



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 10, 2024

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, October 10, 2024.

**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 10, 2024:**

**Attendance**

**Members Present:** Chair Kevin McKinley, Vice Chair Tenaya Miramontes, Willie Mae Canady, Jessica Pestrikoff

**Member(s) Excused:** Wendy Palin

**Staff Present:** Cynthia Spencer & Wanda Whitcomb, Licensing Examiners, Renee Carabajal, Program Coordinator, Investigators Sonia Lipker, Chace Evans, and Jacob Daviscourt, Sara Chambers, Boards and Regulations Advisor, Alison Osborne, Regulation Specialist.

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

**Public Present via Zoom:**

There were 5 members of the public attending via Zoom.

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

The board was called to order at 8:31 a.m.

**2. Review Agenda**

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

Cynthia Spener stated there was no quarter four budget report for the board to review so agenda item 6, Division and Financial Updates could be cancelled; this would allow the board to move onto other agenda items as needed.

Chair McKinley asked if there were any other amendments; hearing none the agenda was approved.

**3. Ethics Disclosure**

The board reviewed the provided Ethics packet.

Board members present stated, by roll call, they had no conflicts to disclose.

The board decided to move onto Item 10 until public comment at 9:30am.

**10. New Business**

**A. Local Shop Courtesy License (body arts) Discussion**

Chair McKinley gave a brief background of the courtesy license creation; Chair McKinley informed the board this license type was created before large events were coming to Alaska and was for local shops to bring artists into shops to teach techniques they specialize in and to allow shops to bring in artists as substitutes for local artists when ill or on vacation.

Chair McKinley stated he understands the 90-day application deadline change from 30-days due to the number of applications staff receives for special events and the time it takes to process these applications. However, the 90-day deadline is prohibitive and has created unintended consequences to local shops seeking to bring in artists to fill in for local artists. Chair McKinley went on to state he would like to begin a discussion on this matter for possible regulatory changes or create a new similar license for local shops. Chair McKinley asked if board members had

questions or would like to discuss.

The board had no questions or comments. Chair McKinley asked that this topic be added to the next meeting agenda.

Vice Chair Tenaya Miramontes stated she could check with local (Juneau) shops for impact of the 90-day deadline and needs for courtesy licensees.

Wanda Whitcomb urged the board to be very careful with wording if they decide to move forward with a regulation change or new regulation; LE Whitcomb cautioned the board that events do read statutes/regulations and look for loopholes.

**Action Item:** Add this topic - local shop courtesy license to next meeting agenda.

**B. Apprentice/Student/Trainee Documentation Submission Discussion**

Chair McKinley gave a brief background on this matter as discussed with staff, problems across all training programs regulation by this board with the submission of training documentation. Chair McKinley stated staff is looking for solutions and help from the board with these ongoing issues.; the board could set up a strike system and possible loss of students for x amount of time.

Vice Chair Miramontes stated that this was an issue for one of her apprentices as they have not been able to obtain previous training documentation; she also suggested allowing students be allowed to submit their own training documentation. Vice Chair Miramontes stated empowering students to submit their training documentation might be a better option and may ensure this documentation was submitted as required.

Mae Canady agreed that this was an issue; as an instructor she takes it very seriously to submit her apprentices training documentation on time. Ms. Canaday agreed with a two or three strike system for those who continually fail to submit training documentation per regulation requirements.

Ms. Canady stated that staff does not have time to track each individual apprentice, student, and trainee file to verify what has been and hasn't been submitted.

Vice Chair Miramontes asked if there was an online portal that this documentation could be submitted through or an online system where hours could be updated? Chair McKinley asked if she was thinking something like the MyAlaska portal. Vice Chair Miramontes stated yes, MyAlaska or another portal program that would allow updating hours, etc. Chair McKinley stated that was a good idea as the state is moving towards more digital submission of documentation.

Ms. Canady stated when a person has completed training they should receive copies of all training documentation that maybe they could submit, however it really boils down to the person providing training to submit the required documentation, not submitting is not fair to the student; whether a school, etc., a person is paying the money for training, completing their training and now they're ready to work and apply for a license but are not able to due to this matter. Ms. Canady stated that she believes repeat offenders of non-submission, either two or three strikes should be held accountable; as there is no accountability in place, instructors can keep violating submission requirements.

LE Spencer reviewed regulations 12 AAC 09.130, 09.185, and 09.190; and stated staff needs teeth in the training documentation submission requirements and stated changes to training documentation submission requirements would require regulation changes.

Chair McKinley asked the board if they had any further thoughts. Chair McKinley stated that if they combined Vice Chair Miramontes and Ms. Canady's statements and came up with a three-strike system, a resolution might be reached.

Vice Chair Miramontes suggested allowing students to submit a notice to staff stating they completed training; staff could then review files and contact instructors for missing documentation.

LE Spencer stated that is what is happening now; this is causing lost time for both staff and the person obtaining training as it is currently taking weeks – months to obtain complete and correct training documentation if at all. LE Spencer also informed the board that staff has also had to recreate training using limited training documentation submitted and many times this results in requiring the individual to enroll again to complete training that staff cannot verify with documentation that has been submitted. LE Spencer informed the board that staff frequently submits instructors, etc., to the investigative unit for violations of training documentation submission, however this has not helped the situation. Ms. Spencer also stated the board has a fine schedule which reflects possible consequences for this matter with first, second, and third offences.

Ms. Spencer went on to state that a strike system may also require investigative processes as well as the investigative unit enforcement is more official and would give teeth to a strike system through license action, fines, etc.

Chair McKinley agreed with LE Spencer stating that we need teeth in this matter as that is what is lacking and might motivate those providing training to comply with regulatory requirements.

The board agreed this matter is important as it directly effects the individual obtaining training moving forward with their chosen profession and agreed this should also be discussed during item 7, Investigations.

#### **4. Public Comment**

Chair McKinley stated that public comment is very important for the board as they appreciate hearing concerns from the public, however as there is a limited time everyone should be respectful with time keeping.

LE Spencer asked if there were any attendees that would like to address the board. Rachel Lauesen and Jacqueline Polis stated they would like to address the board.

