



## Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development

# Virtual Meeting Code of Conduct

I understand that by participating in any virtual board meeting or event hosted by the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development, **I am agreeing to the following code of conduct:**

### Expected Behavior

- All board members, invited guests, members of the public, and staff will be treated with respect.
- Be considerate, respectful, and collaborative with fellow participants.
- Demonstrate understanding that the boards are following a business agenda and may reasonably change it to ensure meeting efficiency.
- Speak only when recognized by the Chair. When speaking, adhere to the topic and time limits.
- Recognize the Chair has the authority to manage the meeting, and staff may intercede to assist, if needed.
- All participants are subject to State and Federal laws.

---

### Unacceptable Behavior

- Harassment, intimidation, stalking, or discrimination in any form is considered unacceptable behavior and is prohibited.
- Physical, verbal or non-verbal abuse, or threat of violence toward any board member, invited guest, member of the public, staff, or any other meeting guest/participant by any meeting participant is prohibited.
- Disruption of any meeting or hosted online session is prohibited. Public participants should mute their microphones and turn off video when not recognized by the chair.
- Examples of unacceptable behavior include:
  - Interrupting the meeting without being recognized by the Chair.
  - Making harassing comments or exhibiting other disruptive unprofessional behavior.
  - Comments related to gender, gender identity or expression, age, sexual orientation, disability, physical appearance, body size, race, religion, national origin, or political affiliation;
  - Sharing screen or presenting video without being recognized by the Chair;
  - Inappropriate use of nudity and/or sexual images in presentations;

- Use of music, noise, or background conversations as a disruption. While this may happen briefly or incidentally, prolonged or repeated incidents are prohibited.
- Shouting, badgering, or continued talking over the speaker who has been recognized by the Chair.

---

### **Reporting Unacceptable Behavior**

If you or anyone else in the meeting is in immediate danger or threat of danger at any time, please contact local law enforcement by calling 911. All other reports should be made to a member of the management team.

---

### **Consequences**

If the director of the division/agency hosting the meeting determines that a person has violated any part of this code of conduct, staff or board members may take any of the following actions against any individual or group found to be in repeated violation of the code of conduct:

Sanctions may include, but are not limited to:

- Verbal or written warnings;
- Limiting a participant's ability to engage in the meeting, including muting, stopping video, or expelling a participant from the meeting;
- Suspending attendance at a future meeting or event – both virtual and in-person;
- Reporting conduct to an appropriate state entity/organization;
- Reporting conduct to local law enforcement.



## **Board of Barbers & Hairdressers Meeting**

Alaska Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing

November 5, 2025 at 9:00 AM AKDT to November 5, 2025 at 4:30 PM AKDT

**Zoom Details:** <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84894669477>

**Meeting ID:** 848 9466 9477

**Call In:** 1-669-900-6833

### **TENTATIVE MEETING AGENDA**

*Working Groups May Occur*

#### **Agenda:**

- 1. 9:00 a.m. November 5, 2025 Call to Order/Roll Call**
- 2. 9:05 a.m. Review/Amend Agenda and Mission Statement**
  - A. Review/Amend Agenda
  - B. Mission Statement
- 3. 9:10 a.m. Ethics Disclosure**
- 4. 9:15 a.m. 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
- 5. 9:20 a.m. Investigations**
  - A. Investigative Report
  - B. Investigative Probation Report
  - C. Executive Session
  - D. Fine Matrix/Schedule Amend
- 6. 11:20 a.m. Break/Recess**
- 7. 11:30 a.m. Administrative Business, Cont.**
  - A. Strategic Planning Report (J Pestrikoff and S Chambers)
    - i. Homework Check In
  - B. Medical Spa's Multi-Board Workgroup Report (S Thompson and S Chambers)
    - i. Medical Spa Services Frequently Asked Questions
    - 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

**8. 12:00 p.m.      Lunch**

**9. 1:00 p.m.      Public Comment**

**10. 1:30 p.m.      Division and Financial Update**  
                          A. FY25 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Budget Report (M Dumas)

**11. 2:30 p.m.      Administrative Business, Cont.**  
                          A. Alignment and Priority Check (J Pestrikoff)  
                          B. Schedule Future Board Meetings and Strategic Planning Meetings  
                          C. Correspondence  
                                  i. Sarah Maxwell, Tattooing Courtesy License Process Concerns  
                                  ii. Linda McLendon – Continuing Education  
  
                          D. Board Chair and Vice Chair Elections  
                          E. Application Review  
                                  i. PLACE HOLDER  
  
                          F. Tattooing and Permanent Cosmetic Coloring Theory Written Exam  
                                  Adoption Discussion

**2. 4:30 p.m.      Adjourn**

### III. Executive Branch Ethics

Service on a state board or commission is a public trust and members are expected to conduct the public's business in a way that preserves the integrity of the governmental process and avoids conflicts of interest. The Ethics Act (AS 39.52) doesn't forbid public officers from having opinions, interests, or professional pursuits outside of their service on boards or commissions, but it does require that members disclose certain matters so a determination can be made about whether they constitute a conflict of interest.

#### Compliance with the Executive Branch Ethics Act

All board and commission members and staff should be familiar with the procedures outlined below. The Act covers a board, commission, authority, or board of directors of a public or quasi-public corporation, established by statute in the executive branch of state government. Additional information is available from the Alaska Department of Law at <http://law.alaska.gov/doclibrary/ethics.html>. Much of the information in this section of the manual is taken directly from this site.

#### *Misuse of Official Position (AS 39.52.120)*

Members of boards or commissions may not use their positions for personal gain or to give an unwarranted benefit or treatment to any person. For example, members may not:

- use their official positions to secure employment or contracts;
- accept compensation from anyone other than the State for performing official duties;
- use State time, equipment, property or facilities for their own personal or financial benefit or for partisan political purposes;
- take or withhold official action on a matter in which they or an immediate family member have a personal or financial interest;
- coerce subordinates for his/her personal or financial benefit, or
- attempt to influence the outcome of an administrative hearing by privately contacting the hearing officer.



Alice knew that a proposal that was before the board would harm Alice's business partner. Instead of publicly disclosing the matter and requesting recusal, Alice engaged in discussions about the proposal and voted on the proposal.



Jack serves on a board that regulates parts of the building construction industry. Wearing a nametag that identifies him as a member of the industry board, Jack goes to a contractors' trade show and sets up a booth for his consulting business, called "Building a Future in Alaska."

#### *Improper Gifts (AS 39.52.130)*

A board or commission member may not solicit or accept a gift if it could reasonably be inferred that the gift is intended to influence the member's action or judgment. "Gifts" include money, items of value, services, loans, travel, entertainment, hospitality, and employment. The division has interpreted this guidance narrowly to ensure transparency in awareness and reporting.

Travel includes any expense paid directly to the board member in conjunction with a trip connected to the member's position on the board. This type of trip must be approved through the division and all reimbursements made through the CBPL Travel Desk to avoid violating the state's rules regarding travel.

(See section on travel.) All gifts from registered lobbyists are presumed to be improper unless the giver is an immediate family member of the person receiving the gift. This restriction on gifts does not apply to lawful campaign contributions.

A gift worth more than \$150 to a board or commission member or the member's family must be reported within 30 days if:

- the board member can take official action that can affect the giver, or
- the gift is given to the board member because he or she is on a state board or commission.

The receipt of a gift worth less than \$150 may be prohibited if it could reasonably be inferred that the gift is intended to influence the board member's action or judgment. Receipt of such a gift should be disclosed.

Any gift received from another government, regardless of value, must be reported; the board or commission member will be advised as to the disposition of this gift.

A form for reporting gifts is available at [law.alaska.gov/doclibrary/ethics.html](http://law.alaska.gov/doclibrary/ethics.html) or from the board or commission staff.

☹️ The commission is reviewing Roy's proposal for an expansion of his business. Roy invites all the board members out to dinner at an expensive restaurant. He says it will be okay since he isn't excluding any of the members.

😊 Sam buys a holiday gift every year for Jody. Jody was recently appointed to a board, but Sam has no business that is up before the board.

☹️ Margie is a board member and decides to take a last-minute trip to a national conference for state board members in her industry. She is directly reimbursed by the national association for her meals, airfare, and rental car.

### ***Improper Use or Disclosure of Information (AS 39.52.140)***

No former or current member of a board or commission may use or disclose any information acquired through official duties if that use or disclosure could result in a financial or personal benefit to the board member (or a family member) unless that information has already been disseminated to the public.

😊 Sheila has been on the licensing board for several years. She feels she has learned a great deal of general information about how to launch a successful business venture. So, she sets up her own company helping small businesses get started and does well. She is careful not to assist in completing license applications that will be evaluated by the board on which she serves.

☹️ Gordon is a tattoo artist and the reviewing board member for an investigation of serious potential violations of health and safety issues by a licensed shop owner. Before the board votes on the matter, he tells several people who are thinking of getting a tattoo there about the confidential matter and encourages them to come to his shop instead.


### ***Improper Influence in State Grants, Contracts, Leases or Loans (AS 39.52.150)***


A board member who can affect the award or administration of a State grant, contract, lease, or loan may not apply for, or have an interest in that State grant, contract, lease, or loan. This prohibition also applies to the board member's immediate family.

A board member (or a family member) may apply for or be a party to a *competitively solicited* State grant, contract or lease, if the board member does not serve in the same administrative unit awarding or administering the grant, contract, or lease *and* so long as the board member does not take official action in the award or administration of the grant, contract, or lease.

A board member (or a family member) may apply for and receive a State loan that is generally available to the public and has fixed eligibility standards, so long as the board member does not take (or withhold) official action affecting the award or administration of the loan.


Board members must report to the board chair any personal or financial interest (or that of a family member) in a State grant, contract, lease or loan that is awarded or administered by the agency the board member serves. A form for this purpose is available at [law.alaska.gov/doclibrary/ethics.html](http://law.alaska.gov/doclibrary/ethics.html) or from the board or commission staff.

 John sits on a board that awards state grants. John hasn't seen his daughter for nearly ten years, but he figures that it doesn't matter when her grant application comes up before the board; he votes on the grant to his daughter, without disclosing the relationship to the board. (While voting for the grant looks worse than voting against the grant, the Ethics Act prohibits deliberating or voting on the issue regardless of what position the board member takes.)

 The board wants to contract out for an analysis of the board's decisions over the last ten years. Kim bids on the contract since she has been on the board for ten years and feels she could do a good job.

### ***Improper Representation (AS 39.52.160)***

A non-salaried board or commission member may represent, advise, or assist in matters in which the member has an interest that is regulated by the member's own board or commission, if the member acts in accordance with AS 39.52.220 by disclosing the involvement in writing and on the public record, and refrains from all participation and voting on the matter. This section does not allow a board member to engage in any conduct that would violate a different section of the Ethics Act. So, the member must disclose the fact of the member's involvement in the regulated matter and abide by the board or commission's finding as to the existence of a conflict of interest.

 Delores has always coordinated continuing education opportunities for the physicians in her practice. After Delores is appointed to the State Medical Board, she discloses this role to the board and continues to coordinate these classes in her capacity as a private individual, not a board member.

### ***Restriction on Employment after Leaving State Service (AS 39.52.180)***

For two years after leaving a board, a former board member may not work on any matter on which the former member had personally and substantially participated while on the board. This prohibition applies to cases, proceedings, applications, contracts, and similar matters.

Former members of the governing boards of public corporations and former members of boards and commissions that have regulation-adoption authority, except those covered by the centralized licensing provisions of AS 08.01, may not lobby for pay for one year.

This section does not prohibit a State agency from contracting directly with a former board member. With the approval of the Attorney General, the board chair may waive this prohibition if a determination is made that the public interest is not jeopardized.

☹️ The board has arranged for an extensive study of the effects of the department's programs. Andy, a board member, did most of the liaison work with the contractor selected by the board, including some negotiations about the scope of the study. Andy quits the board and goes to work for the contractor, working on the study of the effects of the department's programs.

😊 Andy takes the job, but he specifies that he will have to work on another project.

☹️ Patrice, a licensed health care provider who is about to leave board service after eight years, is asked by a non-profit organization to work as their government relations director, which will require her to register as a lobbyist. She starts work for the organization in this capacity one week after her term on the board ends.

😊 Patrice accepts a clinical position with the non-profit organization instead.

### ***Aiding a Violation Prohibited (AS 39.52.190)***

Aiding another public officer to violate this chapter is prohibited.

### ***Agency Policies (AS 39.52.920)***

Subject to the Attorney General's review, a board may adopt additional written policies further limiting personal or financial interests of board members.

### ***Disclosure Procedures (AS 39.52.220-250)***

All board and commission members and staff should be familiar with the Executive Branch Ethics Act procedures outlined below.

### ***Who Is My Designated Ethics Supervisor (DES)?***

Every board or commission subject to the Ethics Act has several ethics supervisors designated by statute. The Act covers a board, commission, authority, or board of directors of a public or quasi-public corporation, established by statute in the executive branch of state government.

