



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 NOVEMBER 5, 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, November 5, 2025.

November 5, 2025:

Attendance

Members Present: Chair Kevin McKinley, Jessica Pestrikoff, Willie Mae Canady, Jenn Lombardo, Shannon Thompson

Staff Present: Cynthia Spencer, Barbara Denney, and Damen Bennett Licensing Examiners, Program Coordinator Lacey Derr, Sylvan Robb Division Director, Sara Chambers Boards and Regulations Advisor, Investigators Jenni Summers, Joy Hartlieb.

Public Present via Zoom: There were 5 members of the public attending.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The board was called to order at 8:58 a.m.

2. Review/Amend Agenda and Mission Statement

A. Review/Amend Agenda

Chair Kevin McKinley asked if there were any amendments to the agenda.

LE Cynthia Spencer informed the board that Item 10 A, now has the 4th quarter budget report which would be reviewed; Item 11 F had been changed from "application review" to "shear fire academy of hair design student training review".

Inv Joy Hartlieb informed the board that Case 2024-001114 was not ready for presentation under Item 5 C.

Hearing no dissent Chair McKinley moved onto the next item

B. Mission Statement

Chair McKinley informed the board that there was no mission statement to be read at this time and hopes eventually we'll have the mission statement ready to read at the beginning of the meeting.

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. Administrative Business

A. Review/Edit/Approve Meeting Minutes

- i. August 13, 2025 Strategic Planning Meeting
- ii. August 20, 2025 Board Meeting
- iii. September 10, 2025 Strategic Planning Meeting
- iv. October 14, 2025 Strategic Planning Meeting

Chair McKinley asked if everyone had a chance to review the minutes.

Jenn Lombardo responded that the minutes looked great overall but had a couple of follow-up questions. She referenced the August 13 meeting minutes, specifically the note that Ms. Schmaling

had offered to compile a list of services that fall under basic aesthetics based on current statutes and the new appliance regulation.

Le Spencer confirmed that no list had been received from Ms. Schmaling and that she would follow up on this item for the next meeting.

Ms. Lombardo thanked Cynthia and confirmed that was her only follow-up question. She also complimented LE Spencer on doing a great job preparing the minutes.

Chair McKinley then asked if there were any other edits or questions regarding the remaining meeting minutes.

There were no other comments from board members. Chair McKinley thanked board members and requested a motion to approve meeting minutes.

Motion: 1st Mae Canady – 2nd Jenn Lombardo

Approve August 13, 2025, August 20, 2025, September 10, 2025, and October 14, 2025, meeting minutes as presented.

Approved by roll call vote.

Chair McKinley noted the board was ahead of schedule and asked LE Spencer to see if remaining Investigators would be able to join the meeting early. LE Spencer stated she would reach out, and the board could move onto another item while waiting.

Ms. Lombardo asked about the status of the mission and vision statements.

LE Spencer confirmed that no documents had been received regarding the finalized statements.

Ms. Lombardo noted that during the previous meeting (which Chair McKinley was absent from), the board had refined the mission and vision statements. She recalled that Sarah Chambers had compiled and possibly finalized them. Jennifer suggested that once Ms. Chambers arrived, the board could request that she send over the typed versions, as they appeared ready for review and inclusion.

Chair McKinley initiated a discussion on the fine matrix, noting they had approximately 15 minutes available. He raised concerns about the current structure, particularly the treatment of first offenses. He observed that some first offenses extended over a year, which may not align with the intent behind issuing a non-disciplinary advisement letter.

Ms. Lombardo recalled that the previous matrix used a time-based distinction (e.g., less than or more than 90 days), but it didn't account for multiple first offenses. She proposed combining the two approaches:

- First offense less than X days: eligible for a non-disciplinary advisement letter
- First offense more than X days: potentially subject to further disciplinary action

Ms. Lombardo also raised a broader question about how the board determines the appropriate level of disciplinary action.

Chair McKinley expressed support for Ms. Lombardo's idea, agreeing that distinguishing between shorter and longer first offenses makes sense.

Ms. Canady added that while both ideas were valid, she was concerned about being boxed in by rigid categories. She suggested including a clause for extenuating circumstances, allowing board members discretion in cases that don't neatly fit the matrix. This would provide flexibility while maintaining structure.

Chair McKinley acknowledged the value of Ms. Canady's input and noted that the board was generating strong ideas to revisit when the fine matrix item is formally addressed.

Investigative staff joined the board and moved onto Item 5.

5. Investigations

Investigators Joy Hartlieb and Senior Investigator Jenni Summers greeted the board.

A. Investigative Report/Memo

Inv Hartlieb reviewed the Investigative Memo with the board. Inv Hartlieb reported for the period August 1 – October 31, 2025, there are 26 open cases and 37 closed cases and asked if board members had any questions.

Chair McKinley inquired about the label “violation of profession, statute, or regulation,” noting he had not seen that classification before.

Inv Hartlieb explained that in the referenced case, the violation involved an unlicensed tattooist who was alleged to have tattooed a minor.

Chair McKinley also noted an increase in the number of closed cases and asked whether cases were being processed more efficiently.

Inv Hartlieb responded that many of the recent compliance inspections coincided with the license renewal period. In several cases, licensees renewed their licenses during her on-site visits via their MyAlaska accounts, resulting in immediate compliance by the time she returned to the office. She noted this was a positive trend.

Chair McKinley acknowledged the benefit of those timely reminders and asked if there were any further questions for Ms. Hartlieb.

Board members had no additional questions.

B. Investigative Probation Report

Senior Inv. Jenni Summers greeted the board and stated Probation Monitor Dannie Kerfeld was unable to attend this meeting so she would be reviewing the Probation Report with the board. Inv Summers reported for the period July 30, 2025 – October 3, 2025, there are currently 8 licensees on probation and no licensee released from probation.

Senior Inv. Jenni Summers noted that Investigator Joy Hartlieb would be presenting a probation-related request shortly.

Ms. Lombardo asked about a licensee whose probation was listed as ending on October 3, 2025, and why it had not been marked as closed.

Senior Inv. Summers clarified that at the time the report was generated, Mr. Valladolid was still technically on probation but was released the following day. His release will appear in the next quarter's report.

Chair McKinley asked about a case listed in all capital letters and whether that formatting had any significance.

Senior Inv. Summers explained the formatting is a legacy practice from earlier case management protocols, where last names were capitalized due to law enforcement-style reporting. This practice has since been phased out, but older cases like Mr. Valladolid and Ms. Grocott still reflect that formatting.

Chair McKinley also asked about the reasons for non-compliance among probationers.

Senior Inv. Summers responded:

- Ms. Grocott may not have renewed her license.
- Mr. Sanger was unable to renew online and was advised to submit a paper application.
- Mr. Curran is currently out of compliance but has submitted a request to modify his consent agreement, which will be presented by Investigator Hartlieb. If approved, he would be considered in compliance.

Desarae Hager asked whether it is standard for individuals on probation to be restricted from renewing online.

Senior Inv. Summers confirmed that this is the case, and that the MyAlaska MyLicense portal is typically locked for licensees under disciplinary action. This ensures compliance is verified before renewal.

Ms. Hager noted that this process helps flag compliance issues, and Senior Inv. Summers confirmed that licensees should be aware of this requirement.

Chair McKinley thanked Investigator Summers and asked if there were any further questions.

Board members had no additional questions.

Senior Inv. Summers concluded her report and turned the floor over to Investigator Hartlieb to present Mr. Curran's probation modification request.

