the regulation now seems redundant, as any future university program could follow the existing school application process.

Ms. Hager supported removal of the regulation, noting her experience with a similar process in Galena and confirming the regulation duplicates existing requirements.

Ms. Canady expressed concern about underserved areas but agreed the regulation is unlikely to be used again.

Ms. Pestrikoff asked whether removing this regulation would be difficult. Ms. Chambers and Chair Lombardo clarified that it would be a regulatory change, not a statutory one, and could be bundled with other “no-brainer” changes in a future regulation project.

Chair Lombardo emphasized the board’s goal to simplify and modernize its regulations, making them more accessible to industry professionals and the public.

Ms. Pestrikoff supported removing “low-hanging fruit” to build momentum and motivation.

Ms. Hager added that the regulation largely repeats content from the preceding regulation and only differs in referencing public institutions.

Ms. Chambers confirmed this is a regulation, not a statute, and can be changed by the board. She stated it aligns with Administrative Order 360, the Governor’s regulatory reform initiative, which encourages removal of outdated or unnecessary regulations. The board’s work on this item will contribute to the department’s regulatory reduction goals for 2026 and 2027.

Ms. Chambers proposed classifying this item as a “Number 1 – No-Brainer” for removal and bundling it with similar items in a future regulation project.

Board Members agreed unanimously.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the board’s consensus to rank this as a 1 –No-Brainer for removal and bundling it with similar items in a future regulation project.

Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 23, 12 AAC 09.127. 12 AAC 09.130(c), (e), and (f). Sara Chambers introduced the item, which proposes removing or revamping subsections (c), (e), and (f) of the regulation related to school records. The rationale is that the board does not currently enforce these requirements, as demonstrated by repeated investigative referrals.

LE Spencer provided context, the regulation has led to delays in reenrollment for students, apprentices, and trainees due to missing training documents. Current regulations require documents to be submitted directly by instructors or trainers, which often does not happen. She stated that despite years of noncompliance, the board has not taken disciplinary action, typically issuing only non-disciplinary letters.

This results in wasted staff time and confusion for applicants.

Ms. Canady asked how other states handle school and student records. Discussion revealed:

- Most states do not license schools directly; oversight is typically handled by post-secondary education offices.
- Students usually submit their own transcripts to the state board, similar to college or university processes.
- Alaska is one of the few states with apprenticeship programs and direct school regulations.

Ms. Canady and Ms. Hager both supported ranking this item as a “1 – No-Brainer”, citing the burden on students and the redundancy of the regulation.

Ms. Pestrikoff and Chair Lombardo agreed, emphasizing the importance of removing unnecessary barriers and focusing on achievable reforms.

Ms. Hager added that allowing trainees to submit their own documents would resolve many of the recurring issues.

Ms. Chambers noted that this is a regulatory, not statutory, change and can be addressed by the board. This issue also aligns with Administrative Order 360, which encourages the removal of outdated or burdensome regulations. She stated the board may also consider a future statutory change to remove its role in school licensure, transferring that responsibility to the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education.

Board Members unanimously agreed to rank this item as a “1 – No-Brainer” for removal or revision.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the board’s consensus to rank this as a 1 –No-Brainer for removal and bundling it with similar items in a future regulation project.

Ms. Chambers: reviewed Activity Prioritization Items 24 and 25, 12 AAC 09.162(3) and 12 AAC 09.162(11); Ms. Chambers introduced the items, which includes two proposed edits:

1. Remove “sanex strips” from the list of required equipment.
2. Update language regarding dermal lights and electrical equipment to align with the board’s updated appliance regulations adopted last year.

Ms. Chambers noted that this appears to be a missed update during the last regulatory revision and asked the board to consider whether this should be prioritized for cleanup.

Ms. Thompson, Ms. Hager, and Ms. Canady all agreed this was a “1 – No-Brainer” item for removal and revision.

Board Members unanimously agreed to classify this item as a top-priority regulatory cleanup.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the board’s consensus to rank these as a 1 –No-Brainer for removal and bundling it with similar items in a future regulation project.