- The chair serves as DES for board or commission members.
- The chair serves as DES for the executive director. This does not apply to professional licensing boards and commissions, whose staff are employees for the Department, not the board.
- The Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development has assigned a Special Assistant to serve as DES for staff.
- The governor is the DES for a chair. The governor has delegated the DES responsibility to the Director of Administrative Services in the Office of Governor.

### ***What Do I Have to Disclose?***

The Ethics Act requires members of boards and commissions to disclose:



- Any matter that is a potential conflict of interest with actions that the member may take when serving on the board or commission.
- Any circumstance that may result in a violation of the Ethics Act.
- Any personal or financial interest (or that of an immediate family member) in a state grant, contract, lease, or loan that is awarded or administered by the member's board or commission.
- The receipt of certain gifts.

The staff of a board or commission, as state employees, must also disclose:

- Compensated outside employment or services.
- Volunteer service, if any compensation, including travel and meals, is paid or there is a potential conflict with state duties.

For more information regarding the types of matters that may result in violations of the Ethics Act, board or commission members should refer to the guide, *"Ethics Information for Members of Boards and Commissions."* Staff should refer to the guide, *Ethics Information for Public Employees."*

Both guides and disclosure forms may be found on the Department of Law's ethics website:

<http://law.alaska.gov/doclibrary/ethics.html>.

#### ***How Do I Avoid Violations of the Ethics Act?***

- When in doubt, disclose and seek advice from division staff or the department Boards and Regulations Advisor.
- Make timely disclosures.
- Follow required procedures.
- Provide all information necessary to a correct evaluation of the matter. You may supplement the disclosure form with other written explanation as necessary. Your signature on a disclosure certifies that, to the best of your knowledge, the statements made are true, correct and complete. False statements are punishable.
- Follow the advice of your DES.

#### ***What Are The Disclosure Procedures for Board and Commission Members?***

The procedural requirements for disclosures by members are set out in AS 39.52.220 and 9 AAC 52.120.

One goal of these provisions is to help members avoid violations of the Ethics Act. The procedures provide the opportunity for members to seek review of matters in advance of taking action to ensure that actions taken will be consistent with the Act.

#### ***Procedures for Declaring Actual or Potential Conflicts***

Members must declare potential conflicts and other matters that may violate the Ethics Act in writing to the chair. Public disclosure may take the place of a written disclosure if the meeting is recorded, a tape or transcript of the meeting is preserved, and there is a method for identifying the declaration in the record.

- Notice of Violation or Request for Determination forms should be filed with the Designated Ethics Supervisor (the board chair) as soon as known.
- If a determination on whether a conflict exists on a matter pending before the board, it is ideal for the conflict to be submitted to the chair with enough time for the determination to be made—usually several weeks.
- If the matter is before the board before a determination has been made, the member must

refrain from voting, deliberations or other participation on it. In most, but not all, situations, refraining from participation ensures that a violation of the Ethics Act does not occur. Abstention does not cure a conflict with respect to a significant direct personal or financial interest in a state grant, contract, lease, or loan because the Ethics Act prohibition applies whether or not the public officer actually takes official action.

- If a member is uncertain whether participation would result in a violation of the Act, the member should disclose the circumstances and seek a determination from the chair before the meeting.

*Confidential disclosure in advance of public meeting.* Potential conflicts may be partially addressed in advance of a board or commission's public meeting.

- A member identifying a conflict or potential conflict may submit a Notice of Potential Violation to the chair, as DES, in advance of the public meeting.
- This written disclosure is considered confidential. No one may discuss or disclose this information.
- The chair may contact staff to seek advice from the Attorney General. Staff and the AAG will walk the chair through the process.
- The chair makes a written determination, also confidential, whether the disclosed matter represents a conflict that will result in a violation of the Ethics Act if the member participates in official action addressing the matter. The chair must give a copy of the written determination to the disclosing member. There is a determination form available on the Department of Law's ethics web page. The ethics supervisor may also write a separate memorandum.
- If the chair determines that the member would violate the Ethics Act by taking official action, the chair directs the member to refrain from participating in the matter that is the subject of the disclosure.
- A general oral report of the notice of potential violation and the determination that the member must refrain from participating is put on the record at a public meeting. In this manner, a member's detailed personal and financial information may be protected from public disclosure.

*Determinations at the public meeting.* When a potential conflict is declared by a member for the public record, the following procedure must be followed:

- The member must declare she or he has a potential conflict regarding a matter before the board.
- The chair states his or her determination regarding whether the member may participate. This ruling must be consistent with Attorney General advice and statute/regulation.
- Any member may then object to the chair's determination.
- If an objection is made, the members present, excluding the member who made the disclosure, vote on the matter.
- Exception: A chair's determination that is made consistent with advice provided by the Attorney General may not be overruled.
- If the chair, or the members by majority vote, determines that a violation will exist if the disclosing member continues to participate, the member must refrain from voting, deliberating, or participating in the matter. When a matter of particular sensitivity is raised and the ramifications of continuing without an advisory opinion from the Attorney General may affect the validity of the board or commission's action, the members should consider tabling the matter so that an opinion may be obtained.

*If the chair identifies a potential conflict of his or her own, the same procedures are followed. If*

possible, the chair should forward a confidential written notice of potential violation through staff to the Office of the Governor for a determination in advance of the board or commission meeting. If the declaration is first made at the public meeting during which the matter will be addressed, the members present, except for the chair, vote on the matter. If a majority determines that a violation of the Ethics Act will occur if the chair continues to participate, the chair shall refrain from voting, deliberating, or participating in the matter. A written disclosure or copy of the public record regarding the oral disclosure should be forwarded by staff to the Office of the Governor for review by the chair's Designated Ethics Supervisor (DES).

### ***Procedures for Other Member Disclosures***

A member's interest in a state grant, contract, lease or loan and receipt of gifts are disclosed by filling out the appropriate disclosure form and submitting the form to the DES for approval. The disclosure forms are found on the Department of Law's ethics website: [law.alaska.gov/doclibrary/ethics.html](http://law.alaska.gov/doclibrary/ethics.html).

### ***How Are Third Party Reports of Potential Violations or Complaints Handled?***

Any person may report a potential violation of the Ethics Act by a board or commission member or its staff to the appropriate DES or file a complaint alleging actual violations with the Attorney General.

- Notices of potential violations and complaints must be submitted in writing and under oath.
- Notices of potential violations are investigated by the appropriate DES who makes a written determination whether a violation may exist. The DES provides a copy of the notice to the employee or board/commission member who is the subject of the notice and may seek input from the employee or board/commission member, his or her supervisor and others. The DES may seek advice from the Attorney General.
- A copy of the DES' written determination is provided to the subject employee or board/commission member and the complaining party. The DES submits a copy of both the notice and the determination to the Attorney General for review as part of the DES' quarterly report. If feasible, the DES shall reassign duties to cure a potential violation or direct divestiture or removal by the employee or board/commission member of the personal or financial interests giving rise to the potential violation.
- Complaints are addressed by the Attorney General under separate procedures outlined in the Ethics Act.
- These matters are confidential unless the subject waives confidentiality or the matter results in a public accusation.

### ***What Are the Procedures for Quarterly Reports?***

Generally, Designated Ethics Supervisors must submit copies of notices of potential violations received and the corresponding determinations to the Attorney General for review by the state ethics attorney as part of the quarterly report required by the Ethics Act. In this division, staff compile any disclosures received during a meeting or outside of a meeting via the chair, then forward them on a quarterly basis to the Division Director, who send them to the department DES.

If the state ethics attorney disagrees with a reported determination, the attorney will advise the DES of that finding. If the ethics attorney finds that there was a violation, the member who committed the violation is not liable if he or she fully disclosed all relevant facts reasonably necessary to the ethics supervisor's or commission's determination and acted consistent with the determination.

### ***How Does A DES or Board or Commission Get Ethics Advice?***

A DES or board or commission may make a written request to the Attorney General for an opinion regarding the application of the Ethics Act. In practice, the Attorney General, through the state ethics attorney, also provides advice by phone or e-mail to designated ethics supervisors, especially when time constraints prevent the preparation of timely written opinions.

- A request for advice and the advisory opinion are confidential.
- The ethics attorney endeavors to provide prompt assistance, although that may not always be possible.
- The DES must make his or her determination addressing the potential violation based on the opinion provided.

### ***Complaints, Hearings, and Enforcement (AS 39.52.310-370, AS 32.52.410-460)***

Any person may file a complaint with the Attorney General about the conduct of a current or former board member. Complaints must be written and signed under oath. The Attorney General may also initiate complaints from information provided by a board. A copy of the complaint will be sent to the board member who is the subject of the complaint and to the Personnel Board.

All complaints are reviewed by the Attorney General. If the Attorney General determines that the complaint does not warrant investigation, the complainant and the board member will be notified of the dismissal.

The Attorney General may refer a complaint to the board member's chair for resolution. After investigation, the Attorney General may dismiss a complaint for lack of probable cause to believe a violation occurred. The complainant and board member will be promptly notified of this decision.

Alternatively, if probable cause exists, the Attorney General may initiate a formal proceeding by serving the board or commission member with an accusation alleging a violation of the Ethics Act. An accusation may result in a hearing.

When the Personnel Board determines a board member has violated the Ethics Act, the member must refrain from voting, deliberating, or participating in the matter. The Personnel Board may order restitution and may recommend that the board member be removed from the board or commission. If a recommendation of removal is made, the appointing authority will immediately remove the member. If the Personnel Board finds that a former board member violated the Ethics Act, the Personnel Board will issue a public statement about the case and will ask the Attorney General to pursue appropriate additional legal remedies.

### ***Conflict of Interest and Ex Parte Communication***

Conflicts outside of the Executive Branch Ethics Act may arise due to improper communication with a stakeholder. "Improper communication" can be any communication with an interested party where the communication is about something on which the board has authority to act, and which comes outside of a publicly-noticed meeting. A familiar example is the contact that a member of a jury could have with people or even news stories that could bias their opinion unfairly. Sometimes it is impossible for juries in high-profile cases to avoid hearing information that is inadmissible in court, so they are sequestered in hotel rooms with no television or public contact.

Board and commission members are not likely to be treated to such extremes, but they must take care not to discuss matters with others or among each other outside of appropriate meeting channels.

### ***Ex-Parte Contact***

The foundation of due process is that each side in a dispute has the opportunity to be heard. If one side has the opportunity to make an argument, the other side must have the opportunity to respond. It is sometimes tempting for an applicant, licensee, or attorney to attempt to circumvent the usual application decisionmaking procedures, to seek information on a pending application, to discuss a pending disciplinary action, or to seek to influence an individual's decision by directly contacting one of the board members. Such communications are called "ex parte" communications.

**Ex parte communications are improper. The result of such a communication is that the board member so contacted may be unable to discuss, participate in, or vote on the application or disciplinary action.**

The risk to the applicant or licensee who attempts such communication is that a board member who might have been favorably disposed to their license application or disciplinary case may not be able to participate in the decision or vote.

**Ex parte communication must be disclosed.** Should any individual attempt to contact you to discuss a license application or disciplinary case, please refer them to a staff member (licensing examiner, investigator, or executive administrator) for response.

Should you experience an ex parte communication, alert the chair about the contact in writing before the meeting and on the record at the beginning of the meeting so he or she can determine whether it is appropriate that you be recused from the discussion, deliberation, and vote. As the DES for the board, the chair is required to declare any conflict on the record.

If you are unsure about the nature and extent of the contact, please contact the board's staff for guidance.

### ***Conflict Due to Market Interest***

Another interesting conflict of interest issue that is gaining awareness is that of the potential for disproportionate influence of "active market participants" on boards. An active market participant is defined as someone who is currently engaged in the profession that the board regulates—or, licensees.

By nature, all licensed members of a board have an inherent market interest. However, determining whether a conflict exists goes a little deeper. Questions board members may ask to evaluate whether there is a possibility of running afoul of AS 39.52.120 (Misuse of Official Position):

- Does the matter involve an individual or business that is a direct competitor?
- Will ruling on this matter have a meaningful or measurable financial outcome for me, my family, or my business?
- Is there a *perception* that either of these answers are "yes"?
- A licensee wishes to utilize a new, cutting-edge health care technology and is seeking the

board's "thumbs up" in approving it for practice in Alaska. A member of the board is an investor in this technology and is considering utilizing it in his practice. The board member discloses this financial interest and asks to be recused from deliberation and vote. The chair recuses him, and he does not participate.

Market conflicts can extend to entire boards, as well. A 2015 United States Supreme Court decision ([\*North Carolina Board of Dental Examiners v. Federal Trade Commission\*](#)) resulted in a ruling that stripped the board of its immunity when addressing what might have seemed like a routine matter: The board violated the Sherman Act when it directed staff to send cease-and-desist letters to unlicensed teeth whiteners. Under North Carolina law, the teeth whitening companies posed a direct financial threat to dentists. By instructing them to close, they deprived the businesses of due process—as well as an income. The board did not work through their attorney or follow the standard investigative process when directing these individuals to close their businesses.