D. Fine Matrix Discussion (Continued)

The board discussed whether to proceed with the fine matrix schedule or move into executive session. It was noted that Senior Inv. Summers did not need to be present for executive session, but the board had previously expressed interest in her input on the matrix discussion.

Kevin McKinley confirmed with Senior Inv. Summers that she was available to stay, and the board proceeded with the fine matrix discussion.

Ms. Canady reiterated her concern about being boxed in by rigid categories in the matrix. She supported combining the previous and current approaches to allow more flexibility in decision-making.

Ms. Lombardo agreed, noting that while the matrix is helpful, it shouldn't create a precedent that limits future discretion. She emphasized the importance of having a clause or language that allows for flexibility in unique or complex cases.

Chair McKinley shared that taking time to write detailed justifications on the review worksheet has been helpful, especially in cases with extenuating circumstances. He asked Senior Inv. Summers if those explanations are useful.

Senior Inv. Summers confirmed that board members can go outside the matrix as long as they provide a clear explanation. If the worksheet space is insufficient, members can email or attach additional documentation. She emphasized that investigators need that rationale to support the board's decisions, especially in potential litigation.

Ms. Canady appreciated the clarification and emphasized the importance of board members understanding that the matrix is a guideline, not a constraint.

Chair McKinley asked Ms. Lombardo whether all violations should be broken down into "first offense less than 90 days" and "first offense more than 90 days," or if some should remain unchanged.

Ms. Lombardo responded that she hadn't reviewed each violation in detail but suggested that most violations could be broken down that way, except for serious offenses like touching a minor or fraudulent licensing, which should not qualify for non-disciplinary action even on a first offense.

Chair McKinley invited other board members to share their thoughts on the topic.

Program Coordinator Lacey Derr added to the discussion, emphasizing that the fine matrix is a guideline, not a strict rule. She encouraged the board to consider the harm caused by violations, particularly in cases involving unlicensed instruction of apprentices. She noted that if an instructor

is unlicensed, the apprentice's hours may not count toward licensure, which directly harms the apprentice. She also raised concerns about student records, suggesting the board consider revising the strict time limits currently in place. For example, if a student record is more than 30 days late, it currently results in a letter of advisement, but if it's 3 months late, that may warrant a stronger response due to the impact on the student.

Chair McKinley thanked Lacey and asked if her comments were related to changes being implemented through AO360, which she confirmed.

Ms. Hager asked for clarification on the "90 days or under" concept.

Chair McKinley explained using a tattoo artist as an example. A licensee who is unlicensed for 30–45 days (e.g., due to a missed renewal) might receive a non-disciplinary letter of advisement. A licensee who has been unlicensed for over a year is a more serious case, and the board may want to escalate the disciplinary action. This distinction is why the board is considering breaking down first offenses by duration of the violation.

Ms. Hager agreed and added that intent and effort to comply should also be considered. She shared an example where a licensee attempted to renew but was unaware their application was incomplete due to miscommunication. She suggested that if a licensee took action before the 90-day mark, they should be treated differently than someone who took no action at all.

Chair McKinley agreed and reiterated the importance of documenting rationale on the review worksheet. He emphasized that thorough explanations help investigators and legal staff defend the board's decisions, especially if a case proceeds to a hearing.

Inv. Summers confirmed that board members can go outside the matrix as long as they provide a clear explanation. She encouraged members to reach out if they need more space to document their reasoning or to submit additional documentation separately.

Senior Inv. Summers added to the discussion by highlighting that several other boards, including the Board of Nursing and CPAs, have adopted graduated disciplinary matrices for unlicensed practice. These matrices scale fines based on the duration of the violation, such as:

- Less than 10 days: lower fine (e.g., \$200)
- 90 days or more: higher fines
- Over a year: significant penalties

Senior Inv. Summers noted that while these matrices don't always account for whether the licensee attempted to renew, that could be a condition the board considers. She supported Ms. Hager's earlier point that effort to comply should be factored into disciplinary decisions.

Chair McKinley asked what happens when someone has never attempted to get licensed and is not a first-time offender.

Senior Inv. Summers explained that such individuals are not subject to board discipline because they are not licensees. In those cases:

- A temporary cease and desist order is issued.
- If the individual continues to practice, the matter may be escalated to Superior Court for an injunction.
- If the individual later applies for licensure, the board can issue a conditional license with a consent agreement (e.g., probation for one renewal cycle).

Senior Inv. Summers also noted that Inv. Hartlieb has been proactive in educating the public during inspections and often gives unlicensed practitioners a short window to come into compliance.

Ms. Hager expressed support for a graduated fine structure, similar to the Board of Nursing's model. She emphasized that while violations should have consequences, excessive fines could discourage individuals from remaining in the profession. She also appreciated the idea of scaling fines based on license type or income level, as done by the Board of Nursing.

Ms. Canady referenced upcoming changes the board would be discussing later in the meeting, suggesting that clearing out some of the current regulatory burdens (e.g., the 25% rule) might help align the matrix with future expectations.

Chair McKinley acknowledged PC Derr's contributions to the board packet and encouraged members to review her work.

Ms. Lombardo echoed Lacey's earlier point about evaluating violations based on potential or actual harm. She distinguished between:

- A licensed practitioner who accidentally fails to renew for a short period
- Someone who knowingly practices without a license

Ms. Lombardo emphasized that not all violations are equal and thanked Lacey for reframing the issue in terms of harm caused, which she found to be a helpful perspective.

Chair McKinley then invited Shannon Thompson to share any comments, noting she had not yet spoken on the topic.

Ms. Thompson expressed appreciation for the earlier comments, particularly those from Ms. Lombardo, which helped articulate her own concerns. She shared that as an RBM, she had been interpreting the matrix too literally and was relieved to hear that it is intended as a guideline. Her main concern was the seriousness and intent behind violations, not just the duration. She emphasized the importance of distinguishing between accidental lapses and willful negligence.

Ms. Lombardo followed up with an example, noting that while license display violations are important, they may not carry the same weight as more serious offenses like tattooing a minor or failing to submit student records. She supported the idea of ranking violations by harm and suggested the board review each violation to determine whether it should remain as-is, be adjusted, or be placed on a graduated scale. She also noted that it may be more efficient to revisit the matrix after reviewing AO360-related regulation changes.

Chair McKinley invited Jessica Pestrikoff, the public board member, to share her perspective.

Jessica Pestrikoff stated that having a matrix as a guide is helpful, but flexibility is essential. Coming from an HR background, she emphasized the importance of being able to justify decisions and consider context, rather than being bound by precedent alone.

Ms. Hager raised a point about transparency and deterrence, suggesting that while the board may not want to publish the exact matrix, it could be helpful to include language in regulations stating that violations may result in fines "up to X amount." She shared that when her school learned of the \$1,000 fine per unlicensed student, they acted quickly demonstrating that clear consequences can drive compliance.

Senior Inv. Summers added that the Attorney General's Office has recommended that boards publish their disciplinary guidelines or matrix on their websites.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether the matrix is currently published, noting that it had been discussed in a previous meeting, but she had not seen it posted.

Senior Inv. Summers clarified that while the Attorney General's Office has recommended boards publish their disciplinary matrices online, she was unsure if the Barbers and Hairdressers Board matrix was currently posted.

Ms. Lombardo recalled that when the matrix was adopted, the board had agreed it should be made publicly available. She noted she had searched for it but had not found it on the website. She suggested it may be posted under a less obvious section, as seen on other board websites.

