



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 OCTOBER 14, 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, October 14, 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.

October 14, 2025:

Attendance

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

Member Excused Absence: Kevin McKinley

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

Public Present via Zoom: Rachel Lauesen

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

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

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

2. Review Agenda

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

Motion: 1st Mae Canady– 2nd Shannon Thompson

Approve October 14, 2025, meeting agenda as written.

Motion Approved by majority

3. Ethics Disclosure

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

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

4. Strategic Planning and Prioritization Processes.

Sara Chambers welcomed the board and thanked Acting Chair Lombardo. She acknowledged the volume of documents shared in advance and encouraged members not to feel overwhelmed. She noted that no additional homework had been assigned this time and emphasized that the session would focus on walking through the materials together.

Sara introduced a "matrix-style" system she developed to organize the board's strategic goals and steps. She explained that the goal of the session was to:

- Review the draft strategic plan layout
- Gather feedback and input
- Repackage the plan based on discussion
- Identify strategies, focus areas, and a general timeline.

She expressed optimism that by the end of the session, the board would have a working strategic plan with actionable steps.

LE Cynthia Spencer confirmed the meeting would end at 1:00 PM. Ms. Chambers encouraged members to take a break midway through the session as needed. Jennifer Lombardo supported the idea of incorporating short breaks.

Ms. Chambers shared a visual layout of the high-level strategic plan. She noted that several board members had submitted suggested mission and vision statements prior to the last meeting. Using those submissions and examples previously provided, she drafted a proposed mission and vision statement for the board to review and potentially adopt or revise during the session.

Mission Statement Discussion

Ms. Chambers introduced the draft mission statement, explaining the distinction between a mission and a vision:

- Mission Statement: What the board is here to do—its purpose and statutory authority.
- Vision Statement: What success looks like—what the regulated industries look like when the board is doing its job well.

Ms. Chambers presented the proposed mission statement: *"To ensure the health and safety of Alaska consumers by promoting the highest level of professional standards and by enforcing the laws of the barbering, hairdresser, tattooing, and esthetics industry."*

Ms. Chambers noted that the language could be refined and invited feedback.

Shannon Thompson supported the wording, with minor tweaks.

Chair Lombardo: Agreed and suggested including additional industries such as body art, body piercing, permanent cosmetics, and nail technology. She recommended using the term "industries" to reflect the diversity of professions regulated by the board.

Ms. Canady, Jessica Pestrikoff, and Danielle Desarae Hager: All expressed support for the draft with the suggested additions.

Ms. Chambers agreed with the revisions and confirmed that "body art" could encompass tattooing, body piercing, and permanent cosmetics.

Chair Lombardo proposed that the board read the mission and vision statements aloud at the beginning of each meeting to help members focus and transition into their regulatory roles. This idea was well received by all board members.

Ms. Chambers also supported including the statements in each meeting packet.

Vision Statement Discussion

Ms. Chambers introduced the draft vision statement and explained its purpose: to describe what success looks like when the board fulfills its mission. She presented the proposed draft: *"The Board of Barbers and Hairdressers cultivates an environment where consumers obtain barbering, hairdressing, body art, manicuring, and esthetic services with the confidence and security that their health and safety are protected."*

Ms. Canady supported the statement, emphasizing that including "health and safety" effectively captures the board's purpose.

Ms. Hager suggested the vision should also reflect the board's role in guiding professionals, not just protecting consumers.

Chair Lombardo agreed, noting the importance of including licensees and practitioners in the vision.

Ms. Chambers acknowledged the feedback and proposed incorporating language about providing transparent and attainable pathways to licensure, reflecting the board's broader responsibilities.

Refinements Discussed:

- Adding "practitioners" to the mission statement to clarify the board's role in setting professional standards.
- Considering terms like "industry services" or "professional services" to streamline the vision statement.
- Including language about innovation and forward-thinking to reflect the board's adaptability to industry changes.

Ms. Hager proposed revised language for the vision: *"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."*

This version was well received by the board.

Chair Lombardo suggested the board take time to review the revised statements and consider formally adopting them at the November 5, 2025, board meeting. She also reiterated her earlier idea to read the mission and vision statements aloud at the start of each meeting, which had broad support.

Ms. Chambers confirmed that the updated statements would be included in the November meeting packet. The board could choose to formally adopt the statements at that time; and the strategic plan documents would be cleaned up and shared with staff for inclusion in the board materials.

Ms. Chambers thanked the board for their thoughtful feedback on the mission and vision statements. She then stated the next phase of the session would be reviewing the first draft of the strategic plan. Ms. Chambers emphasized that the documents were interconnected and represented a working draft. She noted that while the content was largely in place, the formatting and structure would benefit from tightening and cleanup, which she committed to completing before the November board meeting. She reiterated that the goal of this phase was to walk through the draft plan together, identify areas needing clarification or refinement, ensure alignment between goals, strategies, and timelines, and prepare a cleaner, more finalized version for board review at the November meeting.

