

1 STATE OF ALASKA

2
3 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
4 DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING
5 BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS & LAND
6 SURVEYORS

7
8 Minutes of Meeting
9 August 11-12, 2014

10
11 By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, the
12 Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors held a meeting August 11-
13 12, 2014 at 550 West 7th Avenue, Suite 1270 in Anchorage AK.

14
15 Monday August 11, 2014

16
17 **Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Roll Call**

18
19 9:00 a.m. The Chair called the meeting to order. Roll call, all present except Eric Eriksen and
20 Jeffery Koonce. Both excused from this meeting.

21
22 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board:

- 23
24
- Richard Rearick, Architect, Chair
 - Colin Maynard, Civil Engineer, vice-Chair
 - Kathleen Schedler, Mechanical Engineer, Secretary
 - Brian Hanson, Civil Engineer
 - David Hale, Land Surveyor,
 - Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect
 - Keith Walters, Mining Engineer
 - John Kerr, Land Surveyor
 - Donald (John) Christensen, Public Member
- 25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Representing the Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing were:

- 35
- Sara Chambers, Director CBPL (via telephone)
 - Martha Hewlett, Administrative Officer II
 - Vernon Jones, Executive Administrator.
 - Sarena Hackenmiller, Licensing Examiner.
 - John Savage, Investigator.
- 36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Agenda item 2 – Review/Amend Agenda**

44
45 Jones: passed out several items that were received after the Board packets and agenda were
46 mailed.

47
48 Chair: Asks if there are any changes to the agenda.
49

1 **On a motion duly made by Kerr, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it was**
2 **RESOLVED to approve the agenda as amended.**

3
4 **Agenda item 3 – Ethics reporting**

5
6 Hanson: Reports that he attended the Western Zone meeting as a funded delegate.

7
8 Rearick: Reports that he attended the NCARB meeting as a funded delegate.

9
10 Jones: Sara is going to have some good news.

11
12 **Agenda item 4 - Review and approve the Minutes of the May 2014 meeting.**

13
14 Schedler: Asked that the phrase “a short free for all” throughout the minutes be changed to “a
15 short discussion”

16
17 Kerr: Page 5 line should say “a whole lot of times and line 38 “clock” should be “block” and
18 page 20 line 15 the word “data” should read “datum”. It appears twice in that line.

19
20 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it**
21 **was RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the May 2014 meeting as amended.**

22
23 **Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report**

24
25 Chair: The investigative report has been moved to tomorrow at 9:10.

26
27 **Agenda item 6 – Regulation update**

28
29 A) Status of Statute changes.

30 1) HB167 Sponsor – Labor & Commerce w/revision by House Rules
31 Committee. **Signed by the Governor July 8th. Will be effective on or about**
32 **October 6th.**

- 33 a. AS 08.48.221 Seals
34 b. AS 08.48.281 Prohibitive Practice
35 c. AS 08.48.341 Definitions
36 d. AS 08.48.331 Exemptions
37 e. AS 08.48.091 Written examinations

38
39 2) HB 187 re License Fees.

40
41 Chair: Asks the status of this.

42
43 Jones: It has to be reintroduced next session. It didn't make it through. Item B has been
44 submitted to the regulations specialists and he is waiting for an ok from the division to public
45 notice it.

46
47 Urfer: Asks why landscape architecture was singled out in subpara (b) at the top of page 5.

48
49 There was a short discussion explaining this to her that landscape architect was added after the
50 other professions and this is the way it was done.

51

- 1 (B) Regulation project for Structural Engineer and By Laws Change
2 (a) 12 AAC 36.063 Engineering Education and Work Experience Requirements
3 (SE);
4 (b) 12 AAC 36.108 Application for Registration as a Structural Engineer;
5 (c) 12 AAC 36.180 Seals; and
6 (d) 12 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals.
7

8 Chair: So this had been submitted for public notice?
9

10 Jones: Yes, it got hung up on Sara's desk for a while. There is a process we have to go
11 through before we can public notice anything and it has slowed things down to a crawl.
12

13 Maynard: Yes we gave this to them in February.
14

15 Chair: It would be nice if it got public noticed so it would overlap our next board meeting. Are
16 we asking for 60 days on that?
17

18 Hanson: Yes and we can extend it if we want to.
19

- 20 (C) Regulation changes adopted by the Board.
21 (1) 12 AAC 36.071 Standards of Practice for Land Surveyors.
22

23 Jones: These have been sent to Law and once accepted by them on to the Lt. Governor. I
24 talked to Jun and he said that a lot of people in both offices were on leave after the session and
25 it may be awhile.
26

27 Chair: The next item is the expenditure report but that isn't scheduled until 10:30 so we'll skip
28 the break, item 8 for now, actually let's go back to the expenditure report. He asks if anyone
29 wants to talk about it before the call to Sara.
30

31 Jones: This is the line item breakdown you have been asking for. The end of year report
32 probably won't be out until next month.
33

34 Hanson: We've seen this one before.
35

36 Chair: It looked familiar. He asks if anyone has any comments.
37

38 **Agenda Item 9 - Board Correspondence Received since May 2014.**
39

- 40 A) CLARB:
41 1. Member Board E-news May 2014
42 2. E-mail from Missy Sutton re Voting
43 3. Member Board E-news June 2014
44 4. Member Board E-news July 2014
45

46 Chair: Luanne any comments?
47

48 Urfer: Thinks the annual meeting will focus on the exams.
49

- 50 B) NCARB:

- 1 1. BOD Brief April 2014
- 2 2. CEO Update April 2014
- 3 3. CEO Update May 2014
- 4 4. BOD Brief June 2014
- 5 5. Business meeting follow-up from Kathy Hillegas.
- 6 6. E-mail from Kathy Hillegas re annual business meeting follow-up.
- 7 7. Letter from Greg Erny re/election as Secretary.
- 8 8. Memo from CEO re/legislation in Wisconsin
- 9 9. E-mail from Kimberly Tuttle re NCARB Booth at the AIA Conference.
- 10 10. CEO Update June/July 2014
- 11 11. Town Hall Outcomes 2014-2015

12
13 Chair: Comments that a log of organization send our informative bulletins and some of
14 the things are included in other discussion by the Board. Most of item B. is just updates
15 on things the NCARB Board is working on as well as follow-up on things that were
16 discussed at the National Conference. There are three things that we will be discussing
17 under item 17 regarding the IDP, BEA and BFEA. Those were the three big things at
18 the conference this year. There are a couple of things in here that we need to take a
19 look at. Items 5 and 6 we will discuss as part of item 17. He briefly explains items 7
20 and 9. Item 9 is about outreach if anyone is interested I will let Vern know when that's
21 going to be. I will respond to Kimberly and let her know that we are not going to have a
22 booth and who to contact which will be me. NCARB is really trying hard with their
23 outreach to reach every board, school, state.

24
25 Urfer: Adds that the CLARB Board met in Aleska and had dinner with them in
26 Anchorage and talked about some of the issues re licensure.

27
28 Chair: Asks if the CLARB Board by meeting up here noticed how different landscape
29 issues are here compared to the other states.

30
31 Urfer: Yes, I think so. We talked a lot about the politics of how different boards work
32 and their legislative issues. A lot of talk about how to streamline things. They were very
33 interested in landscape architecture in Alaska.

34
35 Chair: Explains that there was a "town hall" near the end of the meeting where you
36 could text questions and they would answer them. B-11 is a response to that. If there
37 is anything relevant I will talk about them during item 17.

38
39

- 40 C) NCEES:
- 41 1. E-mail from Jerry Carter asking about early testing for PE w/response
 - 42 from Vernon.
 - 43 2. E-mail from Lea Strickland re Agricultural exam.
 - 44 3. E-mail from Jerry Carter re motions for the Annual
 - 45 Meeting in Seattle this August.
 - 46 4. Memo from Melissa Cornelius re BOD meeting in Lincoln NE.

- 1 5. E-mail from Lehmon Dekle re subject matter reports for FE/FS
- 2 6. News release re Seattle University winning the Engineering
- 3 Award.
- 4 7. Email from Jerry Carter re Supreme Court case.
- 5

6 Hanson: Was on the UPLG committee and explains that they were asked to de-couple
7 exam and experience. So they did that and sent it to the BOD and they didn't like it
8 because we de-coupled them which is what they asked us to do. He explains that the
9 de-coupling was basically allow education, examination and experience to be obtained
10 in any order and that these are model law and model rule changes so it's up to each
11 board how they want to do it. For example we don't allow the exam to be taken before
12 the experience is obtained. He adds that there are some boards that do accept the
13 model law and model rules so we need to be aware that there are some boards out
14 there that may let people take the PE the day after they graduate and whether or not we
15 want to accept those folks for licensure in Alaska after they have done that. If we are
16 going to accept them then why don't we do the same. If we allow someone from Texas
17 who took the PE right out of college then got their experience and became licensed, if
18 we are going to accept them then why don't we allow our people to do the same. He
19 doesn't want to start a big discussion right now but we should see how the change goes
20 and be aware that there are states already doing this.

21
22 Chair: Notes that NCARB is working on the same changes.

23
24 Kerr: Asks if he knows what they driving force for this is.

25
26 Hanson: You have to remember that NCEES is to promote licensure. So the argument
27 is that people get busy, move on with their lives and they never take that next step. A
28 lot of people take the FE to graduate then they start a family, go into construction,
29 whatever, and never get back to getting their PE. Surveyors is the same sort of deal,
30 it's not just engineers we are talking about here. It's to keep interest alive and keep
31 people, women in engineering has been a big push the last few years and they are at
32 the highest risk of dropping out and not coming back and getting their PE. A lot of
33 women do but there are a lot that have kids and are away from the field for 10 years
34 and want to come back but they can't get their PE or they have to jump through all
35 these hoops so it's a way to try to get people to get licensed.

36
37 Hale: So it's just to get people licensed it doesn't have anything to do with more
38 experience or better engineers or surveyors?

39
40 Hanson: No, and the argument is that they can pass it easier out of school. Well
41 everybody in this room and around the country builds that exam, it's not professors.
42 They do their PACS studies I'm sure everybody in here, or maybe you haven't, got a
43 survey for a PACS study that says what you use in your profession and what's required
44 to be a professional engineer. So I fill it out as it relates to the work that I do and Colin
45 will fill it out as to how it works in structural. Each discipline combines the experience

1 and the input they get from around the country and they build the exam based on that
2 so it's not designed as you get through school and you pass it.

3
4 Chair: It's practice analysis that validates the exam and makes it legally defensible.

5
6 Maynard: Adds that the theory is that you could take the FE and PE right out of high
7 school and then go to college.

8
9 Hanson: A lot of states are not completely de-coupling. They say you have to have
10 75% of your degree to take the FE and to take the PE you have to have graduated.
11 You have to be able to eventually get licensed. You have to have an engineering
12 degree to get licensed so they do not let you take the PE unless you have an
13 engineering degree.