Ms. Chambers: reviewed Activity Prioritization Items 26 and 27, 12 AAC 09.185(e), (g), (h) and 12 AAC 09.990(i), (j), (k). Ms. Chambers introduced Items 26 and 27, which propose removing or revising documentation submission requirements for apprentices and trainees in body piercing, tattooing, and permanent cosmetic coloring. These items mirror the issues discussed under 12 AAC 09.130, where documentation must be submitted by the trainer/instructor.

Ms. Chambers asked whether the board would like to group these items with the previous documentation-related regulation for a future bundled regulation project.

Ms. Hager supported grouping all documentation-related regulations into a single project and suggested consulting with the division to ensure the changes benefit all parties.

Ms. Lombardo agreed it could be a larger project. She originally scored it a “3” due to timing and

competing priorities, though she acknowledged it is a no-brainer conceptually.

LE Spencer emphasized that the board's failure to enforce its own regulations is a serious concern, particularly when repeated violations are treated as minor issues.

Ms. Canady and Ms. Thompson agreed that while the issue is important, it may not be as urgent as others. They supported bundling it with related items and assigning it a "2 – Important but not urgent" ranking.

Ms. Chambers confirmed that the board can adjust priorities over time and that these items may become more pressing under the Governor's Administrative Order 360 regulatory reform initiative.

Board Members agreed to reclassify Items 26 and 27, along with Item 23, as "2 – Important" and to bundle them into a future documentation-focused regulation project.

Sara Chambers: reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 28, 12 AAC 09.990(7). Ms. Chambers introduced the item, which defines a *manicurist* as including individuals licensed in any jurisdiction as a *nail technician*. She asked for clarification on whether this definition is creating confusion or should be revised.

LE Spencer explained that most states use the term *nail technician*, not *manicurist*; the definition may have been added to help out-of-state applicants understand Alaska's licensing terminology. LE Spencer stated that this has also created confusion, especially after legislative changes that temporarily replaced the manicurist license with a nail technician license, then reversed that change. LE Spencer noted that the training requirements for manicurists and nail technicians differ significantly, and the current definition may be misleading.

Ms. Hager suggested grouping this item with other unresolved issues related to manicurist and advanced manicurist licensing.

Chair Lombardo and Ms. Canady agreed that while the issue is valid, it is not urgent. They proposed assigning it a "3 or 4 – Low Priority" and bundling it with other nail technician-related topics for future review.

Ms. Chambers confirmed that the current definition may still be helpful for out-of-state applicants and that statute allows manicurists to use the title *licensed nail technician*, which limits the board's ability to resolve the confusion through regulation alone. She recommended labeling this as a low-priority item, to be grouped with other nail tech-related issues for potential future cleanup or legislative consideration.

Board Members agreed to assign this item a low priority, to be revisited as part of a broader review of nail technician-related statutes and regulations.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 3 – Low Priority.

Ms. Chambers began reviewing the Strategic Planning "Wish List" Items

Ms. Chambers reviewed board review and Issuance of licenses. Ms. Chambers noted that legislation to remove license approval from the board's purview and delegating authority to staff is already in progress. She reminded the board that Chair McKinley had been given authorization by the board to begin outreach and advocacy for this change at the last regular board meeting.

Ms. Chambers noted that no further action is needed at this time as this item is already moving forward.

Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) – Inspection Standards. Ms. Chambers introduced the topic of outdated and unenforced DEC regulations related to sanitation and inspection of salons and body art establishments.

Chair Lombardo emphasized DEC's regulations are over 20 years old and have not been updated since 2001–2002. The board previously submitted recommended updates, which were not adopted. She stated

if DEC is unwilling to modernize or enforce its regulations, it may not be the appropriate agency to oversee the body art industry.

Ms. Hager shared her experience opening a salon in Galena, where DEC's outdated requirements (e.g., lighting levels, heater specs) were burdensome and misaligned with current industry needs.

Ms. Thompson added that salon and body art professionals across Alaska feel deprioritized by DEC, which is overwhelmed with other responsibilities (e.g., regulating food service on boats).

LE Spencer noted that within the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA), inspections are conducted and enforced, however, outside MOA, inspections are rare or nonexistent.

Board Members agreed this is a high-priority advocacy issue, though not directly within the board's regulatory authority.

Ms. Chambers suggested the board could:

- Advocate through the Division Director to elevate the issue with DEC.
- Consider whether sanitation oversight should be transferred from DEC to the Department of Commerce or the board itself.
- Revisit this topic under Administrative Order 360, which may prompt DEC to modernize or relinquish outdated regulatory responsibilities.