Ms. Chambers confirmed that the updated documents would be packaged and shared with staff for inclusion in the November 5, 2025, board packet.

Review of Priority List and Strategic Goal Categories

Ms. Chambers transitioned the discussion to the priority list, which compiled items discussed at recent meetings. She explained that each item had been categorized under one of the board's emerging strategic goals:

- Board Development Opportunities
- Education and Outreach Opportunities
- Enforcement Opportunities
- Legislation (items the board may wish to pursue in future sessions)
- Regulation Changes (including cleanup and modernization efforts)

Ms. Chambers noted that while the categories were broad for now, future refinements could further classify items (e.g., licensing changes, continuing education, etc.). She emphasized that this structure would help the board better understand how to proceed with its priorities, especially given the volume of legislative and regulatory work already underway. She also highlighted a group of yellow-highlighted items that required further clarification. These had been discussed with Kevin, who was unable to attend the meeting but sent his regards. These items could be revisited in a future strategic planning discussion.

Ms. Chambers asked Ms. Canady whether she had any updates or clarifications from the 2023 strategic planning meeting minutes, as referenced in a previous session.

Ms. Canady confirmed that she had reviewed the minutes and found that most of the content—particularly related to aesthetics—had already been addressed in current discussions. She recommended removing the item from the follow-up list.

Ms. Chambers agreed and thanked Mae for her preparation, officially removing the item from the board's reporting list.

Discussion: CPR and Blood-Borne Pathogen Course Approval

Ms. Chambers introduced a new regulatory change proposal, based on recent staff observations and a suggestion from Cynthia Spencer. The proposal would:

- Remove the requirement for CPR and blood-borne pathogen courses to be “board-approved”
- Allow staff to accept courses from recognized organizations (e.g., American Red Cross, American Heart Association) or equivalent providers
- Provide greater flexibility for applicants and staff, especially as online training options have become more standardized and accessible

Ms. Chambers noted that this change had not yet been added to the strategic planning documents but was discussed via email the previous week. She emphasized that the change would still require courses to meet or exceed recognized standards but would delegate approval authority to staff rather than requiring formal board review.

Ms. Hager sought clarification on whether the board would still ensure course quality. Sara confirmed that staff would verify course legitimacy and alignment with national standards.

Chair Lombardo provided historical context, noting that the original requirement was created when online courses were less reliable. She supported the change, provided staff maintained a vetting process.

LE Spencer confirmed that staff already verify course content and have rejected some online courses that exceeded requirements but lacked board approval.

Ms. Canady and Ms. Thompson expressed support for the change, emphasizing the importance of maintaining quality while reducing unnecessary barriers to licensure and renewal.

The board agreed to add this item to the strategic plan. It was assigned a priority level of 1, indicating high urgency due to its impact on licensees and potential to delay licensure or renewal.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the item would be added to the strategic plan draft and thanked Cynthia for identifying the issue. She encouraged continued input from staff and board members as additional regulatory cleanup opportunities arise.

Strategic Plan Structure, Implementation & Accountability

Ms. Chambers walked the board through the strategic planning documents, highlighting how the priority list, goal categories, and color-coded themes were organized to reflect the board's discussions and decisions. She explained that each item from past meetings had been categorized into strategic goal “buckets”:

- Board Development
- Education & Outreach
- Enforcement
- Legislation (color-coded green)
- Regulation Changes

Ms. Chambers stated the documents were interlinked and would be refined and repackaged for clarity before the November board meeting. She emphasized that the strategic plan serves as a “North Star”—a guiding document to help the board:

- Stay focused on agreed-upon priorities

- Avoid being distracted by urgent but non-strategic issues
- Evaluate new proposals or public comments against existing goals
- Maintain momentum on long-term legislative and regulatory efforts

Ms. Chambers acknowledged that boards often struggle with balancing immediate concerns and long-term planning, and that a clear, living strategic plan helps manage time, energy, and expectations more effectively.

Accountability and Strategic Plan Oversight

Ms. Chambers thanked Jessica Pestrikoff for continuing in her role as the board's Strategic Plan Shepherd. Jessica will:

- Monitor the plan's progress
- Prompt the board to revise or update priorities
- Help ensure that board agendas and discussions align with the strategic plan

Ms. Chambers stated LE Spencer will include the updated strategic plan in future board packets, and the board will begin incorporating it into regular meeting workflows. She noted that the board is developing repeatable systems to keep strategic planning visible and actionable, regularly assess progress, and adjust priorities as needed without losing sight of core goals.

Legislative Goals and Implementation Planning

Ms. Chambers introduced the first strategic goal category: Legislation and walked the board through how legislative priorities were organized in the draft strategic plan. She explained that Legislative goals were grouped by priority level, based on previous board discussions. The top legislative goal was to "address immediate needs for updates that have an impact on economic viability or public safety." These were referred to as the board's "no-brainers." She stated that each legislative item was paired with a strategy and space for implementation details, which would help the board track progress and accountability.

