



Board of Barbers & Hairdressers Meeting

Alaska Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing

February 3, 2026 at 9:00 AM AKDT to February 3, 2026 at 4:30 PM AKDT

Zoom Details: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85468798311>

Meeting ID: 854 6879 8311

Call In: 1-253-215-8782

TENTATIVE MEETING AGENDA

Working Groups May Occur

Agenda:

- 1. 9:00 a.m. February 3, 2026 Call to Order/Roll Call**
- 2. 9:05 a.m. Review/Amend Agenda**
 - A. Review/Amend Agenda
- 3. 9:06 a.m. Ethics Disclosure**
- 4. 9:08 a.m. Review/Approve Meeting Minutes**
 - A. Review/Edit/Approve Meeting Minutes
 - i. November 5, 2025 Board Meeting
 - ii. December 9, 2025 AO 360 Meeting
 - iii. January 13, 2026 AO 360 Meeting
 - iv. January 20, 2026 AO 360 Meeting
- 5. 9:10 a.m. Public Comment**
- 6. 9:20 a.m. Investigations**
 - A. Dept. of Law, Office of Administrative Hearing – Case Review (Judge Goldstein)
 - B. Investigative Report
 - C. Investigative Probation Report
 - D. Executive Session
- 7. 11:20 a.m. Break/Recess**
- 8. 11:30 a.m. Administrative Business**
 - A. MedSpa Services Esthetics Continuum
 - B. Fine Matrix Update - Review/Approve
 - C. AOM 360 Completion (Derr)

- 9. 12:30 p.m. Lunch**
- 10. 1:00 p.m. Division and Financial Update**
- A. FY26 1st Quarter Budget Report (M Dumas)
 - B. House Bill 243 (Chambers/McKinley)
 - C. 2026 Legislative Guidance (Chambers/Derr)
- 11. 2:00 p.m. Administrative Business Cont.**
- A. AOM 360 Cont.– Review/Approve Decisional Tracker
 - B. Review/Edit/Approve Mission Statement
 - C. Correspondence
 - D. Application Review
 - i. Yoseph Malcuit, Shear Fire Academy of Hair Design Training Consideration
 - E. Schedule Future Board Meetings
- 12. 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 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 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.

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 NOVEMBER 5, 2025

By the authority of AS. 08.01.070(2) and AS08.86.030 and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.64, Article 6, a scheduled board meeting was held via teleconference/Zoom, November 5, 2025.

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.

November 5, 2025:

Attendance

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

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

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

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

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

2. Review/Amend Agenda and Mission Statement

A. Review/Amend Agenda

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

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

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

Hearing no dissent Chair McKinley moved onto the next item

B. Mission Statement

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

3. Ethics Disclosure

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

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

4. Administrative Business

A. Review/Edit/Approve Meeting Minutes

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

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

Jenn Lombardo responded that the minutes looked great overall but had a couple of follow-up questions. She referenced the August 13 meeting minutes, specifically the note that Ms. Schmalling had offered to compile a list of services that fall under basic aesthetics based on current statutes and the new appliance regulation.

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

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

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

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

Motion: 1st Mae Canady – 2nd Jenn Lombardo

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

Approved by roll call vote.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Investigative staff joined the board and moved onto Item 5.

5. Investigations

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

A. Investigative Report/Memo

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

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

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

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

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

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

Board members had no additional questions.

B. Investigative Probation Report

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senior Inv. Summers responded:

- Ms. Grocott may not have renewed her license.
- Mr. Sanger was unable to renew online and was advised to submit a paper application.

- Mr. Curran is currently out of compliance but has submitted a request to modify his consent agreement, which will be presented by Investigator Hartlieb. If approved, he would be considered in compliance.

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

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

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

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

Board members had no additional questions.

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

D. Fine Matrix Discussion (Continued)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Program Coordinator Lacey Derr added to the discussion, emphasizing that the fine matrix is a guideline, not a strict rule. She encouraged the board to consider the harm caused by violations, particularly in cases involving unlicensed instruction of apprentices. She noted that if an instructor is unlicensed, the apprentice's hours may not count toward licensure, which directly harms the apprentice. She also raised concerns about student records, suggesting the board consider revising the strict time limits currently in place. For example, if a student record is more than 30 days late, it currently results in a letter of advisement, but if it's 3 months late, that may warrant a stronger response due to the impact on the student.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Hager expressed support for a graduated fine structure, similar to the Board of Nursing's model. She emphasized that while violations should have consequences, excessive fines could

discourage individuals from remaining in the profession. She also appreciated the idea of scaling fines based on license type or income level, as done by the Board of Nursing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senior Inv. Summers elaborated, explaining that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair McKinley thanked Lacey for her work.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Approved by majority.

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

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

Motion: 1st Mae Canady – 2nd Jenn Lombardo

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

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

Motion Approved by roll call vote

Motion: 1st Mae Canady – 2nd Desarae Hager

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

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

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.

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

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

7. Administrative Business, Cont.

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. Chambers highlighted the “Project Information” section of the matrix, where individual responsibilities and timelines are documented. She pointed out that the board had already voted to

have the Chair work with legislators on a statutory proposal to allow staff to issue licenses—this was marked as urgent and in progress. She then directed attention to Part 3 of the matrix, marked in yellow, which is intended to be updated at the November meeting and reviewed at every subsequent meeting. This section is designed to:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Identify and group all “no-brainer” regulation changes
- Incorporate them into the AO360 project
- Separate statutory from regulatory changes for clarity
- Take advantage of the Governor’s streamlined process to move these changes forward efficiently

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair McKinley explained:

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

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

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

expect a follow-up email or phone call as the board continues to build support for the bill.

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

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

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

Chair McKinley thanked the board and Sara for their work.

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

Chair McKinley responded with appreciation and reaffirmed his support.

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

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

i. Medical Spa Services Frequently Asked Questions

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

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

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

Ms. Thompson thanked Sara for the update.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether the workgroup is still meeting.

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

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

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

e. Makenzie Melsom, Microneedling – Response from S Chambers

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

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

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

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

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

9. Public Comment

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

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

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

Jacqueline Polis, Esthetician.

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

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

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

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

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

No additional public commenters were present.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PC Derr encouraged the board to move onto another item.

11. Administrative Business, Cont.

B. Alignment and Priority Check (J Pestrikoff)

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

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

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

D. Correspondence

i. Sarah Maxwell, Tattooing Courtesy License Process Concerns

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

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

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

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

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

Board members confirmed they had read the correspondence.

ii. Linda McLendon – Continuing Education

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10. Division and Financial Update

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

A. FY25 4th Quarter Budget Report

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

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

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

Dir. Robb reported licensing revenue trends in FY24 (renewal year), the board earned over \$1.1 million in license fees and in FY25 (non-renewal year), revenue dropped to just over \$300,000, consistent with historical trends. She noted that similar revenue patterns are visible in previous cycles (e.g., FY22–23, FY20–21).

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

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

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

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

Board members had no further questions.

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

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

Dir. Robb reviewed key requirements of AO360:

1. Stakeholder Engagement:

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

2. Regulatory Reduction Targets:

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

3. Counting Regulatory Requirements:

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

4. Guidance Documents:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Investigations, Cont.

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

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

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

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

Approved by majority.

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

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

Motion: 1st Jenn Lombardo– 2nd Desarae Hager

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

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

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.

The board thanked Inv. Hartlieb for her time.

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

11. Administrative Business

C. Schedule Future Board Meetings

The board agreed to the following meeting dates and times:

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

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

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

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

F. Application Review

i. Shear Fire Academy of Hair Design Student Training Review

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

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

Approved by majority.

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

Motion: 1st Jenn Lombardo – 2nd Mae Canady

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

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

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

THE MOTION PASSED BY A MAJORITY VOTE.

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

The board briefly reviewed meeting dates and tabled items.

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

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

15. Adjourn

The chair declared the board off the record at 4:54 p.m.

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 DECEMBER 9, 2025

By the authority of AS. 08.01.070(2) and AS 08.86.030 and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.64, Article 6, a scheduled board meeting was held via teleconference/Zoom, December 9, 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.

December 9, 2025:

Attendance

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

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

Public Present via Zoom: Jacqueline Polis

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

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

2. Review Agenda

Chair Mckinley asked if there were any amendments to the agenda; hearing none he requested roll call vote for approval

Agenda Approved by roll call vote

3. Ethics Disclosure

Chair Mckinley stated Shannon Thompson works out his Anchorage 5th Avenue shop as a "booth renter" under her own business.

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

4. Administrative Order AO 360 Planning.

Sara Chambers opened the discussion by commending the board for its proactive approach to strategic planning and regulatory reform. She emphasized the importance of the Governor's AO360 initiative, which aims to reduce unnecessary and burdensome regulations to improve Alaska's business environment. The initiative aligns with the department's long-standing support for Right Touch Regulation.

Key points from the presentation:

AO360 is a statewide effort to streamline regulations, benefiting licensees, service recipients, and government operations. Boards are required to submit a regulatory reform plan by February 13, 2026. The department will compile these and submit a final plan to the Governor's Office and Department of Law by March 1, 2026.

Board members were directed to review the Decisional Tracker in OnBoard. This tool helps identify discretionary regulations that can be modified to reduce burden. Staff will calculate proposed reductions using a provided formula.

The board is expected to achieve a 15% cumulative reduction by 2026, and an additional 10% by 2027, totaling 25%

Focus Areas:

- Only regulations—not statutes—are eligible for reduction.
- Boards should avoid proposing changes to statutory requirements, as these will not count toward AO360 goals.
- Examples were provided to illustrate how small regulatory details (e.g., document seals, notary requirements) can create unnecessary burdens.

Ms. Chambers challenged the board to:

- Reevaluate existing regulations with a fresh lens.
- Consider the actual public safety risks being addressed.
- Avoid legacy thinking (“this is how we’ve always done it”).
- Explore bold ideas within the board’s regulatory authority.

Ms. Chambers encouraged board members to think creatively and critically in upcoming meetings, with support from staff including Lacey Derr, Cynthia Spencer, and Damen Bennett.

Ms. Chambers continued the presentation with practical examples and strategic insights to guide the board’s regulatory review:

Ms. Chambers and Chair Mckinley discussed whether licensees should be required to proactively submit all records or simply maintain them and produce them upon request—like how medical records are handled. Ms. Chambers cited a successful past example where the Division of Environmental Conservation (DEC) replaced a certificate of inspection with an affidavit of compliance, reducing paperwork burden while maintaining accountability.

Ms. Chambers emphasized that if the board is not actively enforcing a requirement, it should reconsider whether that requirement belongs in regulation. Unenforced standards may not contribute meaningfully to public safety or the board’s mission.