Chair McKinley asked Rachel Lauesen if three minutes would be enough time. Ms. Lauesen stated she thought three minutes would be fine.

Rachel Lauesen, Attorney, Lauesen law Team, representing Skinlife Medspa.

- Medical Spa Services Work Group concerns:  
Is there legal involvement with Medical Spa Working Group providing oversight?  
Links on work group website reflect current adopted guidance on dermatological procedures that were implemented January 2004, revised in 2014 and 2017 but during 2018 legislation, 08.64.106, was enacted tasking the Medical Board to issue regulations authorizing delegation power to individuals not licensed by the Medical Board. Medical Board then adopted 12 AAC 04.290 which has inconsistencies in relation to this board and the Medical Board guidelines.

Chair McKinley stated he felt Ms. Lauesen's comments seem more geared towards the Work Group and the Medical Board, not this board.

Ms. Lauesen disagreed and stated the Work Group was derived from actions taken by this board and the Work Group was formed to address these actions.

Program Coordinator Renee Carabajal informed Ms. Lauesen that the Work Group was established and is being run by Board Advisor Sarah Chambers, Ms. Chambers, is the individual providing all the information on the website updating all of it and managing of those meetings. This board will be receiving updates from those meetings but is not directly linked to the running or decisions made by the medical Spa work group; this work group is still in the early stages of reviewing information before making any recommendations to other licensing boards. PC Carabajal recommended Ms. Lauesen submit her concerns directly to Ms. Chambers as she the best person at this time to submit concerns to; PC Carabajal also informed Ms. Lauesen Ms. Chambers would be able to present those concerns to the Work Group for review.

Ms. Lauesen stated she would submit her concerns to Ms. Chambers and went on to state that as this is the board that regulations estheticians, she thought this board would be a stake holder in the Work Group and interested in receiving this information.

PC Carabajal stated this board is a stake holder and appointed board member Wendy Palin to serve as their representative on the Work Group; Ms. Palin was unable to attend this meeting to provide an update on the Work Group, however Ms. Palin would be provided information from this meeting. PC Carabajal continued to reiterate this is why Ms. Lauesen should submit her concerns directly to Ms. Chambers. PC Carabajal also stated that the board is not planning on any decisive changes until after they received guidance from the Work Group which they will be getting an update on later this afternoon from Ms. Chambers.

Ms. Lauesen stated that as she had commented during prior meeting, this is why the board should have public comment in the afternoon or before the end of meetings as people do not know what will happen during the meeting and therefore cannot comment. Ms. Lauesen also complained about cancelled meeting and the lack of scheduled meetings.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Lauesen and asked if board members had questions for Ms. Lauesen. Hearing none, Chair McKinley asked if LE Spencer would forward Ms. Lauesen's concerns onto Ms. Chambers. LE Spencer stated she was not comfortable with forwarding on Ms. Lauesen's concerns on the chance she may misquote and urged Ms. Lauesen to forward her concerns directly to Ms. Chambers.

Jacqueline Polis, Esthetician

- Agree with Rachel Lauesen's comments.
- Board should have time for public comment at the end of meetings to allow attendees to address entire meeting concerns, etc.
- Board should have more open communications with licensees.
- Work Group and board all intertwined; Work Group and board should have more open conversations.

Chair McKinley asked if Ms. Polis had any additional comments.

Ms. Polis stated she did not agree with LE Spencer not wanting to pass along Ms. Lauesen's comments to Sara Chambers due to misquote concerns.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Polis for her concerns with forwarding Ms. Lauesen's comments and reiterated PC Carabajal's suggestion that Ms. Lauesen contact Ms. Chambers directly with her concerns. Chair McKinley stated all comments are important and valuable to the board; having Ms. Lauesen contact Ms. Chambers directly ensures her concerns and intent are completely relayed.

Ms. Lauesen interjected into Chair McKinley's statement and Ms. Polis' comment time stating that this shows a complete lack of support by the board to say her comments will not be passed along to Ms. Chambers. Ms. Lauesen stated the fear of misquoting was not acceptable as there are recordings of the meetings and meeting minutes that accurately record conversations.

Chair McKinley attempted to course correct Ms. Lauesen's interruption.

Chair McKinley asked if Ms. Polis had any additional comments.

Ms. Polis continued that she hoped the Work Group and board would be able to have conversations and if there was a way to have this information more readily available/shareable with licensee and public which would allow for more collaboration. Ms. Polis stated that the board begin having meetings which would allow back and forth conversations with the public and board; board meetings just don't allow for this type of conversation.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Polis and stated he appreciated her concerns. Chair McKinley stated the board would be working towards holding more "town hall" meetings which would allow for members of the public to directly address the board and have that open conversation/back and forth dialog.

Chair McKinley went onto state recognizing past meetings and board issues, moving forward this board is on a new path and will continue to make improvements, continue to work with the Work Group and public.

Chair McKinley asked LE Spencer if there were any other individuals for public comment. LE Spencer stated only Ms. Lauesen and Ms. Polis were signed up for public comment.

PC Carabajal informed the board and attendees that she had reached out to Ms. Chambers regarding Ms. Lauesen's and Ms. Polis's Work Group concerns. PC Carabajal stated that Ms. Chambers had been notified that Ms. Lauesen had been directed to reach out directly to Ms. Chambers with her concerns and that the meeting recordings would be available to Ms. Chambers shortly after this meeting adjourned.

Chair McKinley thanked PC Carabajal for this information and reaching out to Ms. Chambers.

*Recess The Board recessed at 9:21 a.m. for a short break; reconvened at 9:32 a.m. Majority of the board confirmed by roll call.*

The Board was ahead of schedule and moved to Item 12, Administrative Business, while waiting for investigative staff.

Chair McKinley asked LE Spencer if there were any correspondence and applications to review. LE Spencer stated the board had none of these items to review.

## **12. Administrative Business**

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

#### **i. August 8, 2024 Meeting**

Chair McKinley asked if board members had reviewed the meeting minutes and if they had any edits. Hearing none, Chair McKinley asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

#### **Motion: 1st Mae Canady – 2nd Tenaya Miramontes**

Approve August 8, 2024, meeting minutes as presented.

**Approved by majority.**

### **C. Correspondence**

There were no correspondence items to review.