Ms. Chambers informed the board that they had previously approved legislation to allow staff to issue licenses, a proposal brought forward by the director. The board endorsed the legislation and authorized Chair Kevin McKinley to seek a sponsor. This action was taken in August 2025, and the board is now awaiting legislative adoption by the end of the current session.

Chair Lombardo inquired about the status of the licensing legislation.

Ms. Chambers and board staff confirmed that Chair McKinley had been in contact with potential sponsors and that interest had been expressed, though no formal commitment had been made yet. Ms. Chambers confirmed that the board expects a more detailed update at the November 5, 2025, meeting.

Ms. Chambers emphasized that the strategic plan is not a static checklist but a living document that:

- Provides milestones and timelines for key initiatives
- Helps the board prioritize and sequence its work
- Serves as a reference point when new issues arise or public comments are received

Ms. Chambers encouraged the board to assign target dates to each legislative strategy and to use the plan to determine whether new issues should be elevated, deferred, or added to the "parking lot" for future consideration

Ms. Chambers reiterated that Ms. Pestrikoff would continue serving as the Strategic Plan Shepherd and LE Spencer will ensure the updated strategic plan is included in future board packets. She concluded by noting that the board is developing repeatable systems to keep strategic planning integrated into its regular operations, helping members stay focused on what matters most.

Legislative Goal 1B: Tiered Aesthetics Licensing Program

Ms. Chambers introduced the second legislative goal: development of a Tiered Aesthetics Licensing Program, referred to as Goal 1B in the strategic plan. This initiative builds on prior discussions from the MedSpa workgroup and includes the creation of an Advanced Esthetician license. Sara noted that this initiative is more complex than the “no-brainer” legislative fixes, as it involves creating an entirely new licensing structure. The board has access to model legislation and support from subject matter experts, including Suzanne Schmaling from the Aesthetics Council. She reminded the board that public input will be essential and should be formally built into the process.

Ms. Chambers outlined the next steps the board should consider for implementation by considering forming a Workgroup or Subcommittee. She noted the board may wish to establish a dedicated group to develop the proposal. This could include board members, industry professionals, public participants (e.g., regular meeting attendees or stakeholders), and experts like Suzanne Schmaling.

Ms. Chambers stated strategies may include reviewing model legislation, gathering public and industry feedback, drafting statutory language, and coordinating with the Department of Law and legislative liaisons. She suggested targeting May 2027 as a realistic goal for introducing legislation, allowing time for research and drafting, public engagement, board review and approval, and Legislative sponsor identification. She emphasized the importance of backward planning from that date to ensure steady progress and accountability.

Legislative Goal 1C: Conceptual Statutory Improvements

Ms. Chambers introduced the next legislative goal: statutory changes that are not urgent but would improve board operations or industry regulation. These items were generally ranked as priority 2 or 3 on the board’s activity list. She noted these are conceptual improvements, not immediate fixes and may be bundled into a separate bill from the “no-brainer” legislation.

Ms. Chambers informed the board that they will need to:

- Define strategies for each item
- Identify responsible parties
- Establish implementation timelines
- Consider whether to form a committee or workgroup to develop proposals

Ms. Chambers emphasized that while these items require more thought and planning, they are important for long-term improvement and should be included in the strategic plan to ensure they remain visible and actionable.

Ms. Chambers reviewed the regulations bucket of the strategic plan. She explained that this section includes all regulation changes identified by the board. The first regulatory goal mirrors the legislative structure which addresses immediate regulatory changes that improve clarity, efficiency, or public safety. She noted additional regulation changes that were not ranked as top priorities are still included for future consideration.

Ms. Chambers reiterated that the strategic plan would help the board prioritize and sequence these efforts, and that implementation details—such as forming workgroups or assigning leads—will be essential for tracking progress.

Introduction to Administrative Order 360 (AO360)

Ms. Chambers introduced Administrative Order 360 (AO360), issued by the Governor on August 4, 2025, which mandates a statewide effort to reduce regulatory burden across all agencies, boards, and divisions. She informed the board that AO360 requires each board to review its regulations and identify opportunities to reduce burdens on stakeholders (e.g., applicants, licensees, the public). She noted the target reduction is:

- 15% by the end of 2026
- 25% by the end of 2027

Ms. Chambers stated this is a requirement, not a request, and applies to all regulatory bodies under the Department of Commerce. She encouraged board members to review the email from Director Sylvan Robb, which includes an overview and expectations and prepare questions for the formal AO360 presentation scheduled for the November 5 board meeting.