The board was encouraged to critically evaluate time-based requirements (e.g., training hours) that may lack current justification or alignment with national standards. Ms. Chambers suggested exploring modern alternatives such as online training, especially for safety and sanitation topics.

Even if a requirement cannot be eliminated, streamlining the process (e.g., reducing repetitive documentation or relying on third-party certifications) may still count toward AO360 goals. These changes require narrative justification on the board’s cover sheet.

Chair Mckinley proposed an automatic fine or disciplinary action for missing documentation to reduce board member involvement. Ms. Chambers clarified that while this idea could improve staff efficiency, it falls outside AO360’s regulatory scope and would require separate discussion.

Board Member Jennifer Lombardo asked about the board’s current progress toward the reduction goal.

Ms. Chambers responded that percentages have not yet been calculated but will be included in the Decisional Tracker for the next meeting. Program Coordinator Lacey Derr and Ms. Chambers will collaborate to ensure the data is ready.

Lacey Derr (Program Coordinator 2) shared that the initial markup identified approximately 550 discretionary requirements, meaning the board would need to eliminate around 140 to meet the 25% reduction target. She highlighted that Section 09.002 alone contains over 100 duplicative requirements and could be a major contributor to the reduction effort.

PC Derr expressed confidence in the board’s ability to meet and potentially exceed the AO360 goals, especially given past challenges such as quorum issues and COVID-related disruptions.

Ms. Lombardo expressed appreciation for the clarity provided by Ms. Chambers and PC Derr regarding the board’s progress toward AO360 goals.

Ms. Canady shared her perspective on the volume of proposed changes, noting that the board already has a substantial amount to work with. She also requested the option of receiving physical

packets, citing personal preference and accessibility concerns with digital-only formats.

PC Derr apologized for the delay in distributing updated documents due to a medical emergency and committed to providing:

- The division-highlighted version of the regulations
- Her markup version
- An editable Excel spreadsheet for board member input

Ms. Canady reiterated her preference for printed materials and asked whether physical packets were still an option. PC Derr acknowledged the challenge but agreed to explore possibilities for providing printed copies, especially for the AO360 project.

Ms. Lombardo voiced support for returning to in-person meetings, particularly given the complexity of the AO360 initiative.

Ms. Chambers acknowledged the feedback and noted that while OnBoard has been the standard since 2018, printing is always an option for board members. She encouraged PC Derr to explore whether exceptions could be made for this project.

Ms. Chambers then transitioned the board into the working portion of the meeting: The board reviewed the Summary of Intended Changes column in the AO360 Decisional Tracker, focusing on 12 AAC 09.002, which contains duplicative license application requirements.

Chair McKinley asked for clarification on whether the entire section of 12 AAC 09.002 could be removed.

PC Derr confirmed that 12 AAC 09.002 is largely duplicative of requirements found in individual license sections. She explained that the section appears to have originated from a departmental checklist and could be condensed or eliminated without loss of regulatory clarity. Removing this section would eliminate nearly five pages of redundant regulation.

Ms. Chambers emphasized that this section represents “low-hanging fruit” and a strong starting point for the board’s AO360 reduction efforts. She encouraged members to review the proposed changes, consider additional ideas from the strategic plan, and prepare for deeper work in upcoming meetings.

Licensing Examiner Cynthia Spencer strongly supported the removal of 12 AAC 09.002, calling it a significant opportunity to reduce regulatory burden.

Ms. Lombardo raised concern about ensuring that any essential content from 09.002 is properly relocated to relevant license sections if the board chooses to eliminate it.

Ms. Chambers clarified that the current AO360 work is a planning phase, not a formal regulation change. Any proposed changes will go through the full regulatory process—including drafting, legal review, and public comment—likely in 2026 or 2027.

Ms. Chambers emphasized that the board is not locked into decisions at this stage and can revise its plan as needed. She encouraged members to focus on identifying burdensome or duplicative requirements, such as:

- Notary requirements
- State seals
- Certified copies
- Monthly recorded submissions

Ms. Chambers stated these items often create unnecessary costs and delays for applicants and may no longer be essential for public safety.

Ms. Chambers reminded the board that regulations should be designed for the average honest applicant, not tailored to catch rare bad actors. Enforcement mechanisms exist for fraud and misconduct, and regulation should not be overly restrictive.

Chair McKinley and Board Member Desarae Hager sought clarification on the location and duplication of 09.002 content. PC Derr confirmed that the requirements in 09.002 are repeated in Article 4: Licensing Requirements, beginning at 12 AAC 09.082. She explained that 09.002 originated as a departmental checklist and is now largely redundant.

Ms. Chambers and PC Derr agreed that the board could consider removing 09.002 entirely, retaining only essential language and relocating it if necessary. This would eliminate nearly five pages of duplicative regulation and contribute significantly to the board's AO360 reduction goals. Ms. Chambers reiterated that any formal regulation changes will occur in 2026 or 2027, following the standard process with side-by-side comparisons, legal review, and public comment. The current AO360 work is a planning phase, allowing flexibility and revisions.

Ms. Chambers confirmed that removing 12 AAC 09.002 would eliminate over 100 duplicative requirements, significantly contributing to the board's 25% reduction goal. Additional flagged items—such as CPR and Red Cross requirements—may also be removed, pending board review.

Ms. Canady supported the proposal, calling it a “perfect start” and noting she was reviewing her regulations booklet.

Chair McKinley raised questions about school-related requirements highlighted in orange in the markup.

PC Derr explained that these items—such as student records and quarterly reports—require deeper board discussion. While some changes may be straightforward, others need consensus due to their impact on schools and instructors.

LE Spencer provided context on how other states regulate schools. Most do not require student enrollment applications or quarterly reports. Instead, schools submit rosters and progress updates periodically. Final transcripts are submitted with license applications. LE Spencer confirmed that Alaska's approach is more detailed than most states and that streamlining would align the board with national practices. She also noted that quarterly reports are time-consuming for staff, with frequent errors in basic math. While ACPE requires quarterly updates, those could be submitted directly to ACPE rather than the board.

Ms. Hager, an instructor, asked whether the quarterly reports were a holdover from post-secondary requirements.

LE Spencer clarified that the board originally established the requirement independently. Desarae offered to share a PDF form that automates math calculations, but LE Spencer noted that the issue is not software, it's user error.

Chair McKinley concluded the discussion by expressing strong support for streamlining school-related regulations, including square footage and equipment list requirements. He agreed with staff that many of these items are duplicative and could be removed without compromising oversight.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether certain school-related requirements stem from DEC regulations. LE Spencer and PC Derr deferred to Ms. Desarae Hager, who confirmed that many board regulations overlap with DEC's environmental standards, which are more detailed.

Ms. Hager suggested simplifying board regulations by referencing DEC standards directly, rather than duplicating them.

Ms. Chambers supported this approach, emphasizing that licensees must comply with DEC and ACPE standards regardless of board regulations. She encouraged the board to consider removing duplicative language and rely on agency certifications instead. Ms. Chambers proposed that the board could adopt languages such as: “If a school is certified by ACPE as a school of hairdressing, barbering, or manicuring, then the board will issue a license.” This would streamline the process and eliminate the need for detailed equipment lists and environmental standards already covered by other agencies.

Chair McKinley agreed, comparing the approach to how body art licenses rely on DEC sanitary certification. He emphasized the importance of reducing redundancy and trusting other agencies to fulfill their regulatory roles.

Ms. Hager asked whether the board could simply require schools to adhere to environmental standards and cite the relevant codes.

Ms. Chambers clarified that while this is possible, the board must determine how it will verify compliance. She recommended referencing statutory standards and relying on ACPE certification as a qualifying condition.

LE Spencer added that while some requirements are locked into statute, others could be streamlined. She noted that most states do not regulate schools as extensively as Alaska does and that aligning with national practices would not be unusual.

Chair McKinley and Board Members Ms. Canady, Ms. Thompson, and Ms. Pestrikoff expressed strong support for the direction of the AO360 initiative.

Ms. Canady reflected on her experience applying for a limited manicuring school license, describing the process as overly burdensome and praising the board's current efforts.

Ms. Thompson shared that she initially felt overwhelmed by AO360 but now feels energized and optimistic thanks to PC Derr's clear breakdown of the work.

Ms. Pestrikoff emphasized the importance of reducing barriers to entry while maintaining consumer safety, a sentiment echoed by other board members.

Ms. Canady also recalled the board's decision to eliminate the practical exam during COVID, which was initially controversial but ultimately successful.

Ms. Chambers agreed, citing it as a bold and effective change that saved time and resources without compromising safety.

Chair McKinley closed the discussion by highlighting the value of public perspective and encouraging the board to continue thinking creatively and boldly.

Ms. Chambers recapped the board's earlier discussion on eliminating 12 AAC 09.002 and pivoting to school regulations. She outlined two major options for the AO360 reform plan:

- Eliminate 12 AAC 09.002 entirely due to duplication.
- Streamline school-related regulations, relying on oversight from ACPE and DEC.

Ms. Chambers emphasized that while some school requirements are mandated by statutes such as curriculum details, minimum hours, facility standards, and financial responsibility, the board can simplify how these are expressed in regulation. For example, instead of listing specific equipment like paraffin wax machines, the board could reference ACPE or DEC standards. She encouraged the board to document its intent to reduce and simplify, even if exact calculations aren't yet available. The Governor's Office prioritizes meaningful reform over precise percentages.

Ms. Hager asked whether reducing operation counts—such as lowering the requirement for wet hairstyling from 180 to 100—would count toward AO360 goals. Ms. Chambers confirmed that any quantifiable reduction, including operation counts, contributes to the board's target.

Chair McKinley shared a real-world example where a school's license application was delayed due to missing Sani strips, illustrating the burden of overly specific requirements.

Ms. Chambers challenged the board to reconsider whether it's necessary to mandate specific operations or equipment, noting that schools are already incentivized to prepare students for exams and market success. She suggested generalizing requirements, such as: "Students must complete 1,650 operations covering basic competencies." This would eliminate the need to track exact counts for each procedure.

Chair McKinley asked whether the board should pursue statutory changes to remove rigid requirements like the 1,650-hour minimum.

Ms. Chambers responded that while AO360 focuses on regulations, the board can use its strategic plan to tee up legislative efforts for Fall 2026. Options include:

- Adding to the current legislative request
- Proposing a second bill (streamlined or broader)
- Aligning legislative efforts with AO360 timelines

Ms. Chambers expressed enthusiasm for pursuing long-standing statutory reforms and suggested the board begin planning in July 2026 to take advantage of the two-year window.

LE Spencer added that most states use general curriculum language, such as: "Training must include the following practicals..." They do not specify operation counts. LE Spencer noted that Alaska's curriculum has not been updated in over a decade, despite frequent updates to national exams and textbooks. She strongly supported removing numerical requirements and trusting schools to meet competency standards.