14
15 Maynard: Adds that the people he has heard talking about this want to de-couple it
16 from experience but don't want to de-couple it from education.

17
18 Kerr: Notes that in all of this discussion he hasn't heard anything about how it relates to
19 the public health, safety and welfare.

20
21 Chair: Thinks that this is going to tie into some of the things he is going to talk about
22 because NCARB is going down that same path and maybe going one step further
23 where they are trying to do an experimental program where you get your experience
24 and education all at the same time and then you have your exam at the end and you are
25 licensed.

26
27 Hanson: Notes that they have started analyzing the results of the early test takers and
28 they are worse is what he has heard so the exam is doing what it's supposed to do.

29
30 Hale: Asks what's worse.

31
32 Hanson: The pass rate, so the exam is doing what it's supposed to do which is setting
33 minimum competency.

34
35 Chair: The next item.....

36
37 Hanson: These are all the committee reports. There are a lot of changes here, a lot of
38 wordsmithing, a lot of clean-up for CBT. The big one is engineering surveys on page
39 16. He notes that we are working on that here also and asks if it's on the agenda. He
40 reads the proposed changes and with the new language being, surveying incidental to
41 the practice of engineering excludes. And it just tells you what it excludes not what you
42 can do.

43
44 Chair: And that in the model law?

45

1 Hanson: Yes this is model law and they are also changing the definition of the practice
2 of engineering. We did a complete model law and model rules review so there were a
3 lot of UPLG changes.

4
5 Kerr: Adds that at the combined western/central zone meeting there was a committee
6 that produced some language for an amendment. I was involved with that committee or
7 that work group, there were 8 of us on it and it was rejected. The language was
8 considered deficient and an attempt was made to change it. The rationale behind it was
9 that many of the engineering programs don't teach the subjects that you need to be
10 competent doing the work that they are allowing.

11
12 Chair: Asks if this has been introduced.

13
14 Hanson: No this will be voted on at the Annual next week. He adds that some board
15 get hung-up on wordsmithing but this is model law and no one has to adopt it. It will get
16 a lot of discussion and will probably be amended on the floor.

17
18 Hanson: Goes through the rest of the motions and makes a brief comment on each.
19 Most are just cleaning up the language.

20
21 Maynard: Asks if he thinks there are any of the changes that don't concur with what we
22 are doing here.

23
24 Hanson: Some of them aren't what we do, we don't go that route. The examination is a
25 good example of that. But I don't know of a reason not to support the model law. He
26 recommends that the board read through the changes and see what they are.

27
28 There were no comments of importance on any of the other NCEES correspondence.

29
30 D) Memo from SD Board regarding early testing for PE.

31
32 Hanson: Explains that this is just comments from the SD board on early testing.

33
34 E) E-mail string between Colin Smith and Chair re reciprocity with Canada with
35 an invitation to the PNWER summit.

36
37 Jones: Explains that the Canadian Associations want Alaska to adopt regulations
38 similar to what they talked Idaho into where anyone who is licensed in another
39 jurisdiction for 8 years without any discipline action would be granted strait across
40 reciprocity.

41
42 Chair: Notes that we have had that discussion quite a bit and I don't think anyone on
43 this board wants to advance that at this time. He thinks that NCEES is starting to talk to
44 the Canadians a bit more.

45

1 Jones: Suggests that one of the points you might want to make with them is if we
2 adopted that Canada would have to accept our engineers that met that criteria without
3 any examination.

4
5 Maynard: Agrees and notes that so far they haven't been willing to do that.

6
7 F) Invitation to the APEGBC Annual conference.

8
9 Jones: We declined. I think next year it's going to be in Montana so maybe we can
10 make that one.

11
12 G) Email string between Chris Miller and Vernon re minutes and
13 Web postings.

14
15 Jones: He wants us to post everything (board packets, draft minutes) on the web and
16 that's not going to happen.

17
18 Chair: Ok, I think I remember this one now.

19
20 H) Letter from Paul Vibrans re arctic engineering course waiver.

21
22 Hanson: I think he applied and don't think we should discuss this. We do have an
23 arctic requirement and I don't think we should waive that.

24
25 Several members commented that they didn't think we should or could waive it.

26
27 I) Letter from Sara Chambers re Travel

28
29 Chair: Asks Vern if we need to respond.

30
31 Jones: Like I said before I think she is going to have some good news for us.

32
33 J) Response from MVA re Disaster Assistance in U.S.

34 K) Response from MVA re Disaster Assistance

35
36 Jones: That's the response about across border emergency response in the event of a
37 disaster.

38
39 Hanson: Asks if we can issue courtesy license and military courtesy licenses.

40
41 Jones: Explains that it's in centralized statutes and regulations and the AELS Board
42 would have to put it in our regulations.

43
44 Maynard: We would have to have a regulation that explains how we would do that.

1 There was a short discussion on whether or not there was a need for this type of
2 regulation.

3
4 L) E-mail from Bryan Oakland re PE exam

5
6 Jones: This gentleman will probably be here for public testimony. He explains that Mr.
7 Oakland's education doesn't fit our tables and he was told to get an engineering degree
8 that did. UAA has told him that in order for them to accept him in a program he would
9 have to take courses that he don't apply to the engineering degree and he doesn't think
10 this is fair. He can take the FE but would not be qualified to take the PE.

11
12 There was a short discussion on where he might fall on our tables or whether or not to
13 revise them for situations like this.

14
15 Chair: We will wait and see what he has to say and review his application.

16
17 M) Email string re as-built surveys

18
19 Hale: Asks if Vern talked to him or just the emails.

20
21 Jones: Just the emails.

22
23 Hale: Explains his comments in the email string that as-built's are certified as to the
24 relationship of improvements to the boundary.

25
26 Kerr: His statement that no boundary work is involved is false. The purpose of an as-
27 built survey is to show the relationship of buildings and improvements to the property
28 line. That's the function of that survey so unless he is using a different definition of as
29 built survey, which he may be, but the core definition in the civil survey world for
30 residential as built would be that. Now there are as built's where you just go and mark
31 up a set of plans showing what was actually constructed, if that's what he's talking
32 about....

33
34 Hale: That's not what he's talking about.

35
36 Kerr: Right and he states he's going to Yukon Title which is a title company which
37 involves land rights relative to boundaries. So I don't know what he's thinking.

38
39 Chair: We have responded to him. Do we need to do an additional response?

40
41 Jones: He might show up for the public testimony too. He indicated that he might come
42 to the meeting.

43
44 Chair: So at this point in time this has been answered and if he has further questions
45 that he wants to bring up during public comment.....

1 Hanson: There are companies out there that do as built and they state right on there
2 that it's not a survey and it's not a legal document but it's what's on the property and it's
3 what's built. It's where you get into the relation to the boundary that's the surveyor
4 realm but going and simply mapping out, ok this is the building as it exists, appraisers
5 do it all the time.
6

7 Hale: Responds that that is a different function. The function of an as-built survey is to
8 show that the structures aren't across the property line or in an easement or their not
9 encumbering another right. If it's an as-built survey, that's what it's for.
10

11 Hanson: If it's a true as-built survey they have to do a boundary retracement and go
12 through the title and make sure that that individual actually does have the right to the
13 property not just that it's built in the right spot. They actually have to do the title
14 research to, the surveyor does, to prove that this boundary was properly originated and
15 there is a chain and it's been followed and there hasn't been any pieces parsed off and
16 the structure is right here and it does or does not cross the boundary.
17

18 Maynard: So are you saying to me that if an architect or civil engineer does a site plan
19 that shows a property line and somebody goes and says yes it was built exactly like that
20 it has to be a surveyor and the architect or civil engineer who prepared those
21 documents can't do it?
22

23 Kerr: Correct.
24

25 Maynard: Well they shouldn't be able to prepare the documents in the first place and
26 they've been doing that for longer than I've been an engineer.
27

28 Hale: The mortgage surveys are done a little differently because they are done so
29 quickly and cheaply.
30

31 The discussion continued for a short time with no new points. Just mostly about Muni
32 requirements and what people are actually doing.
33

34 Chair: Asks if there is a deficiency in our regulations or a deficiency in the way people
35 are performing.
36

37 Hanson: Thinks it's both. There is no definition of engineering surveying in our
38 Regulations and Statutes. There's a definition of surveying. He then looks up the
39 definition of engineering and reads line 12 "or the performance of engineering surveys"
40 that's the only place, I believe, in our Statutes and Regulations that engineering
41 surveys.....
42

43 Hale: It's not in Regulations?
44

45 Jones: It's in Statute but not in Regulations anywhere.
46

1 Hanson: Reads the definition of surveying and then adds that nowhere in either of
2 these does it say well if I'm not laying out land, if I'm just going back out and saying ok
3 there's the corners and figuring out where the building is on it. That's why I say it's
4 both, it's maybe a gray area, maybe it shouldn't be but we read both of these together.
5 Ok, he's not establishing control, I would never establish control as an engineer, but
6 you're assuming he's using existing control. It's an existing subdivision lot that may or
7 may not have existing corners. They're not staking out new land and they're trying to
8 figure out where the building is on it. That's where it gets into the gray area, it doesn't
9 say in either of them that they can't do it.

10
11 Kerr: It's clearly covered in the practice of land surveying in the last sentence where it
12 says preparation and perpetuation of maps, record plats, field note records and property
13 descriptions that represent these surveys. So there was a survey that occurred and
14 he's preparing a map that's supposed to represent the survey, the boundary.....

15
16 Hanson: Creating a new one.

17
18 Kerr: Right, but it's representing the surveys that were performed above. So he's
19 locating land when he shows the property line.

20
21 Maynard: Thinks that is ridiculous because you're saying that no architect or engineer
22 can do a site plan ever again. They've been doing it forever and there is no reason for
23 them not to do it.

24
25 Kerr: There is a good reason for them not to do it and that's because every property
26 line is based on title research and the interpretation of boundary law to discern what
27 rights exist on what piece of property and where those rights are. And the structural
28 engineers and architects haven't been schooled on that activity.

29
30 Maynard: Structural engineers don't do site plans, civil engineers do.

31
32 Kerr: Ok, But the whole reason is that it's a complex thing to determine title and where
33 it is. That's why it's covered under this Statute. It's easy to not know about property
34 rights, their existence or their proper location without doing this additional work.
35 Anytime somebody does that they're exposing themselves unnecessarily. It's real easy
36 to get someone to come in, a professional surveyor, to do that and it protects the
37 person, the client, so they don't end up with a structure that encroaching on an
38 easement that somebody didn't know about or maybe there's a defect in the boundary
39 that they didn't know about and they thought they had 15 feet of setback but it's really
40 only 5 or whatever. You just don't know, it's a complicated thing and that's why it's in
41 the law. It's not because surveyors want to touch every project it's because it's more
42 complicated than the people that are doing that stuff realize.