Ms. Chambers explained that a regulatory requirement is defined as anything that imposes or prohibits an action (e.g., required hours for licensure, mandatory forms, board approvals). Staff are already working on counting and categorizing these requirements. She stated the board will receive a spreadsheet or summary of these counts by early November to begin analysis.

Ms. Hager asked whether the 25% reduction applies per license type or overall.

Ms. Chambers clarified that the target is 25% overall for the entire Department of Commerce, not per license.

Chair Lombardo raised concerns about how the 25% reduction is quantified.

Ms. Chambers acknowledged the complexity and explained that the Department of Law has provided detailed guidance on how to count regulatory requirements. Staff are becoming familiar with this methodology and will support the board in applying these requirements. She emphasized that the board is ahead of many others due to its ongoing strategic planning work and AO360 will require additional meetings and possibly a dedicated subcommittee to meet the February 2026 planning deadline. She noted that the board's existing work on regulatory cleanup aligns well with AO360 goals.

Ms. Chambers concluded the AO360 overview by emphasizing that:

- One size does not fit all—the Governor's Office has made it clear that public safety must not be compromised in the pursuit of regulatory reduction.
- Boards are expected to defend essential regulations that protect health, safety, and sanitation.
- However, the board must be prepared to justify why certain regulations cannot be eliminated, ensuring the rationale is based on evidence and necessity, not tradition or convenience.
- The board is encouraged to explore whether modernization, simplification, or technological advances could reduce burden without sacrificing safety.

Sara reiterated that the board's strategic planning work aligns well with AO360, and that the upcoming November meeting will include a formal presentation and timeline from Director Robb.

At approximately 11:00 AM, a city-wide power outage in Juneau caused Juneau staff to lose connectivity to the meeting.

Chair Lombardo proposed a 10-minute break, suggesting the board reconvene at 11:20 AM to allow time for staff to reconnect and for members to regroup. The board agreed to take a brief recess.

Recess The Board recessed at 11:10 a.m. for a break; reconvened at 11:20 a.m. Majority of the board confirmed by roll call.

Power still had not been restored in Juneau, Chair Lombardo asked if the board could pause and pivot to the Emergency Adjudication item while waiting. LE Spencer contacted Investigative Staff and informed the board that they could move onto this matter.

Power was tentatively restored in Juneau at 12:15 p.m. Ms. Chambers and Juneau staff re-joined the meeting with connectivity issues.

Chair Lombardo proposed a brief 5-minute break and suggested extending the session slightly to make up for lost time. She noted the original meeting was scheduled to end at 1:00 p.m., with an extension to 1:30 p.m. for another matter and proposed continuing the session until 1:30 p.m., allowing the board to make the most of the remaining time without exceeding the planned schedule.

Board members agreed with Chair Lombardo.

Recess The Board recessed at 12:12 p.m. for a short break; reconvened at 12:15 p.m. Majority of the board confirmed by roll call.

Chair Lombardo thanked board members and the public attendee for their patience and turned the meeting over to Ms. Chambers.

After returning from the break, Ms. Chambers resumed the meeting and thanked the board for their flexibility during the Juneau-wide power outage. She noted that the team was operating on diesel generators and would continue the session as long as possible.

Sara invited any final questions on Administrative Order 360 (AO360) before moving forward.

Ms. Lombardo asked would AO360's mandate to reduce regulatory burden conflict with the board's efforts to revamp aesthetics and manicuring licenses, which may involve increased requirements?

Ms. Chambers clarified AO360 applies only to regulations, not legislation. Since the first step in creating new license types would be legislative, AO360 would not restrict that process; once legislation is passed, the board would then draft supporting regulations, which could be evaluated for burden. She stated importantly, the intent of the proposed licensing changes is to expand opportunities for practitioners and improve access to services for Alaskans—not to create unnecessary barriers. This aligns with the spirit of AO360. Ms. Chambers emphasized that the board's work on tiered licensing is responsive to industry needs, and the administration is open to justified regulatory structures that promote economic opportunities and public safety.

Ms. Lombardo thanked Sara for the clarification and noted it would be helpful for future planning.

No additional questions were raised by board members regarding AO360.

Ms. Chambers emphasized that All board regulations will fall under AO360's scope.; the board will also continue identifying additional regulations for cleanup and modernization. Ms. Chambers informed the board that more detailed discussion and planning will occur during the November 5, 2025, board meeting, including a formal presentation and timeline. She encouraged members to come prepared with questions and ideas, noting that the board's strategic planning efforts have already positioned them ahead of many others in meeting AO360's goals.

Enforcement Goal: Maintain Up-to-Date Enforcement Standards

Ms. Chambers introduced the next strategic initiative enforcement, with the primary goal to keep enforcement standards up to date. She stated that the board identified revising the disciplinary fine and fee matrix. Ms. Chambers noted that this item is already in progress and is scheduled for discussion at the November 5, 2025, board meeting. A legal review will be necessary to determine whether the matrix should remain a board policy or be formalized into regulation. This distinction depends on how the matrix is used and the language it contains. She emphasized that while the board would not delve into the legal nuances during this session, the matrix revision is a key step in maintaining fair and consistent enforcement practices.