Ms. Canady raised a key concern: If the board has already tried to address this issue and DEC has not acted, what can the board realistically do?

Ms. Chambers responded the board can still take a formal position and advocate through the Division Director (Director Robb). She stated leadership at DEC has changed, and Administrative Order 360 may create new pressure for regulatory reform. The board could:

- Revisit and update its past recommendations to DEC.
- Draft a formal letter of concern or recommendation.
- Request a meeting with DEC to discuss the public health implications of outdated and unenforced regulations.

Ms. Thompson and Chair Lombardo discussed the potential for remote inspections, especially in rural areas. During COVID-19, DEC conducted inspections via Zoom, but this practice has since become inconsistent and unclear.

Ms. Canady supported the idea of sending a letter, noting that sometimes agencies need to be reminded of their responsibilities. She appreciated the empowerment that comes from taking action, even if indirect.

LE Spencer clarified that the board contracts with DEC to perform inspections. She noted the board even offered to increase funding when DEC stopped inspecting non-body art shops, but DEC declined.

Ms. Hager asked whether DEC's authority over sanitation regulations is mandated by statute and whether any of that authority could be transferred back to the board.

Ms. Chambers explained there is a statutory partnership between DEC and the Department of Commerce. DEC currently holds all regulatory authority over sanitation standards, and any transfer of authority would require legislative action.

Ms. Hager also asked how much of a roadblock DEC's outdated regulations are for licensees.

Ms. Thompson and Chair Lombardo confirmed DEC's outdated, and inconsistently enforced regulations create significant barriers for shop owners, especially in rural areas and the lack of clarity and consistency in inspections delays openings and causes confusion.

Ms. Canady and Chair Lombardo expressed concern about how to move forward on an issue that has already been addressed without results.

Ms. Chambers recommended:

- The board take a formal position on the issue.
- Work through LE Spencer and Director Robb to advocate for change.
- Revisit and update past recommendations to DEC.
- Draft a formal letter and request a meeting with DEC to discuss the public health implications of outdated and unenforced regulations.

Ms. Thomason and Chair Lombardo discussed the potential for remote inspections, especially in rural areas, noting that DEC had used Zoom during COVID but that the practice is now inconsistently applied.

Ms. Canady supported sending a letter as a first step, emphasizing the board's role in holding DEC accountable.

Ms. Hager asked whether DEC's outdated regulations are a roadblock for licensees.

LE Spencer confirmed that there is no current roadblock for non-body art shops due to the compliance certification process. She stated when DEC stopped inspecting non-body art shops, the board created a Certification of Compliance with 18 AAC 23 form, which shop owners must sign and notarize. Body art shops still require a DEC Inspection Report or Certificate of Sanitary Standards, which are received regularly

Based on this clarification, Ms. Hager recommended ranking the issue as a "3 – Medium Priority", since it is not currently causing significant delays or barriers for licensees.

Board Members agreed to assign this item a priority level of 3, recognizing its importance but acknowledging that it is not an urgent operational issue at this time.

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

Body Art Courtesy Licenses for Alaska Shops. Ms. Chambers introduced the topic, noting that it was raised without detailed context. She invited board members to clarify the issue.

Chair Lombardo and LE Spencer explained:

- The original intent of the body art courtesy license was to allow temporary licensure for artists working in Alaska-based shops, not for special events.
- Over time, the application process evolved to accommodate special events, leading to confusion and repeated changes to submission deadlines (currently 90 days).
- Chair McKinley has expressed interest in creating a more flexible option for Alaska shops to bring in out-of-state artists to cover short-term staffing needs.

Chair Lombardo recalled Chair McKinley's concern that artists who visit regularly (e.g., every 3 months) must reapply for a new courtesy license each time. Current rules limit courtesy licenses to 30 consecutive days, with a maximum of two per calendar year.

Ms. Chambers clarified that this issue is distinct from the Universal Temporary Licensure legislation, which is intended as a pathway to permanent licensure. She noted that Chair McKinley's proposal appears to focus on short-term, non-permanent licensure for temporary staffing needs.