The case is complex, yet under Alaska law, the takeaway for professional licensing boards is straightforward:

- Ensure that the division's investigative standard operating procedures are followed.
- Adhere to the Administrative Procedure Act when taking action against anyone, licensed or unlicensed.
- Invite the department Boards and Regulations Advisor to assist with decisionmaking processes.
- Ask staff to invite an agency attorney to advise in policymaking that may restrict those outside the profession from engaging in business practices.
- Hold all deliberations in public view and invite the public to actively observe and comment.

Regarding matters involving ethics or potential real or perceived conflicts of interest, always ask for help well ahead of a meeting on the matter. Obtaining proper advice and following it will ensure everyone's rights are protected and that the most appropriate process is followed.

### **Board Members and Public Records**

As officers of the state, board members are compelled to adhere to state standards of documents and information shared with them. This may mean maintaining strict confidentiality, which could require saving on an unshared computer or storing in a locked cabinet. Confidential documents should always be transmitted via OnBoard, ZendTo, or using email encryption.

All emails, documents, handwritten notes, texts, and other means of communicating state business are discoverable. Many board members set up separate email addresses to ensure their state business is separate from work accounts or their personal lives. If communication on a legal matter were to be subpoenaed, it is possible that deep entanglement could require confiscation of a personal cell phone or computer. Board members are advised to become familiar with the standards and take steps to separate accounts, documents, and other information containing state business.

## Ethics Disclosure Form

**CONFIDENTIAL**  
**REQUEST FOR ETHICS DETERMINATION**

TO: \_\_\_\_\_, Designated Ethics Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
*(Identify Your Department, Agency, Public Corporation, Board, Commission)*

I request advice regarding the application of the Executive Branch Ethics Act (AS 39.52.010 - .960) to my situation. The situation involves the following:

☐ I have provided additional information in the attached document(s).

I believe the following provisions of the Ethics Act may apply to my situation:

- ☐ AS 39.52.120, Misuse of Official Position
- ☐ AS 39.52.130, Improper Gifts
- ☐ AS 39.52.140, Improper Use or Disclosure of Information
- ☐ AS 39.52.150, Improper Influence in State Grants, Contracts, Leases or Loans
- ☐ AS 39.52.160, Improper Representation
- ☐ AS 39.52.170, Outside Employment Restricted
- ☐ AS 39.52.180, Restrictions on Employment after Leaving State Service
- ☐ AS 39.52.190, Aiding a Violation Prohibited

**I understand that I should refrain from taking any official action relating to this matter until I receive your advice.** If the circumstances I described above may result in a violation of AS 39.52.110 - .190, I intend that this request serve as my disclosure of the matter in accordance with AS 39.52.210 or AS 39.52.220.

I certify to the best of my knowledge that my statement is true, correct, and complete. In addition to any other penalty or punishment that may apply, the submission of a false statement is punishable under AS 11.56.200 - AS 11.56.240.

\_\_\_\_\_  
*(Signature)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*(Date)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*(Printed Name)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*(Division, Board, Commission)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*(Position Title)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*(Location)*

*Designated Ethics Supervisor: Provide a copy of your written determination to the employee advising whether action is necessary under AS 39.52.210 or AS 39.52.220, and send a copy of the determination and disclosure to the attorney general with your quarterly report.*

## Ethics Disclosure Form

### Receipt of Gift

TO: \_\_\_\_\_, Designated Ethics Supervisor, \_\_\_\_\_  
(Agency, Public Corporation, Board,  
Commission or Council)

This disclosure reports receipt of a gift with value in excess of \$150.00 by me or my immediate family member, as required by AS 39.52.130(b) or (f).

1. Is the gift connected to my position as a state officer, employee or member of a state board or commission?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Can I take or withhold official action that may affect the person or entity that gave me the gift?

☐ Yes ☐ No

*(If you answer "No" to both questions, you do not need to report this gift. If the answer to either question is "Yes," or if you are not sure, you must complete this form and provide it to your designated ethics supervisor.)*

The gift is \_\_\_\_\_

Identify gift giver by full name, title, and organization or relationship, if any:

\_\_\_\_\_

Describe event or occasion when gift was received or other circumstance explaining the reason for the gift:

\_\_\_\_\_

My estimate of its value is \$ \_\_\_\_\_ The date of receipt was \_\_\_\_\_

☐ The gift was received by a member of my family. Who? \_\_\_\_\_

*If you checked "Yes" to question 2 above, explain the official action you may take that affects the giver (attach additional page, if necessary):*

\_\_\_\_\_

I certify to the best of my knowledge that my statement is true, correct, and complete. In addition to any other penalty or punishment that may apply, the submission of a false statement is punishable under AS 11.56.200 - AS 11.56.240.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Printed Name)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Division)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Position Title)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Location)

Ethics Supervisor Determination: ☐ Approve ☐ Disapproved

\_\_\_\_\_  
Designated Ethics Supervisor\*

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

*\*Designated Ethics Supervisor: Provide a copy of the approval or disapproval to the employee. If action is necessary under AS 39.52.210 or AS 39.52.220, attach a determination stating the reasons and send a copy of the determination and disclosure to the attorney general with your quarterly report.*





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

**CONDENSED MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD August 13, 2025**

By the authority of AS. 08.01.070(2) and AS08.86.030 and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.64, Article 6, a scheduled board meeting was held via teleconference/Zoom, August 13, 2025.

**These are DRAFT minutes prepared by the staff of the Division of Corporation, Business and Professional Licensing. These minutes have not been reviewed or approved by the board.**

**August 13, 2025:**

**Attendance**

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

**Members Not in Attendance:** Danielle Desare Hager – Unexcused Absence

**Staff Present:** Cynthia Spencer, Barbara Denney, and Damen Bennett Licensing Examiners, Sara Chambers, Boards and Regulations Advisor, Investigators Jenni Summers, Joy Hartlieb, and Dannie Kerfeld

**Guest Presenters:** Susan Colard, NIC Executive Director/Government Relations, Angie Printz, NIC National Exam Program Manager, and Henry Sorensen, Ph.D., President, Prov, Inc.

**Special Attendee:** Susanne Schmaling, LME, CLT, Medical Spa Services Work Group

**Public Present via Zoom:** There were 2 members of the public attending. (Rachel Laesen and Tyler Eggen)

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

The board was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

**2. Review Agenda**

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

**Agenda approved by roll call**

**3. Ethics Disclosure**

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

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

**4. Examination Review – NIC and Prov (Executive Session)**

Suan Colard, Angie Printz, and Dr. Henry Sorensen greeted the board and introduced themselves.

Chair McKinley asked LE Spencer to refresh the board regarding this examination review.

LE Spencer stated the board requested to review theory written examinations for Advanced Practice Esthetics/Combined Esthetics, Advanced Micropigmentation, Permanent Cosmetics/Micropigmentation, and Tattooing. She stated the board may consider adopting the Tattooing and Permanent Cosmetics/Micropigmentation to replace the current State Board theory written examination for these license types. LE Spencer stated that during previous meetings, in conjunction with discussions of updating the current esthetician curriculum and creating a tiered or advanced esthetician license, the board had requested to review these examinations to ensure curriculums would provide adequate training covering topics within the theory written examinations.

**Motion to enter executive session:** 1st Jenn Lombardo - 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 charter, or ordinance are required to be confidential; Board staff to remain during the session.

**Approved by majority.**

*Board entered executive session at 9:05 a.m. and returned from executive session at 11:05 a.m. Quorum of board confirmed by roll call.*

The board thanked Ms. Colard, M. Printz, and Dr. Sorensen for attending and allowing them to review examinations.

Chair McKinley asked board members for their thoughts on the examinations.

Shannon Thompson raised concerns about the overlap between permanent cosmetics and fine-line tattoos. She noted a trend of artists performing tiny tattoos under the permanent cosmetics license, which may blur legal boundaries.

LE Spencer clarified that statutes clearly define the difference between tattooing and permanent cosmetic coloring; performing services outside the scope of one's license is illegal. LE Spencer suggested enforcement and education as necessary steps to address this issue.

Ms. Thompson questioned whether current tests reflect the evolving practices in the industry and whether study materials are adequate.

Mae Canady noted that the advanced aesthetics curriculum may offer insights into future testing needs.

Jenn Lombardo confirmed that her inquiry to NIC focused on tattooing and micropigmentation, and that study materials were not clearly defined.

LE Spencer shared the NIC's reference materials for permanent cosmetic coloring, including:

- Milady
- Epidermal Cell Therapy Skills Book
- Fundamentals of Permanent Cosmetics
- Foundation of Fundamental Application, Tips and Techniques

LE Spencer informed the board that these exams are available in multiple languages, unlike the sanitation exam for tattooing, which is only in English.

The board briefly discussed the inclusion of Alaska statutes and regulations in current exams.

LE Spencer noted that while training requires review of state laws, there is no formal state law or jurisprudence exam.

The board and staff discussed incorporating a state law exam into NIC/PROV-administered exams and creating a jurisprudence exam as part of the application process.

Ms. Canady and Ms. Lombardo supported the idea of including state-specific content in exams to ensure compliance and understanding.

*Recess The Board recessed at 11:17 a.m. for a short break; reconvened at 11:25 a.m. Majority of the board confirmed by roll call*

**6. Administrative Business**

**A. Strategic Planning Report (J Pestrikoff)**

- i. Homework Check In

Chair McKinley asked Jessica Pestrikoff for an update on strategic planning.

Jessica responded that she does not have an update yet but plans to work on it this week.

Ms. Chambers greeted the board and confirmed that the strategic planning materials were sent to all board members on July 22nd. She emphasized the importance of completing the two homework assignments and submitting them to her by noon on August 18th. Sara noted she is on personal leave and will be compiling responses in her own time. If responses are not submitted, board members will need to present their work at the meeting. She reminded everyone that the next strategic planning meeting is on August 20th, followed by another on September 10th. The homework includes two color-coded worksheets and instructions. Questions should be submitted by tomorrow due to her upcoming leave. Participation in the homework is optional but encouraged to maintain progress.

Ms. Chambers urged board members to complete and submit strategic planning homework to her by August 18th at noon and to direct any question to her by August 16th.

Chair McKinley shared his initial reaction to the homework, noting it seemed daunting at first but became manageable once he started. He encouraged others not to be intimidated and suggested starting with small steps. Chair McKinley stated he found the 1–3 rating worksheet particularly helpful and noted it sparked deeper thinking and potential for discussion.

Ms. Lombardo asked for clarification on how the upcoming two-hour meeting would be structured.

Ms. Chambers outlined the plan:

- Review compiled responses and updated documents.
- Begin forming a mission statement and vision statement based on board input.
- Discuss the activity list and identify any additional items.
- Begin grouping activities into strategic initiatives (e.g., licensing, enforcement, exams, scope of practice).
- The goal is to finalize the list of activities and begin organizing them into initiatives for prioritization at the September 10th meeting.

Chair McKinley asked if brief responses were acceptable.

Ms. Chambers confirmed that short, high-level thoughts are perfectly fine. She stated the goal is to get board members thinking and contributing ideas, not to write in-depth essays; even brief phrases or bullet points are helpful for discussion and planning. She emphasized, don't let perfect be the enemy of good enough. Ms. Chambers stated board members are encouraged to share honest opinions, even if critical or brief, and both long-serving and newer members bring valuable perspectives.

Chair McKinley asked if there were any other questions or concerns.

Ms. Chambers confirmed that all questions had been addressed, and the board is on track for the August 20th meeting.

Susanne Schmaling, LME, CLT Medical Spa Workgroup joined the board. Board members and Ms. Chambers greeted Ms. Schmaling and thanked her for attending the meeting.

#### **B. Medical Spa's Multi-Board Workgroup Report (S Thompson)**

##### **i. Medical Spa Services Frequently Asked Questions**

Ms. Thompson stated she was having technical difficulties. Chair McKinley asked Ms. Chambers to provide an update on the Workgroup.

Ms. Chambers introduced the topic and invited Ms. Thompson to provide an overview of the Med Spa Workgroup's recent efforts.

Ms. Thompson deferred to Ms. Chambers to begin the summary while she located her notes.

Ms. Chambers commended Ms. Thompson for her active participation and also thanked Chair McKinley and Ms. Canady for their involvement in the Workgroup meetings.

Ms. Chambers stated the Med Spa Workgroup last met in June or July; during that meeting, they reviewed a draft Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document created by her, based on previous workgroup discussions, relevant statutes and regulations, and input from the Department of Law. She stated the FAQ document clarified terms such as medical director and medical spa, noting these are primarily medical and nursing terms, not directly tied to licensees unless they are working under a medical director. She emphasized that “licensure” refers to Alaska state licensure, not product certifications (e.g., hydrofacial machine training).