Board Development and Education & Outreach Goals

Ms. Chambers introduced the final two strategic goal areas: Board Development and Education & Outreach. The board's goal is to create systems to ensure regular review of board activities for alignment with the strategic plan, mission, and vision." Ms. Chambers stated key strategies include:

- Routine review of statutes and regulations to ensure continued relevance and alignment
- Developing a method for periodic review, not as a one-time effort, but as a systemic, ongoing process
- Incorporating strategic plan check-ins into regular board meetings

Ms. Chambers noted that this aligns with the Chair's previously stated goal of building systemic review processes into board operations. Staff will assist in developing tools and workflows to support this with

identified needs to improve communication and support for applicants and licensees.” These strategies include:

- Developing videos, guides, and tools to help applicants successfully complete licensing applications
- Clarifying training requirements on application and reporting forms
- Ensuring exam content is current, particularly for tattooing, but potentially applicable to other license types

Ms. Chambers noted that some of these needs may be addressed through regulatory simplification under AO360, but until then, these tools remain essential for supporting applicants.

Ms. Chambers concluded the walkthrough of the strategic plan structure by noting that all items from the board’s activity list have now been incorporated into the strategic plan format and she would now show the board one final document to support implementation and tracking.

Strategic Plan Project Tracking Tool

Ms. Chambers introduced the final document: a project tracking tool designed to help the board manage and monitor progress on strategic initiatives. She noted that the current version is in development and will be streamlined before being included in future board packets; this tool will be used by Ms. Pestrikoff, the board’s Strategic Plan Shepherd, too:

- Track assignments and deadlines
- Prompt updates during board meetings
- Ensure accountability and continuity between meetings

Ms. Chambers explained that the tool includes a “Project Information” section, which helps the board break down each strategy into manageable components. Key fields include:

- Strategy Description: Pulled directly from the strategic plan
- Authority: Identifies whether the board, legislature, or another entity (e.g., NIC) has authority over the change
- Urgency: Assesses whether the issue involves public harm, economic opportunity, or time-sensitive deadlines
- Resources Required: Identifies who is responsible, what support is needed, and any external stakeholders (e.g., schools, licensees)

Ms. Chambers emphasized that this tool is especially useful for clarifying roles and responsibilities, tracking legislative and regulatory projects, preventing delays due to unclear ownership or missed follow-ups. She encouraged the board to populate the tool with real-time updates, such as:

- Who is drafting or reviewing legislation
- Who is coordinating with sponsors or stakeholders
- What deadlines or milestones are approaching

Ms. Chambers noted that this tool addresses a recurring challenge for many boards: losing momentum between meetings due to lack of clarity on project status. By using this tool consistently, the board can ensure transparency, accountability, and progress.

Priority Ranking and Implementation Tracking

Ms. Chambers introduced the final component of the strategic planning framework: a simplified priority rubric to replace the numerical ranking system (1s, 2s, 3s, etc.) used in the board’s activity list.

She recommended categorizing each item as:

- U – Urgent: Items that are already in progress or need immediate attention. These should be placed on upcoming agendas, assigned to individuals or workgroups, and actively tracked.
- S – Scheduled: Items that are important but not immediate. These should be scheduled for future meetings (e.g., February 2026, May 2027) and bookmarked for follow-up.

- P – Postponed: Items that are not currently actionable but should remain on the board’s radar for future consideration.

Ms. Chambers explained that this system would provide clarity and focus, help the board prioritize limited time and resources, and ensure that nothing falls through the cracks. She also demonstrated how the “next steps” section of the tracking tool could be used to:

- Assign specific tasks to individuals (e.g., Kevin McKinley’s outreach to legislative sponsors)
- Set due dates and meeting checkpoints
- Prompt progress updates at each board meeting

Ms. Chambers emphasized that this tool would be most effective when used consistently, with Jessica Pestrikoff prompting updates during her regular strategic plan check-ins.

Ms. Canady expressed appreciation for the clarity of the process, noting that while it may feel slow at times, it’s important to “get it done right.”

No other board members had additional questions or comments.

Chair Lombardo thanked Sara and asked if the group was ready to continue.

Priority Conversion and Final Planning Steps

Ms. Chambers proposed a streamlined approach to converting the board’s previously ranked priorities (1s, 2s, 3s, 4s) into a simplified rubric for strategic tracking:

- Urgent (U) = Items previously ranked as 1
- Scheduled (S) = Items previously ranked as 2
- Postponed (P) = Items ranked as 3 or 4, unless the board chooses to schedule them

Ms. Chambers stated this conversion will help the board quickly identify which items require immediate attention, schedule future discussions for mid-priority items, and defer lower-priority items while keeping them visible. Ms. Chambers offered to batch convert the rankings using a find-and-replace method and encouraged the board to review the 3s and 4s to determine whether they should be scheduled or postponed.