LE Spencer noted attempts to distinguish between brick-and-mortar shops and special events have been complicated by licensing requirements that treat both similarly. She emphasized any changes would likely require a regulatory revision and possibly a broader revamp of the convention/special event licensing structure.

Chair Lombardo suggested tabling the discussion until Chair McKinley can provide more clarity on his proposal.

Ms. Chambers agreed and recommended adding this to the "Talk to Kevin" follow-up list for future discussion.

Board Members agreed with Chair Lombardo and Ms. Chambers.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to table this item for further discussion with Chair McKinley.

Tiered Esthetician License. Ms. Chambers introduced the topic, noting that it originated from the Med Spa Services Workgroup and reflects ongoing discussions about creating an advanced esthetician license. She noted that while the board has not yet explored the full details, there has been general consensus that this is a beneficial and necessary initiative.

Chair Lombardo recommended assigning this a "1 – High Priority", stating it should be one of the board's first major projects.

Ms. Thompson and Ms. Canady agreed with the ranking.

Board Members unanimously agreed to assign the Tiered Esthetician License initiative a priority level of 1.

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

Medical Spa–Related Needs and Changes. Ms. Chambers introduced the topic, noting that it is closely related to the Tiered Esthetician License discussion. She recommended combining this and the tiered esthetician license topics into a single project, as they are deeply interconnected.

Chair Lombardo agreed with the recommendation.

Board Members agreed to combine this item with the Tiered Esthetician License initiative, which has already been assigned a priority level of 1.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to combine this with Tiered Esthetician License and rank both as a 1.

Add Details from 2023 Minutes Regarding Statute Changes. Ms. Chambers noted that this item was a general placeholder based on earlier reviews of past meeting minutes, particularly from 2023.

Ms. Canady recalled that the topic likely relates to aesthetics and the early discussions around advanced esthetics but could not recall specific details during the meeting. She committed to reviewing the 2023 minutes and reporting back at a future meeting.

Board Members agreed to label this item as "Mae Will Report Back" for future follow-up.

Update 12-Hour and Manicurist with Advanced Endorsement Licenses. Ms. Chambers noted that this topic had already been addressed earlier in the meeting so no further discussion or ranking needed.

Update the Tattoo Exam. Ms. Chambers asked whether this item was completed at the August 13 meeting.

Chair Lombardo confirmed that the board reviewed the NIC theory written exam, but no formal action was taken. She recommended assigning it a "2 – Important" ranking, noting that it should be discussed further but is not the most urgent matter.

LE Spencer confirmed that this item is scheduled for action on the November board meeting agenda.

Ms. Chambers acknowledged that the item is already in progress and does not require further prioritization at this time.

Require Tattooists to Be Licensed for More Than One Year Before Taking on an Apprentice / Possible Instructor License Changes. Ms. Chambers introduced the topic and asked for clarification on its origin.

Chair Lombardo confirmed that the suggestion was hers but noted that Chair McKinley adamantly opposes the idea.

Ms. Chambers recommended tabling the discussion until Kevin is present.

Board Members agreed to defer this topic for future discussion when all relevant parties are available.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to table this item for further discussion when all board members were present.

Examine Tattoo School Requirements. Ms. Chambers introduced the topic.

Chair Lombardo confirmed that this was a Chair McKinley-initiated item.

Board Members agreed to defer discussion until Kevin is present to provide context and direction.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to table this item for further discussion with Chair McKinley.

Review Statutes and Regulations Requiring Documentation to Only Come from the Instructor. Ms. Chambers noted that this topic had already been discussed earlier in the meeting.

Chair Lombardo confirmed that it was part of the broader conversation about documentation submission requirements and should retain the same ranking previously assigned.

No further discussion or changes were made.

Review Statutes and Regulations to Eliminate Outdated Language (e.g., Fax Requirements). Ms. Chambers introduced the topic as a general cleanup project, citing outdated language such as requirements to submit documents "by fax."

Ms. Hager and Ms. Canady agreed that this type of cleanup would likely be addressed organically as part of broader statute and regulation reviews already underway.

Chair Lombardo suggested ranking it as a "3 – Medium Priority", to be addressed after more pressing statutory and regulatory changes are completed.

Board Members agreed to assign this item a priority level of 3.