43
44 Hale: It's really important to protect the public because this client is seeing it's stamped
45 by some professional and they have no idea about any of this stuff, They're certifying it

1 and they are saying ok, I'm good to go and they buy the property. There's some real
2 potential harm in that.
3
4 Kerr: Site plans are particularly important to get right because it's the beginning of
5 spending a whole lot of money and people don't know what problems they're potentially
6 going to encounter because they haven't had someone who is qualified go through it to
7 determine what's really going on there. A plat or a written legal description is only part
8 of the whole story.
9
10 Maynard: Surveyors should be doing grading plans too then.
11
12 Kerr: They should be involved, yes.
13
14 Christensen: States that he bought a lot plotted in 1970 and when they surveyed it they
15 guys driveway was in my yard which created a problem because he had been using the
16 driveway for 15 years. Relates how he actually experienced what they are talking about
17 and the difficulties he encountered dealing with it.
18
19 Chair: There are code plans that we do that show a building on the site based upon the
20 property boundary that are on a survey plat and there are also assumed property lines
21 that we use for code purposes that have no meaning in the survey world. So as an
22 architect our interest is the distance to the property line, if there are encumbrances we
23 want to know about it. Ultimately that falls under another discipline and you're better to
24 have that survey done, title search, the whole bit.
25
26 Jones: We've got to call Sara in 10 minutes, can we have a break?
27
28 Chair: Ok, back in 10 minutes.
29
30 10:20a.m. Break
31
32 10:30a.m. On record.
33
34 Placed a call to the Directors office.
35
36 Good Morning Sara, this is Vernon, you're in the Board meeting.
37
38 Chair: Hi Sara this is Richard Rearick and Martha Hewlett is sitting here at the table
39 with us.
40
41 Chambers: Fantastic, thank you.
42
43 Chair: So, would you like to start?
44
45 Chambers: Sure, thank you Mr. Chairman, members of the board, for the record, this is
46 Sara Chambers, Director of the Division of Corporations, Business and Professional

1 Licensing. I'd actually like to defer to our Admin Officer to discuss the financials if she's
2 available and then I have some other items to inform the board about and certainly
3 available to discuss any other Divisional items that the board may wish to add to our
4 agenda.

5
6 Chair: Ok, that sounds great, Martha.

7
8 Hewlett: I'm sure that Vern has made sure that all of you have a copy of your first
9 through third quarter financials in your packet. Looking at FY14 first through third
10 quarter your revenues are looking excellent in comparison to year 12 which is a good
11 comparison marker since the biannual renewal. Your expenses, as well, are looking to
12 be right on track on where you should be at the end of the third quarter. It looks like you
13 guys will end with a sizable surplus at the end of the year which is very fortunate for
14 you.

15
16 Chair: Could we stop.....

17
18 Jones: I did not include that.

19
20 Hewlett: Oh, ok I can get you copies after I leave. So at this point your licensing
21 revenue at the end of third quarter, you're at about \$1,885,000. Which is very good in
22 comparison to your FY12 which was at about \$845,000 at the end of the year. So
23 considering you'll still have revenue coming in the fourth quarter you are looking very
24 well on that end. Your personnel services at \$202,000 thousand which is on par for
25 where you should be at 3rd quarter. Travel is just under \$30,000. Your contractual is
26 just under \$31,000. That would be various contracts such as proctors and any legal
27 bills you may have incurred over the year, hearings and such and supplies a measly
28 \$1,811 to office supplies and various things to keep admin running. Your total indirect
29 through the third quarter is estimated at \$323, 000 and the way the indirects work are
30 because some of these things are processed at the beginning of the year, others at the
31 very end and there is a true-up where everything is hashed out and calculated
32 accurately. But to keep a place marker it was decided years ago that they would take
33 the prior year expenses for indirect and tack on quarters at a time just so you
34 understand that you have a place holder and that you don't have more excess revenue
35 than you may have in reality. So at the end of the day you're ending things with a
36 surplus at the end of the third quarter was a little over a million dollars and you will still
37 have fourth quarter revenues and expenses coming in that will alter that a bit. We
38 should have should have those together for you guys at the beginning of October. Right
39 now we are at a fiscal year end and the new calendar year for the state has already
40 opened. We currently have two fiscal years open and are still doing the final for last
41 year and the new year has already begun with a bang for us. So all-in-all you guys are
42 looking right on track and sitting very nicely at the end of the year. After I go back to the
43 office I can make copies of this and give it to Vern and you can review it in more detail.

44
45 Jones: We reviewed this at the end of the third quarter but I'll make new copies for
46 everyone.

1
2 Hewlett: Then you guys can come back to me with any questions you have on it. So
3 unless you have further questions on financials we can defer to Sara for the other
4 updates.

5
6 Hanson: Asks if they are going to change the way the indirect is allocated, right now it's
7 based on the number of licensees not the direct expenses. He uses 2013 as an
8 example. We had direct expenses of 330 that's our personnel and contractual, etc. yet
9 we paid 431,000 in indirect then you go to the medical board who has \$700,000 in direct
10 so they obviously have a lot more resources within the Division, a lot more people
11 working for them, yet they only pay \$350,000 in indirect. I know that indirect is office
12 space, insurance, etc. so they have more than double the direct expenses which to me
13 means more than double the personnel and resources and yet they're paying
14 significantly less in their indirect allocation. Is there any plan to change that allocation
15 based on direct expense?

16
17 Chambers: We have been working on some refinements to our indirect allocation
18 methodology that will be applied for FY14, the year that we are in reconciliation with
19 right now. We have been able to go through the types of indirect expenses that are
20 incurred by the Division from the various sources and look at whether it makes more
21 sense to allocate some of those by PCN or number of staff as opposed to number of
22 licensees. So we've identified what we anticipate will be over a million dollars in re-
23 allocation by PCN method as opposed to licensee method. Because that process, the
24 fiscal year, as Martha mentioned, is still being closed out and trued up we won't know
25 the exact impact of that change until it's finalized. But, it seems like it would make more
26 sense to make those changes and I think that speaks to the concerns the board
27 member who just spoke raised where there are a specific number of staff related issues
28 that those expenses be allocated differently than licensees and you're correct there is
29 no standard methodology for if a program has a certain number of licensees then they
30 have a certain number of staff it varies differently from program to program. The issue
31 of how to allocate according to revenue, that's not been a methodology we've pursued,
32 or direct expenditures, excuse me, because direct expenditures encompass a lot more
33 than just direct licensing personnel services and as Martha mentioned, contractual
34 expenses can vary widely depending on the investigator needs or the hearing needs of
35 a particular program. So we are looking at this particular refinement to be instituted for
36 this fiscal year in hopes that it will get us further down the road to address those issues
37 that you mentioned.

38
39 Chair: Thank you Sara.

40
41 Chambers: If I could elaborate on indirect as well we have also started in the last
42 couple of months going through our indirect expenses a little bit more thoroughly, the
43 term fine toothed comb comes to mind. Martha and I and members of our
44 Administrative Services financial staff has spent some time walking through line by line
45 of the indirect itemization and really looking at ways that we can cull costs out of that
46 pool where they are more appropriately charged to a program directly and we have

1 found some ways to improve upon that. At the end of third quarter we had found over
2 \$400,000 in indirect expenses that made more sense to move over to direct expenses.
3 And we are really excited and confident in completing that process for this entire fiscal
4 year, getting that fourth quarter in there and then we'll be able to, in October when we
5 have all this information, present you all with more details about what went into the
6 indirect costs, how those costs are allocated and the changes we have made and how
7 that ultimately has increased the integrity of the indirect expenses. That may mean that
8 some programs pay more ultimately because they're finally paying for the direct
9 expenses that had been carried through indirect in the past. So that is certainly a more
10 defensible position to be in and we can explain those things to all Boards.

11
12 Chair: Asks if those changes she identified be in the FY14.

13
14 Chambers: Yes, they will be.

15
16 Hanson: Asks if she has a sense of where the indirects are headed. They were \$4.8M
17 last year. Are they going to be about the same?

18
19 Chambers: We don't really know until the end of the year because directs are more
20 than what our Division incurs. It's the addition overhead costs from just being part of
21 State government and indirect costs that are incurred to support all of our Divisions
22 functions from IT to accounting and travel support and so forth. We'll know that as we
23 get closer to October. I would forecast though, just looking at past trends, that the
24 indirect expenses, what we were charged last year for certain expenses will probably
25 cost a little bit more this year since we have seen sort of a cost of living or CPI increase.
26 Things including the Union negotiated salary increases of 5 % we'll see that jump up.
27 But if we're able to re-allocate some of this indirect, more appropriately, to direct
28 expenses in could mean that overall indirect hit is a little bit lower. So are some of the
29 trends that I can forecast with indirect but we won't truly know anything until the bills are
30 all received in the next month or so.

31
32 Hanson: Last year it went up 18.5 % or something like that so I guess I'm hoping that
33 we are not continuing to see that inflation. I know there were some big costs incurred
34 but I was just seeing if you think they are going to be 4.8 or 5.8 or 3, I don't think they'll
35 ever be 3 again.

36
37 Chambers: Last year it was 4.2 and the year before it was 3.6 so it is increasing but we
38 are doing everything that we can to not only mitigate those expenses but also plan to
39 continue the way that we are explaining them to board members so at least there is a
40 sense of knowing what the costs are. I'm looking forward to having that conversation
41 with you at your next meeting.

42
43 Schedler: States that this board takes its financial responsibilities seriously and
44 expresses her disappointment at not having current information available for the
45 meeting. She adds that we need to have the information in the packet so we can review
46 it and come to the meeting ready to discuss it and that the information in the packet had

1 been seen before and was old information and you come to the meeting with new
2 information and read it to us.

3
4 Hewlett: I don't know if this has been expressed to the Boards in the past or not but the
5 way the State operates for the accounting function, we actually have the Admin
6 Services Unit that processes all the bills and revenues after we collect them. When the
7 quarter closes they have 30 days to finish processing all of our expenses and revenues
8 and have the numbers to generate the Board Report. Then the end of year, final
9 version is a bit longer than the 30 days because of the re-appropriation period where
10 there is a multitude of things going on and so those are out in October. I've noticed the
11 same things. I find that when the financials are available doesn't always align perfectly
12 with when Board meetings are scheduled. And I can understand that would be very
13 frustrating if I were in your position as well. Unfortunately we have to give Admin
14 Services their 30 days to calculate and finalize the numbers to make sure that they are
15 accurate before they are published and put out to everyone. The only suggestion I
16 could have there is, as Vern said, in the last Board meeting that aligned with right when
17 the third quarter financials came out. So those were gone over with you then, I believe
18 Sara was with you that meeting. I was in another Board meeting at the time. In the
19 future if the new information is not there that we not allocate the time in the meeting for
20 it and just plan on the next one. Ultimately whatever is the Board's pleasure works for
21 me.

22
23 Jones: That was what came out at the end of April and was review at the May meeting.