Ms. Chambers outlined what services may be delegated by physicians and physician assistants. This section is pending review by the Medical Board, which is meeting soon. She highlighted the role of professional judgment in delegation decisions, particularly for medical directors. She noted that RNs cannot delegate these services by law; only APRNs may serve as medical directors under the Board of Nursing. Ms. Chambers stated that EMTs and Paramedics cannot work in med spas. She reviewed the esthetics section and stated this section is relevant to this board and requires review. Ms. Chambers stated the board is asked to provide corrective language and suggestions or vote to support the section as written.

Ms. Chambers provided an overview of the FAQ’s and stated the FAQ aims to clarify what services Alaska-licensed estheticians may legally provide under their license, referencing statutes and regulations. She stated the document is designed to direct licensees to the appropriate legal sources for scope-of-practice questions. She emphasized holding a manufacturer’s certification (e.g., for a device like a hydrofacial machine) does not equate to state licensure; this distinction is critical, as many estheticians mistakenly believe product training grants legal authority to perform certain services. Estheticians must refer to Alaska State law to determine what services fall within their license. She stated the FAQ includes a new definition of “appliances”, recently adopted by the board, which helps clarify permitted tools and procedures. The FAQ outlines what limited esthetic services hairdressers may perform under current statutes.

Ms. Chambers informed the board that Advanced Esthetic services are not defined under Alaska law; the term is used to describe services outside the esthetician’s licensed scope. In such cases, estheticians must consult with a medical director or the Board of Nursing to determine if delegation is permissible. She stated the FAQ includes a special note referencing guidance from the Medical Board. The FAQ also includes a section addressing Healthcare Practices & IV Hydration; the practice of medicine and nursing, to help clarify jurisdictional boundaries. IV hydration, which is not within this board’s scope, as it involves prescription delivery and falls under medical regulation.

Ms. Chambers stated according to the Alaska Board of Barbers and Hairdressers, statute 08.13.220 esthetics is defined as “The use of the hands, appliances, cosmetic preparations, antiseptics, or lotions in massaging, cleansing, stimulating, or similar work on the scalp, face, or neck, including skin care, make-up, and temporary removal of superfluous hair, for cosmetic purposes for a fee.” She stated this definition is critical in determining what services fall within the scope of an esthetician’s license. Services involving other areas of the body (e.g., body contouring) may fall outside this scope and could be considered advanced aesthetic services, which are not currently defined in Alaska law and may require delegation under medical or nursing oversight.

Ms. Chambers invited board members to ask questions or propose edits to the aesthetics section of the FAQ.

Board members confirmed they had read the section in advance.

Suzanne Schmalting raised a concern about the ambiguity of “advanced aesthetic services,” particularly in relation to services like body contouring. She noted that while many devices may fall under the new appliance rule, the area of application (e.g., body vs. face/neck/scalp) may place the

service outside the esthetician's legal scope. She suggested this may require clarification or legislative change to resolve.

Ms. Chambers agreed, noting the issue is ongoing and tied to the board's strategic planning discussions about a potential second-tier license and without statutory changes, services outside the esthetician license fall under delegated medical practice, requiring oversight from the Medical Board or Board of Nursing. She stated the Board of Nursing has already endorsed the FAQ; and the Medical Board will review it at their August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025, meeting.

Ms. Chambers informed the board that services applied to areas outside the scalp, face, or neck (e.g., inner thighs, abdomen, arms) are not included in the esthetician's defined scope. These may fall under "advanced aesthetic services", which are not currently defined in Alaska law and may require medical delegation. She stated even if a device falls under the new "appliance" definition, its application area matters. If used on the body (not face/scalp/neck), it may exceed the esthetician's scope. She emphasized that estheticians seeking to perform services beyond their scope must work under a medical director (physician, PA, or APRN); the Medical Board and Board of Nursing have their own delegation rules, which must be followed.

Ms. Lombardo asked if estheticians are able to practice those services under a physician, or would the services only be able to be provided by a physician

Ms. Chambers noted the FAQ could be more explicit in directing estheticians to consult with a medical director when considering services outside their licensed scope. She suggested adding "If a service or procedure falls outside the scope of an Alaska esthetician license, consult with a licensed medical director (physician, PA, or APRN) to determine whether it may be legally delegated under their supervision."

Ms. Schmaling offered to compile a list of services that fall under basic esthetics, based on the current scope of practice and the new appliance rule and advanced esthetic services, which may require medical delegation. She used microneedling as an example, noting that microneedling to a depth of 1 mm remains within the epidermis and may be permissible under current law. However, the area of application (e.g., face vs. body) and device classification are key factors.

Chair McKinley supported the idea and asked for input from the work group and Sara Chambers.

Ms. Chambers agreed and suggested Ms. Schmaling could build on the color-coded chart previously developed for the December meeting.

Chair McKinley stated collaboration with Ms. Schmaling, Ms. Thompson, and Ms. Chambers would ensure accuracy and alignment with current regulations.

Ms. Chambers stated the updated chart could be reviewed by the Department of Law under Administrative Order 360, which now requires legal review of all guidance documents. She stated the goal is to bring the refined chart back to the board for review and ratification at a future meeting.

Ms. Thompson confirmed her availability and enthusiasm to participate

Ms. Chambers reviewed the next steps in this process, Ms. Schmaling, Ms. Thompson and she will collaborate over the coming weeks to refine the chart. The draft will be reviewed by the Department of Law and presented to the board for approval.

Ms. Canady expressed interest in receiving materials from the Medical Board related to esthetician scope discussions, given her role as the esthetician representative on the board.

Ms. Thompson and Chair McKinley supported Mae's involvement. Ms. Chambers agreed and noted that if a workgroup is formed with multiple board members, it will need to be publicly noticed and conducted in view of the public, per open meetings requirements.

Ms. Chambers stated she and LE Spencer will coordinate logistics. She offered to assist with formatting and finalizing the chart once the workgroup completes its review.

Ms. Schmaling reiterated her willingness to contribute, noting her experience offering training to state inspectors and the value of clarifying common questions.

Ms. Chambers requested a formal board decision to endorse the aesthetics section of the FAQ. She noted the Board of Nursing has already endorsed it; this board's endorsement will allow the FAQ to move forward for public posting and cross-board alignment.

Chair McKinley asked for a volunteer to make a motion to endorse the esthetics section of the FAQ.

**Motion: 1<sup>st</sup> Jenn Lombardo – 2<sup>nd</sup> Mae Canady**

Accept the esthetics portion of the presented Frequently Asked Questions worksheet.

Chair McKinley asked if board members had any questions or would like to discuss the motion; hearing none, he asked for a roll call vote.

**Motion Approved by roll call vote.**

Ms. Chambers thanked the board and stated she appreciates the board and is looking forward to the next steps with this document and the other document that had also been discussed.

The board thanked Ms. Chambers and briefly reviewed the remainder of their agenda.

*Recess The Board recessed at 12:10 p.m. for a lunch break; reconvened at 12:30 p.m. Majority of the board confirmed by roll call.*

**8. Administrative Business, Cont.**

**A. Review/Edit/Approve Meeting Minutes**

- i. May 15, 2025, Meeting
- ii. July 10, 2025, Strategic Planning Meeting

Chair McKinley asked if board members had reviewed the meeting minutes and if they had any edits or would like a few minutes to read through them. Hearing no requests, Chair McKinley asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

**Motion: 1st Mae Canady – 2nd Shannon Thompson**

Approve May 15, 2025, and July 10, 2025, meeting minutes as presented.

**Approved by majority roll call vote.**

Ms. Lombardo requested LE Spencer confirm with Ms. Chambers that their September 10, 2025, strategic planning meeting was scheduled from 10:00 a.m. – Noon and not later in the day. LE Spencer stated she would reach out to Ms. Chambers

**B. Military Licensing – SCRA Delegation from Boards to Division**

The board and LE Spencer discussed a request from the Military Licensing Program to delegate the authority to issue licenses under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA) to the Division, rather than requiring board review of each application.

LE Spencer stated the SCRA Military Licensing Program facilitates license portability for military service members and their spouses/partners transferring to Alaska. She stated the program allows for expedited licensing without requiring full board review, provided applicants meet federal and state criteria. LE Spencer informed the board that they currently lack statutory authority to delegate general licensing decisions to staff and the SCRA program is requesting explicit board approval to allow the Division to issue licenses for applicants who qualify under SCRA. She emphasized that without this delegation, the board would need to review each SCRA application individually via OnBoard.

The board briefly discussed licenses are required only for off-base work; on-base activities are federally governed and do not require Alaska licensure.

Ms. Lombardo and Ms. Canady requested a simplified explanation, which was provided by LE Spencer and others.

Ms. Thomson asked whether applicants must meet Alaska's licensing requirements. It was clarified that while they don't need to meet all initial qualifications, they must hold a valid license and comply with Alaska law once licensed.

LE Spencer provided application clarification. LE Spencer stated that applicants must hold unencumbered, active licenses in another jurisdiction; once issued, the license is subject to Alaska's statutes, regulations, and renewal cycles. She stated the program is federally mandated and applies across multiple professions. She also informed the board that prior briefings on this topic by Director Sylvan Robb and Deputy Director Glenn Saviers.

**Motion: 1<sup>st</sup> Jenn Lombardo – 2<sup>nd</sup> Shannon Thompson**

Licenses applied for under the Federal Servicemembers Civil Relief Act's (or "SCRA") licensure portability laws be reviewed, approved, and issued by the division, rather than by the board, in order to comply with federal law requiring expediency and due to the fact that the board's authority and requirement to approve and issue licenses is under Alaska Statute Title 8, rather than federal law. Once licensed is issued pursuant to the SCRA, these licensees will be subject to the requirements of Title 8 of Alaska Statutes and subject to the board's authority, same as all other Alaska professional licensees under the board's jurisdiction.

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**

Ms. Thompson thanked LE Spencer for clarification on this matter.

**C. Schedule Additional Strategic Planning Meetings**

LE Spencer stated this item was added just in case and asked the board if they would like to table this item until the September 10, 2025, strategic planning meeting.

Chair McKinley agreed and stated that they would also check with Ms. Chambers if any additional scheduling additional strategic planning meetings needed to be scheduled when she rejoined the board for Item 10.

Chair McKinley noted the board was ahead of schedule and asked LE Spencer to see if Investigators would be able to join the meeting now.

The board briefly discussed the NIC tattooing theory written examination.

Ms. Lombardo raised a question about the tattoo exam, noting the board hadn't had a chance to fully discuss it during the meeting.

Chair McKinley shared that he's generally okay with the exam but expressed uncertainty about how to handle the statutes and regulations portion. He acknowledged Cynthia had suggested some possible approaches.

Ms. Lombardo agreed, stating that both the current and proposed exams contain outdated content. She noted:

- The NIC exam focuses more on procedural questions and less on health and safety.
- The availability of the NIC exam in multiple languages is a benefit.
- If other industries are not requiring statutes and regulations testing, it may not be necessary here either.

Chair McKinley and Ms. Thompson commented on the exam's references to coil tattoo machines, which are now largely outdated in favor of rotary machines.

Ms. Canady asked whether NIC is planning to revise all exams this year.

Ms. Lombardo responded that she had heard that intention mentioned but noted it had been said before.

LE Spencer informed the board NIC typically updates all theory exams every few years, not just those related to body arts.

## **9. Investigations**

Investigators Joy Hartlieb and Dannie Kerfeld greeted the board. Senior Investigator Jenni Summers greeted the board and introduced Inv Kerfeld, a new probation monitor for non-healthcare programs.

Ms. Lombardo asked why they were going through investigative training again.

LE Spencer stated that this training would be a yearly event and may also be done several times a year depending on when new board members were appointed. LE Spencer emphasized investigative processes may change and to ensure all board members were current with investigative processes, this training would occur at minimum, yearly.

### **A. Investigative Process Training Schedule Amendment – Training Documentation Submission Issues**

#### **i. Investigative Process**

Inv Hartlieb reviewed the Investigative Process Training materials with the board and asked if board members had any questions.

Board members had no questions and thanked Inv Hartlieb and agreed to complete reviewing investigative documentation that could be done outside of executive session.

### **B. Investigative Memo**

Inv Hartlieb reviewed the Investigative Memo with the board. Inv Hartlieb reported for the period April 15, 2025 – July 31, 2025, there are 31 open cases and 40 closed cases.

Chair McKinley asked what "litigation initiated" means?

Inv Summers explained an accusation is currently being drafted; once completed, the case will proceed through the Office of Administrative Hearings in coordination with the Attorney General's Office.

### **C. Investigative Probation Report**

Inv Kerfeld reviewed the Probation Report with the board. Inv Kerfeld reported for the period May 10 – July 29, 2025, there are currently 6 licensees on probation and no licensee released from probation.

Ms. Lombardo asked what happens when individuals on probation fail to come into compliance with their consent agreements.

Inv Kerfeld responded, if a licensee violates their consent agreement, it is already codified that this could lead to license suspension. She also stated that the board would be notified of non-compliance and would determine any disciplinary action.