Ms. Hager shared a personal example of how Alaska's strict practical operation requirements blocked reciprocity with other states. Though licensed as a cosmetologist in Texas, she was only eligible for a hairdressing license in Alaska due to differences in how practicals are tracked.

LE Spencer explained that Alaska previously had a cosmetology license, but it was split into separate licenses due to stakeholder complaints.

Chair McKinley noted that Alaska's approach has since become a national trend, with other states decoupling cosmetology into specialized licenses.

Ms. Chambers cautioned the board to stay focused on AO360-related regulation changes rather than broader statutory reforms like reinstating a cosmetology license. She emphasized that overly granular requirements—such as specific operation counts—can hinder reciprocity and licensing flexibility.

Ms. Chambers encouraged the board to consider collapsing detailed lists into generalized competency requirements, which would:

- Support AO360 reduction goals
- Maintain public safety
- Align with less prescriptive regulatory models (e.g., body art licensing)
- She proposed that PC Derr calculate the number of requirements that could be removed by:
- Eliminating 12 AAC 09.002
- Streamlining school licensing regulations
- Collapsing curriculum operation counts

Chair McKinley agreed, noting that detailed requirements affect not only licensees but also employers and board members who must interpret and enforce them. He proposed that the board vote on how to proceed with:

- Section 09.002
- School licensing requirements
- Curriculum operation requirements

Ms. Chambers confirmed that the board had already voted on the strategic plan, which will be incorporated into the AO360 documentation. She requested the board's disposition on the three remaining areas so that staff can update the documents ahead of the January 13 and January 20 meetings, with the final AO360 plan due by February 13, 2026.

Motion: 1st Jenn Lombardo 2nd Desarae Hager

To remove Section 12 AAC 09.002 for the purposes of AO360 regulatory reform.

Chair McKinley asked for discussion on the motion. Board members agreed that the section is duplicative, and its removal would significantly contribute to the reduction goal. Assurance was given that any

necessary content would be preserved in other sections during the formal regulation process.

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

Motion Approved by roll call vote

The board agreed to address the orange-highlighted sections next, starting with 12 AAC 09.125, which pertains to school licensing requirements.

Ms. Hager volunteered to assist with identifying and saving citations from the document to support the next motion.

LE Spencer and Ms. Chambers emphasized the importance of distinguishing between school licensing and curriculum requirements for clarity in future motions.

The board will proceed with:

- Reviewing and potentially streamlining school licensing regulations.
- Addressing curriculum operation counts, such as the 180 wet hairstyling requirements.
- Ensuring all changes align with statutory requirements and AO360 goals.

Motion: 1st Desarae Hager 2nd Shannon Thompson

To remove the highlighted portions of Section 12 AAC 09.125, which include redundant school licensing requirements already addressed by other agencies (e.g., DEC, ACPE).

Chair McKinley asked for discussion about the motion.

Ms. Hager noted that many requirements are duplicative and covered in external documents.

Ms. Thompson emphasized her long-standing support for removing regulatory redundancies.

Chair McKinley clarified a formatting question regarding overlapping highlights.

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

Motion Approved by roll call vote

Motion: 1st Desarae Hager 2nd Mae Canady

To remove the highlighted portions of Section 12 AAC 09.146, which outline specific equipment requirements for advanced manicuring schools.

Chair McKinley asked for discussion on the motion.

Ms. Hager stated that the equipment list is redundant and unnecessary.

Ms. Canady supported the motion, noting that the change would reduce burden and improve clarity.

Chair McKinley added that the removal would simplify the process for school owners and applicants.

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

Motion Approved by roll call vote

Motion: 1st Mae Canady– 2nd Shannon Thompson

Removal of Highlighted Portions in 12 AAC 09.155 (School Equipment Requirements)

Chair McKinley Asked for discussion on the motion.

Ms. Canady noted that the section includes outdated items like blackboards that no longer need to be specified.

Ms. Thompson emphasized the importance of removing obsolete requirements such as Sanix strips.

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

Motion Approved by roll call vote

Motion: 1st Desarae Hager 2nd Mae Canady

Removal of Highlighted Portions in 12 AAC 09.162 (Esthetics School Equipment Requirements)

Chair McKinley asked for discussion on the motion.

Ms. Hager stated that removing specific item listings would simplify the licensing process.

Ms. Canady agreed, noting that refining the section would improve clarity and reduce burden.

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

Motion Approved by roll call vote

The board confirmed that the next section for review is 12 AAC 09.164 but agreed to pause further discussion of curriculum sections until the next meeting.

Ms. Chambers and LE Spencer listed remaining curriculum sections for future review:

- 12 AAC 09.148
- 12 AAC 09.160
- 12 AAC 09.161

- 12 AAC 09.163
- 12 AAC 09.164
- 12 AAC 09.165
- 12 AAC 09.167
- 12 AAC 09.168
- 12 AAC 09.169

The board confirmed that 12 AAC 09.127 will be held for future discussion.

The board agreed to finalize review of the orange-highlighted sections and return to curriculum-related items at the January 13 and January 20, 2026, meetings. The board transitioned to reviewing curriculum sections not previously highlighted, beginning with 12 AAC 09.148 – Advanced Manicurist Endorsement Curriculum.

Chair McKinley initiated the discussion by asking LE Spencer about the course's usage and value.

LE Spencer reported:

- The 250-hour course is offered only by Ahead of Time Design Academy.
- Very few students have completed the course in recent years.
- The endorsement does not grant additional practice privileges beyond the 12-hour license.
- Historically, the endorsement helped with out-of-state licensing, but that benefit has diminished.

Ms. Hager and Ms. Canady expressed concern about the 12-hour license allowing full practice with minimal training.

Ms. Hager described it as a public safety issue, while Ms. Canady noted longstanding confusion and questioned the license's value.

Ms. Chambers refocused the board on AO360's scope—regulatory reform, not statutory change. She recommended pausing the discussion and revisiting the topic in a future meeting, possibly in spring, as part of the board's strategic planning.

Ms. Lombardo suggested the board consider whether it should give staff too much to prepare before the next meeting.

Chair McKinley agreed but encouraged brief discussion on 09.148 before pausing.

Ms. Hager proposed a proficiency-based approach to curriculum requirements, suggesting the board replace specific operation counts (e.g., "180 wet sets") with general language such as: "Students will practice and gain proficiency in the following practicals..." This approach received positive feedback and aligned with earlier discussions on streamlining curriculum and reducing regulatory burden.

The board agreed to pause further motions on curriculum sections and revisit them at the January 13 and January 20, 2026, meetings. Staff will begin updating the AO360 Decisional Tracker based on motions passed during this meeting. The board will continue reviewing curriculum sections and consider adopting proficiency-based language in place of specific operation counts. The board began reviewing 12 AAC 09.160 – Hairdresser and Barber Curriculum, which currently requires:

- 1,650 total hours
- 185 hours of theory
- Specific counts of practical operations (e.g., 180 wet sets, 180 thermal styles)

Ms. Hager proposed replacing specific operation counts with a proficiency-based model, suggesting language such as: "Students will practice and gain proficiency in the following practicals..." This would allow flexibility while maintaining training standards.

LE Spencer confirmed that most other states follow a similar model—listing required competencies without specifying operation counts. She cautioned that distinctions (e.g., beard shaving for barbers only) must still be clearly defined.

Ms. Hager and Ms. Canady discussed the need to separate hairdressing and barbering curricula, as their scopes differ.

Ms. Canady expressed concern about removing all numeric requirements, particularly for chemical services, which pose public safety risks. She supported minimizing rather than eliminating numbers for services like hair coloring and permanent waves.

Ms. Lombardo and Ms. Thompson shared insights into tattooing and permanent cosmetics, noting that: Alaska requires specific operation counts (e.g., 50 observe, 50 assists, 50 perform) Other states and international standards focus more on total operations and proficiency Simplifying requirements could benefit students and align with broader industry trends

Chair McKinley summarized the discussion, noting that: The board is considering a shift from numeric requirements to proficiency-based standards Any changes must preserve public safety and clarify license scopes The board may want to vote on this at a future meeting, possibly in two parts:

- Remove or reduce specific operation counts
- Separate hairdressing and barbering curricula

Ms. Chambers encouraged the board to provide staff with clear directions to begin updating the AO360 Decisional Tracker. She recommended continuing the discussion at the next meeting and scheduling a future agenda item to address broader curriculum and licensing reforms.

Motion: 1st Desarae Hager 2nd Mae Canady

To revise Section 12 AAC 09.160 by:

- Removing the specific number of required practical operations
- Retaining the types of operations
- Clarifying which operations apply to hairdressers vs. barbers

Chair McKinley asked for discussion on the motion.

Ms. Hager emphasized the importance of shifting to a proficiency-based model while maintaining clarity between license scopes.

Ms. Canady supported the motion, especially the clarification of operation types.

LE Spencer confirmed that no other states require specific operation counts and highlighted distinctions between barbering and hairdressing service.

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

Motion Approved by roll call vote

Chair McKinley shared that Representative Ashley Carrick has agreed to sponsor the board's legislative bill. He expressed appreciation for her support and noted that board members may be called upon to speak at committee hearings in the future.

Ms. Chambers confirmed receipt of the draft and will review it with Cynthia Spencer and Lacey Derr. She recommended forwarding the draft to the director if that hasn't already occurred.

5. Adjourn

The chair declared the board off the record at 12:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Damen Bennett, Licensing Examiner II

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 JANUARY 13, 2026

By the authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and AS 08.86.030 and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.64, Article 6, a scheduled board meeting was held via teleconference/Zoom, January 13, 2026.

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.

January 13, 2026:

Attendance

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

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

Public Present via Zoom: Teesha Northcott, Jacqueline Polis, Kim Hand, and 2 unknown telephone numbers.

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 no amendments, Chair McKinley approved the agenda.

Chair McKinley briefed the board and call-in attendees on the added public comment agenda item; he stated speakers would be limited to 1 minute and accepted topics would only be regulatory suggestions. He informed the board that during this board members would only need to listen to presentations and not open the floor for conversations with participants.

3. Ethics Disclosure

Chair McKinley stated that Shannon Thompson works out of his Anchorage 5th Avenue shop as a "booth renter" under her own business.

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

The board was ahead of scheduled; LE Spencer suggested that the Board allow Sara Chambers to provide an update on House Bill 243 (HB243).

Chair McKinley agreed and welcomed Sara Chambers.