### **D. Application Review**

There were no applications to review.

## **7. Investigations**

Senior Investigator Sonia Lipker joined the board introduced herself and announced that Senior Investigator Jennifer Summers was unable to join the board so she would be presenting the training along with Investigator Chace Evans. Inv Lipker stated Inv Evans was having technical difficulties and would join the board soonest.

Chair McKinley asked while they were waiting if the board would please review the 2024 and 2025 calendars and begin choosing meeting dates. Chair McKinley stated by statute the board must meet at minimum three times a year, however, due to pressing matters, would the board consider scheduling four meetings just in case. The board agreed and began reviewing the calendars.

Board members agreed not to schedule meeting close to holidays during November and December 2024.

Inv Evans joined the meeting, the board agreed to pick up this matter later.

Inv Evans greeted the board and introduced himself.

### **A. Investigative Process Training**

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

Chair McKinley asked during the processes reviewed, when would investigative staff communicate with licensing staff updating them on progress.

Inv Evans stated this typically is only done with the reviewing board member and then through cases presented during meetings.

Chair McKinley stated that he had gotten a printout of cases for the last five years from Senior Investigator Jennifer Summers which reflected 42 cases still open beginning 2021 – 2024; the number of open cases and length of time he was concerned with why 2021 – 2023 cases were still unresolved.

Inv Lipker stated she believes what Chair McKinley is referencing is the Quarterly Board report. Inv Lipker continued for every quarterly board meeting, the investigative unit prints/provides an investigative report that shows all cases that are open, all cases that are closed, and their status; this report gives the board an overview of where the cases are in their different stages.

Chair McKinley thanked Inv Lipker but stated he was under the assumption that the investigator would email staff information regarding a case closed and reviewing board member (RBM) conclusions. Chair McKinley asked if this was correct or had never been done.

LE Spencer clarified Chair McKinley's question; previously when staff would refer a matter to the investigative unit would email staff with a case number, staff would then update the master "Yes Answer" spreadsheet; once a RBM had reviewed documentation, the investigator would email staff with case closed, etc., information and a synopsis of the RBM findings, staff would then update the "Yes Answer" spreadsheet with this information and either a case would be presented to the board at the next meeting or the case was closed. LE Spencer stated this level of communication has not been occurring for quite some time.

Chair McKinley asked investigators if they wanted to comment on this. Inv Lipker stated she wasn't familiar with the day-to-day operations of the investigators for this board and cannot speak to the general overview of how investigative policies work. Inv Lipker went on to state that if there haven't been any cases closed in the last few weeks staff wouldn't have been notified; the individual who is typically notified of a case closure is the person who filed the complaint.

Chair McKinley asked about cases that are opened but there wasn't enough information, etc., to really open a case and go forward; however, if a case is opened, is that information provided to staff?

Inv Evans stated that investigative matters are dealt with on a case-by-case basis; there may be submitted complaints, complainants are sent the "complaint packet" with a 30-day submission deadline, if within the 30-days a completed packet is not received, the matter is closed due to a lack of information. Initial submitted complaints are typically a synopsis and not complete information, investigators must have additional information to back up the complaint and move forward with the matter. Inv Evans continued, if actionable information is received after the 30-day deadline, the matter will be re-reviewed and if opening a case is warranted, a case will be opened and a RBM will be contacted, and the jurisdictional review begins. Inv Evans stated that he thought Chair McKinley's question sounds like he is wanting staff to be updated throughout the process.

Chair McKinley responded that he thought communicating with staff was something that used to occur but hasn't been happening. Chair McKinley stated that he thought this type of communication was helpful to staff and has the investigators stopped or changed this process.

PC Carabajal informed the board with her experience dealing with multiple boarded programs, that information provided by Inv Lipker is correct; however, when staff refers a matter to the investigative unit, the investigator should email the reporting staff member with a case opened notice and case number. PC Carabajal continued stating staff will not receive any further information/communication from the investigator until the investigative process is complete, however, if a matter is referred to the investigative unit from a member of the public, staff will not receive communications from the assigned investigator. PC Carabajal elaborated that investigative

matters submitted by a public member are not provided to staff as staff must remain unbiased.

Chair McKinley thanked PC Carabajal and asked LE Spencer if this was the information discussed during earlier conversations they had had. LE Spencer stated that the communication issue for cases referred by staff still had not been addressed.

PC Carabajal informed the board that as Senior Investigator Jennifer Summers was not able to attend this meeting, she and LE Spencer and Whitcomb would follow up this conversation with an email to Senior Investigator Summers, copying Inv Evans, Inv Lipker and Chief Investigator Erika Prieksat.

Chair McKinley thanked PC Carabajal and reiterated his concerns with the lack of communication from the investigator to staff in response to staff submitted investigative matters. Chair McKinley stated that he's very interested in this matter and would possibly suggest process changes if needed. PC Carabajal assured Chair McKinley a conversation would be started.

**Action Item:** *Email communication concerns to Summers, Evans, Lipker, and Prieksat.*

Chair McKinley asked if board members had any other questions.

Vice Chair Miramontes asked if there was a process for investigating unlicensed businesses and professionals.

Inv Evans stated this was difficult due to numerous individuals and businesses providing services without proper licensing as many are conducting services/business out of their homes. Inv Evans continued that it is very difficult to get in contact with these individuals/businesses as it is not certain emails are being received by the service provider/business; many of these people are marketing on social media outlets, which is where contact information may be found, and may be good or bad contact information. Inv Evans went on to state that most of these people know they are providing services illegally, however, there are those that don't. Inv Evans informed the board that the investigative process for unlicensed services/businesses is the same as licensed investigative matters.

Vice Chair Miramontes asked if investigators were waiting on someone to file complaints about unlicensed activity or do investigators go online to locate unlicensed advertising.

Inv Evans stated that this was a complaint driven process and investigators don't have the time to check online for unlicensed activities; however, if during an investigation, an unlicensed matter is noted, for example at another establishment or service provider, then a new case for the establishment and/or service provider will be opened.

Vice Chair Miramontes asked if a board member or investigator happens to come across an unlicensed matter, should the board member submit a complaint packet. Inv Evans stated yes, the person who happened across the matter should file a complaint packet. Vice Chair Miramontes thanked Inv Evans.