Inv Summers added the probation auditor first attempts to bring the licensee into compliance by reaching out and offering a reasonable timeframe; if the issue remains unresolved, the Division may move forward with license suspension. She also informed the board that of the six individuals currently listed as on probation, two cases involve both an individual and their associated business *Eden Chase and Vanity Lash* (one case) and *Sarah Grocott and Cedar LLC* (one case).



Ms. Lombardo followed up, asking how long the Division typically waits before escalating non-compliance to the board.

Inv Kerfeld explained that the timeline is circumstantial, for example, unpaid civil fines may warrant more leniency to allow for budgeting or payment plans. She also stated other types of violations may require faster action depending on severity.

Chair McKinley asked if board members had any questions. Hearing none, Chair McKinley requested a motion be made to adjourn into executive session for the remaining training and case reviews.

**Motion to enter executive session:** 1st Shannon Thompson - 2nd Jenn Lombardo.  
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 1:17 p.m. and returned from executive session at 2:26 p.m.  
Quorum of board confirmed by roll call.*

**Motion: 1st Jenn Lombardo – 2nd Mae Canady**  
Adopt Consent Agreement for Case 2022-000291, Jordan Curren, as presented.

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**

*Board entered executive session without Chair McKinley to review case 2022-000808 at 2:31 p.m.  
and returned from executive session at 2:35 p.m. Quorum of board confirmed by roll call.*

**Motion: 1st Jenn Lombardo – 2nd Shannon Thompson**  
Adopt Consent Agreement for Case 2022-000808, Darren Sanger, as presented.

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

**Roll Call Vote**

NAME	YES	NO	Recuse
Shannon Thompson	X		
Kevin McKinley			X – Reviewing Board Member
Jessica Pestrikoff	X		
W. Mae Canady	X		
Jenn Lombardo	X		

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.**

*Board entered executive session without Shannon Thompson to review case 2024-000751 at 2:37 p.m. and returned from executive session at 2:43 p.m. Quorum of board confirmed by roll call.*

**Motion: 1st Jenn Lombardo – 2nd Mae Canady**

Adopt the Voluntary Surrender of License for Case 2024-000751, Vincent Almanza Sanger, as presented.

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

**Roll Call Vote**

NAME	YES	NO	Recuse
Kevin McKinley	X		
Jessica Pestrikoff	X		
Jenn Lombardo	X		
W. Mae Canady	X		
Shannon Thompson			X – Reviewing Board Member

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.**

The board thanked Investigators Hartlieb, Kerfeld, and Summers for their time and assistance.

**10. Administrative Business, Cont.**

**A. Board Member Training (Chambers)**

Sara Chambers introduced herself to the board stating she is the Boards and Regulations Advisor for the Department; it is her job to help board members with understanding their roles and responsibilities through training and education.

Ms. Chambers informed the board that the purpose of this training was to provide a refresher and orientation on board member responsibilities, resources, and tools, with a focus on the Board Member Handbook and Welcome Packet.

Ms. Chambers thanked board members for their time and dedication, acknowledging the significant workload and volunteer nature of their roles.

Ms. Chambers provided a Board Member Handbook Overview titled “guide to excellence in regulation.” She stated that these materials are available in meeting packets, email, and on the board’s website under “Board Member Resources.” She encouraged members to read it regularly, especially before bed for light reading.

Ms. Chambers informed board members that this would be provided to new board members upon appointment, this includes a Quick Start Guide, Checklist, and links to key resources. She detailed the checklist including liaison contacts, Governor’s Code of Conduct and Oath, statutes and regulations, and website and training resources.

Ms. Chambers mentioned several training videos created to support different learning styles. She encouraged members to watch them during downtime (e.g., while doing chores); videos cover key board member responsibilities and regulatory concepts.

Ms. Chambers highlighted the importance of knowing key personnel such as Jenni Summers, Senior Investigator, Cynthia Spencer, Licensing Examiner, and noted that contact roles may change over time.

Ms. Chambers directed board members to review the Board Member Handbook and Welcome Packet, complete any outstanding training videos, use the checklist to ensure all onboarding steps are completed and to reach out to LE Spencer with any questions or for additional support.

Ms. Chambers reminded the board that they are quasi-judicial decision-makers. She stated board member responsibilities include determining scope of practice (e.g., aesthetics, med spa

procedures), issuing disciplinary actions, including fines or license revocation, and making decisions that can impact careers and public safety. She emphasized the seriousness of the role and the power held by professional licensing boards.

Ms. Chambers stated that proper procedure is essential to avoid legal and financial complications and key procedural elements are making motions correctly, ensuring quorum, and adhering to the Executive Branch Ethics Act. She stated members are encouraged to lean on staff (LE Spencer, PC Derr, or Director Robb) for guidance and support.

Ms. Chambers reviewed board composition and collaboration as the board includes subject matter experts and public members that offer critical perspectives that balance professional viewpoints. Ms. Chambers stated board members are encouraged to collaborate and rely on each other's expertise, especially in a multidisciplinary board setting.

Ms. Chambers stated board work is ongoing, not limited to quarterly meetings and members should be scheduling time to review materials and prepare for meetings, choosing a preparation style that works best for them (e.g., early review vs. just-in-time), and communicate with LE Spencer if life circumstances affect their ability to complete board work.

Ms. Chambers stated board members must be familiar with centralized statutes and regulations, Code of Conduct, Open Meetings Act (ensures transparency and public access), and Executive Branch Ethics Act. Ms. Chambers stated ethics training is strongly recommended, especially for the board chair, who serves as the designated ethics supervisor. She informed the board that members must disclose any potential conflicts of interest, including financial or personal relationships with applicants or licensees. Ms. Chambers noted that past criticism of the board for lack of disclosure was noted as a cautionary reminder.

Ms. Chambers emphasized the importance of intentional, statute-based decision-making. She encouraged members to read the handbook in small, manageable segments, and use the decision-making flowcharts to guide regulatory and disciplinary actions. Ms. Chambers stated that members should always begin with statutory authority before forming conclusions or issuing guidance. She clarified the difference between regulation and policy, and the importance of grounding board actions in law. She also addressed common challenges such as defining scope of practice and avoiding overreach.

Ms. Chambers emphasized the importance of making proper motion, ensuring a quorum of members, and following correct procedures to avoid appeals or legal challenges. She noted that procedural missteps can result in overturned decisions, financial burdens, and the need for corrective meetings.

Ms. Lombardo expressed appreciation for the training, noting it was more comprehensive than what she pieced together during her previous four-year term.

Chair McKinley invited questions; no additional questions were raised by board members.

Ms. Chambers emphasized that informal consensus (e.g., "everyone good?") is not sufficient to direct staff or establish board positions. She stated all board actions must be accompanied by a formal motion and vote to be valid and recorded. She cited the recent MedSpa FAQ vote as a positive example of proper procedure. Ms. Chambers stated roll call voting is especially important in virtual meetings where nonverbal cues are limited.

Ms. Chambers briefly addressed Administrative Order 360 (AO 360), recently issued by the Governor of Alaska. She stated AO360 will require serious review of existing regulations. She informed the board that she is leading the department's response and will provide guidance to boards through Director Robb. Ms. Chambers encouraged members to read the AO available on the Governor's website; more information and expectations will be shared in future meetings.

Ms. Chambers reviewed Effective Regulation Development with the board. She encouraged members should review the "Effective Regulations" section of the handbook.

She stated that key questions to consider are what harm are we trying to address and is the proposed regulation grounded in statutory authority? Ms. Chambers stated that this section will be especially relevant as boards take on more regulatory review responsibilities under AO 360. Ms. Chambers stated the board had just completed their investigative training, and reminded members that these materials are available for reference in the handbook and meeting documents.

Ms. Chambers reviewed the Legislative Process and stated that a section in the handbook outlines how boards can initiate legislation and how to prepare for and participate in testimony. She stated this is relevant to upcoming agenda items involving legislative discussion.

Ms. Lombardo asked for clarification on the bill mentioned (AO 360) and expressed appreciation for the clarity and comprehensiveness of the training.

Ms. Chambers reviewed Travel Procedures and informed members that the handbook includes a travel FAQ and guidance for board-approved travel. Members encouraged to consult the handbook first, as staff may not always be immediately available to respond to travel-related questions.

Ms. Chambers reviewed the Board Finances section of the Handbook and informed the board that detailed information is provided on how fees are set and assessed, and where licensing revenue goes. She stated this section is useful for both board members and licensees who inquire about financial processes.

Ms. Chambers encouraged the board to consider periodic evaluations as part of strategic planning. She reviewed the meeting evaluation form and a board member self-evaluation tool. She stated that these tools are designed to prompt reflection on individual contributions, meeting effectiveness, and alignment with the board's mission. She offered to provide one-on-one support for members interested in personal development or feedback.

Ms. Chambers shared a personal list of qualities that contribute to being an effective and respected board member:

- Interest in Public Service: Board members should be motivated by serving the public, not advancing personal or professional agendas.
- Common Sense and Curiosity: Asking questions is essential. Members should feel empowered to speak up if they're confused or unprepared.
- Preparation: Board members are expected to read their packets, understand agenda items, and seek clarification from the chair or staff when needed.
- Subject Matter Gaps: Members are encouraged to request presentations or background information when unfamiliar with technical topics (e.g., tattooing, aesthetics).
- Commitment to Participation: Attendance is critical. Lack of quorum has historically been a challenge. Members should prioritize meetings and communicate proactively if conflicts arise.
- Accountability: Boards have the authority to recommend the removal of members who are consistently absent or unengaged. Sara emphasized the importance of honoring the governor's appointment by being an active, contributing member.

Ms. Chambers emphasized the importance of understanding the organizational structure, roles of the Division Director, Deputy Director, Administrative Law Judges, and support staff like LE Spencer and PC Derr. She stated knowing who to go to for what helps board members operate more effectively.

Chair McKinley praised LE Spencer's long-standing expertise and institutional knowledge. Ms. Chambers echoed this, noting LE Spencer's role in helping her learn the ropes and her value as a resource to the board.

Ms. Chambers invited board members to share any final questions or training needs for future agendas.

Ms. Lombardo and Chair McKinley participated in the discussion and supported the training's value.

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

Ms. Chambers thanked the board for their time and reiterated members can reach out with any questions or concerns.

#### **11. Public Comment**

LE Spencer stated that she had received communication from Mechille South that she would like to address the board during public comment, however, Ms. South had not joined the meeting at this time. LE Spencer stated at this time there was only one person, Rachel Laesen, online who would like to speak during public comment.

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

Rachel Laesen, Attorney, Laesen law Team, representing Skinlife Medspa

- **Zoom Access Issue:** Ms. Laesen noted that the Zoom link on the board's website (under the board packet section) was incorrect, which may have prevented other attendees, including Mechille South, from joining. She was eventually able to join via the agenda link and recommended reviewing the posted links for accuracy.
- **Breakout Room Confusion:** She clarified that she was redirected to a breakout room during executive session and wanted to ensure the board understood it was unintentional.
- **Executive Session Question:** Ms. Laesen inquired why portions of the investigative training were held in executive session, expressing concern that investigative processes should be publicly accessible.
- **Appreciation for Public Comment Timing:** She expressed support for holding public comment later in the meeting, as it allowed her to respond to real-time discussions and encouraged the board to continue this practice.

Chair McKinley acknowledged the feedback and committed to reviewing the Zoom access issue to ensure public accessibility.

LE Spencer confirmed there were no other attendees that were requesting to speak. Chair McKinley requested an agenda update.

LE Spencer stated Dawn Fabanich, for Item 12 scheduled for 3:40 p.m., had not joined the meeting. Chair McKinley asked if the board could start the application review. LE Spencer stated the applicant may join the meeting and they still needed to wait to see if Ms. Fabanich joined the board. She suggested the board review correspondence items. Chair McKinley agreed and stated if any additional attendees arrived for public comment the board would accept testimony until 3:40 p.m.

#### **13. Administrative Business, Cont.**

##### **B. Correspondence**

##### **i. Marie Hensley, Esthetician Training**

Ms. Lombardo emphasized the importance of continuing education within the aesthetics program and acknowledged that her points were valid and aligned with ongoing board efforts, noting that similar feedback has been received in the past and is currently being addressed.

The board briefly discussed the correspondence item and agreed that it included topics the board had just covered with Ms. Chambers relating to the Medical Spa Working Group. Board members also noted that Ms. Hensley's questions were outside of the board purview and requested the email from Ms. Hensley be forwarded to Ms. Chambers for review and response. Ms. Chambers stated she would review and respond to the email.

##### **ii. Sarah Crosswhite, Medical Director Questions**

The board reviewed the correspondence item and agreed that this would also need review and response from Ms. Chambers as it crosses into medical territory.

The board requested LE Spencer forward this email to Ms. Chambers.

Chair McKinley asked how the board was doing on time. LE Spencer informed the board that it was now 3:40 p.m. and she had not received email communication from applicant Sonja Barone or Dawn Fabanich.