Legislative Update – House Bill 243 (HB243)

Sara Chambers greeted the board and provided an update on HB243, the board's requested legislation. She informed the board HB243 has been filed and, if passed, will allow staff to take direction from the board and issue licenses. She stated that the bill is simple and straightforward; next step is scheduling for a committee hearing. The board will need to prepare legislative testimony and strategy to support passage before the end of the session (May 2026). Ms. Chambers informed the board that if the bill does not pass this spring, the process will restart next year.

Ms. Chambers stated Chair McKinley has been instrumental in obtaining sponsorship and drafting the bill. She recommended that the board should consider backup spokespersons for hearings if the Chair is unavailable and possibly having the involvement of school instructors to testify in support of the bill, as it impacts entry-to-practice and licensing timelines.

Ms. Chambers stated Legislative hearings may be scheduled with short notice; board should be prepared.

Resources for board members are available through the Board Member Handbook ("Guide to Excellence") available on the Board of Barbers and Hairdressers webpage, Alaska State Legislature website: akleg.gov for tracking HB243. She also stated staff (OLE Spencer and PC Derr) will provide updates as available.

Ms. Chambers encouraged the board to discuss legislative testimony strategy at upcoming regular meeting scheduled for February 3, 2026, and to identify potential backup spokespersons for hearings and consider outreach to school instructors for testimony support.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Chambers and asked if there were questions.

Jennifer Lombardo asked about the status of filling the barber seat.

Chair McKinley reported that efforts are underway, including reviewing a list of barbers and planning direct outreach (phone calls) to encourage applications.

Ms. Lombardo suggested sending an email to all licensees to increase awareness. She stated this had been requested during a previous meeting.

PC Lacey Derr confirmed that an email was sent via the listserv on October 20, and the vacancy notice is posted on the website.

Ms. Lombardo stated she signed up for the listserv and did not receive the email. PC Derr stated she will follow up on why Ms. Lombardo did not receive the email despite being subscribed.

Chair McKinley encouraged board members to spread the word and personally reach out to potential candidates.

Mae Canady noted she had referred someone who has not been contacted and asked about disqualification criteria.

Ms. Chambers clarified that appointments are made by the Governor's Office, which is currently very busy. Minimum qualification: an active barber license. Other factors, such as disciplinary history, may affect selection. Applicants should follow up directly with the Governor's Boards and Commissions team at boards@alaska.gov or by phone to confirm receipt of their application.

Ms. Chambers also reminded the board to consider confirmations for any new members at the February meeting.

4. Public Comment.

LE Spencer greeted online attendees Jacqueline Polis and Teesha Northcott. She stated comments would only be accepted for regulatory change suggestions and asked if they would like to speak.

Jacqueline Polis: No regulatory suggestions at this time; expressed interest in assisting when the board addresses statutes.

Teesha Northcott: No regulatory suggestions; indicated willingness to assist the board in her expertise area if needed.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Polis and Ms. Northcott. He confirmed there will be another 10-minute public comment window at the next meeting on January 20, 2026 (10:15–10:25 A.M.) for regulatory suggestions.

PC Derr noted she was prepared to pause the meeting over the next 5–7 minutes if public comment needed to resume; the board agreed to proceed to Agenda Item 5: Administrative Order (AO) 360 Planning.

5. Administrative Order (AO) 360 Planning

PC Derr greeted the board and asked if everyone had received and reviewed the email she sent Friday, January 10, 2026.

Chair McKinley confirmed he had received the email and stated it was very helpful.

PC Derr noted the session would involve a more detailed policy discussion related to curriculum requirements and statutory/regulatory alignment. Regulation Specialist Stefanie Davis was present online to assist where conversations may be complex or technical. She noted the board has expressed interest in removing specific practical hours within the curriculum while retaining the subject areas. PC Derr emphasized the importance of ensuring consistent communication across statutes and regulations, so the board does not inadvertently create inconsistencies or restrict future flexibility. She encouraged board members to pause, ask questions, and revisit sections as needed throughout the review.

PC Derr reviewed documents the board would be reviewing during AO 360 planning.

1. Updated Excel Tracker

- Revised to reflect the prior full removal of Section 9.002.
- Includes information gathered from strategic planning.
- PC Derr requested members flag any strategic planning items that may be missing.

2. Working Draft – Peach Highlight + Redline

- The version previously under board review, now with redlines and highlights added by PC Derr.

3. Division Highlighted Copy – Yellow/Green + Pink Marks

- A visual representation of the Division's review identifying discretionary requirements.

12 AAC 09.004 Courtesy License

PC Derr reopened the courtesy license section (12 AAC 09.004), noting prior removal of 9.002 in its entirety and that subsections (E) and (F) of 09.004 had been discussed during strategic planning. She highlighted portions in the working draft indicate discretionary requirements, including the sponsor requirement (sponsor must hold a permanent Alaska license). PC Derr asked the board to consider whether the sponsor is necessary for public safety or whether requirements could be amended/streamlined, by consolidating multiple proofs into a single verification standard.

Chair McKinley described the sponsor as a local check to ensure compliance with Alaska statutes and regulations, deter offsite/unregulated practice, and maintain aftercare and complaint continuity when guest artists depart.

Ms. Lombardo emphasized that aftercare for tattoos/piercings can span 2–3+ weeks, and a local point of contact (sponsor) supports consumer safety and complaint follow-up. She noted that based on her 2017 information, tattooing is licensed in most U.S. states, but requirements are not uniform; some states have minimal or no training standards, while others do not license at all yet have capable practitioners.

Board members discussed that accepting an out-of-state "license" at face value may not guarantee consistent training or safety standards.

Ms. Hager observed potential redundancies: proof of current work experience, working in a licensed Alaska shop, and having a sponsor may be overlapping "fail-safes."

PC Derr asked whether three separate proofs (e.g., sworn statements, client records, employment/student verification) could be reduced to one through a license verification, while maintaining safety.

LE Spencer cautioned that if the Board moves toward license verification in lieu of the current 3(a)–(c) proofs, the regulation must explicitly distinguish a license from a permit. She noted many incoming practitioners historically hold one-year permits with limited prerequisites (e.g., CPR) rather than a full license; permits should not qualify as "license verification."

Ms. Lombardo reiterated that Alaska practitioners must work in licensed shops, which are annually inspected by DEC, and asked what the practical alternative would be if the sponsor requirement were removed, given shop licensure and inspection already in place.

The Board acknowledged this section is complex and interdependent (sponsor role, shop licensure, verification standards, interstate variability). No decision was made; the Board agreed to defer further action and revisit 12 AAC 09.004 at a later meeting to allow more debate and potential streamlining proposals.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect that this was a broader conversation and would be revisited possibly during the January 20 planning meeting.

12 AAC 09.005 Examination Requirements

PC Derr introduced revisions to 12 AAC 09.005 and stated fee authority language will be retained. She stated that the Division no longer administers exams; administration is performed by PROV. The section should be updated to reflect the current process and remove Division-centric provisions (e.g., postponement procedures, document verification handled by PROV, notary requirement previously discussed for removal).

PC Derr stated section E was struck as duplicative with the reexamination provisions. Application abandonment policy highlighted by LE Spencer noted if an applicant receives an exam voucher but does not take the first exam within one year, the application becomes stale-dated and is considered abandoned; simple email contact is not sufficient to preserve the application. Reapplication would be required. She continued the objective is to streamline the section, preserve Board authority to require examinations, and align regulatory text with current practice under PROV.

Ms. Hager noted that at the last meeting the Board discussed repealing much of Article 1 (Examination Applications and Standards), with courtesy license retained elsewhere, and that exam content reappears in Article 3 (Examinations), creating redundancy.

Ms. Davis advised it can be beneficial to maintain a consolidated exam requirements section, separate from license-specific sections, because it contains additional information not present in those and avoids duplicating language across multiple license types.

Ms. Canady supported removing blacked-out/redlined provisions and leaving the rest, given the Division no longer administers exams.

Ms. Lombardo suggested, as a general design principle, organizing statutes/regulations by industry for user clarity, acknowledging this may be a larger structural project beyond the current edits.

Ms. Hager asked whether the Board could repeal and relocate a cleaned-up “written exam requirements for licensure” section into Article 3 to reduce cross-referencing.

Ms. Davis confirmed that approach is feasible (repeal/move), noting it would essentially be relocating the consolidated exam requirements into Article 3 with the Board’s edits; this avoids repeating the same requirements in each license section.

PC Derr emphasized the Division’s preference to avoid duplication and rely on cross-references rather than replicate identical requirements across multiple sections.

The Board agreed to remove the redlined items in 12 AAC 09.005 that reflect Division-administered exam processes no longer in use, and to retain language necessary to:

- Preserve Board authority to require examinations,
- Maintain fee authority, and
- Align with PROV administration and application abandonment timelines.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal of redlined items.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether the Board’s edits and removals discussed today are proposed suggestions to be forwarded to Ms. Chambers and the Division—not final decisions—and would still go through the formal regulation process, including legal review and public comment, with opportunity for further Board consideration and changes.

Chair McKinley confirmed: Yes—hypothetically and procedurally, these are proposals; final adoption depends on the regulation process and public input.

PC Derr outlined the standard process:

1. Division Regulation Specialist review,
2. Department of Law input,
3. Public Notice & Comment, and
4. Return to the Board for additional review and potential modifications.

Chair McKinley added the Board will see drafts multiple times to check for unintended consequences and ensure proposed changes reflect Board intent.

Ms. Chambers contextualized the effort; the Board is setting an intention (early in the year) to reduce regulatory requirements in alignment with the Governor's request. She stated the Board should aim for a middle-of-the-road balance be specific enough to signal targets for reduction (e.g., consolidating three requirements into one), while recognizing the process may span up to two years and will allow tweaks based on meaningful public feedback. Perfection now is not necessary; the Board should give its best shot to identify reductions and refine through the process.

The Board affirmed that all edits discussed to date are proposed and subject to the formal regulation process, with public comment and legal review, and may be changed before final adoption.

12 AAC 09.75(b) Reexamination

PC Derr asked the Board to consider whether the remedial training requirement of 50 hours after three failed exam attempts remains appropriate and necessary for public safety, or if it should be reduced or removed. She noted that current practice involves PROV issuing score reports identifying deficiencies, and the Division's role includes verifying student/apprentice/trainee permits and training reports before re-vouchering candidates for retest.

Ms. Canady stated she feels 50 hours appears excessive; a lower or no hourly mandate may be appropriate.

Ms. Lombardo stated requiring set hours before retesting feels unusual compared to other testing regimes; candidates should be able to retest when ready without mandated hours.

Chair McKinley asked for confirmation that PROV provides score reports showing weak areas; asked whether hours must target deficiencies.

PC Derr confirmed Prov provides candidates with detailed results letters reflecting areas of deficiency. She stated the Division does not track how remedial hours align to deficiencies; it only verifies 50 hours were completed via student reports before re-vouchering.