PC Carabajal stated earlier in the meeting there was a discussion about courtesy licenses for events. PC Carabajal informed the board that she had reached out to investigations several months ago about possible unlicensed artists advertising services based on information seen on Facebook; these artists were not on final rosters of courtesy licensees for any upcoming Alaska events. PC Carabajal continued that in this matter the division is being proactive checking for unlicensed activities at special events; investigative staff will conduct walk throughs, and she will be attending event's occurring in Juneau checking for unlicensed individuals; this is a collaborative effort with staff and investigators.

Chair McKinley asked if there were any other questions from board members.

Ms. Canady asked if this was a good time to discuss training documentation submission issues as discussed earlier in the meeting. Chair McKinley asked Ms. Canady to continue.

Ms. Canaday reiterated the board's earlier conversation regarding training documentation submission issues for schools, apprenticeships, and trainee programs. Ms. Canaday asked if these matters should be submitted to investigations as the board has received a petition to accept training that staff is unable to verify. Chair McKinley gave an example, a student needs their hours to either continue training or move on with the license process, however the trainer is not signing off on documentation and/or not submitting the documents.

Chair McKinley asked how the board can get more teeth in enforcing training documentation submission regulation requirements and the board is considering a three-strike rule that would prohibit a school, instructor, or trainer from accepting additional students for a period of time when they reach three strikes for not submitting training documentation or enrollment applications. Chair McKinley asked Inv Evans what he thought about this.

Inv Evans stated this would be up to the board and that there was nothing like this in place now. Inv Evans continued this is a good topic for discussion and there should be repercussions for not submitting documentation.

Inv Lipker informed the board they must ensure they have statutory and regulatory authority to enforce something like this.

Chair McKinley asked Ms. Canaday if they had addressed all of her concerns. Ms. Canaday stated her concerns had been addressed and that the board should continue to resolution. Ms. Canaday asked Inv Lipker if the students should also file a complaint with investigators. Inv Lipker responded that students should submit complaint packets; if any students asked about this they should be directed to the investigative website where they can find the complaint packet and investigative contact information.

LE Spencer informed the board that staff has been submitting numerous complaints to the investigative unit for these matters, unfortunately, there seems to be no movement on the investigative side. LE Spencer continued that many of these submitted matters are repeats for the same school, instructor, or trainer; as there has been no resolution, staff continue to enroll students, apprentices, and trainees with these repeat offenders which leads to more violations of training documentation submissions. LE Spencer urged the board to continue this discussion and consider a three-strike system that would result in possible fines, license action, and wouldn't allow new enrollments for x time.

Chair McKinley requested the supporting regulations. LE Spencer provided regulations 12 AAC 09.130, 09.190, and 09.185. Chair McKinley suggested the board update their fine schedule/matrix and stated the board needs to assist these students who are in this situation in obtaining their training so they can move on with their profession.

Chair McKinley asked for board and investigator comments.

Inv Evans stated that the board would need to be careful as some submission issues are not malicious but due to other matters; ensure there are checks and balances.

LE Whitcomb agreed with Inv Evans and went on to state matters submitted to investigations were extreme and ended up causing staff to spend hours and sometimes several days auditing student files to verify what training had been completed. LE Whitcomb informed the board that staff is busy with daily work that they don't have the time to audit each student file regularly, however, in many cases staff receives an email from a student stating they've completed training and asking what their next steps are, upon reviewing the individual's file, it is noted that there is either no training documentation, missing training documentation, and in cases where several quarters worth or a year's worth of training documents are submitted at once, the documents are incomplete or have numerous errors; this leads to weeks or even months of back and forth with the trainer to submit and/or correct training documents before the student can either move forward with licensure or reenrolling to complete training. LE Whitcomb urged the board to consider instating repercussions for failure to submit training documentation in accordance with their regulations.



Chair McKinley thanked LE Whitcomb for her comments and asked board members if they used the fine schedule/matrix when they were the RVB for a case. Inv Evans interjected stating any RBM should be using the board approved fine schedule. Chair McKinley agreed with Inv Evans and reiterated, any RBM should be following the approved fine schedule during their review.

Chair McKinley again urged the board to consider a three-strike update to the fine schedule that may include no new enrollments for a six-month period or something along those lines as long as current regulations allow.

LE Spencer informed the board that as Senior Investigator Jennifer Summers was not in attendance, the board may want to consider adding this discussion to the next meeting agenda when Inv Summers would be in attendance as she would be able to provide more accurate information and question answers.

Chair McKinley requested Inv Lipker provide Inv Summers with this information/discussion so Inv Summers would be prepared for the next meeting. Inv Lipker stated she would share this information with Inv Summers.

**Action Item:** *Add fine schedule amendment discussion and investigative unit communication to staff submitted investigative matters to next meeting agenda with confirmed attendance by Senior Investigator Jennifer Summers.*

The board briefly discussed options for updating the fine schedule. Chair McKinley asked if there were any additional questions, hearing none the board continued with investigations.

PC Carabajal suggested due to the time, the board continue to review investigative matters that could be done in the public session then adjourn into executive session for the last part of training and other investigative matters.

#### **B. Investigative Memo**

Inv Evans reviewed the Investigative Report with the board. Inv Evans reported for the period August 6, 2024 – September 25, 2024 73 cases were opened, and one case closed.

Inv Evans asked if there were any questions about the report. Hearing none the board moved to the probation report.

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

Investigator Jacob Davis court joined the board and introduced himself.

Inv Davis court reviewed the probation report with the board and reported eight individuals on probation, one individual released from probation, and one individual with a suspended license.

Inv Davis court asked the board if they had any questions; there were no questions.

Chair McKinley thanked Inv Davis court for his time and requested a motion for executive session.

#### **D. Executive Session - Investigative Training - Board Member Review Process**

LE Spencer informed the board that as there were no applications or cases to review, the executive session motion should reflect section four of AS 44.62.310(c).

**Motion to enter executive session:** 1st Tenaya Miramontes – 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 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 10:39 a.m. and returned from executive session at 11:21 a.m. Quorum of board confirmed by roll call.*

*During executive session, Jessica Pestrikoff was offline from 10:48 a.m. – 10:58 a.m. The board took a brief break during this time.*

The board thanked Inv Evans and Lipker for their time and assistance.