Chair McKinley agreed to follow up and determine whether the matrix is posted and, if so, whether it needs to be relocated for better visibility.

LE Spencer confirmed that the matrix is not currently on the website, but she has added it to her task list and will notify the board once it is posted.

Chair McKinley then shifted the discussion to the issue of tattooing minors, which had been raised as a serious violation. He asked Inv. Hartlieb to confirm whether this offense is classified as a Class B misdemeanor, and what enforcement options exist, especially when law enforcement is unresponsive.

Inv. Hartlieb deferred to her supervisor, noting that enforcement would require involvement from Superior Court due to the criminal and civil nature of the offense.

Senior Inv. Summers elaborated, explaining that:

- Many boards face challenges getting law enforcement to act on regulatory violations, even when they are criminal offenses.
- Law enforcement agencies are often understaffed and prioritize more serious crimes.
- In one past case on the Kenai Peninsula, a trooper visited a home where minors were being tattooed (by another minor) helped stop the behavior, even though no charges were filed.
- The presence of a uniformed officer can be a deterrent, even if formal charges are not pursued.

Senior Inv. Summers emphasized that while criminal prosecution is rare, the division uses tools like temporary cease and desist orders and community education to address unlicensed or unlawful activity.

Chair McKinley acknowledged the difficulty of enforcement but appreciated the proactive steps taken by investigators. He asked if there were any additional questions.

LE Spencer informed the board that Lacey Derr had made live edits to the fine matrix during the discussion and now had a marked-up version available for review.

PC Derr explained that she added notes and a graduated scale to several items, including student and apprentice records. She clarified that:

- Student permits are established in statute, so while regulatory changes are possible, the permit requirement itself cannot be removed.
- Student/apprentice record submission is currently required within 15 days of the end of the quarter, which informed the timeframes she included in the matrix.
- The updated matrix provides a visual reference based on the board's discussion.

Chair McKinley thanked Lacey for her work.

Ms. Lombardo asked LE Spencer if the updated matrix could be uploaded to the board packet.

LE Spencer confirmed she would upload it during the next break so the packet would reload with the new content.

Chair McKinley asked if the updated matrix resembled those used by other boards.

PC Derr noted that some boards don't have a matrix at all, which can lead to inconsistent decisions. She said the current matrix (last revised in 2020) is a helpful tool and that Inv. Summers could better speak to how it compares to other boards.

Senior Inv. Summers confirmed that the updated matrix is very similar to what the CPA Board recently adopted and what the Board of Nursing has used for some time.

Ms. Lombardo suggested that the updated matrix could serve as a temporary solution until the board completes its AO360 regulatory review, particularly the 25% reduction due by the end of 2027. She recommended revisiting the matrix after those changes are finalized.

Chair McKinley asked for clarification on the timeline, noting that a 15% reduction is due by the end of the upcoming year, with the 25% target due in 2027.

PC Derr confirmed that the board will likely be holding multiple meetings in the near future due to the scope of AO360. She supported uploading the matrix now, allowing board members time to review it, and placing it on the next meeting agenda for possible adoption or revision.

Ms. Lombardo and Ms. Canady agreed with this approach.

Chair McKinley expressed general agreement but raised a concern: having an updated matrix sooner could help with upcoming case reviews. However, he acknowledged that board members can still go outside the matrix with proper justification, as discussed earlier. He concluded that it made sense to wait until the next meeting to revisit the matrix after reviewing Lacey's proposed regulatory changes.

Chair McKinley asked if there were any final comments on the matrix. He confirmed that, hearing no further comments, the updated matrix will be added to the next meeting agenda. He noted that the board will be scheduling upcoming meetings later in the session. He also requested that copies of the disciplinary matrices from the Board of Nursing and Board of Public Accountancy be provided as examples of graduated disciplinary actions.

Senior Inv. Summers offered to send those documents to LE Spencer and PC Derr.

LE Spencer confirmed that the matrix will be uploaded to the board packet and added to the next meeting agenda.

Chair McKinley emphasized the importance of all board members reviewing the updated matrix thoroughly before the next meeting, noting that the board will soon need to begin making decisions. He encouraged members to consider:

- The impact on licensees
- The severity of violations
- The guidance and flexibility discussed during the meeting

Chair McKinley requested a motion be made to adjourn into executive session for case reviews.

LE Spencer noted the Ms. Canady and Chair McKinley were RBM's for 2 cases. She noted that Ms. Canady's case was not ready for presentation at this time; each would be excluded from the executive session during reviews of their cases.

Motion to enter executive session: 1st Desarae Hager - 2nd Mae Canady.

Alaska State Board of Barbers and Hairdressers enter executive session in accordance with AS 44.62.610(c) and Alaska constitutional right to privacy provisions, for the purpose of discussing subjects that tend to prejudice the reputation and character of any person, provided the person may request a public discussion and matters involving consideration of government records that by law are not subject to public disclosure. Board staff to remain during the session.

Approved by majority.

*Board entered executive session at 10:11 a.m. and returned from executive session at 11:08 a.m.
Quorum of board confirmed by roll call.*

Chair McKinley left executive session at 10:45 a.m.

Motion: 1st Mae Canady – 2nd Jenn Lombardo

Adopt amended consent agreement for Case 2022-000291 and 2022-000291-PRB as presented for Jordan Curren.

Chair McKinley asked if the board had any additional comments or questions; hearing none, Chair McKinley requested a roll call vote.

Motion Approved by roll call vote

Motion: 1st Mae Canady– 2nd Desarae Hager

Adopt Consent Agreement for Case 2025-000780 as presented for Janelle S. Liles

Chair McKinley asked if the board had any additional comments or questions; hearing none, Chair McKinley requested a roll call vote.

Name	Roll Call Vote		
	YES	NO	RECUSE
Shannon Thompson	X		
Kevin McKinley			X Reviewing Board Member
Jessica Pestrikoff	X		
W. Mae Canady	X		
Jenn Lombardo	X		
Desarae Hager	X		

THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.

The board thanked Senior Inv. Summers and Inv. Hartlieb for their time and assistance.

Recess The Board recessed at 11:13 a.m. for a short break; reconvened at 11:30 a.m. Majority of the board confirmed by roll call

7. Administrative Business, Cont.

A. Strategic Planning Report (J Pestrikoff and S Chambers)

Sara Chambers Boards and Regulations Advisor greeted the board and thanked them for the opportunity to return. She began by acknowledging the board congratulated them on completing their strategic planning process. She acknowledged the significant effort, thoughtful discussion, and collaboration that went into the process and expressed her appreciation for being part of it. She explained that she would begin the presentation and that Jessica Pestrikoff was welcome to contribute or ask questions throughout. She also noted that she would be transitioning the strategic planning responsibilities from herself to Jessica and the full board, ensuring everyone was aligned on next steps.

Ms. Chambers explained that the purpose of this segment was to:

- Review the finalized strategic planning documents (previously emailed to the board)
- Introduce a visual summary of the plan, including the mission and vision statements, and a breakdown of Phase 1 and Phase 2 priorities
- Provide guidance on how to integrate the strategic plan into ongoing board operations
- Posting the visual summary on the board’s website and including it in meeting materials
- Adding a standing agenda item for strategic planning updates at each board meeting
- Using the plan to stay focused on board priorities and avoid being sidetracked by lower-priority or one-off issues

Ms. Chambers emphasized the importance of momentum, noting that consistent attention to strategic goals increases the likelihood of progress. She encouraged the board to use the prioritization matrix and strategic activity list as tools to track and manage progress.