24
25 Hanson: Agrees with Kathleen and adds that this is really a \$22M corporation that runs
26 every month on a lot of money. I work for a private company and if we do not have the
27 financials within three days of the month end our auditors are on us because, where is
28 all the money going, they have to account for every penny, they have to finalize them
29 within seven days. Yearend has to be preliminary within 15 days of the end of the year
30 and if it's not done in 30 you've got auditors and banks coming down on you saying
31 where is all the money going, who's getting paid, who's not getting paid. There should
32 always be a sense of where the money is going. He understands it's not Martha or
33 Sara but this is a \$22M corporation and it should be run like a corporation and keep
34 track of the money.

35
36 Chambers: We are adhering to government accounting principles which are audited
37 and I know it's difficult to compare what the State government is to a private industry
38 that has a different set of guidelines. We're adhering to the requirements of the State of
39 Alaska so there's nothing untoward or being hidden from this Board. Under Statute it is
40 the Division responsibility to ensure that the fiscal information is taken care of and is
41 provided to the stake holder according to those best practices so again we are adhering
42 to those and they are audited regularly. I understand Vern's perspective of these
43 numbers have already been discussed so we wouldn't necessarily put them in the
44 Board packet but it wouldn't be a bad idea to have them in the packet if you're inviting
45 staff to discuss them. So I would look forward to that information being in front of you
46 again if it's been awhile since you've seen it. The schedule is published in the Board

1 Orientation Manual which has been distributed to all Board Members. So if there is a
2 concern about understanding the timeline of when the financials will be distributed and
3 maybe looking toward aligning Board meetings to that timeline then you can certainly
4 refer to that schedule. Any other tools that we have that would make your position
5 easier I would be more than happy to try to pursue those with you but I just want to
6 reassure you that the operation that the AELS Board is engaged with is being handled
7 probably the best that it has been handled in a decade. Many of you will remember
8 going some exercises a few years ago to double and triple check that we were adhering
9 to these best practices and making sure we were not giving you guestimate numbers
10 along the way, that we were reconciling all numbers to the accounting system before we
11 were distributing them to boards. So we're not engaging in that outdated practice
12 anymore. We're ensuring that all the numbers are reconciled and that we are giving
13 you something that has been through the checks and balances which again was an
14 audit finding in 2011 and we have responded to and are being held accountable for.
15 The AELS Board takes in just over a million dollars and expends a million dollars and
16 how that money is being spent is your business and statutorily it's our responsibility so
17 we want to make sure that we get you the tools that you need and that you feel
18 confident about them.

19
20 Schedler: States that she has been on the Board three years and we are not there yet.
21 We have this discussion every meeting and everything you just said is just words and
22 how embarrassed she would be if she met and engineer on the street and he ask how is
23 the Board managing their fiduciary responsibilities that she would have to respond that
24 she hasn't a clue. I don't know if your fees are adequate, I don't know if they are being
25 adequately spent. I don't know if the indirects are holding up the state government. I
26 have not a clue and I have been trying to pay attention. I have been trying to ask the
27 right questions and I am getting frustrated.

28
29 Chambers: I totally understand it's a different type of accounting process and while
30 we....

31
32 Schedler: Different than what? I've worked for the University for 26 years, it's not
33 different.

34
35 Chambers: We have worked over the last couple of years to improve the level of
36 information that you're provided and it's my goal to continue down that path. I agree
37 that we're not there yet. Now, in my new position I'm planning to provide more
38 explanatory information to Board Members so the conversations that we are having will
39 make sense so there's more education on how the process works. I've served as staff
40 and on board of many non-profit organizations in the last 20 years and private non-profit
41 accounting is very different than the State government agencies and even the University
42 of Alaska fiscal processes are different than the regular divisional processes. So I
43 recognize that your Board and all the other boards struggle with some of the
44 terminology and dynamics and it's especially hard when you don't have that information
45 in front of you. When you don't have your quarterly schedule which itemizes all of your
46 direct expenses and the last year of indirects which also provided itemized are not in

1 front of you. I recognize and honor your frustration and when that information comes
2 out in October I'm planning to ensure that there's a more education piece to help to
3 articulate some of the terms and the processes that you can hang on to and be able to
4 hold us accountable for explaining them to you. I agree, I don't think that's been done
5 effectively in the past and it's my aim to change that when that information comes out.
6

7 Chair: Anybody else on that topic? Sara did you have some other topics that you
8 wanted to talk about?
9

10 Chambers: Yes, I do. Mr. Chairman recently you wrote a letter to my attention which
11 regarded travel and I understand that the prior chairman Mr. Eriksen wrote a similar
12 letter to Director Habeger just a few months ago. I have been working to address the
13 issue of direct booked travel since this became an issue in 2012. We have talked at
14 almost every board meeting about it and I'm happy to be able to tell you that last week
15 Commissioner Bell signed a policy interpretation memo that I presented to her that
16 would allow the boards and staff to take advantage of direct booked travel where it may
17 be offered by industry associations. So where you've been able to work directly with
18 NCEES, NCARB and the other associations that you work with on travel you will be able
19 to resume doing so. Starting September 1st we are also going to be offering the ability
20 to, it's not a requirement, the ability for any Board Member who may want for us to
21 make their travel arrangements for them to be able to do so. Some Board Members
22 across all 20 of our boards have expressed concern about carrying some of the
23 expenses for travel on their own personal credit card over a period of time until you
24 engage in travel and can submit receipts and get reimbursed. So this will eliminate the
25 requirement for someone to be able to manage that personal expense for a couple of
26 months. So around September 1st I'll be providing written guidance to Board Members
27 and to staff on how all of these processes will work. That way you won't be guessing
28 about it, you'll have clear guidance on when you want to take advantage of this direct
29 travel what you need to do to remain compliant with state law and do what you've been
30 requesting to do. So, hopefully that's a positive change that's been a long time in
31 coming and takes one concern off of your plate.
32

33 Chair: Asks if this means we can if NCARB funds a delegate we can have them pay for
34 it and not have to run anything back through the state and affect our travel budget.
35

36 Chambers: Essentially that's true, yes. The information that will be provided to you in
37 writing will be that you still have to go through the pre-approval process to let us know
38 what the estimated expenses are because we do have to record, not in your accounting,
39 but to gage the impact of that travel. It's the process that Vern usually does for you that
40 is estimating here's what the airfare cost is, here's what the hotel costs is, here's what
41 NCARB is willing to pay. We need to do that for two more reasons. One is risk
42 management, if you're traveling on behalf of the State on behalf of the Board in your
43 capacity as a board member the state is liable for insuring you and being aware of your
44 travel and should something happen to you or to any property that you might be
45 associated with like a rental car, a hotel room. The state is an obligor in that
46 responsibility so we need to make sure that we are aware of that travel. And lastly we

1 are also responsible for any expenses that those agencies may not pay such as meals
2 and incidentals or other transportation costs. Every association is different so we want
3 to make sure that you're getting reimbursed to the full extent that you're owed. Beyond
4 that preliminary requirement the only other requirement will be at the end of travel that
5 you file an ethics report which is about a 30 second process to let the State of Alaska
6 know that you received that travel expense directly from that association so should
7 there be a question in the future, that's recorded and you self-reported it and filed it
8 away for good measure. So again, not to overcomplicate it, you'll receive that
9 information in writing and what it boils down to is exactly as you said, you can book with
10 them, they'll cover the expenses and hopefully that will make the process a lot
11 smoother.

12
13 Chair: That's definitely a step in the right direction and we appreciate the Division's
14 efforts on our behalf.

15
16 Kerr: Asks if, when they submit a request for reimbursement, there is any kind of
17 reconciliation email or anything. I submit a request for reimbursement and then
18 sometime in the future money shows up in my account and there is no notification and I
19 don't know if all my expenses have been approved or not approved or anything. Is
20 there some kind of reimbursement reconciliation email or report that we can get when
21 this occurs?

22
23 Chambers: That's a great question. I've asked our travel folks in the Division of
24 Administrative Services if they could improve in that area that would be helpful for all
25 board members and staff. Vern could certainly request that from our travel planner
26 specifically but I'm interested in more of a systemic fix because if we could get those
27 automatically that would be helpful. So, yes, and I hope so.

28
29 Jones: They'll provide it now but I have to ask specifically for it for each individual.

30
31 Hewlett: One thing to add that may not fit specifically what you're looking for. There is
32 an online application for the State of Alaska where you can go in and put in your
33 personal number, your PVN in state accounting, and it will pull up any payments that
34 have gone to you and it will give you the line-item detail that you got reimbursed \$60 for
35 per diem, \$180 for mileage, so on and so forth. And it'll give you the warrant number
36 and the date that it was transferred to your account if you're on the EDI electronic
37 payment system.

38
39 Kerr: That's great do you have a URL?

40
41 Hewlett: I can email that to Vern and he can send it on out to you.

42
43 Several board members responded that that would be very helpful.

44
45 Hewlett: I personally don't use it, I use the accounting system but if it doesn't fit your
46 needs get back to me and we can see if we can come up with something better.

1
2 Chair: Is there any other topics of discussion for Sara or Sara is there anything else you
3 want to add?

4
5 Chambers: I don't think there is anything else that we didn't already touch on at your
6 spring meeting. I would remind you that I'm available anytime, phone, email, walk in,
7 whatever way that I can assist you and again I take your concerns very seriously and
8 hope that's evident in the travel changes that we've been able to accomplish in the last
9 week and we'll follow-up this fall as published with additional information. You are not
10 the only board that finds what we do mystifying so it's my responsibility, I believe, as
11 Director to ensure that you have as much information as you need to be able to
12 converse on these topics so I appreciate your candor with me and look forward to
13 having a similar discussion later on this fall.

14
15 Hanson: I think I sent you an email on this but i like the happy new fiscal year report
16 you put out. It feels like you're involved with the Division at that point even as a board
17 member kind of knowing what's going on and I hope you keep that up whether it's
18 quarterly or annually or whatever. It's nice to hear what you guys are doing. I
19 appreciate that.

20
21 Chair: And I'd just like to say I know the State system can be difficult and we are a
22 passionate board and we want as much information as we can get. But we do
23 appreciate you striving to get us that information.

24
25 Chambers: Thank you, I appreciate that feedback. I certainly don't want to spend time
26 on things that are not useful. I did get a lot of positive feedback about the
27 communication so I will continue doing so with more travel updates probably being the
28 next email that you get from me. And Brian I'm glad that you mentioned that one
29 because I hope that you all will take the time to respond to the quick survey link that
30 was in that message regarding board training that I'm scheduling for this fall. It's
31 certainly voluntary training I know that several of you attended this training the last time
32 that we held it in 2012 in Anchorage. Part of that poll was a question about what are
33 some topics that you may be interested in, what dates may work for you so if you
34 haven't responded yet I would encourage you to do so. So you can have a hand in
35 making sure that training opportunity is a valuable for you as you would like for it to be.
36 Thank you.