Ms. Canady stated many failures relate to test-taking skills rather than practical competency; forcing 50 hours may not address the root cause.

Ms. Hager stated candidates generally self-study to pass; a fixed hour requirement may be redundant and create delays/costs.

PC Derr informed the board that verifying the 50 hours adds multiple staff steps and may be a barrier to licensure without clear public safety benefit.

LE Spencer informed the board that pre PROV, theory exam pass/fail was roughly 50/50, with a sizable group needing multiple attempts. With computerized testing, failure rates dropped somewhat, but ~25–30% still cannot pass the theory exam; approximately a dozen candidates have attempted to pass over 5–6 years without success.

LE Spencer informed the board that staff approves candidates for 3 attempts upon complete application

and application fee. After 3 failures, candidates must re-enroll in a training program if their permit is still active. If the permit is inactive, they must apply for a new permit. Once re-enrollment or enrollment is completed, and if within one year of application, candidates receive three more attempts.

Chair McKinley stated that since unlicensed candidates cannot practice, the public is not exposed to risk due to exam failure; a remedial hour mandate may not be a public safety requirement.

PC Derr informed the board that subsection (d) provides a pathway to keep applications/documents active by taking at least one exam annually, preserving progress without stagnation.

The Board agreed to remove subsection (c) of 12 AAC 09.75, 50-hours remedial training requirement after three failed attempts) and retain the rest of the section. The Board agreed that the hour mandate is not necessary for public safety, imposes operational burdens on staff and candidates, and PROV score reports already guide candidates on areas to improve before retesting.

The Board acknowledged that failing the exam prevents licensure, thereby protecting the public without necessitating a minimum remedial hour mandate.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal of 12 AAC 09.075(c) and keep the rest of the regulatory verbiage.

12 AAC 09.082, 09.086, 09.090, 09.100, 09.106, 09.108 - License by Examination

PC Derr noted that the Board previously agreed to remove the phrase “or similar organization approved by the board” wherever it appears regarding blood-borne pathogen training—this cleanup applies throughout the regulations. For the License by Examination sections listed above, PC Derr proposed removing redlined text that simply restates that applicants must comply with examination requirements—this language is redundant, as compliance is already required via Division application processes and cross-references to consolidated exam regulations. She stated the objective is to streamline the sections by eliminating duplicative narrative without changing substantive requirements, ensuring edits elsewhere (e.g., examinations) do not create conflicts.

The board agreed that eliminating repeated “in accordance with the exam requirements” language is appropriate and will clean up the sections without altering substance.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether CPR can be removed across body art licensing, noting blood-borne pathogens is standard in the industry while CPR adds cost and is not directly relevant to the work performed.

PC Derr indicated CPR appears multiple times across the regulations; removing it would contribute to significant reductions.

Chair McKinley asked if CPR is a statutory mandate.

PC Derr and staff indicated CPR appears in regulation, not statute; AS 08.13.080(d) generally references training and passing exam, not CPR specifically.

Ms. Thompson, Ms. Pestrikoff; Ms. Canady supported retaining blood-borne pathogens and removing CPR, citing minimal relevance to body art procedures, added expense, and that fainting/lightheadedness—not cardiac events—are the more typical shop scenarios.

Ms. Hager asked whether tattooing increases cardiac event risk; Ms. Lombardo responded no based on long experience, emphasizing standard release forms and disclosure of underlying conditions.

Chair McKinley acknowledged broader public interest in CPR training, but agreed with the Board that CPR does not appear necessary as a regulatory requirement for body art licensure.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether CPR removal would also apply to courtesy licenses.

PC Derr confirmed edits can be made throughout, including courtesy license sections; Board directed

removal throughout.

Board members agreed removing CPR reduces costs and barriers for applicants while maintaining core health/safety via blood-borne pathogens training.

Board members agreed to proceed with removing redundant examination compliance language (redlined portions) across 12 AAC 09.082, 09.086, 09.090, 09.100, 09.106, 09.108, to retain blood-borne pathogen training requirements, with prior decision to remove “or similar organization approved by the board” wherever it appears, and remove CPR requirements throughout the regulations for tattooing, permanent cosmetic coloring, and body piercing, including in courtesy license provisions.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal of redlined sections and remove CPR requirements for body art licenses, including courtesy licenses throughout regulations.

PC Derr asked Board members if they would like a brief break or continue.

Chair McKinley proposed continuing until 11:30 A.M. and then recessing.

Board members agreed to continue and take a break at 11:30 A.M.

PC Derr noted she had not paused on curriculum hour totals earlier because the Board had previously indicated interest in removing specific practical hour requirements per subject while retaining the overall total hours. She asked whether the Board wished to revisit hour totals before moving on.

Ms. Hager raised potential hour reductions for hairdressing, noting Alaska requires 1,650 hours for hairdressing, whereas other states may structure licensure differently (some combine hairdressing and esthetics under cosmetology, with different hour totals). She suggested Alaska’s hairdressing hour requirement could be reduced given it is not a full cosmetology license.

Chair McKinley clarified the Board does not issue a cosmetology license.

LE Spencer advised that changing required training hours is a statutory project and would require the Board to initiate a legislative request if pursuing reductions.

Ms. Lombardo noted the Board has long discussed moving certain requirements from statute to regulation to allow more agile updates; this topic is on the Board’s radar (previously ranked as a priority item) but likely outside the immediate AO360 regulatory-reduction scope.

Ms. Hager stated her understanding that 1,650 hairdressing hours may not be listed in statute, while some other hour figures (e.g., instructor, manicuring, advanced manicuring, braiding apprenticeship) are in statute; she suggested hairdressing, tattooing, and barbering hour numbers may not be codified in statute.

PC Derr indicated that appears correct but recommended additional review and a fuller discussion at a later time.

Ms. Canady remarked that in many states 1,650 hours historically aligns with obtaining a cosmetology license, and Alaska split licensure into esthetics and hairdressing—suggesting the current hour structure could merit reevaluation in a future agenda item.

12 AAC 09.111(1) - Mobile Shops

PC Derr raised whether 12 AAC 09.111(1)—requiring “the physical location of where the unit will be parked when not in service”—is necessary for public safety and whether the Board needs this information in regulation.

LE Spencer stated that records reflect this requirement originated when DEC conducted mobile unit inspections and arose from DEC inspection logistics, needing a fixed meeting location for mobile units. She noted that currently DEC does not inspect shops that do not provide body arts, and the board created a Certification of Compliance with 18 AAC 23 to affirm safety/sanitation standards.

Chair McKinley added that historically each move of a mobile shop triggered a new inspection, reinforcing the need for DEC to know the unit's location. He said that requiring the parking location now appears invasive and unnecessary, given DEC's role has changed.

LE Spencer reminded members that mobile units are not available for body arts under existing regulation.

Ms. Lombardo asked if staff were issuing Mobile Shop licenses.

LE Spencer stated that since 2013, the Board has issued 5 mobile shop licenses; 2 are currently active.

Ms. Lombardo asked whether required information (owner details, addresses) could be handled via the application rather than regulation.

LE Spencer noted the mobile shop owner license application is separate from the standard shop application; currently it requests a physical address (not simply a mailing address), except for sole proprietors.

Board members suggested changing to mailing address rather than a physical parking location and aligning mobile shop requirements with the standard shop owner framework.

PC Derr highlighted a language discrepancy; many licensing sections use "an applicant shall submit on a completed application form provided by the department." 12 AAC 09.111 uses "the board may issue a shop owner's license to an applicant" with additional items like (1) and (3). She suggested aligning mobile shops with the standard application submission language would allow removal of (1) and potentially (3) without losing necessary data to be captured on the application form.

The Board briefly discussed these changes and agreed to remove (1) and (3) from 12 AAC 09.111 and add standardized language consistent with other license sections, "An applicant shall submit on a completed application form provided by the department."

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal of (1) and (30 and to add "An applicant shall submit on a completed application form provided by the department."

Recess The Board recessed at 11:33 a.m. for a short break; reconvened at 11:42 p.m. Majority of the board confirmed by roll call.

12 AAC 09.115 Verifications

PC Derr proposed repealing 12 AAC 09.115 in its entirety. She noted that this section mandates notarization and requires primary-source submissions (e.g., transcripts sent directly from schools, license verifications sent directly from issuing authorities). In practice, staff can obtain direct-source, real-time license verification online from most states, including disciplinary history, rendering the current notarization/direct-send requirement an unnecessary barrier to licensure. If repealed, verification expectations would default to the specific licensing sections (e.g., "verification of license from the state in which you are licensed") and department procedures, rather than prescriptive notarization language.

Chair McKinley asked whether the notarization/primary-source mandate enhances public safety.

PC Derr indicated staff can meet safety and authenticity needs via official state online license lookups, which are timely and authoritative, without the burden of notarization or direct-mail requirements.

Ms. Pestrikoff, Miss Thompson, Ms. Canady, and Ms. Hager each agreed the section is not necessary, noting it delays applications and holds up paperwork without adding substantive protection.

PC Derr noted direct-from-source requirements are messy in practice (e.g., schools mailing transcripts to students first; re-mailing to the Division), causing processing delays.

The Board agreed to repeal 12 AAC 09.115 Verifications.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal 12 AAC 09.115.

12 AAC 09.130 School Records - Related Sections: 12 AAC 09.185 (Apprentices), 09.190 (Trainees)

PC Derr requested Board guidance to modernize school record requirements by:

- Removing quarterly report mandates (e.g., “within 15 days” submission timelines) and the requirement that documents must come directly from the school owner/instructor.
- Transitioning to a single “Completion of Training” form or Termination of Training form, submitted at the end of training, signed by both the student and the instructor/trainer.
- Allowing the student to email/mail the final form to the Division (with required signatures), instead of requiring submission by the school/instructor only.
- Keeping schools/instructors responsible for daily timekeeping and retaining records (e.g., timecards, logs) and the rule that no more than 10 hours may be credited per day.

PC Derr noted this approach reduces paperwork burdens for students, instructors, and Division staff, aligns with the digital age, and improves access for students, eases issues experienced during the abrupt school closure scenario (e.g., notary requirements and direct-from-school submission caused avoidable delays), conforms better with common practices nationally; some states do not require apprenticeships or quarterly reporting, and Alaska’s current process is documentation-heavy.

Ms. Hager supported eliminating quarterly reporting but emphasized the final form must require both student and instructor/trainer signatures to prevent self-reporting without oversight.

Chair McKinley highlighted cases where trainers delay or refuse signatures; enabling student submission with required signatures removes a barrier and reduces chasing paperwork.

LE Spencer stated quarterly report processing consumes significant staff time; removing it would be highly beneficial. The Board does not enforce current reporting timelines (e.g., monthly/quarterly) in practice, and investigation outcomes frequently result in NDLA or no action despite identified violations, making the current system a poor use of resources.