Chair McKinley stated that public comment is now closed, and Ms. Fabanich had not joined the meeting; the board would take a quick break.

*Recess The Board recessed at 3:44 p.m. for a short break; reconvened at 3:45 p.m. Majority of the board confirmed by roll call*

Chair McKinley requested LE Spencer confirm if Sonja Barone was online with the meeting. LE Spencer informed the board that Ms. Barone had not joined the meeting. The board decided to complete reviewing correspondence items.

**iii. Thatiana Marchi, Scope of Practice Inquiry – Use of Non-Invasive Body Contouring Device**

The board briefly discussed this correspondence item and noted additional information on the type of device Ms. Marchi is referring to. The board agreed that this correspondence item did cross over into possible medical areas and requested the email be forwarded to Ms. Chambers for review and response.

**iv. Jessie Hill - Laser Tattoo Removal Questions**

The board briefly discussed this correspondence item and noted tattooing laser removal was also a topic of discussion during Work Group meetings and agreed this correspondence item may cross over into possible medical areas and requested the email be forwarded to Ms. Chambers for review and response.

**v. Sue Shroy - Regarding the Future of Esthetics**

The board reviewed the correspondence item and asked LE Spencer who Tyler Eggen is. LE Spencer informed the board that Mr. Eggen is the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education Program Coordinator who oversees schools and schools licensed by this board.

**vi. Mindy Millhouse - Industry Concerns**

The board reviewed the correspondence item.

**vii. Makenzie Melsom - Microneedling Question**

The board reviewed the correspondence item and noted that currently, through statutes, Sec 08.13.220(16) only a tattooist may provide microneedling. The board noted that this statute was incorrect and was on their goals to be corrected to reflect the service be removed from tattooing and added to the definition of esthetics.

The board asked LE Spencer to respond to Makenzie Melsom's email.

**12. Style Starts Here Hair Academy — School Matters (Dawn Fabanich)**

Ms. Fabanich did not join the board for this item, so no further action was taken.

The board decided to review Ms. Barone's application next.

**13. Administrative Business, Cont.**

**A. Application Review**

**i. Sonja Barone, Esthetician by Waiver of Examination**

Ms. Lombardo raised concerns regarding the timing and processing of Ms. Barone's application. She noted that the application was submitted four days before Ms. Barone's Montana license expired. There is no clear guidance in statutes or regulations regarding expected processing time; Ms. Barone may have believed she was in compliance by submitting the application before her license expired. She noted that the Montana license verification was received six days after the license had expired.

LE Spencer informed the board that all documents are processed in the order received, with a minimum 10-day processing period. She noted applications are not immediately available upon arrival due to mail sorting and receipting procedures. LE Spencer noted statutory authority requires that applicants for licensure by waiver of examination must hold an active, current license from another jurisdiction at the time of application. LE Spencer stated Ms. Barone submitted multiple copies of her license verification herself, which is not acceptable. Verifications must come directly from the issuing authority. She noted that the official license verification from Montana was received on March 6, but the license had expired on March 1. LE Spencer cautioned the board that there is no precedent for approving a waiver of examination application when the applicant does not hold an active license at the time of review.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether the situation could have been avoided had Ms. Barone applied for a temporary permit.

LE Spencer stated Ms. Barone did not request a temporary permit. A temporary permit may have been issued if she had applied and maintained an active Montana license throughout the review process. She stated to qualify for a temporary permit, applicants must submit a copy of a valid, current out-of-state license showing issue and expiration dates. She emphasized that based on the February 24 submission date and March 1 expiration, a temporary permit might have been issued, but renewal of the Montana license would have been necessary to maintain eligibility.

Ms. Lombardo expressed sympathy for Ms. Barone's situation and suggested that clearer guidance might help applicants avoid similar issues in the future.

LE Spencer acknowledged the comment and stated this would be taken under advisement.

Chair McKinley inquired whether Ms. Barone could still renew her Montana license from Alaska to resolve the issue.

LE Spencer stated Yes, Ms. Barone can renew her Montana license online or by phone; once renewed, the division can verify the license directly via the Montana licensing website. LE Spencer explained that no new license verification from the Montana Board would be required and upon confirmation of the renewed license, the Alaska license could be issued.

Kevin McKinley expressed concern about the implications of approving the application and stated the board is approaching a sunset audit, shortened from 7 to 5 years; by approving an application in violation of statute could jeopardize the board's standing. He stated that while sympathetic, approving this request could set a precedent for future violations. He emphasized that Ms. Barone can resolve the issue by renewing her Montana license remotely.

Ms. Lombardo agreed, noting while expressing concern about applicant understanding she was unsure if Ms. Barone had been clearly advised to renew her Montana license. She expressed concern about the lack of applicant understanding and the need for clearer guidance. She referenced HB158, which proposes universal temporary licenses, potentially addressing similar cases in the future.

LE Spencer stated Ms. Barone was advised multiple times to renew her Montana license. If she renews the license the division can verify it online and proceed with issuing the Alaska license. She cautioned the board that violating statutes for one applicant would require the same for all future applicants.

Ms. Lombardo and Ms. Thompson expressed sympathy but agreed the board cannot selectively enforce statutes. Submitting an incomplete application and failing to maintain an active license are applicant responsibilities.

Ms. Lombardo and Ms. Thompson agreed compassion is important in communication, especially given the applicant's personal circumstances. However, the board is bound by statute and cannot selectively enforce requirements. Submitting an incomplete application and failing to

maintain an active license are applicant responsibilities.

LE Spencer clarified that it's common for applications to be submitted incomplete. She informed the board that the front desk and mail staff are not qualified to assess application completeness. She explained that all corrections and updates must be submitted in writing and staff cannot act on verbal updates or assumptions.

The board agreed that option 2 was favored, conditional approval based on renewal or examination pathway. The agreed application denial was considered a last resort and not appropriate in this case. The board emphasized the importance of providing applicants with clear, compassionate guidance.

The board noted Ms. Barone may renew her Montana license online for \$135. Once renewed, the division will verify the license via the Montana licensing website and no new license verification will be required from the Montana Board; upon verification of renewing the Montana license the Alaska license could be issued promptly.

**Motion: 1<sup>st</sup> Shannon Thompson – 2<sup>nd</sup> Jenn Lombardo**

Approve the application for an esthetician license by waiver of examination for Sonja Barone pending verification of renewing her Montana license OR passing the Esthetics theory written examination.

Chair McKinley asked if the board had any additional discussion.

Chair McKinley, Ms. Lombardo, Ms. Thompson and Ms. Canady expressed sympathy for the applicant's situation, especially given personal challenges. They also expressed frustration with the complexity of the licensing process, even for experienced professionals. They expressed concern about setting a precedent by bending statutes and emphasized the importance of clear, compassionate communication. They all acknowledged that the applicant has been informed of her option's multiple times.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair McKinley requested a roll call vote.

LE Spencer reread the motion:

**Motion: 1<sup>st</sup> Shannon Thompson – 2<sup>nd</sup> Jenn Lombardo**

Approve the application for an esthetician license by waiver of examination for Sonja Barone pending verification of renewing her Montana license OR passing the Esthetics theory written examination.

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

**Roll Call Vote**

NAME	YES	NO	Recuse
W. Mae Canady	X		
Jenn Lombardo	X		
Shannon Thompson	X		
Jessica Pestrikoff	X		
Kevin McKinley	X		

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.**

Ms. Chambers encouraged the board to reflect on this case as a prime example of how overly prescriptive regulations can limit staff flexibility and hinder common-sense decision-making.



She emphasized that the board has full authority over its own regulations and noted that under Administrative Order 360 (AO360), the board will be required to review and reduce regulations, and this situation illustrates the need for Right Touch Regulation—balancing public protection with practical, flexible processes. She urged the board to consider how future regulatory revisions could allow for reasonable discretion in similar cases.

Chair McKinley acknowledged the importance of the point and anticipated further discussion on AO360 in upcoming meetings.

Ms. Chambers confirmed that more information and engagement on AO360 is forthcoming.

**C. Begin Delegation of License Issuance to Staff**

Chair McKinley introduced the need for the board to consider delegating license issuance authority to division staff. He clarified that this would require a legislative change, as the board currently lacks statutory authority to delegate this function. Chair McKinley requested board approval to initiate a legislative project to allow delegation of license issuance and to engage with legislators and Director Sylvan Robb to explore sponsorship of a bill.

LE Spencer reminded the board to be aware that processing applications and issuing licenses are two separate components.

Ms. Chambers clarified that the board cannot delegate authority on its own; it must pursue legislation to do so. She emphasized the urgency of initiating this project due to legislative timelines, with August–September being critical for bill sponsorship and noted that this request is outside the normal strategic planning cycle but justified due to timing and workload concerns. She confirmed that she and Chair McKinley could begin drafting language and working with leadership if the board approved the motion.

**Motion: 1<sup>st</sup> Jenn Lombardo – 2<sup>nd</sup> Mae Canady**

Approve the board initiate legislative conversations to allow the division to issue licenses

Ms. Lombardo asked for historical context on why the board is currently responsible for reviewing applications.

Chair McKinley explained that in the early 2000s, the board reviewed applications directly, but as volume increased, a checklist system was introduced. Legal counsel later clarified that statutory authority was required to delegate issuance. He emphasized that the current volume (20–50 applications per week) makes board-level review unsustainable.

Ms. Sara Chambers provided historical context on the use of the checklist as a mechanism for license issuance. She explained that earlier legal advice supported the checklist as a valid delegation tool, allowing staff to issue licenses if all checklist items were met. However, more recent legal interpretation determined that the board lacks statutory authority to delegate license issuance, regardless of checklist use. Ms. Chambers emphasized that this shift in legal interpretation is what prompted the need for a statutory change and noted that this issue was previously raised by Director Sylvan Robb and should be included in the board's regulatory reform priorities under AO360.

Ms. Lombardo thanked Ms. Chambers for the clarification.

Chair McKinley requested a recap of the motion.

LE Spencer provided the motion had been made by Ms. Lombardo, seconded by Ms. Canady and stated, "Move that the board initiate legislative conversations to allow the division to issue licenses."

Chair McKinley confirmed the motion language and opened the floor for final comments. Hearing no further discussion, a roll call vote was conducted.

### Roll Call Vote

NAME	YES	NO	Recuse
W. Mae Canady	X		
Shannon Thompson			
Jenn Lombardo	X		
Jessica Pestrikoff	X		
Jessica Pestrikoff	X		
Kevin McKinley	X		

### THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.

#### D. Fine Schedule/Matrix Update

Chair McKinley opened the discussion by referencing prior conversations about the fine matrix and invited Ms. Canady to share her previous comments.

Ms. Canady expressed that while the matrix is helpful, it may be too lenient—particularly in cases of repeat non-compliance, such as failure to submit required paperwork. She noted that the matrix does not adequately address ongoing or repeated violations, especially in apprentice-related cases.

Ms. Lombardo provided historical context from the 2019 meeting with former investigator Dawn Bundick. She explained that the previous matrix was based on timeframes (e.g., less than or more than 90 days), which allowed repeat offenders to avoid escalating consequences. She supported the 2020 shift to a first offense/second offense model but noted that it still has limitations. Ms. Lombardo suggested enhancements such as differentiating between first offenses based on severity or duration (e.g., first offense under 30 days vs. over 90 days), addressing multiple types of first offenses across different violations (e.g., paperwork, license display, etc.), and introducing a cumulative or tiered approach to better reflect repeat behavior across categories.

Chair McKinley agreed with Ms. Lombardo's insights and acknowledged the need for a more nuanced approach. He proposed treating this as a homework project for board members to reflect on and bring ideas to a future strategic planning session. He emphasized the importance of input from all board members, given the diversity of modalities and experiences.

Ms. Chambers raised a legal concern regarding the current structure of the fine matrix. She noted that if the matrix functions as a "if you do this, then this happens" model, it may constitute a regulation, which would require formal adoption through the regulatory process. Ms. Chambers explained that most boards use precedent-based disciplinary actions, not binding matrices. She suggested the board consider whether the matrix is intended as guidance or a binding framework, and to explore whether it should be removed from regulation or revised accordingly. Ms. Chambers committed to gathering additional input from the investigator and consulting with Cynthia to further assess the issue.

Chair McKinley acknowledged the matrix has evolved over time through trial and error. He expressed a desire to develop a stable, effective framework that doesn't require constant revision and supported Sara's recommendation and emphasized the importance of legal clarity and consistency.

The board agreed to include the fine matrix review in the upcoming strategic planning process. Board members will reflect on the current matrix and propose improvements, consider the legal implications of binding language versus precedent-based guidance and will collaborate with Ms. Chambers and LE Spencer to ensure any revisions align with statutory and regulatory requirements.

Chair McKinley thanked everyone for their time and participation. He stressed that everyone is really doing a good job.