Chair Lombardo and the board agreed with the approach.

Ms. Chambers confirmed she would apply the conversion, transfer the updated priorities into the bottom section of the tracking tool, and prepare the documents for ongoing use at future meetings

Review of Priority 3s and 4s: Categorization Discussion

Ms. Chambers guided the board through the final step of the strategic planning session: reviewing items previously ranked as 3s and 4s to determine whether they should be:

- Scheduled (S) for future board agendas, or
- Postponed (P) for long-term tracking without immediate action

Ms. Chambers reviewed student permit terminology alignment submitted by LE Spencer; statutes currently use the term “*student*” universally, while regulations distinguish between:

- Students (in schools)
- Apprentices (in beauty shops)
- Trainees (in body art)

Ms. Chambers stated the goal would be to update statutory language to reflect correct terminology for each training type and asked LE Spencer for clarification.

LE Spencer clarified that this change would align statutory language with existing regulatory definitions.

Chair Lombardo noted that while the change is straightforward, it still requires a statutory review and should not be deprioritized.

Ms. Hager suggested grouping it with other training-related updates, but Jennifer cautioned against delaying a simple fix by bundling it with more complex reforms.

Ms. Chambers recommended classifying it as Scheduled (S) to include it in the board's next legislative cleanup project, likely targeted for 2027.

Board members agreed to reclassify this item as Scheduled (S) and include it in the broader legislative planning timeline.

Ms. Hager raised a question about legislative strategy, asking whether combining multiple statutory changes into a single bill could risk the entire bill being rejected if one part is controversial.

Ms. Chambers clarified a veto works that way, but during the legislative process, sponsors and committees can amend bills, removing or modifying specific provisions. The board can propose a comprehensive bill, and the sponsor or committee can choose to include or exclude parts. She continued strategic decisions about how to package legislation can be made later, likely in mid-2026, after AO360 work is further along.

Ms. Canady supported including even minor statutory updates (like terminology corrections) in the board's legislative planning, noting that sponsors typically provide early feedback on what they're willing to support.

Chair Lombardo and the rest of the board agreed.

Board members agreed that all items previously ranked as 2 will be reclassified as Scheduled (S), the terminology alignment item (originally a 3) will also be reclassified as Scheduled (S) to ensure it remains on the board's radar for future legislative planning.

Ms. Chambers confirmed she would:

- Convert all 1s to Urgent (U) and 2s to Scheduled (S)
- Leave 3s and 4s for board review to determine whether they should be Scheduled or Postponed
- Transfer the updated priorities into the project tracking tool for use in future meetings

Ms. Chambers presented a past proposal from former board member Tenaya Miramontes to allow unlicensed personnel to use hot tools as a way to expose young people to the industry and create training opportunities.

Ms. Chambers asked whether the board wanted to add the proposal to the Scheduled (S) list for future legislative consideration, or move it to the Postponed (P) list, acknowledging it as a lower priority for the foreseeable future

Ms. Canady recalled the original discussion and noted that while the idea may have been suitable for Juneau, Anchorage already has programs like King Career Center (KCC) that serve a similar purpose. She recommended postponing the proposal.

Ms. Hager, a licensed instructor, expressed concern about the public safety risks of allowing untrained individuals to use hot tools. She also supported postponing the item.

Ms. Lombardo agreed with Ms. Canady and Ms. Hager, deferring to their expertise and experience.

The board agreed to classify the proposal as Postponed (P), meaning it will remain on the strategic plan for future reference but will not be actively pursued at this time.

Ms. Chambers confirmed that the item could be revisited in the future if priorities shift.

Ms. Chambers initiated the discussion regarding the prioritization of regulatory projects in light of Administrative Order 360 (AO360). She noted that many items had been marked with a priority level of "2" and recommended that all such regulation projects be moved into "urgent" status. This would align with the board's upcoming requirement to develop a regulatory reform plan and help track progress effectively. She emphasized that marking these as urgent would:

- Keep them visible and prioritized.
- Help the board determine which regulations to address first.
- Support the board's reform plan development over the next few months.
- Prepare the board to propose regulatory changes following the November presentation.

Chair Lombardo expressed support but noted a desire for more information about AO360 and the board's plan of action before proceeding. She agreed with the approach as a preliminary step.

Ms. Canady, Ms. Hager, and Ms. Thompson all voiced agreement with the proposal.

No objections were raised by other board members.

The board reached consensus to move all regulation projects marked as "2" into "urgent" status in preparation for AO360 compliance and upcoming regulatory reform planning.

Ms. Chambers highlighted that DEC regulations are included under Administrative Order 360 (AO360), even though the board does not have direct control over them. As the department's AO360 agency regulatory liaison, she has observed overlapping regulatory responsibilities between departments, including DEC and the Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing (CBPL).