The board was ahead of schedule and decided to pick move back to Item 12, scheduling meeting dates.

## **12. Administrative Business**

### **B. Schedule Upcoming Meeting Dates**

The board reviewed the 2024 and 2025 calendars and briefly discussed meeting date options.

PC Carabajal reminded the board towards mid to end January the next legislative session will be starting and recommended the board not schedule meetings during legislative session on Thursdays and Fridays as division staff may be in hearings and may not be available to present reports, etc.

The board thanked PC Carabajal for the reminder and continued to review date options. The board agreed to the following meeting dates with all meetings set to begin at 9:00 a.m. and tentatively adjourn at 4:00 p.m.:

- February 5, 2025
- May 15, 2025
- August 13, 2025
- November 5, 2025

The board was ahead of schedule and asked if Ms. Chambers could join them earlier. PC Carabajal informed the board that Ms. Chambers was currently participating in a Medical Board meeting and would not be able to join the board earlier than what is currently scheduled.

Chair McKinley asked LE Spencer to provide information on a new document added to the meeting packet. LE Spencer informed the board that she had emailed board members and uploaded to the OnBoard meeting packet a draft of the new proposed regulation, 12 AAC 09.990(b), defining appliances as referenced in statute 08.13.220(5). LE Spencer informed the board that regulation specialist Alison Osborne had completed this draft from information received from Ms. Chambers via the Medical Spa Work Group; also Chair McKinley had also worked with Ms. Chambers on this verbiage.

The board briefly reviewed the drafted regulation.

*Recess The Board recessed at 11:47 a.m. for a lunch break; reconvened at 1:01 p.m. Majority of the board confirmed by roll call.*

## **9. Administrative Business**

### **A. Board Required Application Review/Consideration**

PC Carabajal reminded the board that they are required to participate in application reviews staff loads to OnBoard. PC Carabajal stated that if any board members need assistance and training with how to review and vote to please let staff know; participating in OnBoard application reviews is very important and to do so within the time frame specified by staff. PC Carabajal informed the board that if a quorum response is not received from board members staff is at a standstill until they can present at a meeting which also puts undue hardships on the applicant as they wait for licensure, examination scheduling, etc.

Chair McKinley thanked PC Carabajal for the reminder and stressed the importance of board member participation in these application reviews.

### **B. Board Member Training**

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

Ms. Chambers reviewed the “Guide to Excellence In Regulation” booklet with the board. Ms. Chambers stated she understood this is a lot of information and urged board members to contact staff or herself with any questions or concerns. Ms. Chambers informed the board that this booklet and other useful information can be located on the website under the quick link “Board Member Resources”. Ms. Chambers assured board members that roles and responsibilities will become easier as they obtain more experience as board members.

Ms. Chambers informed the board when considering regulation and legislative changes to remember that changes effect licensees and to always consider the consequences of any changes.

Ms. Chambers stated that the board is responsible for the content of their meetings; board members are responsible for making sure that all of the issues, concerns, regulations, correspondence, and public comments that come in are actively worked on and responded to.

Ms. Chambers reminded board members it’s very important to come to meetings, ask questions, and read meeting materials ahead of time. Ms. Chambers stated if there is something that they don’t understand to please call LE Spencer and ask for assistance.

Ms. Chambers stated this board has struggled for the last few years with participation, scheduling meetings, taking on responsibilities, and being prepared. Ms. Chambers went on to state that this board has new board members and hopes moving forward there will be improvements.

Ms. Chambers informed the board that if they decide statutory changes are needed, it has a legal responsibility to pursue them, and it’s a legislative audit issue if the board sates a statutory change is needed and nothing is done. Ms. Chambers stated that statutory changes require board members to contact legislators, look sponsors, attending meetings either on zoom or in person, and to testify about the need for a change, or testifying against a proposed change.

Ms. Chambers concluded with a reminder to board members to please read the “Guide to Excellence” and all other published board training materials.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Chambers and stated reading these materials is very important as he had a question which he was able to answer by reading the “Guide to Excellence”.

Ms. Chambers thanked Chair McKinley and began reviewing “Defensible Decision Making” located within the “Guide to Excellence” booklet with the board.

Ms. Chambers stated this is an area where this board has a great need to make decisions that are impactful to their licensees. Ms. Chambers stated that the ongoing esthetician issues have been being discussed for several years with no action taken by the board; licensees and the public have been very keen on hearing from this board regarding what they are doing to address the matter. Ms. Chambers stated through statute the board has been told they must answer these questions as the legislature has informed the board they must deal with these issues. Ms. Chambers stated she felt the board was getting closer to a resolution and tightening up processes; as the decision makers and profession experts this is an important responsibility for the board to complete.

Ms. Chambers reminded board members during this process, to continually review their statutes and regulations, confirm proposed changes are within their prevue, and to always consider the big picture of proposed changes. Ms. Chambers urged the board to remove language in their statutes that may hinder regulation changes; removing specific licensure, training, etc., requirements from statute will allow the board to update regulations much easier.

Vice Chair Miramontes asked if collaboration outside of meetings with other board members was allowable, for example if she has a question for Chair McKinley, could she call him directly.

Ms. Chambers informed the board that one board member can call another board member, especially if it’s the chair and asks a clarifying question, etc., however, no more than two board members may communicate outside of a scheduled meeting. Ms. Chambers clarified that if more than two board members communicate outside of a scheduled meeting, this does constitute a meeting which must be public noticed, etc.

Vice Chair Miramontes thanked Ms. Chambers for this clarification.

Chair McKinley asked Ms. Chambers if a board member has questions about a voting matter should they contact him.

Ms. Chambers stated that if board member(s) feel the need to deliberate about a vote, a topic, a regulation, or a case, this should be done appropriately through the public process, whether that means discussing the topic on the record or in executive session; this is where the deliberative process should occur. Ms. Chambers informed the board that if they had these types of questions to first reach out to staff as they would be able to provide information and deliberative process information.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Chambers for this information.