**15. Adjourn**

The chair declared the board off the record at 5:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cynthia Spencer, Licensing Examiner III

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kevin McKinley, Chairperson  
Board of Barbers and Hairdressers

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

DRAFT



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

CONDENSED MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AUGUST 20, 2025

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

**These are DRAFT minutes prepared by the staff of the Division of Corporation, Business and Professional Licensing. These minutes have not been reviewed or approved by the board.**

**July 10, 2025:**

**Attendance**

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

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

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

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

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

**2. Review Agenda**

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

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

**3. Ethics Disclosure**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Chambers acknowledged the activity list submitted by board members and stated although the information provided was not compiled into a single document due members not submitting the information to her by the August 18 deadline. She informed board members that LE Spencer had uploaded the submissions to OnBoard for reference during the session.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Examples from Other Boards

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

- Organization

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

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

Instructions for the Board

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

Ms. Chambers clarified that:

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

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

Board members had no questions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Ms. Chambers reviewed Activity Prioritization Item 2, AS 08.13.080(d)**, remove all license requirements from AS 08.13.080(d). This subsection limits testing for body arts and may block the board from adopting NIC tattooing and permanent cosmetic coloring (PCC) theory written exams. Ms. Chambers stated subsection (d) of the statute contains outdated and overly specific requirements that limit the board's

flexibility to adopt modern, nationally recognized exams (such as NIC theory exams for tattooing and PCC). Moving these requirements from statute to regulation would allow the board to respond more quickly to changes in industry standards and practices. This change would also align with the board's broader goal of maintaining relevance and responsiveness in a rapidly evolving field.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Canady also supported a ranking of 3.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Canady confirmed support for a priority 2 ranking.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Canady and other board members agreed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Board members unanimously agreed, with no further discussion needed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LE Spencer stated that despite this intent, no applications have been received, and the provision has never been used. She asked the board to consider removing the regulatory provisions for courtesy licenses, which were originally created to accommodate temporary, on-site services (e.g., for film and

television productions). Since their creation, no courtesy licenses have ever been issued, raising questions about their necessity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Board members unanimously agreed with Ms. Chambers

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **5. Adjourn**

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

Respectfully submitted:

---

Cynthia Spencer, Licensing Examiner III

Approved:

---

Kevin McKinley, Chairperson  
Board of Barbers and Hairdressers



Date: \_\_\_\_\_

DRAFT



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 AS08.86.030 and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.64, Article 6, a scheduled board meeting was held via teleconference/Zoom, September 10, 2025.

**These are DRAFT minutes prepared by the staff of the Division of Corporation, Business and Professional Licensing. These minutes have not been reviewed or approved by the board.**

**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: 1<sup>st</sup> Mae Canady– 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> 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 delegate 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. Thompson 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 work 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.

Respectfully submitted:

---

Cynthia Spencer, Licensing Examiner III

Approved:

---

Kevin McKinley, Chairperson  
Board of Barbers and Hairdressers

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

DRAFT



THE STATE  
of ALASKA

GOVERNOR Mike Dunleavy

Department of Commerce, Community,  
and Economic Development

DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND  
PROFESSIONAL LICENSING

550 West Seventh Avenue, Suite 1500  
Anchorage, AK 99501-3567  
Main: 907.269.8160  
Toll free fax: 907.269.8195

**PROBATION REPORT**

**DATE:** October 3, 2025  
**TO:** BAH - Board of Barbers and Hairdressers  
**THROUGH:** Jennifer Summers, Senior Investigator  
**FROM:** Dannie Kerfeld, Investigator  
**SUBJECT:** Probation Report for the November 5, 2025 Meeting.

DS  
[Signature]

The following information was compiled as a Probation report to the Board for the period of July 30, 2025 thru October 3, 2025; This report includes probationers who are in compliance with their agreements; non compliant probationers and probationer requests to the Board.

There are currently **Eight (8)** licensee's on probation as of the date of this report. Since the last probation report, **Zero (0)** licensee's were released from probation.

The following is a complete list of individuals on probation for this Board that are in compliance with their Board agreements.

Name	Case Number	Start of Probation	End of Probation
Eden Chase	2023-000467-Prb	03/05/2024	03/05/2026
Vanity Lash Lounge, LLC	2023-000467-Prb	03/05/2024	03/05/2026
Lui Talo	2022-000736-PRB	08/09/2024	08/09/2026
Francisco VALLADOLID	2024-000619-Prb	10/03/2023	10/03/2025

The following is a complete list of individuals on probation for this Board that are not in compliance with their Board agreements.

Name	Case Number	Start of Probation	End of Probation	Disposition Date
Sara GROCOTT	2022-000249-Prb	10/03/2023	10/03/2025	10/02/2025
CEDAR LLC	2022-000249-Prb	10/03/2023	10/03/2025	10/02/2025
Jordan Curren	2022-000291-Prb	08/13/2025	08/24/2027	10/02/2025
Darren Sanger	2022-000808-Prb	08/13/2025	08/13/2027	10/02/2025

The following is a complete list of individuals on probation for this Board that are suspended.

Name	Case Number	Start of Probation	End of Probation	Disposition Date
------	-------------	--------------------	------------------	------------------

The following is a complete list of individuals on Non-Disciplinary Consent Agreements (Monitoring Status) for this Board. All individuals are in compliance with their agreements.

Name	Case Number	Start of Probation	End of Probation	Disposition Date
------	-------------	--------------------	------------------	------------------

The following were released after probation completion.

Name	Case Number	Start of Probation	End of Probation
------	-------------	--------------------	------------------

---

**Board Requests:**

Jordan L. Curren, Case No.: 2022-000291, Request for Amended Consent Agreement to modify terms.

**END OF REPORT**



### **EXECUTIVE SESSION MOTION**

I, \_\_\_\_\_, move that the Alaska State Board of Barbers & Hairdressers enter into executive session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c), and Alaska Constitutional Right to Privacy Provisions, for the purpose of discussing \_\_\_\_\_; Board staff to remain during the session.

Authority: AS 44.62.310(c), Government meetings public

The following subjects may be considered in executive session:

- 1. matters, the immediate knowledge of which would clearly have an adverse effect upon the finances of the public entity;**
- 2. subjects that tend to prejudice the reputation and character of any person, provided the person may request a public discussion;**
- 3. matters which by law, municipal charter, or ordinance are required to be confidential;**
- 4. matters involving consideration of government records that by law are not subject to public disclosure.**

**Disciplinary Sanctions/Fine Schedules (Adopted and Revised May 11-12, 2020)**

Violation	Time Frame	Disciplinary Action	Civil Fine	
			Total Amount	Amount Suspended
AS 08.13.070 (1) & (2) Unlicensed Practice	1st offense	Non-Disciplinary Advisement Letter	n/a	n/a
	2nd or More offense	Imposition of Civil Fine	\$500/incident	n/a
AS 08.13.070 (3) Operating School w/o School License	1st offense	Non-Disciplinary Advisement Letter	n/a	n/a
	2nd or More offense	Consent Agreement (Fine/2-year probation/reprimand)	\$4,000	\$2,000
AS 08.13.070 (4) Teach/Supervise Apprentice w/o License	1st offense	Non-Disciplinary Advisement Letter	n/a	n/a
	2nd or More offense	Consent Agreement (Fine/2-year probation/reprimand)	\$2,000	\$1,000
AS 08.13.080 (5) Shop Owner License	1st offense	Non-Disciplinary Advisement Letter	n/a	n/a
	2nd or More offense	Consent Agreement (Fine/2-year probation/reprimand)	\$4,000	\$2,000
AS 08.13.070 (6) Allow Unlicensed Practice	1st offense	Non-Disciplinary Advisement Letter	n/a	n/a
	2nd or More offense	Consent Agreement (Fine/2-year probation/reprimand)	\$2,000 per Practitioner/student/apprentice	\$1,000 per Practitioner/student/apprentice
AS 08.13.070 (8) Fraudulent License	n/a	Consent Agreement (Fine/2-year probation/reprimand)	\$4,000	\$2,000
AS 08.13.130 (a) License Display	1 offense	Non-Disciplinary Advisement Letter	n/a	n/a
	2nd or More offense	Imposition of Civil Fine	\$1,000	n/a
AS 08.13.217 (a)(b) Tattoo a Minor	n/a	Consent Agreement (Fine/2-year probation/reprimand)	\$4,000	\$2,000
12 AAC 09.130 Student Records	1st offense	Non-Disciplinary Advisement Letter	n/a	n/a
	2nd or More offense	Imposition of Civil Fine	\$1,000	n/a
12 AAC 09.185 Apprentice Records (Tattoo/PCC/Bod y Piercing)	1st offense	Non-Disciplinary Advisement Letter	n/a	n/a
	2nd or More offense	Imposition of Civil Fine	\$1,000	n/a
12 AAC 09.190 Apprentice Records (All Other)	1st offense	Non-Disciplinary Advisement Letter	n/a	n/a
	2nd or More offense	Imposition of Civil Fine	\$1,000	n/a

Department of Commerce Community, and Economic Development  
Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing

Summary of All Professional Licensing  
Schedule of Revenues and Expenditures

Board of Barbers and Hairdressers	FY 18		FY 19	Biennium	FY 20		FY 21	Biennium	FY 22		FY 23	Biennium	FY 24		FY 25 1st -3rd QTR							
<b>Revenue</b>																						
Revenue from License Fees	\$	1,210,958	\$	439,932	\$	1,650,890	\$	1,034,860	\$	389,183	\$	1,424,043	\$	1,035,686	\$	349,898	\$	1,385,584	\$	1,146,245	\$	199,278
General Fund Received																						
Allowable Third Party Reimbursements		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,210,958</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>439,932</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,650,890</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,034,860</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>389,183</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,424,043</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,057,209</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>355,831</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,413,040</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,147,203</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>199,278</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>																						
Non Investigation Expenditures																						
1000 - Personal Services		190,824		195,815		386,639		187,928		154,229		342,157		177,685		201,311		378,996		269,282		200,026
2000 - Travel		10,451		6,127		16,578		2,521		-		2,521		2,862		-		2,862		1,738		1,024
3000 - Services		59,241		58,111		117,352		44,123		39,463		83,586		29,742		27,235		56,977		30,763		16,108
4000 - Commodities		300		193		493		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-
5000 - Capital Outlay		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-
Total Non-Investigation Expenditures		260,816		260,246		521,062		234,572		193,692		428,264		210,289		228,546		438,835		301,783		217,158
Investigation Expenditures																						
1000-Personal Services		108,332		126,521		234,853		163,905		87,573		251,478		97,978		157,238		255,216		58,249		61,386
2000 - Travel		-		-		-		723		-		723		-		-		-		-		-
3023 - Expert Witness		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-
3088 - Inter-Agency Legal		1,425		1,489		2,914		558		288		846		8,185		767		8,952		4,587		1,338
3094 - Inter-Agency Hearing/Mediation		-		868		868		-		-		-		3,624		-		3,624		-		2,976
3000 - Services other		-		481		481		757		81		838		241		643		884		88		76
4000 - Commodities		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-
Total Investigation Expenditures		109,757		129,359		239,116		165,943		87,942		253,885		110,028		158,648		268,676		62,924		65,775
<b>Total Direct Expenditures</b>		370,573		389,605		760,178		400,515		281,634		682,149		320,317		387,194		707,511		364,707		282,933
Indirect Expenditures																						
Internal Administrative Costs		205,071		177,867		382,938		217,172		164,610		381,782		196,546		192,783		389,329		195,961		146,971
Departmental Costs		104,226		96,684		200,910		76,526		60,003		136,529		71,313		70,880		142,193		71,755		53,816
Statewide Costs		33,433		34,066		67,499		46,351		33,188		79,539		34,649		38,993		73,642		31,700		23,775
<b>Total Indirect Expenditures</b>		342,730		308,617		651,347		340,049		257,801		597,850		302,508		302,656		605,164		299,416		224,562
						-						-										
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>713,303</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>698,222</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,411,525</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>740,564</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>539,435</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,279,999</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>622,825</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>689,850</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,312,675</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>664,123</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>507,495</b>
<b>Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)</b>																						
Beginning Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)	\$	202,694	\$	700,349			\$	442,059	\$	736,355			\$	586,103	\$	1,020,487			\$	686,467	\$	1,169,547
Annual Increase/(Decrease)		497,655		(258,290)				294,296		(150,252)				434,384		(334,020)				483,080		(308,217)
Ending Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)	\$	700,349		442,059			\$	736,355	\$	586,103			\$	1,020,487	\$	686,467			\$	1,169,547	\$	861,330
<b>Statistical Information</b>																						
Number of Licenses for Indirect calculation		8,514		6,784				7,460		6,956				7,507		7,086				7,549		
<b>Additional information:</b>																						
• General fund dollars were received in FY21-FY24 to offset increases in personal services and help prevent programs from going into deficit or increase fees.																						
• Most recent fee change: New fee added FY19																						
• Annual license fee analysis will include consideration of other factors such as board and licensee input, potential investigation load, court cases, multiple license and fee types under one program, and program changes per AS 08.01.065.																						