PC Derr clarified the proposal does not exempt schools from keeping daily records or hour clocks. Schools are subject to ACPE (Postsecondary Education) requirements, including quarterly reporting to ACPE (for non-exempt schools), providing external checks and balances.

Chair McKinley and PC Derr agreed that the Division can request timecards/logs upon complaint or audit, and apprentices/trainees cannot begin training until permits are issued—these serve as control points.

Ms. Lombardo asked about end-of-training truthfulness checks; Division confirmed it can request timecards if issues arise and that the Board historically has not enforced training documentation deadlines.

Ms. Hager suggested adding explicit language that records must be available upon request, to resolve disputes between students and schools.

Ms. Canady raised concern about end-of-training accountability; Chair McKinley and PC Derr pointed to investigation triggers (student complaints) and the potential to strengthen the fine matrix at a future meeting.

PC Derr proposed moving “not later than 15 days” language and 20 days for termination from quarterly reports to the final Completion/Termination of Training form requirements, maintaining a deadline so students can obtain their records promptly and invoke investigations if records are withheld.

Chair McKinley asked whether this shift aligns nationally; PC Derr indicated it is cleaner and more consistent with modern, digital practices, with some states having lighter reporting requirements.

The Board briefly discussed and agreed to proceed with removing the quarterly report requirement under 12 AAC 09.130 and the direct-from-school/instructor submission mandate. They agreed to adopt a single end-of-training submission model using Completion of Training or Termination of Training forms signed by student(s) and instructor(s)/trainer(s) and may be submitted by the student (email/mail) to the Division.

The Board agreed that daily timekeeping requirements/records must be kept by schools/instructors and be available upon request to the Division, keeping the cap of no more than 10 credited hours per day, and a 15-day deadline to submit Completion of Training and 20-day deadline to submit Termination of Training forms.

The Board recognizes that ACPE provides external oversight (schools still report to ACPE quarterly unless exempt), and that Board enforcement of training documentation has historically been limited.

The Board also noted that alignment is needed for apprentice (12 AAC 09.185) and trainee (12 AAC 09.190) sections to mirror this approach.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect:

- **Delete quarterly report requirements and the direct-from-school/instructor submission mandate (and any notary requirements tied to quarterly reporting).**
- **Add end-of-training submission language for Completion of Training and Termination of Training forms “on a form provided by the department” with dual signatures, 15-day/20-day deadlines, and records available upon request language.**
- **Retain the rule that no more than 10 hours may be credited per day.**
- **Prepare conforming edits for 12 AAC 09.185 (Apprentices) and 09.190 (Trainees) to match the new model and remove redundant quarterly reporting language.**

Chair McKinley informed the Board that approximately 45 minutes remain to complete the review and requested that the Board expedite discussion—focus on decision-ready items, keep comments brief, and defer complex topics to future meetings as needed.

12 AAC 09.135 Transfer of Hours and Reenrollment

PC Derr noted the Board has already agreed to remove the notarized copy requirement (redlined). She asked whether the Board wishes to retain or remove the 2-year training expiration in subsection (b), which currently invalidates prior training hours if a student/apprentice/trainee re-enrolls two or more years after termination.

LE Spencer explained the 2-year rule was originally adopted as a refresher safeguard because individuals returning after extended gaps often demonstrated low proficiency requiring near restart of training. The rule also aligned with pre-digital recordkeeping and archive policies paper files retained in-house ~2 years, then archived; now all permits issued on/after June 2015 are digital.

PC Derr emphasized that students/trainees must still pass the examination before licensure, providing a competency check regardless of training age.

Chair McKinley questioned the rationale for two years, noting it feels short and could be frustrating for returning students.

Ms. Canady favored removal of the limit.

Ms. Hager expressed being on the fence.

Miss Shannon viewed the limit as unnecessary in regulation.

Ms. Lombardo and Ms. Pestrikoff did not feel strongly, with a slight leaning to leave if needed; however, both acknowledged the exam functions as the primary competency control.

LE Spencer noted it is not uncommon for individuals to seek transfer of hours after 2 years. including those who pause and later enroll in schools out of state, and the two-year expiration can block recognition of legitimately earned training.

The Board agreed to remove the two-year training expiration in 12 AAC 09.135(b) so that previously earned training hours do not expire and may be credited upon reenrollment, subject to existing requirements and the examination as the final competency check.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal 12 AAC 09.135(b).

12 AAC 09.140 Instructor–Student Ratio

PC Derr noted the instructor–student ratio provisions are discretionary requirements and reported no issues identified in the current language.

Board Members agreed the section is acceptable as written and identified no changes at this time.

12 AAC 09.143 Manicuring School Curriculum

PC Derr opened the curriculum discussion for manicuring, noting this section specifies topic-specific hours (e.g., “12 hours” per listed subject). She asked whether the Board should approve manicuring textbooks (subsection (b)) and if that requirement is necessary.

Ms. Canady recalled textbook references appearing in school opening checklists/inspections, but not a consistent Board approval process.

Chair McKinley asked whether ACPE handles textbook matters.

LE Spencer Division clarified ACPE regulates school operations, not subject matter content; the Board is the subject matter expert for curricula (cross-reference: 12 AAC 09.170 Theory Syllabus: “The board will, in its discretion, provide a theory syllabus.”). She reported schools commonly use Milady or Pivot Point texts for manicuring; the Division has not received formal requests for the Board to approve a specific book.

Chair McKinley expressed concern with codifying board-approved textbooks, preferring that schools/instructors select appropriate texts, especially as new editions emerge and the industry changes rapidly.

LE Spencer also noted textbooks are heavy and expensive; Board-level approval would be impractical and slow.

Ms. Hager suggested, if needed, referencing an “industry-standard textbook” rather than “board-approved” to avoid teaching without a text.

Board Members ultimately, favored removing the approval requirement entirely.

LE Spencer confirmed the Student Record for Manicuring form currently asks for “title of book used” and that field can be removed to align with the regulation change. She also informed the board that the phrase “Milady, Pivot Point, or similar organization approved by the board” appears in barber/hairdresser sections tied to online theory (25%); that is separate from manicuring and is being addressed elsewhere in the cleanup.

Board members agreed to remove subsection (b) of 12 AAC 09.143 (Board approval of manicuring textbooks), retain curriculum structure and topic-specific hours for manicuring at this time; textbook selection to be at the school/instructor’s discretion.

PC Derr stated that notes had been updated to reflect removal 12 AAC 09.143(b).

PS Derr thanked the Board and announced she will begin wrap-up at 12:50 P.M. to complete the end-of-meeting necessities.

Curriculums for All Regulated Training Programs - 12 AAC 09.143, 09.148, 09.160, 09.161, 09.163, 09.164, 09.165, 09.167, 09.168, 09.169

PC Derr outlined a proposed curriculum cleanup approach applicable across programs:

- Retain total program hours and retain subject lists for each license type.
- Remove minimum numbers for specific practical operations and fixed theory-hour breakdowns (e.g., “20 hours statutes/regulations,” “180 wet sets,” etc.).

- This mirrors earlier Board interest in streamlining equipment and other prescriptive requirements without altering overall training hours.

PC Derr stated for manicuring (12 AAC 09.143), changes are straightforward: keep subjects, remove the specific hour counts per subject. For tattooing (12 AAC 09.169), the suggestion is to replace detailed practical breakdowns (e.g., observed/participated/performed counts) with a single total (e.g., *150 tattoos total*), and remove fixed theory-hour allocations.

Ms. Lombardo asked for context.

Chair McKinley noted the topic was briefly introduced at the prior meeting and flagged for deeper review.

Board Members agreed this is a major item affecting all industries, warranting discussion now and continuation at the January 20 meeting.

Ms. Hager (hairdressing instructor) proposed removing specific practical counts (e.g., “180 wet sets”), calling them outdated and misaligned with modern training needs; Alaska already uses a block-hour model (e.g., 1,650 hours for hairdressing with 185 theory hours and 5 hours statutes/regulations) and could allow instructors to allocate practical experiences based on student needs.

Chair McKinley and Division staff confirmed the proposal does not change total program hours—only removes granular counts and topic hour minimums—to let instructors target deficiencies and accelerate strengths.

Chair McKinley (body art) suggested consolidating tattoo practical operations to “150 tattoos total” rather than segmented observed/participated/performed requirements; similarly remove specific theory-hour topics (e.g., 20 hours statutes/regulations, equipment).

Ms. Lombardo noted body art standards have worked well, but sees value in flexibility and simplification (e.g., a single total practical requirement), with the caveat that guidance can help newer instructors.

LE Spencer relayed that Alaska’s highly detailed curricula and transcripts are more prescriptive than in most states; many states do not mandate detailed counts, often indicating broad subjects (e.g., finger waves, haircuts) and allowing schools to choose appropriate texts.

Board Members discussed offering non-binding examples or a sample distribution, so newer instructors have a starting framework—without converting those examples into mandatory counts.

PC Derr reminded the board for combined sections (e.g., barber vs. hairdresser), ensure public safety topics remain covered (e.g., beard shaving for barbers; makeup for hairdressers) even if specific counts are removed.

Ms. Canady raised out-of-state reciprocity concerns; staff noted keeping total hours and subjects intact mitigates reciprocity issues while removing unusual Alaska-only counts.

Chair McKinley asked if any items remained before closing this section.

PC Derr commended the Board for a productive, in-depth discussion; she will update the Excel tracker to reflect today’s decisions and discussion points. She noted Regulation Specialist Stefanie Davis will attend next week’s meeting. She encouraged Board members to email questions to her before the January 20th meeting so they can be routed to Ms. Davis and addressed efficiently. She reminded Board Members, when considering removal of specific practical requirements, ensure no public safety gaps—particularly where barber (e.g., beard shaving) and hairdresser (e.g., makeup) requirements are intertwined in regulation. She will finish reviewing the remaining curriculum sections and flag any items missed for Board discussion.

PC Derr announced the Board has met and exceeded AOM360 regulatory-reduction targets; current work is a comprehensive regulation cleanup. This is a huge lift—you’ve done phenomenal work.”

Chair McKinley thanked members for robust participation and input, noted the importance of diverse perspectives, and thanked Regulation Specialist Davis for her support.

Ms. Davis thanked the Board and indicated she looks forward to continued collaboration.

Chair McKinley invited brief final comments with ~3 minutes remaining.

Ms. Hager asked Ms. Davis about whether barbering and hairdressing should be split given differing training requirements.

Chair McKinley noted this is a carry-over item for the next meeting; not for closing comments.

PC Derr confirmed she will coordinate with Stefanie Davis in the background on the barber vs. hairdresser split question.