Ms. Chambers highlighted the “Project Information” section of the matrix, where individual responsibilities and timelines are documented. She pointed out that the board had already voted to have the Chair work with legislators on a statutory proposal to allow staff to issue licenses—this was marked as urgent and in progress. She then directed attention to Part 3 of the matrix, marked in yellow, which is intended to be updated at the November meeting and reviewed at every subsequent meeting. This section is designed to:

- Track progress on high-priority items
- Hold individuals accountable
- Provide context and continuity for ongoing efforts

Ms. Chambers noted that Jessica Pestrikoff, as the public board member, would play a key role in facilitating these check-ins at future meetings.

Ms. Chambers continued her presentation by walking the board through how to actively use the strategic plan moving forward. She emphasized that:

- The board should spend time at each meeting (e.g., 15 minutes) reviewing the strategic plan, particularly Section 3 of the prioritization matrix.
- This section should be used to:
 - ❖ Track next steps for each priority item
 - ❖ Assign responsible individuals
 - ❖ Set or update due dates
 - ❖ Ensure ongoing accountability

Ms. Chambers noted that Chair McKinley is already making progress on the board's top priority (U1), which involves working with legislators to propose statutory changes allowing staff to issue licenses. Although the placeholder due date has passed, the project is active, and the board should continue updating the matrix with next steps (e.g., reviewing draft language, responding to sponsor questions).

Ms. Chambers reminded the board that the strategic plan is a living document and encouraged them to edit it directly as needed. She stressed that this work should remain board-driven, not delegated to staff, to maintain ownership and momentum.

Ms. Chambers reminded the board that Ms. Pestrikoff was designated as the board's strategic planning lead, responsible for checking in at each meeting to ask:

- What's the next step?
- Who is responsible?
- When will it be done?

Ms. Chambers noted, if Ms. Pestrikoff is unavailable, the Chair should ensure the discussion still takes place. Sarah also recommended that the board:

- Treat AO360 regulatory reform as the next top priority (U2), due to the February deadline set by the Governor.
- Use the color-coded matrix to identify and prioritize all regulation-related items (marked in blue).
- Discuss during the current meeting how the board will approach AO360 (e.g., through a committee or additional meetings).

Ms. Chambers offered to send a letter from Director Sylvan Robb outlining strategies for AO360 engagement, in case it wasn't already in the board packet. She concluded by encouraging the board to:

- Keep working on the legislative project (U1)
- Make AO360 regulatory changes the next major focus (U2)
- Use SMART goals and assign clear responsibilities and deadlines
- Review and update Section 3 of the matrix at every meeting

Ms. Chambers opened the floor for questions or concerns before wrapping up with final recommendations.

Ms. Lombardo shared a follow-up comment, agreeing with Ms. Chambers' recommendation to prioritize AO360. She suggested the board should:

- Identify and group all "no-brainer" regulation changes
- Incorporate them into the AO360 project
- Separate statutory from regulatory changes for clarity

- Take advantage of the Governor’s streamlined process to move these changes forward efficiently

Chair McKinley agreed and praised both Jennifer’s input and Sarah’s presentation, asking whether Sarah would continue to be involved.

Ms. Chambers responded that the strategic plan is now in the board’s hands. She will not attend future meetings unless specifically requested but remains available to:

- Join meetings upon invitation
- Answer questions from Ms. Pestrikoff or other board members
- Assist with updates or revisions to the strategic plan or its visual materials

Ms. Chambers also clarified that the strategic plan timeframe is set through 2028, based on the scope of the board’s current goals. The plan can be updated at any time, and she is happy to assist with revisions if needed.

Kevin McKinley provided an update on the board’s top strategic priority (U1)—the legislative initiative to delegate authority to the division to issue licenses. He reported the following progress:

- The process has involved numerous phone calls and follow-ups, emphasizing that legislative projects require ongoing engagement, not just a single outreach.
- The board has secured a House sponsor, Representative Ashley Carrick, who is attempting to introduce the bill as a committee bill. If that is not possible, she has agreed to sponsor it individually.
- Senator Kelly Merrick is being approached as a potential Senate companion bill sponsor, which would help expedite the legislative process by having identical bills in both chambers.
- Rep. Carrick serves on Labor and Commerce, and Sen. Merrick is believed to be on Finance, both of which are strategic committees for this type of legislation.

Chair McKinley stated now is the time to identify stakeholders who would be affected by or benefit from the bill and plans to coordinate outreach to gain support. He noted that Ms. Chambers would likely be contacted for assistance in identifying key stakeholders. Board members will soon be asked to familiarize themselves with their legislators and begin making contact, especially with legislative staff, who often serve as the primary point of communication. He concluded by inviting any questions from the board.

Ms. Lombardo asked for clarification on what a committee bill is.

Chair McKinley explained:

- A committee bill is sponsored by an entire legislative committee (e.g., Labor and Commerce), rather than a single legislator.
- These bills often have a higher chance of advancing through the legislative process because they carry the endorsement of the full committee.
- Other committees are more likely to hear and support a bill if it originates as a committee bill, as it signals broader support.

Ms. Lombardo confirmed her understanding, noting that a committee bill implies collective support from the sponsoring committee, whereas an individual sponsor must work to gain support from others.

Chair McKinley added Rep. Ashley Carrick is currently discussing the possibility of a committee bill with Rep. Zack Fields, who is in leadership. He has received positive feedback from multiple legislators, with no opposition expressed so far. Many legislators view the proposal as common sense, recognizing that the board does not want to be burdened with processing license applications, which can slow down operations. He concluded by noting that Ms. Chambers should expect a follow-up email or phone call as the board continues to build support for the bill.

Ms. Chambers provided final instructions for maintaining and implementing the strategic plan:

- All blue regulation projects should be moved into Part 3 of the plan, with deadlines assigned based on the board’s approach to AO360.
- The board should identify its next “U2” (Underway Priority 2) project and continue assigning responsibilities and deadlines at each meeting.
- The strategic plan should remain a living document, updated regularly as projects are completed or new priorities emerge.

Ms. Chambers encouraged the board to make the system their own, even if it evolves over time, and offered continued support as needed.

Chair McKinley thanked the board and Sara for their work.

Ms. Lombardo expressed appreciation to Kevin for his efforts in communicating with legislators, noting that while it may be his strength, it’s not everyone’s, and the board is grateful for his advocacy.

Chair McKinley responded with appreciation and reaffirmed his support.

The strategic planning session concluded with no further comments or questions.

B. Medical Spa's Multi-Board Workgroup Report (S Thompson and S Chambers)

i. Medical Spa Services Frequently Asked Questions

Ms. Chambers provided a brief update on the Medical Spas Multi-Board Work Group; the FAQ document, which represents the culmination of Phase 1 of the workgroup’s efforts, is still under review by participating boards. Of the six boards involved 4 boards, including this one, have approved the FAQ. The Board of Chiropractic Examiners requested additional time for review, and the Board of Dental Examiners has not yet met but is scheduled to do so within the next month.

Ms. Chambers stated AO360 is contributing to delays; all guidance documents, including FAQs, must now undergo Department of Law review before publication. Although the FAQ was drafted with legal input, it must still go through this formal process. She stated as a result, publication is likely delayed until spring; additionally, any regulatory changes resulting from AO360 may require updates to the FAQ before it can be finalized.