Ms. Chambers reviewed meeting management with the board. Ms. Chambers informed the board that they should all be following “Robert’s Rules” and keep moving their meetings forward with good time keeping and possible rearranging of the agenda, and ensuring they do everything possible to help the public understand what is going on. Ms. Chambers stated that clarity, transparency, and management of board activities are key points for successful meetings.

LE Spencer informed the board that Regulation Specialist Alison Osborne had joined the meeting. Ms. Chambers thanked LE Spencer and completed her presentation.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Chambers for her time and training. Board members had no questions for Ms. Chambers.

Ms. Chambers thanked the board and reminded them that if they had any questions or concerns to please contact her or staff.

## **11. Old Business**

Sara Chambers, Boards and Regulations Advisor, Susanne Schmaling, LME, CLT, Medical Spa Services Work Group, and Alison Osborne, Regulation Specialist, joined the board.

### **A. Medical Spa's Multi-Board Workgroup Update/Report**

Ms. Chambers greeted the board and informed them that this group consists of the Chiropractic Board, Dental Board, Medical Board, Pharmacy Board and this board, with Wendy Palin representing this board; the board met August 12 and most recently October 2, 2024. Ms. Chambers stated it is challenging to schedule meetings due to the different boards involved.

Ms. Chambers provided an overview of the purpose, scope, and process laid forth for the Work Group:

- Identify “lifestyle enhancement” services that have a medical nexus and are currently performed or likely to be performed outside of a medical clinic or without appropriate supervision.
- Identify existing statutes and regulations that govern current requirements for training, licensure, and supervision of these procedures.
- Clarify how licensing boards could—jointly or in part—explain existing statutes and regulations that would help the public and licensees understand how these procedures should be safely administered according to the current laws of the state.
- Suggest changes in statute that would allow defensible and transparent pathways forward for appropriately trained and supervised individuals to provide these services without imposing undue economic or regulatory barriers.
- Carry forward work group updates and work products to the member boards for their subsequent review and action.

Ms. Chambers briefly reviewed the provided “Esthetics Procedures List” with the board. Ms. Chambers informed the board that anyone can find information on the Medical Spa Services Work Group webpage; there are links to this page on the side bar of Divisions home page and individual professions webpages. Ms. Chambers encouraged board members to attend and stated these Work

Group meetings were also open to the public. Ms. Chambers also encouraged individuals who have questions or concerns, email her these directly and she will include those for the Work Group to address.

Ms. Chambers stated that there has been a lot of gossip about this Work Group's ability to implement changes; this is not factual, the Work Group is only an advisory group and does not have any decision-making authority, the Group's findings and suggestions are provided to individual boards and those boards make the determination if changes are needed.

The board and Ms. Chambers continued to review and discuss the "Esthetics Procedures List".

Ms. Chambers introduced Susanne Schmaling, LME, CLT, who has been working with the Work Group as an esthetics advisor through her organization, the Aesthetics Council. Ms. Chambers informed the board that the provided procedures list had been created in collaboration with Ms. Schmaling and to again remember, this documentation and information are only suggestions and opinions, not a binding document.

Ms. Chambers briefly discussed Food and Drug Administration (FDA) classifications and how the FDA updates their requirements.

Ms. Chambers stated that due to the overlap of services across several professions, the public and board members were encouraged to attend Work Group Meetings.

Ms. Chambers asked the board if they had any questions or wanted discussion before discussing a potential regulation change.

Ms. Schmaling greeted the board and introduced herself. Ms. Schmaling stated the procedures list has been a project she and her organization has been working on for several years working towards addressing services/procedures on a national level. Ms. Schmaling informed the board that this worksheet is based on legally defensible curriculum that is used when educating board members, legislators, and even inspectors.

Ms. Schmaling informed the board that the procedures list was a living document that can be made more comprehensive, etc.

Chair McKinley asked board member if they had any questions and informed the board, he had reviewed the list with Ms. Chambers yesterday and had talked about LED lights being classified by the FDA as class II devices. Chair McKinley asked if Ms. Schmaling could talk about this classification.

Ms. Schmaling informed the board that LED light therapy is called a core modality and based on curriculums of 600 to 750 hours of training/education; LED by itself is an FDA designated class II device with no class I designation, however, this does not mean this is a high risk device, it just means that is what the FDA has primarily classified it based on potential risk to eyes if looking directly at the light. Ms. Schmaling continued from the insurance side and risk management; she doesn't know of any claims around an LED device harming an individual.

Ms. Schmaling stated that LED devices are sold over the counter (OTC) to consumers and even those devices must be registered with the FDA as class II. Ms. Schmaling continued where designation comes in that's a little bit different, the Work Group didn't go deeply into FDA designations, however when you see a prescriptive designation or an OTC designation on the application or registration for the FDA. that relates to is primarily the level of instruction that needs to be addressed with that device, for example, many aesthetic devices available are prescriptive because they assume as a licensed professional, States have mandated a certain amount of training, therefore as a licensed professional you can use this device. Ms. Schmaling stated that some States have decided to interpret the prescriptive label and only allow doctors to use the device; this is not an accurate interpretation of FDA, but that is something we're trying to fix. Ms. Schmaling concluded you will see some LED devices that will be Class II registered as OTC which means they can be sold directly over the counter through Amazon and stores, or you can have an LED class II that's designated as prescriptive; this just means the device is not widely available OTC. Ms. Schmaling stated in these

instances, who may use the device goes back to the State to regulate who can use the devices; the FDA does not make that determination.

Chair McKinley asked as a follow-up, we're looking at education/training requirements as determining factors. Ms. Schmaling stated that was correct and the scope of practice is also a determining factor.

Chair McKinley asked board members if they had any questions or should he continue with his questions; hearing none, Chair McKinley asked what educational requirements were for the rest of the United States; Alaska only requires 350-hours.

Ms. Schmaling informed the board that the average training requirements are 600-hours with a few states including Alaska that had lower educational requirements. Ms. Schmaling informed the board that legally defensible curriculums based on a 600-hour requirement and above were created around the Department of Education and accreditation rules. Ms. Schmaling stated educational requirements of anything below 600-hours makes obtaining financial aid difficult.