37
38 Chair: Thanks Martha and asks if she has further comments.

39
40 Hewlett: No, it was good to meet all of you face to face for a change. I'll get that link
41 over to Vern on how to search your payments and you guys can feel free to send me
42 any feedback if that doesn't meet your needs.

43
44 Jones: Goes up to 1500 to make copies of the third quarter financial report.

45
46 Chair: We'll take a quick recess while he does that.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

11:10a.m. Break

11:20a.m. on Record.

Chair: Asks if anyone has any more on the financial topic.

Jones: Once upon a time, (laughter) a few weeks before the board meeting I would send an email to the individual in Martha's position and ask for a Board Report. They would give me the figures up to that point. They don't want to do that anymore they want to wait until they have reconciled the quarter and put it out which, like they said takes a month or so. I didn't include this information in this Board Packet because this is old news. This ended in March. However in the future I can include all Board Reports for the FY in each Board Packet if you would like.

There was a short discussion on year end and how it's done and year end surplus revenue and how it's supposed to be steady instead of peaks and valleys. The question came up, are we adequately staffed? Do we need another person? Are you doing the work of one and a half people? This does happen over time.

Jones: it did happen. He relates how things were when he took the Licensing Examiner position. There were two Licensing Examiners and he would finish his work and be looking for something to do and his supervisor would tell him to take work from the other examiner which upset her. She eventually moved on to another position and instead of filling the vacant AELS position my supervisor let Guides and Transporters have the position. He was able to keep up with it and Sarena seems to be doing so. Alicia felt we needed another examiner. He asks Sarena if she is overworked and she replies no but will never get any filing done. He explains how far behind the filing is and that the Division hires people to file for the whole Division but it's an entry level position and they move on to better paying positions.

Chair: Thinks the amount of effort is related to the amount of customer service you want to provide or I should say how much hand holding you want to do and Alicia would hold people's hand all the way through the process where there could have been some of those items she could have just said you need to submit all your information or it's not going to be considered.

Jones: Sarena is the same way and I was getting files ready up to the day before I left for the meeting. If I had enough to bring it to the board I did. It's do it now or do it later.

Chair: And we want to be as customer service oriented but there are those people out there that just are not prepared to make their application.

Maynard: Asked when John came on full time.

1 There was a short discussion on that and it was determined that it was sometime in
2 January.

3
4 Chair: Getting Back on track we are on item 9 N which is a letter from Julia Hustwit
5 regarding architect registration requirements. It's quite a rambling letter, she has a
6 specific situation and she's recommending new ways to handle licensure. I think it's
7 better directed toward NCARB than this board. He doesn't think any action is required,
8 it was a letter sent to every state in the union.

9
10 We'll move on to Item O, an email from Colin Smith regarding licensure mobility.

11
12 Jones: it has an attachment from the Oklahoma board.

13
14 There was a short discussion on the attachment which concerned mobility between
15 jurisdictions without further examination similar to what the Canadians are asking us to
16 do.

17
18 Hanson: Explains that it's part of the model law and not binding on us.

19
20 Maynard: Points out that the Statute says we will adopt regulations and standards that
21 meet the requirements adopted by recognized national examining councils. So if the
22 national standard says something that we are not doing then some lawyer is going to
23 say you can't do that anymore. So we've got to be careful what the model law says.

24
25 Chair: With that said if it's adverse to our regulations then we would be well suited to
26 oppose it. So that completes item 9.

27
28 **Agenda item 10 – Correspondence Sent Since May 2014.**

29
30 Chair: Asks john if he wants to go today or wait until tomorrow. He opts for tomorrow.

31
32 The first one is an email to CLARB re the welfare pilot program.

33
34 Urfer: Comments that she didn't make the teleconference announcing the selectee.

35
36 Jones: Thinks it was someone from Ohio.

37
38 Chair: Item 10 B. was my response to the IDP changes and basically that we didn't
39 take any exception to it, we talked a little about this at the last meeting. He advised
40 them that although we don't with expanding the reporting requirements we do have
41 concerns that they may be confusing to the interns and may cause some of them to be
42 less vigilant about reporting in a timely manner. He hopes this is rolled out as an
43 exception to the rule and the interns are encouraged to continue report within the
44 confines of the current reporting requirements. He feels that NCARB tends to coddle
45 people through the process and if you do that then people tend to go to that as the rule
46 instead of the exception.

1
2 Next is a letter to the Director that is sent similar to the one Eric sent in the past on
3 travel and it seems like they have made some changes and we will see how that comes
4 out in September.

5
6 Hanson: Asks if it's effective immediately.

7
8 It turns out that he and Colin already made their travel arrangements through the
9 NCEES travel agent. Jones advised them to make an ethics report at the end of the
10 travel.

11
12 Chair: 10 D letter to Buzz Scher re the ASHSC proposal. That's the Alaska Seismic
13 Hazards Safety Commission.

14
15 Maynard: Yes they wanted to require a seismic course for anybody getting licensed in
16 Alaska.

17
18 Chair: Colin had put together this information after our last meeting.

19
20 Maynard: Asks if we wanted to have a cover letter that goes out with the regulation
21 project that explains what we are doing and why we are doing it.

22
23 Jones: People are already asking for that regulation.

24
25 Chair: Asks if we are permitted to do that and if so Colin will take care of it.

26
27 Jones: Will ask.

28
29 Hanson: It's more of a white paper than a position, just Board rationale.

30
31 Maynard: It's just an explanation.

32
33 Chair: 10 E is an email to MVA re emergency response across borders.

34
35 Jones: And their response was items J and K in the received correspondence.

36
37 **Agenda item 11 – Old Business**

38
39 Chair: A is a letter to the Commissioner re travel. That's done. 11 B. also done. C.
40 definition of engineering surveying. Did we have anything to do on that?

41
42 Kerr: There was some correspondence between Dave, Brian and myself.

43
44 Hanson: Comments that Alaska does need to do something on it. He wants to see
45 what happens at the NCEES National. It was decided to keep it as old business.

46

1 Chair: D and E have to do with reciprocity with Canada. At the last meeting we decided
2 to wait and see what NCEES is doing and it sounds like they are starting to have some
3 discussions with Canada. Referred to the Licensure Mobility Committee.

4
5 11 F was indirect cost detail.

6
7 Hanson: This was just my comments on the information Sara had sent us.

8
9 Chair: Asks for a motion to go to lunch.

10
11 Jones: What about dinner tonight? Made a reservation for 8.

12
13 11:48a.m. Recessed for lunch, we have public comment at 1:15 so be back at 1.

14
15 1:02p.m. On record.

16
17 Chair: We are back in session and will go ahead and proceed with the public comment
18 a little bit early. First on the list, David Lanning and we'll make some room for you here
19 at the end of the table.

20
21 Mr. Ludington: I'm going to go first ahead of Dave, we are here on the same issue.
22 Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen and thank you for this opportunity to come and
23 talk. I made up a uh

24
25 Hanson: Could you state your name for the record?

26
27 Ludington: Yes, I'm Milt Ludington, I'm at 552 Grand View Court, Fairbanks, license
28 number 8435. I've been licensed somewhere for 30 some years all over the world and I
29 worked both in the private and public sectors and I base my comments on that
30 experience.

31
32 At issue, what I'm here for is the Alaska State professional licensed surveyors have a
33 mortgage standard that they use for residential mortgage as building. The mortgage
34 companies think it has to be done by a professional surveyor not a civil engineer. I
35 checked the law and the law very clearly states that I'm perfectly able to do licensed
36 engineering surveying and if you look at the real definition of engineering surveying,
37 that's primarily as built surveying. You build it, you've got to know where you're going to
38 put it beforehand, and you've got to know where it's at after. The State actually requires
39 that as built surveys be provided after building anything. I just finished a couple of years
40 at the University, we require all construction, no matter what site modifications were
41 done to be as built by a professional engineer, nothing about land surveying. The
42 ASPLS location survey standards that everybody's using very clearly states by the
43 surveyor that the document does not constitute a boundary survey and is subject to any
44 inaccuracies that s subsequent boundary survey may disclose. That's an important
45 point. If it's not a survey and it's not accurate it can't be verified by a boundary survey
46 then it's an as built survey and a civil engineer ought to be perfectly able and competent

1 to do it. In the back of that packet I handed out to I sent several examples along here.
2 Each one of them here a licensed surveyor did and for whatever reason it was old and
3 had to be redone. You can see my responding as build in the back. The methodology
4 used by the surveying outfit and myself are almost identical. In all, I do, due diligence,
5 we get a plat map, we put together a drawing before we go out there of the lot lines, the
6 easements, any drainage area, swales, whatever might be useful in the field work and
7 then we go out in the field, solve what boundary problems we can, just like a surveyor
8 would, and produce the as built and turn it in. Recently Yukon Title has come back and
9 said we think only licensed land surveyors can stamp these drawings. They took the
10 first dozen I did and paid for them but they aren't going to take anymore until we get a
11 determination from the State Board as to whether or not my license legally covers as
12 building residential properties. Mr. Lanning has joined me today be he on the Planning
13 Commission in Fairbanks and he's also a licensed engineer and I think he can add
14 more to it. But I just don't see in anywhere in my dealings, whether it be in the United
15 States or overseas. I've never heard of an engineer who couldn't do an as built survey
16 and stamp it. And that's basically what this is. This is not a survey, it was never
17 intended to be a survey and that's exactly how the licensed surveyors view it. So does
18 anybody have any questions for me. I'm short and sweet but I thought I'd make my pitch
19 and see what you had to say.

20

21 Chair: We had talked about this topic a little bit this morning so we are aware of it but
22 have not made any decisions yet.