Ms. Chambers emphasized that despite the delay the FAQ has already served a valuable purpose by facilitating inter-board discussions and clarifying issues related to scope of practice and public understanding of medical spa services.

Ms. Thompson thanked Sara for the update.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether the workgroup is still meeting.

Ms. Chambers stated that the group is currently on a temporary break to allow completion of the FAQ review process and for Boards to focus on AO360 regulatory reform planning. She said the workgroup is expected to resume in March, after the holiday season and AO360 planning deadlines.

ii. August 13, 2025, Board Meeting Medical Spa Correspondence Responses

- a. Thatiana Marchi, Scope of Practice Inquiry – Use of Non-Invasive Body Contouring Device – Response from S Chambers
- b. Jessie Hill - Laser Tattoo Removal Questions– Response from S Chambers
- c. Sarah Crosswhite, Medical Director Questions– Response from S Chambers
- d. Marie Hensley, Esthetician Training– Response from S Chambers
- e. Makenzie Melsom, Microneedling – Response from S Chambers

Ms. Chambers reported that she responded to several public inquiries related to medical spa

services, as requested by the board during the August 13, 2025, meeting. The responses were included in the current meeting packet for board review. Ms. Chambers noted she did not receive replies from the individuals who submitted the questions; the responses were based on the FAQ draft, workgroup discussions, and relevant statutes and regulations. Ms. Chambers encouraged board members to review the responses and notify her of any concerns or suggested edits.

Ms. Lombardo expressed appreciation for Sara's work and confirmed the responses were well done. She asked that any future replies from the original correspondents be brought to the board's attention at upcoming meetings.

Chair McKinley reminded board members of the importance of reviewing materials ahead of time to ensure efficient use of meeting time.

Ms. Chambers was thanked by board members for her time and contributions. Ms. Chambers thanked the board.

Recess The Board recessed at 12:04 p.m. for a lunch break; reconvened at 10:00 p.m. Majority of the board confirmed by roll call.

9. Public Comment

Chair McKinley asked LE Spencer who was online for public comment.

LE Spencer stated that the only public attendee who asked to speak with Jacqueline Polis.

Chair McKinley set a 5-minute time limit per person for public comment.

Jacqueline Polis, Esthetician.

Ms. Polis expressed appreciation for the board's efforts and acknowledged the complexity of the issues being addressed. She shared ongoing concerns regarding statutory language defining aesthetics, particularly how it may unintentionally limit the scope of services estheticians can provide. Specifically, she referenced language that restricts services to the face, neck, and shoulders, which may exclude common services such as waxing of underarms, legs, or bikini areas. She noted that some services are being categorized as Advanced Aesthetic Services, potentially pushing them into the medical spa domain unnecessarily.

Ms. Polia emphasized the importance of inclusive and flexible language that reflects the full range of services estheticians provide, while maintaining safety and compliance. She encouraged the board to consider public input during the development of new language or revisions, especially as part of the AO360 reform process.

Chair McKinley thanked Jacqueline for her thoughtful comments and confirmed that LE Spencer would take notes for further review.

LE Spencer clarified that the definition of aesthetics is currently set in statute, not regulation, meaning any changes would require legislative action.

Ms. Polis acknowledged this but reiterated that her intent was to raise awareness and ensure the issue remains on the board's radar during ongoing discussions and planning.

No additional public commenters were present.

While waiting for additional individuals who may like to speak during public comment, the board moved onto discuss an email from Senior Investigator Summers regarding DEC matters.

Ms. Lombardo raised a question regarding an email included in the board packet (page 116) from Senior Investigator Summers to PC Derr and LE Spencer, highlighting issues with DEC's limited inspection scope and the gray area in enforcement for non-body art shops.

PC Derr provided context, the email was prompted by a consumer complaint and highlights the regulatory gap between DEC and the board. DEC only inspects tattoo, piercing, and permanent cosmetic shops, not hair salons or other establishments under the board's purview. She stated applicants are required to attest to compliance with DEC regulations, but enforcement is inconsistent, especially outside of Anchorage. She emphasized that with travel restrictions and limited investigative resources, the board must consider whether it can realistically enforce these standards or whether regulatory amendments are needed under AO360.

Ms. Hager asked whether the requirement for inspections by board members is statutory or regulatory.

LE Spencer stated that DEC's inspection authority is statutory, but enforcement outside of Anchorage is minimal. Within the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA), local authorities actively inspect and have shut down non-compliant shops. She noted that outside MOA (e.g., Wasilla, Fairbanks, Juneau), inspections are rare or nonexistent. LE Spencer stated that Inv. Hartlieb may conduct inspections if a complete complaint packet is submitted, but even then, enforcement options are limited if violations fall under DEC's jurisdiction and DEC declines to act.

Chair McKinley summarized that if a complaint is egregious and well-documented, it is likely to be followed up on, but the system is inconsistent and reactive.

The board acknowledged the enforcement gap and the need to clarify roles and responsibilities between the board, DEC, and local municipalities. This issue may warrant further discussion during AO360 regulatory reform planning, particularly regarding:

- Inspection authority
- Statutory vs. regulatory responsibilities
- Feasibility of enforcement with current resources

PC Derr encouraged the board to move onto another item.

11. Administrative Business, Cont.

B. Alignment and Priority Check (J Pestrikoff)

Chair McKinley asked Ms. Pestrikoff if she was ready to present Item 11 B.

Ms. Pestrikoff responded she was not ready to present this item at the moment.

Chair McKinley stated that the board would move on to Correspondence, Item 11 D.

D. Correspondence

i. Sarah Maxwell, Tattooing Courtesy License Process Concerns

The board reviewed an email from Sarah Maxwell, included in the meeting packet for several weeks, regarding barriers to guest artist licensing, particularly in the context of a tattoo convention in Fairbanks.

Ms. Lombardo suggested the board consider whether this issue could be addressed under AO360, especially in terms of reducing barriers to temporary licensure and aligning with recent executive orders or policy changes related to temporary licensing.

LE Spencer clarified this board is already compliant with temporary licensing requirements including under the SCRA Military Licensing Program. She noted temporary permits and licenses are available for students and individuals relocating from out of state; however, guest artists are not currently covered under these provisions. LE Spencer stated that the board could consider revising or revoking courtesy license requirements for guest artists as part of its AO360 regulatory reform efforts.

Ms. Lombardo acknowledged the distinction and thanked staff for the clarification.

Chair McKinley confirmed that the correspondence was related to a Fairbanks-based event and asked if all board members had reviewed the letter.

Board members confirmed they had read the correspondence.

ii. Linda McLendon – Continuing Education

The board reviewed an email from Linda McLenden, who raised concerns about the requirement for hairdressers to obtain additional training and licensure to perform barbering services. Ms. McLendon expressed the view that hairdressers should be allowed to perform all barbering services without needing to obtain a separate license.

Ms. Hager clarified that the only service hairdressers cannot perform under their current license is shaving with a straight razor (i.e., using a blade without a guard). Hairdressers can already perform beard trims and facial hair removal. She emphasized the importance of proper training for straight razor use due to safety concerns.

Ms. Canady added that hairdressers can obtain a barber license by completing 50 shaves and additional haircut requirements and then passing the written theory exam.