Ms. Schmaling informed the board that in other lower educational requirement states that she's worked with have adopted 600-hours even though you could get away with 350-hours of education and obtain a license; however, with the Department of Education taking a new stance Federally with a new 150 % Rule, allowing licensure with lower education hour requirements no longer applies. Ms. Schmaling informed the board that she is an expert on that side of the industry, however, if your state says 350-hours is what you need for the license you are no longer able to obtain 600-hours to be able to obtain financial aid; this should be considered for regulation of esthetics and setting educational requirements.

Chair McKinley asked the board if they understood what Ms. Schmaling had just said; this is a very important piece of information that board members must understand and consider while considering changes to esthetics. Board members stated they understood.

Chair McKinley stated a 600-hour educational requirement that is standard throughout the US for an esthetician license, but could Ms. Schmaling address an advanced or master esthetician license.

Ms. Schmaling informed the board that an advanced or master esthetician license is a second-tier license with some controversy; some organizations believe that there should be a second-tier license while others feel that the scope and education level should be changed. Aesthetics is an international profession; internationally the minimum educational requirement is a minimum of 1,200 hours or more while in some countries require a two-year degree. Ms. Schmaling went on to state the US is different as the scope of practice has been divided into multiple licenses, esthetician, advanced and master; for example, massage has always been included as part of beauty therapy training which in turn would raise the educational hour requirement, so the US created the advanced and master esthetician license or certification; the educational hours required to obtain these licenses or certification typically bring the educational hour requirement up to 900-hours, with a curriculum and national testing. Ms. Schmaling informed the board that the US had come up with these requirements as most states offer a cosmetology license which includes specific esthetician training; she knows Alaska is a bit different, but the current scope of practice for skin care matches cosmetology and esthetics; however, with a cosmetology education there may only be 5% of the entire curriculum dedicated to skin care whereas with esthetics the curriculum goes a lot deeper into skin care.

Ms. Schmaling stated to deal with safety issues by having a second-tier license that's specific around a certain scope of practice allows for concentrated education, for that advanced license types, and allows for a scope of practice that reflects that education. Ms. Schmaling informed the board that some advanced certifications could allow a person to obtain laser training, however if that is not included in the states scope of practice, even with the additional education, the person could not provide that service. Ms. Schmaling stated that it would be essential to have a second-tier license, and/or the board could make changes to current statutory language so service providers could practice additional services legally; these types of changes would be up to the board and may look like additional certifications, license types, educational requirements, and continuing education.

Chair McKinley stated they could keep the 350-hour license and licensees could obtain additional certification, for example, lasers, and then they could provide these types of services under the 350-hour license.

Ms. Schmaling responded that this would depend on what the interpretation is by this board and their legal department.

The board and Ms. Schmaling briefly discussed certifications, scope of practice and medical supervision, and possible collaborative agreements.

Ms. Schmaling informed the board that some states created separate boards for advanced esthetics; these states have work groups to discuss matters as this board was doing now and included medical and nursing board members as well.

Chair McKinley asked if board members had any questions.

Ms. Chambers stated she wanted to ensure that all board members understood the context of this conversation; one of the benefits of having common regulations across the US and Canada is that we can all learn from each other and see what model legislation and frameworks worked well for other states, or other models that have been in place for a while, aren't working and need fine tuning. Ms. Chambers expressed her appreciation for Ms. Schmaling knowledge and expertise in many states working for and advocating for change.

Ms. Chambers stated that she wanted to be very clear with the board, all of this discussion requires statutory changes; this means the board will need to work with the legislature to find the path forward for these changes. Ms. Chambers stated that if this was the path forward the board wanted to take, make that move whether it be the board or members of the public submitting legislation. Ms. Chambers continued that without legislation changes, the board does not have the power to change the hour requirement for esthetician, however they can change the curriculum requirements. Ms. Chambers also stated the board does not have the authority to institute continuing education requirements either.

Ms. Chambers stated that the board should continue to work with medical boards, continue discussions with each other and the public and to keep in mind the big picture outcome. Ms. Chambers stated whether this leads to training changes, allowing for "grandfathering" or work experience; all of this must work in concert to create a model that is both safe and effective.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Chambers for her comments.

Ms. Canady thanked Ms. Chambers and Ms. Schmaling and stated she had been listening to the discussion but it's hard to formulate questions as there is still so much more information and discussion needed regarding implementation and requirements. Ms. Canady continued to state she sees lots of frustration from the public, however the board must ensure that next steps are clearly discussed and researched.

Chair McKinley agreed with Ms. Canady and stated he believes the board is starting this discussion and is looking at a big and extensive project with statutory and regulatory changes and encouraged all board members ask Ms. Schmaling questions.

Ms. Schmaling urged board members to ask her questions and stated she understands the tension and frustration of the board and public; she is currently working with another state where tensions are high; this led to some poor changes during 2018 that is having poor effects on businesses and licensees with restrictions put in place. Ms. Schmaling urged the board to be thoughtful about restrictions and effects changes will have on businesses and licensees. Ms. Schmaling continued, a thoughtful approach, one based on evidence, legally defensible information would help Alaska's estheticians feel more secure and to be mindful of public safety.

The board and Ms. Schmaling briefly discussed supervision, device classification, reviewed the "esthetics procedures list", and Interdisciplinary Matrix of Medical Spa Services Under Alaska Law".

Chair McKinley asked with this information and discussion about statutory and regulatory changes needed, the need to be mindful of unintended consequences should be forefront in the boards mind. Chair McKinley asked Ms. Schmaling to review the proposed regulation draft for 12 AAC 09.990.

**B. 12 AAC 09.990 – Appliance Definition**

Ms. Schmaling informed the board that the drafted language is based on a sample regulation that she's used in multiple states. Ms. Schmaling sated that a few points hit on areas that are currently narrow in this boards scope of practice statutory definition.

Chair McKinley reminded board members to consider unintended consequences which is why this draft regulation had been written and requested Ms. Schmaling address the benefits of this proposed change.

Ms. Schmaling informed the board that Michigan has a bill going through the process now, however the bill does not reflect how the FDA classifies devices and has the potential to make anything not classified as class II out of the scope of practice, meaning to use another classified device requires supervision. Ms. Schmaling also stated the Idaho 2018 bill contains a section that was added to their cosmetology statutes that states any class II device must be used under physician supervision; this is a good example of unintended consequences which means using something as simple as an ultrasonic disinfectant machine or autoclave cannot be used without supervision.