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

Tattoo Training Requirements and Form Alignment. Ms. Chambers introduced the topic, noting the need to ensure that training requirements and forms are consistent.

Chair Lombardo explained statute and regulation require 1,000 hours of tattoo training, with specific breakdowns for theory and practical hours (totaling approximately 470 hours). The remaining ~530 hours are not defined in statute or regulation but must be categorized as either theory or practical on the current form. This creates confusion, as the form appears to require something not explicitly stated in law. She recommended either updating the form to reflect the flexibility or amending the regulation to clarify the breakdown. She suggested a priority level of 3, as it is not urgent but worth addressing for clarity.

LE Spencer confirmed that the form currently allows the remaining hours to be completed in any combination of theory or practical, but this is not reflected in regulation.

Board Members agreed to assign this item a priority level of 3.

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

Additional Tattoo Requirements – 400 Hours. Ms. Chambers noted this as a separate but related item to the previous item.

Chair Lombardo confirmed it was duplicative of the previous discussion and could be deleted or merged with the above item.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 3 and would combine this with Tattoo Training Requirements and Form Alignment.

Create a Permit for Hot Tools Use by Unlicensed Personnel. Ms. Chambers introduced the topic, originally proposed by former board member Tenaya Miramontes, as a way to allow unlicensed individuals (e.g., students or youth) to use hot tools in shops under a permit system. This would require a statutory change.

Ms. Canady and Ms. Hager both expressed strong opposition:

- Mae noted that existing pathways like apprenticeships and braiding licenses already provide access to the profession.
- Desarae emphasized that the proposal is redundant, and that Alaska already allows unlicensed practice in certain rural areas under specific conditions.

Ms. Thompson and Chair Lombardo agreed with the assessment.

Board Members agreed to assign this item a priority level of 4 or potentially remove it from the list entirely.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 4 with possible removal.

Ms. Chambers began reviewing the Other Priorities Identified by the Board Items

Devise a Method for Periodically Reviewing Statutes and Regulations. Ms. Chambers introduced the item as a proactive measure to avoid future backlogs of outdated statutes and regulations.

Ms. Hager strongly supported the idea, ranking it a "1 – High Priority", to ensure the board doesn't fall behind again.

Ms. Thompson and Ms. Pestrikoff agreed.

Ms. Chambers confirmed this aligned with her own recommendation.

Board Members unanimously agreed to assign this item a priority level of 1.

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

Improve Application and Training Resources for Licensees. Ms. Chambers asked whether the board wanted to prioritize improving how applicants understand and navigate the licensing process.

Ms. Thompsom recommended a "2 or 3", noting it's important for accessibility but not currently a barrier.

Ms. Hager and Ms. Canady agreed.

Board Members agreed to assign this item a priority level of 2–3, with the understanding that it could be addressed after more urgent regulatory work is completed.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus to rank this as a 2 – 3 with the understanding that it could be addressed after more urgent regulatory work is completed.

Additional Town Hall Meetings to Increase Public Engagement. Ms. Chambers introduced the item as more of a strategy than a goal, noting that the Board of Barbers and Hairdressers was the first board to launch town hall-style listening sessions, which have since been adopted by other boards.

Ms. Hager recommended a priority level of 2 or 3, noting that while town halls are valuable, the board has significant work ahead that should take precedence.

Ms. Thompson, Ms. Canady, and Chair Lombardo agreed.

- Chair Lombardo noted that reactive town halls (in response to public concern) were highly successful, while proactive sessions had lower turnout.

- Chair Lombardo emphasized that town halls are a flexible tool the board can use as needed, without requiring regulatory changes.

Ms. Chambers confirmed that town halls can be used to gather public input on regulatory projects or as standalone engagement tools, and that the board has multiple options for structuring public comment opportunities.

Board Members agreed to treat this as a strategic tool, not a formal goal, and to utilize it as needed, particularly when public input is critical.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the board's consensus.

Update the Disciplinary Matrix and Fine Schedule. Ms. Chambers introduced the item, noting that the board began working on this in August and that it may require a regulations project, depending on how the matrix is used.

Ms. Hager supported prioritizing the update, stating that if the board is modernizing regulations, it should also ensure enforcement tools are current and effective.

LE Spencer confirmed the matrix is scheduled for continued discussion at the November board meeting and noted it has appeared on multiple past agendas without resolution.