LE Spencer confirmed the training hours and practicum requirements for barbering and hairdressing are interchangeable. Hairdressers seeking a barber or non-chemical barber license must complete the additional practicum and pass the applicable exam. She noted similarly, barbers seeking a hairdressing license must complete the chemical services portion of the curriculum and pass the exam.

Chair McKinley referenced Sara Chambers' written response to Linda, which cited 12 AAC 09.097 (Credit for Hours of Coursework and Training) and explained the process in detail.

LE Spencer noted that Linda has received this information multiple times from various sources, including:

- Licensing Examiner Damen Bennett
- Deputy Director Glenn Saviers
- Cynthia Spencer
- And most recently, Sara Chambers

The board confirmed that current licensing pathways are clearly defined, and that cross-licensing is possible with additional training and testing. No further action was deemed necessary at this time.

Chair McKinley noted the board had a few moments before 1:30pm and requested a brief recess.

Recess The Board recessed at 1:29 p.m. for a short break; reconvened at 1:30 p.m. Majority of the board confirmed by roll call

10. Division and Financial Update

Director Sylvan Robb and board members greeted each other. Dir. Robb stated that as she would be reviewing AO360 with the board she would also provide the budget report.

A. FY25 4th Quarter Budget Report

Dir. Robb reviewed the 4th quarter budget report with the board.

Ms. Hager inquired about the annual deficit shown in the budget report.

Dir. Robb confirmed that the board spent approximately \$460,000 more than it earned in FY25, which is expected in a non-renewal year. She reported the board began the year with a surplus of \$1.1 million. She noted most revenue is generated during renewal years (e.g., FY24), which helps carry the program through non-renewal years (e.g., FY25). She emphasized this cyclical budgeting is reflected in the two-year financial planning model used by the division.

Dir. Robb reported licensing revenue trends in FY24 (renewal year), the board earned over \$1.1 million in license fees and in FY25 (non-renewal year), revenue dropped to just over \$300,000, consistent with historical trends. She noted that similar revenue patterns are visible in previous

cycles (e.g., FY22–23, FY20–21).

Ms. Hager asked whether the division tracks initial licenses vs. renewals.

Dir. Robb confirmed that this data is available on the CBPL website under “Division Reports” in the CBPL Quick Links section. The FY25 Professional Licensing Statistics report breaks down license types and includes the number of new licenses issued. For example, 12 new barber licenses were issued in FY25, out of 190 total active licenses in that category. The division maintains five years of historical data, allowing the board to track trends over time.

Ms. Hager noted the importance of tracking initial license growth as the board implements reforms to streamline licensing.

Dir. Robb agreed and stated that while causation can’t be definitively proven, a notable increase in new licenses could reasonably be attributed to regulatory improvements. She stated in FY25, the board issued 971 new licenses, making it one of the highest-volume licensing boards in the state.

Board members had no further questions.

B. Administrative Order 360 (AO 360) (Chambers/Robb)

Dir. Robb reported Administrative Order 360 (AO360) was issued by Governor Mike Dunleavy on August 4, 2025, mandating a statewide regulatory reform initiative. The order applies to all state agencies, boards, and commissions, including over 85 divisions and 100+ boards. She stated the goal is to reduce regulatory burdens, improve transparency, and streamline processes while maintaining public safety and consumer protection.

Dir. Robb reviewed key requirements of AO360:

1. Stakeholder Engagement:

- Agencies must solicit written and oral input from the public, licensees, and industry stakeholders.
- The public comment period remains open until the end of the week.
- Boards must respond to each comment, indicating whether suggestions will be adopted or declined, with rationale.

2. Regulatory Reduction Targets:

- 15% reduction in regulatory requirements by end of calendar year 2026.
- 25% cumulative reduction by end of calendar year 2027.
- The focus is on:
 - Clarifying obligations
 - Reducing costs
 - Streamlining procedures
 - Improving transparency

3. Counting Regulatory Requirements:

- A regulatory reduction guide outlines how to count requirements.
- Each discretionary requirement (not explicitly required by statute) counts toward the total.
- Both mandatory actions (e.g., submit an application) and prohibitions (e.g., cannot tattoo a minor) are counted.
- Partial credit is given for streamlining or clarifying language, not just repealing rules.

4. Guidance Documents:

- All current guidance documents must be published on the Alaska Online Public Notice System.
- These documents are also subject to review and potential revision under AO360.

Ms. Hager asked clarifying questions about how discretionary requirements are defined and counted.

Dir. Robb emphasized that the board should not feel pressured to eliminate essential protections but rather focus on efficiency and clarity. She encouraged the board to continue reviewing its regulations and identifying areas for improvement, with support from the division. Dir. Robb informed the board and meeting participants for more details, the full Administrative Order 360 can be accessed here: [Administrative Order No. 360 – Governor Mike Dunleavy](#)

Dir. Robb stated the board must submit its AO360 Regulatory Reform Plan by February 13, 2026. The plan must include:

- A list of regulations under review (identified by section).
- A brief description of each regulation and its purpose.
- Proposed changes or eliminations.
- An estimate of the regulatory reduction impact (i.e., how much each change contributes toward the 15% and 25% goals).

LE Spencer shared a draft version of the AO360 planning document during the meeting, which includes a column for regulation citations, descriptions of the regulation’s purpose, proposed changes, and estimated reduction value.

Dir. Robb reported board staff have begun identifying potential areas for reduction based on common applicant errors, frequently misunderstood requirements, and areas where clarification or simplification could improve efficiency. Dir. Robb emphasized the board retains full authority over its regulations and staff input is intended as a starting point, not a directive. She noted the board must review, amend, and approve the final plan.

Dir. Robb outlined several approaches the board could take to complete the AO360 review:

1. Committee of the Whole:
 - Schedule additional full board meetings to review regulations collaboratively.
2. Subcommittee Approach:
 - Form a working group or subcommittee (which may include industry members) to review and recommend changes.
3. Individual Assignments:
 - Assign board members to review sections of the regulations based on their areas of expertise (e.g., hairdressing, tattooing, esthetics).
 - Members would report back with recommendations for the full board to consider.

Chair McKinley asked whether the public comment period for AO360 was still open.

Dir. Robb confirmed the formal stakeholder engagement meetings have concluded and the written public comment period remains open through Friday (end of the current week). Dir. Robb stated comments can be submitted via email to RegulationsAndPublicComment@Alaska.Gov and a comment form is available on the [CBPL AO360 webpage](#) to help guide submissions.

Dir. Robb encouraged stakeholders to provide feedback, especially now that the board has publicly discussed AO360, as it may prompt more engagement from licensees and the public. She reviewed Board Engagement and Submission Deadline:

- The board must submit its regulatory reduction plan by February 13, 2026.
- The plan will be reviewed by the Governor’s Office and the Department of Law.
- Once approved, the board can proceed with regulation projects without needing a waiver.

- Approved projects will follow the standard regulation change process, including:
 - ❖ Board vote to open a project.
 - ❖ Drafting of proposed changes.
 - ❖ Review by the Department of Law.
 - ❖ Public notice and comment period.
 - ❖ Final board adoption and filing.

Chair McKinley asked whether the board would return to the normal regulatory process after AO360.