Ms. Chambers noted that the board previously submitted recommendations to DEC regarding regulatory updates; DEC showed no interest at the time, and the matter has remained unresolved. She stated that AO360 presents a renewed opportunity to resurrect those recommendations and engage DEC in collaborative reform. Ms. Chambers informed the board that LE Spencer may have archived materials from the board's earlier work on this issue.

Ms. Chambers suggested including the board's prior recommendations in upcoming AO360 meeting packets and potentially inviting DEC to a future board meeting to discuss their regulatory plans.

Chair Lombardo questioned the necessity of dual regulation by DEC and CBPL, noting that DEC has not actively maintained health and safety standards since 2002. She proposed exploring a statutory change to consolidate regulatory authority under the board and division, citing redundancy and lack of engagement from DEC. Chair Lombardo emphasized that the board and division are already maintaining current standards and that a legislative change could simplify oversight without significantly increasing costs, especially if inspections were limited to body art shops.

Ms. Chambers confirmed that a statutory change is possible and would shift the focus from regulatory reform to a legislative project; the board could propose transferring authority for safety and sanitation standards from DEC to the board. She suggested language around inspections could also be revised to reflect the board's capacity and priorities.

The board acknowledged the opportunity to revisit its previous recommendations to DEC and consider a legislative initiative to consolidate regulatory authority. No formal action was taken, but the topic will be revisited during AO360 planning and future board meetings.

Following the initial discussion on DEC's role in regulating safety and sanitation standards, board members shared historical context, frustrations, and ideas for legislative reform.

Chair Lombardo noted that pursuing a statutory change might be more feasible than expecting DEC to act on past recommendations. She emphasized that DEC has not updated its regulations since 2002 and that many of its requirements are outdated or redundant with board regulations.

Ms. Canady reflected on the board's prior efforts, stating that significant work had been done and submitted to DEC, but no action was taken. She supported revisiting the issue and re-engaging DEC, especially under the momentum of AO360.

Ms. Hager supported the idea of transferring regulatory authority to the board. She raised a financial point—that the division pays DEC approximately \$10,000 annually for tattoo and body art inspections—and shared a personal experience where DEC's regulations created unnecessary burdens during a school construction project, only for DEC to show no interest in enforcement.

Chair Lombardo and Ms. Hager both highlighted the disconnect between DEC's written regulations and their actual enforcement, suggesting that this inconsistency adds stress for licensees and applicants.

Ms. Hager emphasized that streamlining regulations and consolidating oversight under one agency would align with the goals of AO360—namely, to simplify licensing processes and reduce regulatory burdens.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the board could pursue a legislative project to transfer authority for safety and sanitation standards from DEC to the board. This would involve reclassifying the issue from a regulatory update to a statutory change initiative and the board could also revise inspection-related language to reflect realistic staffing and cost considerations.

Ms. Thompson shared her experience with inconsistent DEC inspection practices across different communities. She noted that some inspectors were flexible (e.g., offering Zoom inspections), while others were unresponsive or prioritized other duties, such as inspecting cruise ship galleys in Ketchikan. She emphasized that this inconsistency delays business operations and supports the case for consolidating oversight under the board.

Chair Lombardo agreed, reiterating that DEC's focus is often elsewhere (e.g., restaurants), and that the board is already setting and maintaining health and safety standards. She expressed strong support for pursuing legislative change.

LE Spencer added that within the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA), local authorities conduct inspections of all shops (excluding body art) and have shut down several for violations. Outside of Anchorage, however, there is little to no enforcement, including in Juneau.

Ms. Chambers asked whether the board would like to reclassify the DEC regulation issue as a legislative goal rather than a regulatory one. She noted that the board already has legislative priorities and could incorporate this into that framework.

Ms. Hager supported moving the issue to the legislative category, though not as an urgent item.

Chair Lombardo and other board members agreed, suggesting the item be marked as an "S" (strategic) and categorized under legislative change.

Ms. Chambers recommended keeping the item listed under both regulatory and legislative categories:

- As a regulatory item, it aligns with AO360 and provides an opportunity to re-engage DEC.
- As a legislative item, it allows the board to pursue statutory changes to consolidate authority.

Chair Lombardo asked whether a board member could be involved in DEC's regulatory review process.

Ms. Chambers responded that she could coordinate with DEC's regulatory liaison to explore that possibility and present the board's perspective.

Ms. Thompson shared further concerns about inconsistent DEC inspection practices across communities, noting that responsiveness and willingness to conduct inspections (even virtually) varied widely. In some areas, DEC prioritized other duties, such as inspecting cruise ship galleys, leaving industry licensees at the bottom of the list despite paying fees.

Chair Lombardo and other board members agreed that consolidating oversight under the board would improve consistency and efficiency. Jennifer emphasized the importance of having a board member

involved in any DEC regulatory review process, regardless of whether statutory changes are made immediately.