23

24 Ludington: Well, that being said, I'm going to leave it to Mr. Lanning to clarify.

25

26 Mr. Lanning: My name is Dave Lanning, I'm a licensed civil engineer in Alaska. I've
27 been licensed in Minnesota and North Dakota in the past I'm not currently licensed
28 there. I've been an engineer licensed since 1992 and have practiced surveying as part
29 of my professional practice and pre-professional practice for about 30 years. I have
30 taught surveying to rodmen and chainmen back when there were rodmen and
31 chainmen. I've taught beginning surveying at UAF along with other courses for the Civil
32 Engineering Department there. I spent 4 or 5 years on the Platting Board in Fairbanks
33 and as such I've seen hundreds of plats come through with regular sub-division
34 mapping and also with uplands. I'm current on the Planning Commission in Fairbanks
35 where we do zoning changes primarily that revolve around typically plot plans that come
36 before us for some boundary reason or other, say a house is built too close to a lot line
37 or something like that or change zoning for properties that always have a plot plan along
38 with the request. I'm currently on the ticker committee for the National Association,
39 ASCE for the cold regions foundations and structures committee so I say this just to let
40 you know I've been around the walk a few times and I've done hundreds of as built as
41 part of my civil engineering program practice. The one I've handed out is one of 150 we
42 did down in Valdez for the city of Valdez. We had a program to replace septic systems
43 because the lots were so close together and the wells were so close together and the
44 septic, we did it on a kind of neighborhood wide basis. And so as part of this survey,
45 reconstruction and as built afterwards our documentation says this is not a survey. It's
46 exactly what the surveyor's say when they publish a plot plan they say this is not a

1 survey. It's mapping, it's an as built, it's an as built intended for particular purposes. In
2 my case it's intended for DEC to see what we built which is what we said we were going
3 to build and that it meets the requirements that they placed upon us as part of that
4 instruction. But very similar information would be presented along with a plot plat to a
5 mortgage company. The reason mortgage companies and banks require these is to be
6 protected themselves. It's not there to protect the client, the people borrowing the
7 money or the people getting the money, it's to protect themselves so that there's no
8 fraud, there is a house on this lot. Or, there aren't other problems that would come back
9 and bite then should the mortgage go in default and they get the property back. So it
10 isn't really a boundary survey, they aren't getting protected from the boundaries being
11 incorrect but being protected from what's on that lot posing problems to them as a
12 lender. The specialized as built was an intent to solve a problem mortgage companies
13 and title companies had. I have participated in real surveys, real Alta surveys which are
14 the national standard for boundary surveys along with RLS's. We did one in about 19,
15 maybe 2000 maybe 2005 somewhere in there up there in Fairbanks. For a 1 acre gas
16 station that was being purchased by big oil company. As such we had to go back and
17 survey all the way back to the original BLM monuments and we retraced the original
18 sub-division surveys, we retraced all the subsequent surveys. And we found a huge
19 bust, about 10 feet between the lot we were surveying and the next door. So it was
20 impossible for us to resolve it so we go back to the clients and the deal fell through.
21 The important point here is that nobody doing a plot plan would have discovered that.
22 Whether it had been a surveyor doing a plot plan or an engineer doing a plot plan they
23 would look at the nearby monumentation, surveyed the improvements, stamped it and
24 turned it in because a plot plan is not a survey. An Alta survey, a boundary survey is a
25 survey. There's no question that surveyors do surveys, that is the legal issues, where is
26 the property corner is this the property boundary? In order for them to determine that
27 they have to do a real survey. They have to look for real evidence in the field, they have
28 to do real title searches. None of that occurs when they do a plot plan, whether it's
29 surveyors or engineers. So there is no reason in my mind, as far as I can see, why
30 engineers can't do surveys for mortgage companies as plot plans.

31
32 Hale: Asks how he is reconciling the mortgage location survey definition in the hand out
33 you gave us where it says the location survey is a professional survey provided by a
34 professional surveyor.

35
36 Lanning: This is a standard promulgated by surveyors so naturally it said surveyors.
37 But everything else in there, all the ways it's done, all the things it says to do, we think
38 are reasonable and those match what we would do for uh.....

39
40 Hale: The other thing is the certification statement where it says all improvements
41 located lie complete within the property line and don't overlap the property. How do you
42 make that statement without doing a boundary survey?

43
44 Lanning: Everybody does it that way. Surveyors do not do boundary surveys, their plot
45 plans do not say they are a boundary survey in fact they say this is not a survey. So we
46 do it the same way they do. Locate nearby monumentation that we can find. Not all

1 corners are there, some are destroyed, some are not useful, some are bent over. You
2 pick the good ones that you can find, as many as you can. You base that as your
3 reference for the survey and then you survey the improvements. That's exactly what
4 surveyors do.

5

6 Hale: So you write this statement but you really don't know where the boundaries are.

7

8 Lanning: Nope. Nobody does until you do a boundary survey.

9

10 Kerr: So then nobody should be making that statement unless they do the boundary
11 survey.

12

13 Lanning: That's right and that's the reason they say on the front of their plot plan, this is
14 not a survey.

15

16 Kerr: I'm curious as to where you have found that no plot plans have title searches or
17 boundary surveys associated with them.

18

19 Lanning: I've done plot plans with surveyors in Fairbanks for many years as an
20 instrument man or as a guy along with it or whatever and we've never done title
21 searches. We do title searches typically when we do sub-division work.

22

23 Kerr: What is the function of a plot plan?

24

25 Lanning: It's to protect the mortgage company and the title company.

26

27 Kerr: A plot plan?

28

29 Lanning: Yes a plot plan.

30

31 Kerr: Ok, I guess what's your definition of a plot plan?

32

33 Lanning: It's a localized survey, it's a location survey, it's an as built that goes along
34 with a house sale or a small commercial sale that documents that the house exists that
35 the bank or the title company (unintelligible) (Recorder nearest to Mr. Lanning ran out of
36 space and stopped recording. Using the recorders from the other end of the table and
37 his voice is pretty low and it's hard to understand some things he is saying.)

38

39 Kerr: How is that different from an as built?

40

41 Lanning: In my opinion it doesn't.

42

43 Hale: We're talking about protecting the title company or the bank. What are we
44 protecting them from?

45

1 Lanning: Fraud to start with. The building exists on the lot. So that someone isn't just
2 (unintelligible) to get the money.

3
4 Hale: Isn't the purpose to show the improvements in relation to the boundary?

5
6 Lanning: Yes,

7
8 Hale: So why are we doing that. It's my impression that we're doing that to show that
9 the structures are out of easement that on the property not over the line.

10
11 Lanning: Yes, that's all true. There are setbacks. You have to make sure they are not
12 on a setback or easement. All these things are true and everybody is assuming that the
13 property lines match the monumentation.

14
15 Kerr: All of those things are dependent on how you properly establish boundaries and
16 so there is a boundary component to this.

17
18 Lanning: But the surveyors are not guaranteeing that boundary any more than the civil
19 engineers.

20
21 Kerr: I can't speak to what the surveyors do or what they have or have not done but
22 unless you determine the boundary of the property there is no way you can show any
23 improvements in relationship to the boundary until you determine the boundary.
24 People who are doing that without determining the boundaries then they are exposing
25 themselves to huge liability as well as exposing their client to problems down the road
26 and if that's occurring, I'm sorry to hear that, but that does not make it right.

27
28 Ludington: Can I speak to that briefly? Basically the first move you make when you get
29 an assignment like this is you go down to the borough and you get a plat map, a sub-
30 division plat map. You reconstruct that plot plan on auto cad or whatever program you
31 have so you can understand where the easements are, where the corners are
32 supposed to be, what the radius is of the curve on the street, everything you need to
33 know for that piece of property on paper. Then you go out in the field and you spend
34 several hours at that location to find evidence that matches that sub-division plan and
35 using that evidence that you can reestablish the boundary lines, but not exactly, I don't
36 have a gun, that is use by the surveyors. You set the corners you either shoot them or
37 do whatever we have to do with them and measure the distance to them. But those
38 boundaries have to be established within some reason with the sub-division map that
39 you got from the borough. And that sub-division map, you make sure that it's the latest
40 map and all the easements are on it and if there are any anomalies that don't show on
41 the sub-division map then you report that fact. It isn't a matter of just going out and
42 guessing, you have to have the sub-division plat in front of you in order to establish the
43 lot that you are trying to as built.

44
45 Kerr: And to make sure of all the easements, how do you do that?

46

1 Ludington: All the easements are on the subdivision plat and you have to make sure
2 that those easements are showing on your drawing showing that there are no structures
3 inside the easements.

4
5 Kerr: Well, that's one of the problems all the easements are not on the plat all the time
6 you have to do a title search and if that's not occurring then you cannot indicate where
7 the properties that's built on that lot are. If you don't know about them you can't locate
8 them, that has to occur, if someone is choosing to do it without doing that I can't speak
9 to that, however, they are exposing themselves to liability and they are trying to get out
10 of it by making the statement that this isn't a boundary survey, well I don't know how
11 that would hold up in court but if it walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, it's a duck.

12
13 Ludington: It says besides not being a boundary survey it says it's subject to all the
14 inaccuracies that a boundary survey may uncover later. So it's saying that there may
15 be errors, but, I would like to point out that when that boundary or plot survey is done
16 the next person that gets it is the title company and it's their job to do the title search. If
17 they find a problem with that plat that there's something that I didn't put on there, cause
18 they're the ones doing the title search, there's no sense in paying for two then they
19 come back to me and say we did a title search and there's a big easement on this lot,
20 there's drainage ease right through the middle of it and I say ok, show it to me and I'll
21 go plat it.

22
23 Kerr: The statute is written to protect consumers from this exact kind of thing and
24 hopefully it does. It sounds like the survey has some holes in it. The person that buys
25 the house with the undiscovered easement is ultimately left holding the bag. The bank
26 does not absolve them of any problem or costs associated with that. The title insurance
27 company writes their policies to disclaim just about every situation they can anticipate.
28 It's the professional land surveyor that's supposed to get a title report, research the
29 record, the title report is the beginning of the (unintelligible) to specifically disclaim any
30 unwritten rights on that title report yet they could exist by public land order or by other
31 means it's the responsibility of the land surveyor to bring all of this together on his
32 document to protect all the parties and the public that are involved in this, that's why this
33 is a protected activity.

34
35 Ludington: If the Board feels that's correct then they should put it in their standard and
36 we would follow it. There's no reason a civil engineer can't do a title search same as a
37 land surveyor but there's no requirement in the state standard for (unintelligible, several
38 people talking at once). If the State Board wants a title search there's certainly no
39 reason we couldn't do that. I frankly think it's double coverage because the title
40 company's doing it but if a title becomes something that's important than a civil engineer
41 can do it just as well as a land surveyor.

42
43 Lanning: So let me say one more thing here. I agree with you that what you say is
44 completely true. On the other hand the price for a survey ranges between 3 and 5
45 hundred dollars. The title search is at least \$500. There's no way these surveyors are
46 doing a title search first. So if the Board has a problem with that, and maybe they

1 should have a problem with that, I don't disagree with that then they need to go to the
2 surveyors and straighten that out. But our proposition today is that we can do this, and
3 we do, do this all the time and there's no reason we can't do it for the mortgage
4 company.
5
6 Hall: Well it looks to me like the way you guys are doing this is that you are performing
7 a boundary survey because you're showing dimensions to the 100ths for one. You're
8 also dimensioning the building at 120 feet from that property corner. We all agree that
9 engineers can't do boundary surveys and you guys are standing here telling me you're
10 doing it.
11
12 Lanning: Those are all records of distances (unintelligible).
13
14 Hale: So how do you know it's a 120 feet then.
15
16 Lanning: It's a record (Unintelligible) based on modifications (unintelligible)
17
18 Hale: How do you get the two to come together is what I'm wondering because there
19 are no structures shown on the subdivision plat, how are you marrying these two.
20
21 Lanning: That's what the survey does.
22
23 Ludington: The way I do it is I simply find the monumentation I can and I establish a
24 property line to measure from generally I run.....
25
26 Hale: So you're doing a boundary survey.
27
28 Ludington: No, I'm just running a rag tape from one monument to the other and
29 measure the distance to it.
30
31 Hale: it may be a crude boundary survey but you're retracing the boundary. Then
32 you're showing it to a 100th which tells me it's not that crude, it's pretty accurate.
33
34 Lanning: Those are record drawings.
35
36 Hale: Be that as it may it's now your work because you stamped it and you certified it.
37
38 Lanning: Well if you have trouble with our concept of this then you have trouble with the
39 surveyor's standard process.
40
41 Hale: That may well be, we're just dealing with this that's all we can do.
42
43 Lanning: So that's what we'd like to present today and we hope you'll think about it.
44
45 Chair: We appreciate your perspective on it and helping us understand how you are
46 approaching it.