Ms. Schmaling stated that this is why a broad statutory definition is better, and through regulation, the board has the flexibility to update, and change based on new devices coming available on the market.

The board briefly discussed investigative costs for enforcement of appliance regulations and costs to licensees.

Ms. Chambers stated that changes must work together with all aspects of licensing and be practical and economically feasible for practitioners and not unduly restrict services. Ms. Chambers stated this will take time and in partnership with the Work Group; she urged anyone who's interested to attend Work Group meetings as well as these board meetings.

Chair McKinley asked Ms. Chambers to review the new drafted regulation for 12 AAC 09.990(b) and why this draft was different than the first drafted regulation that the board did not agree with.

Ms. Chambers stated several months ago, the Board put forward a starting point for conversation, the initial regulation to define appliances; this regulation had gone out for public notice and written testimony. Ms. Chambers stated received written testimony had been against the change and during the last meeting, the board decided to pause the project to request more information to assist them in understanding FDA classifications and the board also felt the proposed language was restrictive.

Ms. Chambers informed the board that with the assistance of Ms. Schmaling and Work Group recommendations, this new version had been drafted.

Ms. Chambers sated that this proposed regulation was a starting point for the board to begin discussions and provided the option to review the drafted regulation, open discussion, and pause for further consideration or take action with proposed verbiage and begin a regulation project.

Ms. Chambers also recommended the board also allow oral testimony for this as it is such a hot topic. Ms. Chambers elaborated that the board would have written testimony as this is standard and could schedule a special meeting for oral testimony once the project was at that stage.

Regulation specialist Alison Osborne greeted the board and reviewed the regulation process with the board.

The board reviewed the proposed regulation language.

12 AAC 09.990(b) is amended to read:



(b) For the purposes of AS 08.13.220(5),

**(1) “appliances” means the use of esthetic devices, or combinations of devices that stimulate natural physiological processes intended to improve skin appearance and health; devices should meet the following criteria:**

**(A) Do not directly ablate or destroy live tissue or involve incision into skin beyond the epidermis.;**

**(B) Devices must operate within manufacturer guidelines, and FDA registration if required by 21 U.S. Code § 321 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic (FD&C) Act; and**

**(C) These devices should not fall within Class III, IIIA, IIIB, or IV of Radiation Emitting Devices designations.**

Chair McKinley asked if board members had any questions. Ms. Canady stated she felt the proposed regulation was a good start.

**Motion: 1st Mae Canady – 2nd Tenaya Miramontes**

Begin a regulation project, 12 AAC 09.990(b) to define “appliances” as provided in statute 08.13.220(5), allow for oral testimony:

12 AAC 09.990(b) is amended to read:

(b) For the purposes of AS 08.13.220(5),

**(1) “appliances” means the use of esthetic devices, or combinations of devices that stimulate natural physiological processes intended to improve skin appearance and health; devices should meet the following criteria:**

**(A) Do not directly ablate or destroy live tissue or involve incision into skin beyond the epidermis.;**

**(B) Devices must operate within manufacturer guidelines, and FDA registration if required by 21 U.S. Code § 321 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic (FD&C) Act; and**

**(C) These devices should not fall within Class III, IIIA, IIIB, or IV of Radiation Emitting Devices designations.**

Chair McKinley asked the board if they would like additional discussion.

Ms. Canady stated she agreed with the proposed regulation verbiage.

Vice Chair Miramontes stated this is a great starting point to address this ongoing issue.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Schmaling for her time, assistance, and help writing this language. Chair McKinley also thanked Wendy Palin for her work on this matter and involvement with the Medical Spa Services Work Group. Chair McKinley also thanked members of the public for their time attending meetings, participation in public comment; he went on to state the board is working very hard on addressing this matter and moving forward this board would be more active and involved.

Chair McKinley requested a roll call vote.

**Roll Call Vote**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Recuse</b>
<b>Tenaya Miramontes</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Kevin McKinley</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>Jessica Pestrikoff</b>	<b>X</b>		
<b>W. Mae Canady</b>	<b>X</b>		

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

Ms. Osborne thanked the board and stated she would email LE Spencer the staff and board project opening questionnaires for the regulation process.

Chair McKinley announced to the board that one of his intents was to begin a statute and regulation booklet clean up; he had spoken with Ms. Chamber and LE Spencer about this project and wanted to give board members a heads up before the next meeting.

Chair McKinley stated that the board had previously discussed the need to do a major cleanup of their statutes and regulations this topic had also been briefly discussed during previous meetings, however, this project must happen. Chair McKinley informed board members that during a future meeting they would be assigned statutes and regulations to review that pertained to the specific professional licensure, board members would be responsible for reviewing their sections and marking them for cleanup, clarification, rewording, etc.

Chair McKinley gave an example of a statute that he felt needed addressing, Sec 08.13.160(d)(2); this statute allows a "licensed health care professional" to provide services, including body arts, without obtaining a professional license from this board; Chair McKinley stated he felt some clarification was needed either through a scope of practice definition, statute change, or regulation change.

Chair McKinley also asked staff to submit changes they would like to see done.

Chair McKinley asked if there were any closing comments.

LE Spencer stated she was very pleased with how well this meeting went, board member participation was fantastic, and she was so happy to see the board begin good discussions on matters that have been ongoing.

Chair McKinley thanked LE Spencer and stated everyone should give a big hand to Ms. Schmaling for all her work with this board and the Work Group. The board thanked Ms. Schmaling for her time and assistance.

Ms. Canady stated to board members and the public, this board is starting fresh with new members and the goal of moving forward; we cannot fix what has happened in the past, but moving forward this board will do everything in our power to make sure that everyone gets clear answers to questions.

Chair McKinley thanked Ms. Canady and agreed with her statement.

Chair McKinley thanked everyone for their time and participation.

**13. Adjourn**

The chair declared the board off the record at 3:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

---

Cynthia Spencer, Licensing Examiner III

Approved:

---

Kevin McKinley, Chairperson  
Board of Barbers and Hairdressers

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