Dir. Robb confirmed the standard regulatory process remains in place. AO360 simply adds a front-end planning and approval step to ensure alignment with the Governor’s reform goals. She noted once the board’s plan is approved, regulation changes proceed as usual. She clarified that prior to AO360, Administrative Order 358 (issued in May 2025) required boards to obtain a waiver before initiating any regulatory projects. Under AO360, if a regulatory project is included in the board’s Regulatory Reduction Plan (spreadsheet) submitted by February 13, 2026, no waiver is required to proceed with that project. If the board later identifies a new regulatory need not included in the original plan, a waiver request would still be required to initiate that project. She noted that:

- The board may prioritize projects within the AO360 spreadsheet.
- The Department of Law prefers smaller, discrete projects rather than large, all-encompassing ones.
- Prioritization will help the department sequence reviews and manage workload across all boards.
- Board staff have already provided a preliminary list of suggested projects to help the board begin its review and planning.

Chair McKinley raised concern about the board’s ongoing efforts to expand opportunities for estheticians, which may require new regulations. He asked how such growth fits within AO360’s reduction mandate.

Dir. Robb clarified boards can still create new regulations, even under AO360. However, the reduction target remains fixed. For example, if the board starts with 1,000 discretionary requirements, the goal is to be reduced to 750. If the board adds 100 new requirements, the target remains 750, meaning the board must now reduce 350 total to meet the goal. She explained that this means boards must offset any new additions with equivalent or greater reductions elsewhere.

Ms. Canady commented that some of the proposed changes—such as removing notary requirements—could significantly reduce administrative burdens and delays for applicants, especially those coming from out of state or internationally.

Dir. Robb agreed and noted many programs have already eliminated notary requirements due to their limited value and the burden they place on applicants. Other outdated requirements, such as needing a state seal on documents from other jurisdictions, are also being reconsidered. She stated these changes reflect a shift away from paper-era processes and toward more modern, efficient licensing systems.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether the board could receive credit for regulatory reductions already completed, such as removal of notary requirements and elimination of practical exams for hairdressing.

Dir. Robb clarified no retroactive credit is allowed under AO360. She stated the baseline count of regulatory requirements was established in September–October 2025; any changes already adopted and effective before that time are included in the baseline and do not count toward the 15% or 25% reduction goals. She noted that the board’s prior work has lowered its starting point (e.g., 609 requirements instead of 750), which makes the reduction target more manageable.

Ms. Lombardo also asked how the board should handle requirements embedded in statutes that it would like to revise or eliminate.

Dir. Robb explained statutory changes are outside the scope of AO360, which only applies to regulations; only the Alaska Legislature can amend statutes. She stated that the board is encouraged to identify outdated or burdensome statutes during its AO360 review. She explained that these findings can be used to support future legislative proposals, especially when framed as part of a broader reform effort. Dir. Robb additionally informed the board requirements explicitly stated in statute do not count toward the board's discretionary regulation total. If a regulation merely repeats a statutory requirement, removing it does not contribute to the reduction goal.

Chair McKinley asked whether the Governor has the authority to reject a regulation project if it appears to increase regulatory burden.

Dir. Robb clarified the board retains authority over its own regulations; once a project is included in the AO360 Regulatory Reduction Plan, it proceeds through the normal regulatory process:

- Board vote
- Drafting
- Department of Law review
- Public comment
- Adoption by the Lieutenant Governor's Office (not the Governor's Office)

Dir. Robb informed the board that the Governor's Office does not review or approve board regulations directly.

Ms. Lombardo asked what happens if the board fails to meet the 25% reduction target.

Dir. Robb explained the board must submit a regulatory reduction plan by February 13, 2026. If the board cannot meet the full 25%, it should still submit what it can, with justification. She explained that the Governor's Office and Department of Law may review and ask questions, but the board's professional expertise and rationale will be respected. She noted that the AO360 order explicitly states that reductions should not compromise public safety.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether the February 13 submission must include the full 25% plan, or just the 15% due by the end of 2026.

Dir. Robb confirmed the full 25% plan is due by February 13, 2026; the board does not need to complete all projects by then but must identify and prioritize them in the plan. She noted projects should be bite-sized and discrete, not bundled into one large overhaul.

Ms. Lombardo asked for clarification on the purpose of the February 13 submission, and whether the full 25% reduction plan would be implemented immediately after approval.

Dir. Robb explained the February 13 submission is a regulatory reduction plan, not a set of finalized regulation changes and the plan must:

- Identify the regulations targeted for change.
- Estimate the reduction impact (15% by end of 2026, 25% by end of 2027).
- Be approved by the board in a public meeting.

Dir. Robb reiterated once the plan is submitted and approved by the Governor's Office and Department of Law, the board will begin working through the individual regulation projects using the standard regulatory process. She emphasized that the plan is a roadmap, not a replacement for the formal regulation process. Some items may require additional board discussion to determine appropriate revisions. She emphasized the board retains full authority over the content and pace of each project.

Ms. Lombardo confirmed that the explanation clarified her confusion and thanked Sylvan.

Chair McKinley asked whether the board could submit a large block of regulation changes as a single project or if each change must be submitted individually.

Dir. Robb clarified projects should be logically grouped by topic or theme (e.g., notary removals, recordkeeping simplifications). Submitting one massive project is discouraged, as it would

overwhelm the Department of Law's review capacity. She stated conversely, submitting hundreds of micro-projects would also be inefficient as the goal is to strike a balance by bundling related changes into manageable, topic-based projects. Dir. Robb suggested grouping by regulatory theme (e.g., documentation requirements, training hours) and license type or profession (e.g., estheticians, tattoo artists, nail technicians), to make public comment more accessible and relevant. Dir. Robb stated this approach:

- Helps the Department of Law process submissions efficiently.
- Makes it easier for licensees and the public to understand and engage with proposed changes.
- Keeps the board's workflow organized and aligned with AO360 expectations.

Chair McKinley appreciated the clarification and noted that many of the proposed changes are small and could be grouped logically.

Dir. Robb emphasized that board members are not alone in this process, she, PC Derr, and LE Spencer are all available to assist as questions arise. Board members are encouraged to stay grounded in the spirit of AO360: reducing burdens, clarifying language, and streamlining processes without compromising public safety.

PC Derr outlined the tools and documents being provided to board members:

- The AO360 regulatory reduction spreadsheet (in Excel format).
- The Governor's Regulatory Reduction Guide.
- A marked-up copy of the board's regulations with suggested areas for review and potential reduction.

PC Derr shared that she has already identified numerous low-hanging opportunities for reduction, including:

- Notary and certified document requirements, which appear frequently and are often unnecessary.
 - ❖ Removing these could yield approximately 50 individual reductions.
- Exam conduct regulations, which are now handled by PROV, the third-party exam administrator.
 - ❖ These may be outdated and duplicative.
- Redundant licensing requirements in 12 AAC 09.002, which are repeated later in Article 4 for each license type.
 - ❖ Consolidating these could significantly reduce regulatory volume without impacting clarity or enforcement.

PC Derr also flagged more complex areas for future board discussion:

- Courtesy license requirements, which are currently confusing and may need clarification or simplification.
- School regulations, including square footage and equipment lists which may be overly prescriptive and not actively enforced.
- Student reporting requirements, which could be streamlined (e.g., moving from monthly to final reporting).

PC Derr informed the board that she will email all board members the relevant documents for review and individual work. She encouraged board members to review the materials, identify areas they are most familiar with or interested in, and begin drafting suggestions or questions for future meetings. She stated the regulations specialist will join future meetings once the board has more concrete proposals to review. She reassured the board that the 15% reduction goal for 2026 is very achievable through simple, non-controversial changes and the remaining 10% for 2027 can focus on more substantive reforms.