1
2 Kerr: I'm glad you brought this to the Board. One thing to think about, I've survey in
3 Alaska for a number of years and for the companies I've worked for in the past, the
4 largest liability is in this sort of survey. This is where companies buy (unintelligible) for
5 their E & O insurance and it seems like a good way to jeopardize a person's retirement.
6

7 Ludington: One interesting point on that subject is, I've had at least three of these that I
8 couldn't establish a line correctly and I sent them out on the street for a boundary
9 surveyor on the street. The only ones I do are the ones that are fairly clearly
10 straightforward. A four year old chimpanzee could figure out where that plot line is, it's
11 8 feet from the house and if it isn't that simple then I'm quick to send it to a surveyor
12 because I don't want to take any liability for trying to retrace the line. When I retrace it
13 I'm tying a string from one stake to the next stake if that's retracing then any
14 homeowner can do that and I get a fairly decent idea of where the thing is at. Anyway I
15 wanted to let you know that we are not trying to put the surveyors out here. We need
16 surveyors but I call the before I take a chance on (unintelligible).
17

18 Chair: Thanks again guys, next is Brian Oakland.
19

20 Mr. Oakland: My name is Brian Oakland and my objective today is to determine the
21 best way to meet the state requirements to sit for the PE exam. In the past I have
22 corresponded with indirect correspondence concerning my situation through Vern. So
23 first of all I hope I'm in the right place. (Laughter, you're in the right place.)
24

25 Schedler: Asks what indirect correspondence is.
26

27 Oakland: Email. I would ask him a question and I assumed he would relay the question
28 to you and he would respond as I will describe right now. So according to what the
29 Board determined through email I received from Vern I am eligible to take the FE under
30 12 AAC 36.062, however, with my current education I would not be eligible to take the
31 PE exam under 12 AAC 36.063. So is everybody familiar with that document, the
32 education and work experience table? So I will either have to obtain an ABET
33 accredited engineering degree or a MS in engineering in the specific branch applied for.
34 The Board recommends that I transfer the credits I've already earned to an institution
35 with an ABET accredited program. So I received that response and I appreciate the
36 Board's review I agree with the recommendation, however, I have come across some
37 barriers in achieving the State requirements that don't seem reasonable. So going over
38 a little bit of the background of my education in 2007 I earned a BS in Interdisciplinary
39 Engineering and in 2009 the same program was renamed Engineering and
40 Management and was accredited by the Engineering Commission of ABET. I contacted
41 the director of the program to learn what changes were made from 2007 until
42 accreditation in 2009. Those changes include 5 courses, in satisfying the requirement
43 of those 5 courses I would meet all the requirements in an Engineering and
44 Management ABET accredited program degree. However by meeting the program
45 requirements I still would not meet the universities requirements for that degree
46 because a student cannot earn a second degree from that university without taking an

1 additional 30 credits of course work. So I'm hoping you all sort of see the issue there of
2 taking 30 credits that have nothing to do with an ABET accredited degree. So for the
3 sake of meeting the requirements to set for Alaska's PE exam, like I said it does not
4 seem reasonable. So I propose meeting the requirements of the ABET accredited
5 degree at the university where I earned the first degree without meeting the university
6 requirements of the 30 additional credits. What do you all think?
7

8 Chair: Do we just have this one part that deals with non-ABET accredited degrees?
9

10 Jones: I believe so.
11

12 There was a short period of mostly silence where the board studied the education and
13 work experience tables of 12 AAC 36.063.
14

15 Oakland: Just to be clear I'm looking at the section in 12 AAC 36.063 ABET accredited
16 B.S. degree in a branch of engineering that is not the branch for which the applicant has
17 applied. That seems to be the category that would most (unintelligible) for my position.
18

19 Hanson: So you have a BS in Interdisciplinary Engineering and what's your Masters?
20

21 Oakland: I did not bring that but I do have a Masters in Energy Systems Engineering.
22

23 There was some back and forth between Board Members and Mr. Oakland while the
24 Board studied the regulation and Mr. Oakland's qualifications to see if there was a path
25 to licensure for him. The final result was that Mr. Oakland may fit the section that says
26 Master's or doctorate degree in engineering acceptable to the board from a school
27 which has a ABET accredited undergraduate engineering program in the branch for
28 which the applicant has applied. However, he would have to apply before the Board
29 could make a determination.
30

31 Chair: Thanks Mr. Oakland for his comments and informs him that the Board will review
32 his file in Executive Session.
33

34 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hanson and passed**
35 **unanimously it was RESOLVED to go into Executive Session IAW AS 44.62.310**
36 **(c)(3) to review applicant files.**
37

38 1:48p.m. In Executive Session.
39

40 5:30p.m. recessed for the day.
41
42

43 Tuesday August 12, 2014
44
45

1 9:00a.m Called to order. Roll call all present except Eric Eriksen and Jeff Koonce who
2 were excused from the meeting.

3
4 **Agenda Item 5 Investigative Report.**

5
6 Savage: How is everyone doing today? Several things I'd like to cover just to keep you
7 up to date. Our office is, you know we lost our Chief Investigator quite a while ago and
8 John Clark is the temporary. When John Clark came in he was awesome for this
9 Board. Years ago he was the investigator for the AELS Board. So he was very helpful
10 in getting some of the old cases moving and closed, you know, and or action on them
11 and things such as that. The one case we've got over at the AG's office he single
12 handedly got that moving. It is moving now and hopefully we have some satisfaction on
13 that before too long. The individual that is handling it is going to be leaving soon. The
14 AAG, so they are going to be down to one AAG over there so hopefully we will get some
15 resolution of this before he leaves. They are interviewing as we speak for the Chief
16 Investigator position so hopefully we get our Chief Investigator in line and we are also
17 down three or four investigator positions and hopefully those will be filled soon too so it
18 doesn't start effecting all the boards.

19
20 The NCEES meeting next week in Seattle we had some discussions with the Director
21 with Sara being new in the Director position there was some concern about me holding
22 over after the meeting to the investigative forum that they have the last two days and I
23 think the reason was that some of the training they have in that forum is training I have
24 already had through the years. What I want to do is pass on to you, the same thing I did
25 to Sara is the biggest part of me going down to those meetings, I learn a lot concerning
26 some of the things they are proposing that one day may make it to our Statutes and
27 Regulations, but the contacts that we make down there are invaluable, as you can
28 understand when you get some of these rubber stamping individuals that are licensed in
29 50 states, it's such an advantage for me to have these contacts so I can pick up the
30 phone as an investigator and, you know, Carolina or Alabama, or Georgia or whatever
31 and find out what's been going on in their state and what they are willing to do to help
32 us as far as the individuals license in other jurisdictions. So that's my main reason for
33 going to those forums after the meeting and the contacts I make during the meeting.
34 You know people on other boards and that and the things they are doing and I'm sure
35 you guys too you know how are you doing this or what are you doing and this and that.
36 It's kind of interesting when you talk to these other investigative units is, I don't know if
37 their threshold is lower than ours, you know a lot of it is they have many more
38 investigators than we do but you have and AELS Board say in Carolina or whatever and
39 each investigator might work 12 to 15 cases in a year. You know there are times when
40 we are putting that down in a month or a week so it is night and day but you certainly
41 see things in a different light when you're able to talk to other jurisdictions.

42
43 The other question I had concerning things we have pending, and I'm not sure where
44 this at, is the change we had for exemptions for specialty contractors. Has that been
45 signed off on?

1 Maynard: Yes it will be effective in October.
2
3 Savage: And was the language as submitted or did that get watered down at all?
4
5 Chair: Thinks the only thing changed was the 3 and 4-plex thing. Everything else was
6 the same.
7
8 Savage: ok cool.
9
10 Maynard: Explains that we tried to make ours match the Fire Marshals but it didn't go.
11
12 Savage: And right now the Fire Marshal and the Mat-Su are looking at 3-plex and
13 above right?
14
15 Maynard: They don't need a license for 4-plex and above.
16
17 Savage: The other thing that I've been kind of noticing and want to throw it out there,
18 and some of this is going to be me educating these deferred jurisdictions outside of the
19 Fire Marshal's office but even the Fire Marshal when they bring in new plan reviewers
20 I'm starting to hear and see more and more of the MA's and EA's selling themselves,
21 you know, when it's not a complicated commercial building they can put their electrical
22 administrator or mechanical administrator number on the drawings and that will suffice
23 for design professionals. I keep trying to educate these guys and let them know that an
24 administrator is there to oversee the work the journeymen are doing. That's it, they
25 don't have the ability to design any work what-so-ever, if they happen to be the one that
26 designed it for a specialty contractor under the old exemption, so be it but it has nothing
27 to do with them being a licensed administrator be it mechanical or electrical. I just
28 wanted to throw that out there again and maybe we can put our heads together and to
29 think of ways, what other venues we can throw this information out there so it gets out,
30 these forums are of course the best way to do it but there are people in the city of
31 Palmer that are in the high Archie that are in the building department that are
32 administrators say no absolutely not we've been able to design ever since Alaska came
33 into being and that's just not the case. But it's something that's starting to be seen
34 quite a bit again.
35
36 The AG, moving on, I already covered that.
37
38 Maynard: Asks if we should send a letter to the Fire Marshall and the Association of
39 Contractors advising about the change.
40
41 Savage: That might not be a bad idea.
42
43 Chair: Asks if we could maybe put something out.
44
45 Jones: I could put something on the website.
46

1 Savage: I can give you all the, uh, I've got a pretty through list of all the deferred
2 jurisdictions and their address and points of contact and the Fire Marshal over where
3 Diana and Tim Fischer are at.

4
5 There was a short discussion regarding who to send notification to.

6
7 Savage: Once again, just a friendly reminder, I'd like to throw this out there once again
8 that any individuals come up to you with any complaint information what-so-ever please
9 stop them and give them my contact information. I'd be glad to talk to them and get
10 them a complaint package and we can keep everything on the up and up. I know
11 there's a lot of people out there that are you know this is a small business world and I
12 don't like putting my name out there and I've been pretty successful letting them know
13 that their name is not going to go out there unless we go to a hearing or Superior Court.
14 It's not like we are going to be waiving a red flag saying Jonny Hanson has complained,
15 now they have the right to know their accuser once we get into a hearing or court but
16 not prior to that.