Ms. Lombardo stated she had no additional comments; will save for next meeting.

Chair McKinley acknowledged Ms. Lombardo's instrumental contributions during the meeting.

Ms. Pestrikoff stated she had no comments and expressed thanks.

Ms. Thompson stated she had no comments but noted it was a productive meeting.

Ms. Canady stated she appreciated the discussion-focused approach; acknowledged the meeting's progress even without finalizing every item.

5. Adjourn

The chair declared the board off the record at 12:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Cynthia Spencer, Licensing Examiner III

Approved:

Kevin McKinley, Chairperson
Board of Barbers and Hairdressers

Date: _____



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: January 16, 2026
TO: BAH - Board of Barbers and Hairdressers
THROUGH: Jennifer Summers, Senior Investigator
FROM: Dannie Kerfeld, Investigator
SUBJECT: Probation Report for the February 3, 2026 meeting.

The following information was compiled as a Probation report to the Board for the period of October 4, 2025 thru January 16, 2026; This report includes probationers who are in compliance with their agreements; non compliant probationers and probationer requests to the Board.

There are currently **Ten (10)** 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
	2023-000467-Prb	03/05/2024	03/05/2026
Lui Talo	2022-000736-PRB	08/09/2024	08/09/2026
Jordan Curren	2022-000291-Prb	08/13/2025	08/24/2027
Janell Liles	2025-000780-Prb	11/05/2025	11/05/2027
Rosalyn WYCHE	2024-001114-Prb	11/05/2025	11/05/2026
Francisco VALLADOLID	2024-000619-Prb	10/03/2023	11/03/2026

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	10/03/2027	01/06/2026
CEDAR LLC	2022-000249-Prb	10/03/2023	10/03/2027	01/06/2026
Darren Sanger	2022-000808-Prb	08/13/2025	09/15/2027	01/06/2026

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:

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.**

Esthetics Procedures Continuum FINAL – February 2025

~~This document does not reflect any decisionmaking by an Alaska professional licensing work group or board; This document is a working draft and does not define current Alaska requirements;~~

This chart may be used in whole or in part to assist Alaska professional licensing boards understand the procedures in question, as well as assist in clarifying current and future scope of practice of:

- Currently licensed estheticians under the Board of Barbers and Hairdressers
- Future advanced esthetician licensees (requires statute change)
- Persons performing these procedures under medical supervision: In the context of this document, “medical supervision” means on-site supervision by a physician, physician assistant, or APRN operating within the supervisor’s scope of practice and all statutes and regulations pertaining to the supervisor’s license. May be currently allowable or require statute or regulation change to clarify necessary training and education.

Recommendation: At its February 2025 meeting, the Medical Spa Services Work Group voted unanimously to support the Board of Barbers and Hairdressers in seeking statutory changes to require continuing education for certain complex esthetics practices and a new license to allow people who have had training and education in advanced esthetics to practice without medical supervision. (See column with [blue](#) header, below.)

Numbering refers to additional information available in the [Esthetics Procedures List](https://www.commerce.alaska.gov/web/cbpl/ProfessionalLicensing/MedicalSpaServicesWorkGroup.aspx), available on the Medical Spa Services Work Group website: <https://www.commerce.alaska.gov/web/cbpl/ProfessionalLicensing/MedicalSpaServicesWorkGroup.aspx>

Can currently be performed under the existing 350-hour Alaska esthetician license	Recommend statute to require continuing education under existing 350-hour license	Recommend statute to require additional training and continuing education as part of a 900+ hour advanced esthetician license (no medical supervision)	Currently requires medical supervision of any delegated duties
ACTION REQUESTED: Clarify in regulation (currently proposed by Board of Barbers and Hairdressers)	ACTION REQUESTED: Board of Barbers and Hairdressers work on legislative proposal	ACTION REQUESTED: Medical Board, Board of Nursing, and Board of Barbers and Hairdressers collaborate on legislative proposal	ACTION REQUESTED: Medical Board and Board of Nursing clarify in regulation and in white paper
EFFECT OF ACTION: Licensed estheticians will understand what procedures they may perform under their current license	EFFECT OF ACTION: Public safety will be increased; estheticians may continue to perform these services while being held accountable for training	EFFECT OF ACTION: Highly trained estheticians can perform limited advanced esthetics services without medical supervision	EFFECT OF ACTION: Persons supervising, delegating, and performing these services will have clarity on expectations; public safety and awareness will be increased
<p>1. Ultrasonic devices Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>2. Oxygen Concentrator devices Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>3. Electrotherapy devices (galvanic current, High Frequency) Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>4. Mechanical brush devices Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>5. Vacuum spray devices Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>6. Steamers Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>7. LED (light emitting diode) devices. Epidermis Impact: Superficial/Light</p> <p>8. Microcurrent devices Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>9. Microdermabrasion devices, including hydradermabrasion devices. Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>10. Skin analysis equipment Epidermis Impact: None</p> <p>11. Thalassotherapy (application of sea water) Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>12. Thermotherapy (application of heat), manually applied or with the use of devices.</p>	<p>3. Electrotherapy devices (galvanic current, high frequency) Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>9. Microdermabrasion devices, including hydradermabrasion devices. Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>13 & 14. Superficial and light chemical exfoliation; alpha hydroxy acids, beta hydroxy acids, modified Jessner solutions, trichloroacetic acid less than 20% and vitamin based acids. Epidermis Impact: Superficial at lower concentrations</p> <p>15. Low-level ultrasound devices (Sonophoresis) Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>17. Class 2 radiofrequency devices Epidermis Impact: Medium</p> <p>22. Dermaplaning devices* Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>24. Collagen induction device (microneedling) including microchanneling or nanostamp below 1mm, not OTC devices* Epidermis Impact: Superficial</p> <p>(NEW) Semi-permanent hair removal by nonablative IPL</p> <p>*Requires correction of definition in AS 08.13.220</p>	<p>13 & 14. Medium chemical exfoliation including higher-level concentrations, Jessner solutions and TCA Epidermis Impact: Medium</p> <p>16. HIFU (High Intensity Focused Ultrasound) Epidermis Impact: Superficial: Medium Dermis Impact: Deep</p>	<p>13 & 14. Deep chemical exfoliation Epidermis Impact: Deep</p> <p>18. Class 3 laser and radiofrequency devices other than hair removal Epidermis Impact: Medium Dermis Impact: Deep</p> <p>19. Lipolysis Dermis Impact: Deep</p> <p>24. Collagen induction device (microneedling) above 1.0mm Dermis Impact: 1.5mm-2.5mm</p> <p>(NEW) Cosmetic injectables: Prescription drugs intended to treat wrinkles, lines, and other cosmetic complaints, such as botulinum toxin (Botox) and other neuro-modulators, hyaluronic acid gel (Juvederm), calcium hydroxylapatite (Radiesse), polylactic acid (Sculptra)</p> <p>(NEW) Semi-permanent hair removal by ablative laser</p>

<div>Epidermis Impact: Superficial</div> <div>13 & 14. Superficial and light chemical exfoliation; alpha hydroxy acids, beta hydroxy acids, modified Jessner solutions, trichloroacetic acid less than 20% and vitamin based acids. Epidermis Impact: Superficial at lower concentrations</div> <div>15. Low-level ultrasound devices (Sonophoresis) Epidermis Impact: Superficial</div> <div>17. Class 2 radiofrequency devices Epidermis Impact: Medium</div> <div>19. Cryotherapy (application of cold, not lipolysis), manually applied or with the use of devices. Epidermis Impact: Superficial</div> <div>20. Hydrotherapy Epidermis Impact: Superficial</div> <div>21. Cellulite appearance and contouring treatments (creams, wraps, etc.) Epidermis Impact: Superficial</div> <div>22. Dermaplaning devices* Epidermis Impact: Superficial</div> <div>23. Mechanical stimulation (facial massage) Epidermis Impact: Superficial/Medium</div> <div>(NEW) Semi-permanent hair removal by nonablative IPL</div> <div>*Requires correction of definition in AS 08.13.220</div>			
--	--	--	--

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/Body 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 20	FY 21	Biennium	FY 22	FY 23	Biennium	FY 24	FY 25	Biennium	FY 26 1st QTR
Revenue										
Revenue from License Fees	\$ 1,034,860	\$ 389,183	\$ 1,424,043	\$ 1,035,686	\$ 349,898	\$ 1,385,584	\$ 1,146,245	\$ 303,803	\$ 1,450,048	\$ 748,445
General Fund Received		\$ -	-	\$ 21,523	\$ 5,933	27,456	\$ 958	\$ -	958	\$ -
Allowable Third Party Reimbursements	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -
TOTAL REVENUE	\$ 1,034,860	\$ 389,183	\$ 1,424,043	\$ 1,057,209	\$ 355,831	\$ 1,413,040	\$ 1,147,203	\$ 303,803	\$ 1,451,006	\$ 748,445
Expenditures										
Non Investigation Expenditures										
1000 - Personal Services	187,928	154,229	342,157	177,685	201,311	378,996	269,282	298,951	568,233	99,947
2000 - Travel	2,521	-	2,521	2,862	-	2,862	1,738	1,024	2,762	-
3000 - Services	44,123	39,463	83,586	29,742	27,235	56,977	30,763	31,326	62,089	7
4000 - Commodities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5000 - Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Non-Investigation Expenditures	234,572	193,692	428,264	210,289	228,546	438,835	301,783	331,301	633,084	99,954
Investigation Expenditures										
1000-Personal Services	163,905	87,573	251,478	97,978	157,238	255,216	58,249	109,645	167,894	43,412
2000 - Travel	723	-	723	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3023 - Expert Witness	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3088 - Inter-Agency Legal	558	288	846	8,185	767	8,952	4,587	1,722	6,309	-
3094 - Inter-Agency Hearing/Mediation	-	-	-	3,624	-	3,624	-	4,941	4,941	-
3000 - Services other	757	81	838	241	643	884	88	216	304	-
4000 - Commodities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Investigation Expenditures	165,943	87,942	253,885	110,028	158,648	268,676	62,924	116,525	179,448	43,412
Total Direct Expenditures	400,515	281,634	682,149	320,317	387,194	707,511	364,707	447,826	812,532	143,366
Indirect Expenditures										
Internal Administrative Costs	217,172	164,610	381,782	196,546	192,783	389,329	195,961	190,879	386,840	47,720
Departmental Costs	76,526	60,003	136,529	71,313	70,880	142,193	71,755	90,618	162,373	22,655
Statewide Costs	46,351	33,188	79,539	34,649	38,993	73,642	31,700	34,864	66,564	8,716
Total Indirect Expenditures	340,049	257,801	597,850	302,508	302,656	605,164	299,416	316,361	615,777	79,091
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$ 740,564	\$ 539,435	\$ 1,279,999	\$ 622,825	\$ 689,850	\$ 1,312,675	\$ 664,123	\$ 764,187	\$ 1,428,309	\$ 222,457
Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)										
Beginning Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 442,059	\$ 736,355		\$ 586,103	\$ 1,020,487		\$ 686,467	\$ 1,169,547		\$ 709,163
Annual Increase/(Decrease)	294,296	(150,252)		434,384	(334,020)		483,080	(460,384)		525,988
Ending Cumulative Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 736,355	\$ 586,103		\$ 1,020,487	\$ 686,467		\$ 1,169,547	\$ 709,163		\$ 1,235,151
Statistical Information										
Number of Licenses for Indirect calculation	7,460	6,956		7,507	7,086		7,549	6,812		
Additional information: • General fund dollars were received in FY21-FY24 to offset increases in personal services and help prevent programs from going into deficit • Most recent fee change: New fee added FY23 • 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										