Ms. Chambers supported the idea and proposed the following steps:

1. Resurrect the board's previous recommendations to DEC for review.
2. Include this review in upcoming AO360 planning meetings.
3. Allow the board to revise or reaffirm its recommendations.
4. Submit updated recommendations to DEC, with Sara and Cynthia coordinating outreach.
5. Offer board expertise to DEC during their regulatory review process, potentially including board member participation.

Chair Lombardo agreed and emphasized the importance of board involvement, especially since DEC staff are not industry experts. She also acknowledged the time constraints and suggested moving forward with the rest of the strategic planning agenda.

Enforcement Section:

Ms. Chambers introduced the disciplinary fine/fee matrix which is already marked as "U" (Underway) and remains in progress. Ms. Chambers recommended updating other enforcement-related items marked as "1" to "U" based on prior board direction.

Ms. Chambers noted the item "Review statutes and regulations to eliminate outdated language" (4A1) was originally marked as a "3" due to workload prioritization. However, since the board will already be reviewing statutes and regulations under AO360, Sara proposed reclassifying it as "U".

Chair Lombardo suggested combining this item with the previously discussed goal of updating terminology (e.g., changing "student" to "trainee"), as both involve semantic and language cleanup.

Ms. Hager, Ms. Canady, Ms. Pestrikoff, and Ms. Thompson all agreed.

Ms. Chambers confirmed she would break the item into two parts—statutes and regulations—and mark the regulations portion as "U" due to its alignment with AO360.

Public Facing Improvements:

Ms. Chambers introduced public-facing improvements, 5A1: Develop videos or other training aids to help applicants understand licensing processes and 5A2: Review tattoo training requirements and alignment with forms.

Ms. Chambers recommended the board mark both items as "S" (Scheduled), with the understanding that they will be addressed after regulatory and statutory changes are complete. These items are likely to be impacted by AO360, particularly as the Department of Law reviews all guidance documents, FAQs, and instructional materials for alignment with regulations.

Ms. Hager emphasized that these efforts should be deferred until after the regulatory overhaul to avoid duplicating work or creating outdated materials.

Chair Lombardo and Ms. Canady agreed with this approach.

Ms. Chambers confirmed the items would be scheduled accordingly and retained on the board's radar for future action.

Ms. Chambers thanked board members and confirmed that she will:

- Update the strategic planning worksheet by marking all "1s" as "U" (Underway) and "2s" as "S" (Scheduled).
- Repackage the worksheet into a streamlined version for board meetings, with the full version retained as a resource document.

- Add contextual notes (e.g., AO360 relevance) and clarify which items are regulatory vs. legislative.
- Provide the updated documents to Cynthia within the next week for inclusion in the November 5 board packet.
- Prepare a high-level strategic plan summary suitable for public or internal reference, separate from the detailed worksheet.

Ms. Chambers reiterated Ms. Pestrikoff, as the designated strategic plan shepherd, will maintain and update the working document during meetings. She noted LE Spencer will determine which materials should be included in future board packets versus stored in the board's onboarding resources folder.

Chair Lombardo thanked Ms. Chamber for her extensive preparation and facilitation and expressed appreciation for the board's engagement and flexibility.

Ms. Thompson echoed the gratitude and noted that while the process can feel slow at times, the board is making tangible progress that feels meaningful.

Ms. Canady expressed interest in holding a future meeting in person.

Chair Lombardo, Ms. Thompson, and Ms. Hager supported the idea, especially for sessions involving detailed review of statutes and regulations.

Chair Lombardo suggested the Atwood Building in Anchorage as a potential no-cost venue, noting that many board members are located nearby.

Ms. Hager offered to cover her own travel costs from Galena, if necessary.

Ms. Chambers clarified that state policy (AAM60) prohibits board members from funding their own travel for official business. All travel must be approved and paid for by the state to ensure liability coverage and compliance and members within 50 miles of the meeting location are not considered in travel status and may attend in person without restriction.

Ms. Chambers recommended that the board submit a formal request for an in-person meeting, outlining the rationale (e.g., AO360 workload, collaborative efficiency). LE Spencer can then route the request through the appropriate approval channels.

Chair Lombardo agreed to email LE Spencer with a summary of the board's interest and justification for an in-person session.

Chair Lombardo thanked Sara for her extensive preparation and facilitation and acknowledged the board's flexibility and engagement.

Ms. Thompson and Ms. Canady echoed appreciation for the collaborative progress made.

Ms. Chambers confirmed she will deliver updated strategic planning documents to Cynthia within the week for inclusion in the November 5 board packet.

5. Adjourn

The chair declared the board off the record at 1:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Cynthia Spencer, Licensing Examiner III

Approved:

Jennifer Lombardo, Acting Vice Chairperson

Date: _____

DRAFT