Chair McKinley expressed strong interest in prioritizing changes to student training and reporting requirements, citing the potential to alleviate administrative burdens on licensing examiners and the importance of acting sooner rather than later, while momentum and opportunity are present.

Ms. Lombardo agreed, noting the entire 25% reduction plan must be submitted by February 13, but the board retains full control over which projects to tackle first. Student record reforms can be prioritized immediately after submission, even if more complex than the “low-hanging fruit.”

Chair McKinley reiterated that this area could have a direct operational benefit and should not be delayed.

Ms. Lombardo also proposed a long-term structural improvement by reorganizing regulations by license type or profession (e.g., hairdressing, esthetics, tattooing) to improve clarity and usability. She acknowledged this may not reduce the number of regulations but would significantly enhance accessibility for licensees and applicants and while it may introduce some redundancy, the trade-off in readability and efficiency could be worthwhile. She also noted this idea may not fall directly under AO360’s reduction goals but could be considered as part of a future modernization effort.

Ms. Canady expressed optimism about the AO360 process, noting that while the volume of regulations can feel overwhelming, the board has a real opportunity to modernize and streamline outdated content.

Ms. Hager shared that she uses the statutes and regulations in her classroom and often has to skip large sections that don’t apply to hairdressing. She suggested creating profession-specific versions of the regulations for easier use by students and licensees.

Ms. Lombardo supported the idea of reorganizing regulations by license type, even if it introduces some redundancy, to improve clarity and accessibility.

PC Derr noted that Article 4 of the board’s regulations already contains license-specific sections, and much of the general content in 12 AAC 09.002 could potentially be removed or consolidated into those sections. This could reduce the regulation volume by 4–5 pages and make the document more user-friendly without sacrificing content.

Chair McKinley and LE Spencer shared insights from a recent meeting comparing Alaska’s school regulations to other states:

- Many states do not require detailed equipment lists or quarterly student reports.
- Some states only require schools to submit a curriculum and undergo an inspection, without prescribing square footage or specific tools.
- In most states, student documentation is submitted at the time of license application, and either the school or the student can submit it.
- Alaska is currently the only state identified that requires quarterly reporting and restricts who can submit training documentation.

Chair McKinley emphasized that Alaska’s approach appears overly burdensome and out of step with national norms, reinforcing the need for reform.

LE Spencer stated she will continue compiling responses from other state boards and will present a comparative summary to the board once completed.

The board thanked Director Robb and PC Derr for their time, assistance, and information.

LE Spencer announced that Inv. Hartlieb had a final case to present if the board had time.

The board agreed to review the case as it was to be presented earlier but wasn’t complete.

The board reviewed their remaining agenda and agreed to table the following item for their next board meeting.

- 10 A. Advisory Board Discussion
- 10 B Alignment and Priority Check
- 10 E Board Chair and Vice Chair Elections
- 10 G Tattooing and Permanent Cosmetic Coloring Theory Written Exam Adoption Discussion

5. Investigations, Cont.

Inv. Hartlieb rejoined the board and thanked them for taking additional time to review this case.

LE Spencer stated that Ms. Canady was the reviewing board member for this case and therefore would not join the board in executive session.

Motion to enter executive session: 1st Shannon Thompson - 2nd Desarae Hager.

Alaska State Board of Barbers and Hairdressers enter executive session in accordance with AS 44.62.610(c) and Alaska constitutional right to privacy provisions, for the purpose of discussing subjects that tend to prejudice the reputation and character of any person, provided the person may request a public discussion and matters involving consideration of government records that by law are not subject to public disclosure. Board staff to remain during the session.

Approved by majority.

Board entered executive session at 2:53 p.m. and returned from executive session at 4:04 p.m. Quorum of board confirmed by roll call.

Jessica Pestrikoff lost connection to the meeting but rejoined the meeting at 4:08 p.m.

Motion: 1st Jenn Lombardo– 2nd Desarae Hager

Adopt Consent Agreement for Case 2024-001114 as presented for Rosalyn C. Wyche.

Chair McKinley asked if the board had any additional comments or questions; hearing none, Chair McKinley requested a roll call vote.

Name	Roll Call Vote		
	YES	NO	RECUSE
Kevin McKinley		X	
Shannon Thompson	X		
W. Mae Canady			X Reviewing Board Member
Jenn Lombardo	X		
Desarae Hager		X	
Jessica Pestrikoff	X		

THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.

The board thanked Inv. Hartlieb for her time.

PC Derr reminded the board they were short on time and suggested setting future meeting dates.

11. Administrative Business

C. Schedule Future Board Meetings

The board agreed to the following meeting dates and times:

- December 9, 2025, AO360 Planning – 10am – 1pm
- January 13, 2026, AO360 Planning – 10am – 1pm
- January 20, 2026, AO360 Planning - 10am – 1pm
- February 13, 2026, Regular Board Meeting – 9am – 4:30pm with a 30-minute lunch

Board members agreed to also have scheduling future meetings added to the February 13 meeting agenda.

LE Spencer stated they were running close to the 4:30 p.m. adjournment time and unless PC Derr felt otherwise, the remaining item on their agenda was to review training files for Shear Fire Academy of Hair Design students. Le Spencer stated she had been able to prepare 9 student files for their review. She noted that there were at least another 4 to 5 student files she had to audit; the remaining files would be done with board review via OnBoard but wanted to get board members comfortable with these reviews and answer any questions before then.

Board members briefly discussed time constraints and agreed a quorum could remain online until 5pm.

F. Application Review

i. Shear Fire Academy of Hair Design Student Training Review

Motion to enter executive session: 1st Jenn Lombardo 2nd Mae Canady

Alaska State Board of Barbers and Hairdressers enter executive session in accordance with AS 44.62.610(c) and Alaska constitutional right to privacy provisions, for the purpose of discussing matters which, by law, municipal chapter, or ordinance are required to be confidential. Board staff to remain during the session.

Approved by majority.

Board entered executive session at 4:30 p.m. and returned from executive session at 4:50 p.m. Quorum of board confirmed by roll call. Ms. Pestrikoff lost connectivity and left the meeting.

Motion: 1st Jenn Lombardo – 2nd Mae Canady

Accept staff training audit finding for Jennifer Kahler, Suntaya Waterman, Makyla Snodgrass, Haily D. Watkins, Kiana Keller, Michael Blackburn Pike, Frida Garcia Perez, Willow Thiele, and Candice McCloud as presented.

Chair McKinley asked if the board had any additional comments or questions; hearing none, Chair McKinley requested a roll call vote.

Name	Roll Call Vote		
	YES	NO	RECUSE
W. Mae Canady	X		
Jenn Lombardo	X		
Shannon Thompson	X		
Kevin McKinley	X		
Desarae Hager	X		

THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.

LE Spencer thanked the board and stated she would have the remaining files audited and loaded to OnBoard for their consideration as soon as possible.

The board briefly reviewed meeting dates and tabled items.

Chair McKinley thanked all board members and staff for their engaged participation and collaborative spirit throughout the meeting. He highlighted the importance of the board's work, especially in addressing regulatory burdens that directly impact licensees and the public. He acknowledged Ms. Lombardo's earlier point about the board's role in supporting people and commerce and emphasized that this mission remains central to their efforts.

Chair McKinley also thanked PC Derr for her extensive preparation and contributions to the AO360 discussion and regulatory review process and LE Spencer for her behind-the-scenes support and timekeeping.

15. Adjourn

The chair declared the board off the record at 4:54 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: 2/6/2026