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	3000 - Services	Grand Total
1011 - Regular Compensation	81,272.69		81,272.69
1014 - Overtime	51.79		51.79
1021 - Allowances to Employees	29.71		29.71
1023 - Leave Taken	9,358.97		9,358.97
1028 - Alaska Supplemental Benefit	5,567.55		5,567.55
1029 - Public Employee's Retirement System Defined Benefits	11,176.68		11,176.68
1030 - Public Employee's Retirement System Defined Contribution	2,237.89		2,237.89
1034 - Public Employee's Retirement System Defined Cont Health Reim	1,536.12		1,536.12
1035 - Public Employee's Retirement Sys Defined Cont Retiree Medical	367.37		367.37
1037 - Public Employee's Retirement Sys Defined Benefit Unfnd Liab	7,957.50		7,957.50
1039 - Unemployment Insurance	448.77		448.77
1040 - Group Health Insurance	18,668.04		18,668.04
1041 - Basic Life and Travel	24.54		24.54
1042 - Worker's Compensation Insurance	517.65		517.65
1047 - Leave Cash In Employer Charge	1,902.92		1,902.92
1048 - Terminal Leave Employer Charge	823.75		823.75
1053 - Medicare Tax	1,279.97		1,279.97
1062 - GGU Business Leave Bank Contributions	15.85		15.85
1077 - ASEA Legal Trust	78.22		78.22
1079 - ASEA Injury Leave Usage	26.80		26.80
1080 - SU Legal Trst	16.08		16.08
3035 - Long Distance		6.10	6.10
3036 - Local/Equipment Charges		1.09	1.09
3979 - Inter-Agency Management/Consulting		-	-
Grand Total	143,358.86	7.19	143,366.05

34-LS1197\A
Nauman/Gunther
11/13/25

HOUSE BILL NO.

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

THIRTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

BY REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK BY REQUEST

Introduced:

Referred:

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 "An Act relating to the powers and duties of the Board of Barbers and Hairdressers and
2 the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development; and providing
3 for an effective date."

4 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

5 * Section 1. AS 08.13.030(b) is amended to read:

6 (b) The board shall

7 (1) examine applicants and authorize [APPROVE] the Department of
8 Commerce, Community, and Economic Development to issue [ISSUANCE OF]
9 licenses and permits to practice;

10 (2) authorize the Department of Commerce, Community, and
11 Economic Development to issue [ISSUANCE OF] licenses for schools of barbering,
12 hairdressing, manicuring, and esthetics;

13 (3) develop written instructions and notices that tattooing, permanent
14 cosmetic coloring, and body piercing shop owners and practitioners are required to

1 give or display under AS 08.13.215;

2 (4) enforce the provisions of this chapter, regulations adopted under
3 this chapter, and regulations relating to barbering, hairdressing, hair braiding,
4 manicuring, and esthetics adopted under AS 44.46.020(a)(5)(C).

5 * **Sec. 2.** AS 08.13.030(c) is amended to read:

6 (c) The board may

7 (1) refuse to issue, suspend, or revoke a license or permit;

8 (2) on its own motion or upon receipt of a written complaint, conduct
9 hearings and request the

10 (A) Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic
11 Development to investigate the practices of a person, shop, or school involved
12 in the practice or teaching of barbering, hairdressing, hair braiding,
13 manicuring, or esthetics; or

14 (B) Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic
15 Development or the Department of Environmental Conservation to investigate
16 the practices of a person, shop, or school involved in the practice or teaching of
17 body piercing, tattooing, or permanent cosmetic coloring;

18 (3) adopt regulations or do any act necessary to carry out the
19 provisions of this chapter.

20 * **Sec. 3.** AS 08.13.110(d) is amended to read:

21 (d) The board shall authorize the issuance of [ISSUE] a license to a school of
22 manicuring if the school offers a curriculum of 12 hours of instruction or training
23 approved by the board that addresses health, safety, and hygiene concerns of
24 manicuring customers and practitioners that are relevant to the practice of manicuring.
25 A school of manicuring may offer instruction in addition to the 12 hours required for a
26 license, but the board may not authorize the issuance of [ISSUE] a license to a
27 school of manicuring if the school requires its students to complete more than 12
28 hours of the required instruction or training in health, safety, and hygiene concerns
29 before the school will certify that the student has completed the school's manicuring
30 course for purposes of AS 08.13.080(e).

31 * **Sec. 4.** This Act takes effect immediately under AS 01.10.070(c).



THE STATE
of **ALASKA**
GOVERNOR MIKE DUNLEAVY

Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development

DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS
AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING
Juneau Office

P.O. Box 110806
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0806
Main: 907.465.2550
Fax: 907.465.2974

2026 Legislative Guidance for CBPL Board & Commission Members

The primary guidance for board and commission members during legislative session is in the CBPL Guide to Excellence in Regulation – Section IX: Legislation and Legislative Audit (pages 63-70), available on the CBPL Board Resources webpage: www.commerce.alaska.gov/web/cbpl/ProfessionalLicensing/BoardMemberResources.

Section IX of the guide includes information on the following:

- Initiating legislation
- The Open Meetings Act (it always applies)
- Legislative session
- The need to be informed about legislation (and how to do that)
- Guidelines for board member testimony
- Legislative testimony call-in dos and don'ts
- Legislative audit

It's important to remember that division staff cannot represent a board or its positions in meetings with legislators or at legislative hearings, except by pointing to a letter of support or opposition if the board has submitted one for a specific bill. Otherwise, the division only speaks to the Administration's position on legislative matters. This means it's essential for board and commission members to carefully review Section IX of the CBPL Guide to Excellence in Regulation to be aware of how the process works and what their responsibilities include.

If a bill is introduced that actively impacts a board's statutes, the division will notify the board/board chair. However, the division will not always recognize any bills outside of the board's statutes that the board may be interested in, so board members are encouraged to watch bills being introduced themselves. If a board wants to track the progress of a bill, one or more of its members should utilize the Bill Tracking Management Facility (BTMF) on AKLeg.gov, which sends emails anytime a bill on the tracking list is scheduled for a meeting or has a status change. Alternatively (or additionally), a board member can sign up to receive text notifications when a bill is scheduled or its status changes by texting the bill number (*Example: HB1*) to 559-245-2529. Though we will do our best to notify the board if a bill we know they are interested in is scheduled for a hearing, things sometimes move fast in the legislative process, so it's important that the board is tracking those bills' progress, as well.

If a board or commission member has questions on how the legislative process works, please refer to the helpful information linked below. Boards and commissions are encouraged to schedule a walkthrough or training with the DCCED Boards and Regulations Advisor on the process as soon as they begin contemplating seeking legislation; and are always welcome to ask the Advisor or division management to attend a meeting where they are discussing potential statute change to seek sponsorship of. Division management and the department's Boards and Regulations Advisor are also happy to answer any specific questions from board and commission members, but please be aware that we tend to be very busy during legislative session so, at times, it may take a couple of days to receive a response or call back.

HELPFUL INFORMATION

Additional resources on [BASIS](#) that will be helpful in understanding how to navigate BASIS, understand what you're seeing, and become more familiar with the legislative process:

- Track bills in BTMF: https://www.akleg.gov/basis/btmf_login.asp?session=34
- Tips for Using Basis: <https://akleg.gov/docs/pdf/basis.pdf>
- Frequently Asked Questions: <https://akleg.gov/faq.php>
- Legislative Abbreviations & Acronyms: <https://akleg.gov/docs/pdf/abbracro.pdf>
- Glossary of Legislative Terms: <https://akleg.gov/docs/pdf/glossary.pdf>
- Current Senators: <https://akleg.gov/senate.php>
- Current Representatives: <https://akleg.gov/house.php>
- Current Committees: <https://www.akleg.gov/basis/Committee/List/34>
- Steps in Passage of a Bill: <https://akleg.gov/docs/pdf/passbill.pdf>
- Legislative Process: <https://akleg.gov/docs/pdf/legprocess.pdf>
- How to Read a Bill History: <https://akleg.gov/docs/pdf/readbill.pdf>
- Layman's Guide to the Budget Process: <https://akleg.gov/docs/pdf/budgproc.pdf>

How to Watch or Listen in on a Bill Hearing:

- If the bill is currently being heard in a committee:
 - Identify what committee it's being heard in.
 - Go to akleg.gov, select the "Live Now" tab, and select the appropriate committee; **OR**
 - Go to Gavel Alaska (ktoo.org/gavel) and select the appropriate committee.
- If the bill was already heard and the hearing has since concluded:
 - Go to akleg.gov and search for the bill. Once on the bill's page, go to the "Meetings" tab and click on the link for the hearing you want; **OR**
 - Go to Gavel Alaska and look for the hearing in the "Archives".

DEPARTMENT CONTACTS:

- DCCED Boards and Regulations Advisor – Sara Chambers: sara.chambers@alaska.gov, W: (907) 465-2144
- CBPL Director – Sylvan Robb: sylvan.robbs@alaska.gov, W: (907) 465-2524, C: (907) 419-7678
- CBPL Deputy Director – Glenn Saviers: glenn.saviers@alaska.gov, W: (907) 465-2691, C: (907) 321-1423

Division management is often in meetings or hearings throughout the day during legislative session, so email may sometimes be the quickest way to get a response. If you opt to call, make sure to leave a voicemail and consider following up with an email. Please do understand that while management will get back to you as quickly as possible, they may not always be able to get back to you the same day.

Additionally, even when you opt to reach out to one of the contacts above, please be sure to also loop in your board staff before or at the latest, immediately after, the conversation so they can remain in the loop.

Board of Barbers and Hairdressers Mission Statement

“The Board of Barbers and Hairdressers cultivates an environment where practitioners receive transparent and responsive guidance, and consumers obtain services with the confidence and security that their health and safety are protected.”

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		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	