Appropriation Name (Ex)	(Multiple Items)
Sub Unit	(All)
PL Task Code	BAH1

Sum of Budgetary Expenditures	Object Type Name (Ex)			
Object Name (Ex)	1000 - Personal Services	2000 - Travel	3000 - Services	Grand Total
1011 - Regular Compensation	137,268.58			137,268.58
1014 - Overtime	75.15			75.15
1021 - Allowances to Employees	18.50			18.50
1023 - Leave Taken	22,608.87			22,608.87
1028 - Alaska Supplemental Benefit	9,818.47			9,818.47
1029 - Public Employee's Retirement System Defined Benefits	26,757.94			26,757.94
1030 - Public Employee's Retirement System Defined Contribution	3,142.05			3,142.05
1034 - Public Employee's Retirement System Defined Cont Health Reim	1,951.73			1,951.73
1035 - Public Employee's Retirement Sys Defined Cont Retiree Medical	497.77			497.77
1037 - Public Employee's Retirement Sys Defined Benefit Unfnd Liab	10,455.45			10,455.45
1039 - Unemployment Insurance	95.78			95.78
1040 - Group Health Insurance	35,305.77			35,305.77
1041 - Basic Life and Travel	2.23			2.23
1042 - Worker's Compensation Insurance	891.02			891.02
1047 - Leave Cash In Employer Charge	3,692.93			3,692.93
1048 - Terminal Leave Employer Charge	2,444.21			2,444.21
1053 - Medicare Tax	2,272.85			2,272.85
1069 - SU Business Leave Bank Contributions	40.24			40.24
1077 - ASEA Legal Trust	167.70			167.70
1079 - ASEA Injury Leave Usage	15.99			15.99
1080 - SU Legal Trst	29.49			29.49
1970 - Personal Services Transfer	3,859.56			3,859.56
2005 - In-State Non-Employee Airfare			649.55	649.55
2007 - In-State Non-Employee Lodging			239.00	239.00
2008 - In-State Non-Employee Meals and Incidentals			90.00	90.00
2009 - In-State Non-Employee Taxable Per Diem			45.00	45.00
3035 - Long Distance			19.30	19.30
3044 - Courier			13.51	13.51
3045 - Postage			78.29	78.29
3085 - Inter-Agency Mail			26.01	26.01
3088 - Inter-Agency Legal			1,338.37	1,338.37
3094 - Inter-Agency Hearing/Mediation			2,975.70	2,975.70
3979 - Inter-Agency Management/Consulting			16,046.06	16,046.06
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>261,412.28</b>	<b>1,023.55</b>	<b>20,497.24</b>	<b>282,933.07</b>

# State of Alaska

## 2025 HOLIDAY

## CALENDAR

### State Holidays

Date	Holiday
01/01/2025	New Year's Day
01/20/2025	MLK Jr.'s Birthday
02/17/2025	Presidents' Day
03/31/2025	Seward's Day
05/26/2025	Memorial Day
06/19/2025	Juneteenth Day
07/04/2025	Independence Day
09/01/2025	Labor Day
10/18/2025	Alaska Day (observed 10/17/2025)
11/11/2025	Veterans' Day
11/27/2025	Thanksgiving Day
12/25/2025	Christmas Day

Please refer to appropriate collective bargaining unit agreement for more information regarding holidays.

 Holiday



### JANUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

### JULY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

### FEBRUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	

### AUGUST

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

### MARCH

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

### SEPTEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

### APRIL

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

### OCTOBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

### MAY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

### NOVEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

### JUNE

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

### DECEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

# State of Alaska 2026 HOLIDAY CALENDAR

## State Holidays

Date	Holiday
01/01/2026	New Year's Day
01/19/2026	MLK Jr.'s Birthday
02/16/2026	Presidents' Day
03/30/2026	Seward's Day
05/25/2026	Memorial Day
06/19/2026	Juneteenth Day
07/04/2026	Independence Day (observed 07/03/2026)
09/07/2026	Labor Day
10/18/2026	Alaska Day (observed 10/19/2026)
11/11/2026	Veterans' Day
11/26/2026	Thanksgiving Day
12/25/2026	Christmas Day

Please refer to appropriate collective bargaining unit agreement for more information regarding holidays.

Holiday



## JANUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

## JULY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

## FEBRUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28

## AUGUST

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

## MARCH

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

## SEPTEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

## APRIL

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

## OCTOBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

## MAY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

## NOVEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

## JUNE

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

## DECEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

**Derr, Lacey E (CED)**

---

**From:** Sarah Maxwell  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 20, 2025 2:14 PM  
**To:** Board of Barbers Hairdressers (CED sponsored)  
**Subject:** Re: Issues with how the Board handles Lower 48 Artists and Events

Thank you. I really feel like a better way to handle conventions and guest artists coming up would be for them to just send a copy of their tattoo license from wherever they are from. And they become the shop owners liability. If the shop owner who wants to hose them vouches for them with a copy of the license, it should be approved. It makes it way less complicated. Not everyone can get signatures and information on their mentors because not all artists are still in contact or mentors have passed away. A lot of tattoo artists don't plan guest spotting or doing conventions so far in advance at 90 days. Making it extremely difficult to acquire everything that is asked for. I ask these solutions to be included in the meeting please. If you need additional feedback from me, I'd be happy to join in.

On Wed, Aug 20, 2025, 1:57 PM Board of Barbers Hairdressers (CED sponsored)  
<[boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov](mailto:boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov)> wrote:

Good Afternoon Ms. Maxwell,

Your correspondence has been received and it will be included on the next quarterly board meeting's agenda held on November 5th. All board meeting information such as agenda, documents, and meeting links will be available approximately one week prior to the meetings on the board's website [here](#).

Sincerely,

***Lacey Derr***

Program Coordinator 2

Division of Corporations, Business, and Professional Licensing

[Lacey.Derr@alaska.gov](mailto:Lacey.Derr@alaska.gov)

Office: 907-465-3812

<https://www.commerce.alaska.gov/web/cbpl>

---

**From:** License, Business (CED sponsored) <[businesslicense@alaska.gov](mailto:businesslicense@alaska.gov)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 19, 2025 8:11 AM

**To:** Sarah Maxwell

Board of Barbers Hairdressers (CED sponsored)

<[boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov](mailto:boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: Issues with how the Board handles Lower 48 Artists and Events

Good morning,

I am forwarding your email to the Board of Barbers and Hairdressers (included in this reply) to address your concern. You may email the Board directly at [boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov](mailto:boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov).

Thank you.

*Delma O. Siangco*

Business Licensing Examiner

Corporations & Business Licensing Section

Division of Corporations, Business & Professional Licensing

Department of Commerce, Community & Economic Development

[www.BusinessLicense.Alaska.Gov](http://www.BusinessLicense.Alaska.Gov)



---

**From:** Sarah Maxwell

**Sent:** Monday, August 18, 2025 11:27 AM

**To:** License, Business (CED sponsored) <[businesslicense@alaska.gov](mailto:businesslicense@alaska.gov)>

**Subject:** Issues with how the Board handles Lower 48 Artists and Events



**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the State of Alaska mail system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello. I'm Sarah Maxwell and I own a shop in Fairbanks. I am writing you guys because myself and amongst many other tattoo artists in our state, and tattoo artists from other states are having an increasing amount of dissatisfaction and complaints regarding how the State and or Board handle non resident artists and events. I have even submitted twice to become a board member with the state, considering I work in this professional field, to try to help make things smoother and easier for those wanting to connect up here. I received no email, or call back for my inquiry, when I know there are spots open.

We have officially lost a huge connection with Villain Arts Tattoo Expo. They have been a part of the industry for more than 20 years and are well known. They traveled here one year; and because of how strict everything is, the insane hoops they all have to go through, and outrageous fees everyone must pay, they no longer want to come back to our state to conduct business. This is a huge loss in connection for tattoo shops in this state, and revenue.

The 90 day deadline to submit the copious amount of paperwork each artist is faced with is near impossible to get done in time. Every state handles licensing differently, and I believe that should be taken into consideration when artists want to guest spot at a studio or attend a convention traveling here.

There is no clear instructions in the paperwork, wanting specific and complicated verbiage without clarifying, notarizations made etc. So convention holders and artists get a short deadline to resubmit an entirely new application written exactly as you guys ask for. And if its still not to your satisfaction, the application is simply denied and the fee is stolen. \$250 per shop is an asinine fee, and just shows the state has no issue pocketing that money. You can see how that would leave a bad taste in alot of people's mouths?

I have even had issues submitting apprentice paperwork through you guys. Regarding the new change in quarterly hours. The paperwork is not clear how you want it added up. So I sent it in with correct hours, but not written exactly the way you guys are wanting it. I call and speak to Wanda regarding this. And instead of telling me what needs to be changed or simply changing it with me on the phone, she gives me riddles on how to fix it but won't outright say what is written wrong. This feels like a trivia test. Not until I had some words with her, did she finally tell me what was wrong. What is the need for that? Its difficult enough to get licensed already.

This board is destroying the endless possibilities for connections and revenue for this state. Ruining connections for artists who cant afford to fly out, and destroying future events that the community and industry wants and needs. Due to their overly complicated paperwork, licenses etc, lack of transparency, extremely short time frame window, borderline theft amount of fees, and even worse, taking the fees without any explanation. I wouldn't want to come back to a state that gatekept so hard, that I was left feeling like my business isn't even wanted. Things seriously need to change, and I would really like to know who I can speak with that has this authority to look it over.

The longer this continues to happen, the more animosity the local community and tattoo community is going to have. It also widens the door for more under the table work, which I see happening all the time. Which in turn creates dangerous environments, because the board is unwilling to listen.

I would appreciate someone getting back to me via email, or by phone. My number is ."

**From:** [Linda McLendon](#)  
**To:** [Board of Barbers Hairdressers \(CED sponsored\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: I need MORE of your assistance,  
**Date:** Friday, September 19, 2025 6:57:23 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image001.png](#)

---

Yes, please do.

I attended & then taught at Anchorage Alaska Barber College in the 80s. I attended every board meeting & postsecondary education meeting for years 1983 to 1989. We were able to get a lot of things changed for the Barbers.

Additional Certification in the skills of each program should be ENCOURAGED & CREDITED. If it is not deemed mandatory then it will not require more bureaucracy.

Have a great weekend.

On Fri, Sep 19, 2025, 3:02 PM Board of Barbers Hairdressers (CED sponsored) <[boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov](mailto:boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov)> wrote:

Hello,

Thank you for the compliment and I am glad I could help you get the answers you were looking for. I do think your suggestion is worth the merit of discussion, would you like me to submit your correspondence for the next board meeting so they can discuss this and possibly put it on their radar for future action?

*Thank you,*

***Damen Bennett***



Licensing Examiner II

Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing

Board of Barbers and Hairdressers

[boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov](mailto:boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov)

Office: 907-465-2591

[www.commerce.alaska.gov](http://www.commerce.alaska.gov)



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication is intended for the sole use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed to and is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (18 USC § 2510-2521) and may contain Confidential Official Use Only Information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC § 552). If you are not the intended recipient, you are prohibited from disseminating, distributing, or copying any information contained in this communication.

---

**From:** Linda McLendon >  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 18, 2025 5:37 PM  
**To:** Board of Barbers Hairdressers (CED sponsored) <[boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov](mailto:boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: I need MORE of your assistance,

Thank you for the clarification. I will send this to the hairdressers. If they use the schedule for set hours & # procedures accomplished & submits it to the state they can request an exam for those specific procedures.

We should appeal to the board to allow expansion of licenses with credit given for continued education.

Decades ago, Barbers did not want to lose their customers because of the inability to perform chemical treatments...SO THEY attended classes to give them the training. I am sure there are other licensed professionals that use similar ways to expand on their skills.

I really appreciate your time to research this & your very timely response! If there was a review process for your performance I would give you FIVE STARS!

LINDA MCLENDON

On Thu, Sep 18, 2025, 4:05 PM Board of Barbers Hairdressers (CED sponsored) <[boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov](mailto:boardofbarbershairdressers@alaska.gov)> wrote:

Hello,

I hope I can provide you with a little more information and clarity on what you are asking.

**12 AAC 09.097. CREDIT FOR HOURS OF COURSE WORK AND TRAINING.** (a) An applicant may use the same hours of course work and training to qualify for a license as a barber, a license as a non-chemical barber, and a license as a hairdresser. **To be acceptable, the hours of course work and training must meet the requirements set out in this [chapter](#) for the applicable license.**

This means that they don't have to start back at square one, however they will need to complete the practical operations and training that would be under the curriculum of a barber or non-chemical barber, they must then take the proficiency exam AND then apply for licensure by examination. Unfortunately, there is no way to take the extra training and just apply it to their current licensure, as statutes and regulations are currently written, they must apply for each individual aspect license they want. However, between Barber and Non-Chemical Barber there isn't a huge gap in what they must obtain in training.