Ms. Canady requested to review the last three versions of the matrix to understand how it evolved, especially since one version may have been updated without board input.

Ms. Chambers recommended a follow-up conversation between LE Spencer, PC Derr, and the investigative unit to clarify the matrix's history and current use. She noted this would assist in preparing for a more robust discussion at the November meeting.

Chair Lombardo offered to share her notes and past versions of the matrix with Cynthia to support that preparation.

Ms. Hager asked for clarity on why the matrix needs updating and what specific issues are being addressed.

LE Spencer encouraged members to review past meeting minutes for background and context.

Ms. Chambers confirmed that this item is in progress and will be revisited in November.

Ms. Chambers summarized the board's progress, all items brought forward were either ranked, postponed for more information, or grouped for future action. The next step is to populate the strategic planning worksheet, using the board's rankings and goals to begin structuring the plan into categories (e.g., legislation, regulation, licensing, enforcement, outreach). She noted that she's started this process using goals submitted by Acting Chair Lombardo as a foundation which will include:

- Strategic Planning Categories (based on regulatory board best practices):
- Board Administration & Governance
- Legislation & Regulation
- Licensing
- Inspection & Enforcement
- Outreach & Public Engagement

Ms. Chambers emphasized the importance of breaking down large goals (e.g., tiered aesthetics licensing) into strategies, objectives, and implementation steps, assigning responsibilities, setting timelines, and using the plan to guide board agendas and track progress. She also emphasized Ms. Pestrikoff's role as the strategic plan "shepherd" to help maintain momentum and accountability.

Ms. Canady and Chair Lombardo appreciated the structure and Jenn's contributions.

Ms. Thompson Shannon expressed gratitude for the guidance and tools provided, especially around using board minutes as a searchable resource.

Chair Lombardo emphasized the board’s strength in collaborative discussion over individual homework assignments. She suggested simplifying materials by using bullet points, large fonts, concise language, and avoiding lengthy, dense documents that may discourage engagement. She recommended avoiding group splits or independent research tasks; instead, prioritize in-meeting discussions. She noted that simplifying materials will help board members be better prepared and more engaged.

Ms. Chambers agreed with the feedback and committed to:

- Plugging board priorities into the strategic planning framework herself.
- Presenting a draft plan at a future meeting for board review and adjustment.
- Transitioning from planning to implementation once priorities are confirmed.

Ms. Canady echoed support for simpler materials. She shared that overwhelming documents can discourage follow-through, especially for those less comfortable with digital tools. She expressed appreciation for the effort to make materials more accessible.

Ms. Chambers reaffirmed the importance of adapting staff support to the board’s strengths and learning styles. She noted that each of the 21 professional licensing boards has its own culture and engagement style, and staff should be flexible to meet those needs. She proposed:

- Staff will draft the strategic plan based on the board’s clearly stated priorities.
- A follow-up meeting in mid-October (2–3 hours) to review and refine the draft together.
- Final review during the November 5 board meeting, transitioning into the implementation phase.

Chair Lombardo confirmed the next regular board meeting is on November 5 and opened the floor for board members to share availability in October for a dedicated strategic planning session.

The board briefly discussed meeting dates and times. *The board agreed to hold another Strategic Planning meeting on Tuesday, October 14, 2025, from 10:00am – 1:00pm.*

Ms. Chambers reiterated her appreciation for the board’s engagement and collaboration. She emphasized the importance of tailoring staff support to the board’s strengths and learning styles. Ms. Chambers confirmed she will draft the next version of the strategic plan within the next few weeks; include content related to the Administrative Order and prepare materials for review at the October 14 strategic planning session.

Ms. Chambers noted that she and Ms. Pestrikoff will coordinate with LE Spencer to support implementation tracking once the plan is finalized.

Chair Lombardo expressed gratitude to all board members for their participation and openness. She highlighted the value of inclusive discussion and encouraged continued engagement.

Chair Lombardo thanked Ms. Chambers, LE Spencer, and all staff for their support.

5. Adjourn

The chair declared the board off the record at 12:05 p.m.

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

DocuSigned by:

E8BD47FE98DA408...
Jennifer Lombardo, Acting Vice Chairperson
Board of Barbers and Hairdressers

Date: 11/6/2025