17
18 Kerr: Points out the there is really no accuser it's someone bringing facts to light and
19 the facts are the thing doing the convicting. Nobody is doing a testimony, it's not an eye
20 witness it's facts.

21
22 Chair: It can be somebody that has had a spat, you know It could be someone that's
23 just observed something and they report it. It could be they've had this back and forth
24 with this person and now they are sort of raveled into it a bit.

25
26 Hale: Talks about the mortgage survey thing and points out that he on the Board of
27 ASPLS and they just got word of it and explains that they want an update from him and
28 asks how he should handle it.

29
30 Chair: Advises that if it's something that concerns our Board activity he should recuse
31 from any action with the member organization.

32
33 Hale: I can report though?

34
35 Chair: Yes you can report. We've had votes here before where our member
36 organization was for or against something and we just recuse ourselves from the vote.

37
38 Savage: On something like that where we have a generic idea of what we want to
39 know, can they it or can they not, we can as a Board or as a Board Member in the
40 discipline, correct me if I'm wrong her Vern, is do up a little brief explaining it and then
41 forward it on to our AG up in Juneau or here. Here it'll take us another year to get a
42 response but you guys can get an opinion on that where we already have a basis to go
43 forward with it and then any complaint that we receive concerning that topic, we've
44 already got an opinion of, can they do that. The answer is unequivocally no and we're
45 moving forward on a lot faster pace. This is one of those kind of, we've always done it

1 this way, well, that doesn't make it right. There are a lot of things that have always been
2 done that way that are a violation of the Statutes and Regulations.

3
4 Hanson: Presents an example of a case that went on for years over in (unintelligible)
5 but we had one that just came up that was very similar to that and the person flat out
6 told us I've been doing it this way forever, I'm not changing the way I'm going to do it,
7 And that's when we say look, we've already went the distance on this, and then it was,
8 I'm sorry, here's the new calculations, I will remove that etc. so you know we are not
9 actively going out and trying to find people that are violating the law and pursuing them.
10 We rely on people that come to us and say, look I think there's a problem there.

11
12 Chair: Thinks it's just a broad misinterpretation of the Regulations.

13
14 Savage: I wanted to, while we are waiting on a brief or an explanation or something
15 like that, I could have sworn that I did a cursory look through some of my old
16 information, but I had case law on that very topic from years ago, I believe, if I'm
17 remembering it correctly, I'm still digging for it to see what exactly I had, but part of that
18 may be an opinion from years ago and they can just refresh that or review it in today's
19 light and see what we come up with. That's it on my list here.

20
21 Chair: Asks about the open cases and comments that it looks like he has been busy
22 and asks on the status of the old cases.

23
24 Savage: There is no status, the emphasis is on old stuff. I work at least one day a
25 week on older stuff to keep it moving and get it out of here and to revisit it just so we are
26 not spending money on it and have it end up, the last place I want any of our cases to
27 end up is the AG's office. If we can get something through consent or whatever and
28 that's kind of how I look at it. If we come into an agreement on a consent agreement
29 and we keep with our past numbers and that and we are not going over to the AG's
30 office that's big dollars and they spend a year or two over there, we're money ahead,
31 we're absolutely ahead of the ball game.

32
33 Chair: Asks if the sanctions guidelines are working for him.

34
35 Savage: It's absolutely a good place to start where I can eyeball where we're looking at
36 being when I'm talking to the reviewing Board Member and things such as that and we
37 have an understanding of where the case is going and what it's going to cost somebody
38 and when we're talking to them we have an idea, I try to talk to them telephonically or in
39 person before I start drafting up a consent agreement. We're not nearly as successful
40 when we just drop the bomb on them, here's your consent agreement and they are
41 staggering back wondering where we're at. It's worked wonderful, for years we didn't
42 have that tool and the best you could do is go back to old cases and if everything was
43 filed properly you could see what the end fine was and what kind of money they had
44 expended in investigative activity and such as that. I'm hopeful that one day that like
45 some of these states we'll be able to charge for our investigative and administrative
46 activities. That's huge, you know all this overhead we keep talking about, moneys and

1 that, you know let the individual pay it, a lot of these states will have a fine plus
2 investigative costs and I think that's kind of helpful to be able to throw that in there if
3 they ever get that in statute.

4
5 Urfer: Asks about submitting plans to municipalities that issue change orders and when
6 we go to the site it doesn't look anything like our plans. .

7
8 Savage: I would think that would be a contractual thing. It's not like the onus is going to
9 be on you if you have a stamped set of plans that they accepted they just did it
10 differently. There was a Board Member, this was several years ago, I was out on the
11 job and the revision was like a brand new revision I was calling about an issue on there
12 and he told me no that should have been corrected about 7 revisions ago. And when I
13 said something to the guy running the job, this was a pretty high level job, he was like,
14 we don't use those damn plans anyway. This was when they were building the building.
15 I was like hey bud you better get out here and talk to this guy, I don't think he
16 understands how this works. So I think that's something that a board needs to talk
17 about but I would certainly get involved in that if they are not looking at the plans they're
18 making design decisions out there without a license then we have a problem. But it's
19 the same thing with landscape architects, if you happen to come across one of your
20 jobs that something is, they have that profession for a reason so if you go out there and
21 it isn't anything like the plans then if nothing else we can make an example out of
22 somebody and get the word out there that these plans were done by the appropriate
23 design professional and that's what you need to stick with, there are ways to change it if
24 for whatever reason during construction, the site plan or whatever you needed things
25 done differently out there, well there's steps to take to change that.

26
27 Urfer: Adds that sometimes it's difficult to know who is making the unauthorized
28 changes whether it's the contactor, the agency or someone in another discipline.

29
30 Hanson: That's up to John, I would look at that as unlicensed practice. You have a
31 stamped landscape plan, it's no different than you have a design for a building and you
32 go out and the building looks nothing like your design. It may be a little in Seattle but
33 you design a parking lot as a civil engineer and when you go out there nothing is where
34 you set it, well who designed that, someone designed that and if they didn't have a
35 license they're practicing without a license. Is it a specialty contractor, is it a sub, but
36 that's what John's job is to investigate that and if people filing a complaint don't know
37 the individual they may know the project or the contractor. The contractor may say oh,
38 it wasn't us it was the client. Well, ok, let's go talk to the client but that's why we have
39 an investigator. It's like John (Kerr) said, it's not always an eye witness sometimes it's
40 just that something is not right here.

41
42 The discussion continued for a short while and drifted into how changes can be made
43 with several Board Members providing examples of what types of changes need a
44 stamp and what types don't.

45
46 Chair: Asks Savage if he has any questions for the Board.

1
2 Savage: No, everything seems to be clipping along pretty good. Sooner or later out
3 office will be caught up and flying straight and I'm kind of excited about that. As far as
4 boards go our board is clipping along really good.
5
6 Hanson: Asks if he has having address issues still.
7
8 Savage: No more or less than before we talked about it. I'll need to start keeping count
9 of how many we are hunting and pecking, you know it's usually a guessing game, when
10 we start checking through avenues and that,
11
12 Vern will have one address, I come up with another one over here, you know, and a lot
13 of times we'll find out what other jurisdictions their licensed in and I'll find out another
14 address or the true address through them. We've even had individuals on an
15 application issue where we have a yes block that we're looking into or whatever, you
16 know they just did this three days ago and it's not a good address. I get my letter back
17 right away and I find out what jurisdiction they're in now and find out a good address
18 and we start working with them. Who does that, you know you put in an application and
19 you're excited to hear and it comes down that you're giving a bad address. We'll have
20 to start keeping a number on that.
21
22 Jones: I've put a reminder on our webpage. I had Lara cut and paste the regulation
23 about updating your address on there and then I sent it to APDC for their newsletter.
24
25 Hanson: Proposes that we try to contact the individuals, then we post their names on
26 the website and then suspend their license until their address is brought up to date
27 because we're allowed to suspend licenses for a specified period of time so that meets
28 the time requirement. So we give them a couple of opportunities to come into
29 compliance because the regulation says, 12 AAC 02.900 says at all times.
30
31 Maynard: Suggests sending APDC.
32
33 Hanson: I think if something like that were to happen we'd want to public notice it and
34 send to peoples address (Laughter) and it needs to go through the design council just
35 to let people that we are going to start.....
36
37 Maynard: (Unintelligible) the website.
38
39 Hanson: The problem is that the regulation says the latest mailing address on file with
40 the division is the address that will be used for official communication, notification and
41 service of legal process. So that is the only avenue we have at our disposal to officially
42 contact anyone.
43
44 Chair: if we go that path we would definitely want to get the word out because if we
45 suspend their license and they don't know about it and their practicing without a license
46 then we have a licensing action against them.

1
2 Jones: You said last time immediately suspend. You wouldn't be able to do that, you
3 would have to do it in a meeting.
4
5 Hanson: Correct, it would be every three months.
6
7 Savage: When was the last time you did a 100% mail out and got a gest of how many
8 were bad?
9
10 Jones: It's been a while, it costs a lot to do a mail out so we try to avoid that.
11
12 Savage: Do you do it regular mail or certified?
13
14 Jones: Regular mail, you're talking about 4000 letters at what is it \$.45 now?
15
16 Hanson: It would 7000 if you did all of our licensees.
17
18 Kerr: Suggests cards would be a lot less if you want to notify everyone via mail.
19
20 Jones: There is an additional cost for those too because we would have to have those
21 printed.
22
23 Schedler: Asks about email.
24
25 Jones: Explains that we don't have the capability to recall email addresses yet but that
26 the new system will have a field for phone numbers and email addresses.
27
28 Chair: Suggests that during a renewal period is when we could emphasize address
29 updates.
30
31 Schedler: Asks if John overseen the constructions of the igloo.
32
33 Savage: Asks if she means the igloo that was for sale up on the highway. No
34
35 Walters: Adds that they are just doing roadwork there, he hasn't seen them do anything
36 on the building. They are straightening out that S curve.
37
38 A short discussion on the construction in that area.
39
40 Savage: I noticed the last trip up there for the Board meeting there was a gas station
41 outside of, what is it, Cantwell? The one that blew up, that's back.
42
43 Chair: Asks if there are anything else for John then thanks him for his comments and
44 asks for a motion to go back into executive session.
45

1 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hanson and passed**
2 **unanimously it was RESOLVED to go into Executive Session IAW AS 44.62.310**
3 **(c)(3) to review applicant files**

4
5 9:43a.m. Went into executive session to continue file review.

6
7 11:17a.m. Out of executive session and on record.

8
9 **Agenda item 17 – New Business**

10
11 Chair: We are on item 17 which is new business and the only thing we have is the
12 email from Kathy Hillegas requesting comments on changes to the IDP, BEA and BFEA
13 programs. He explains that they are proposing to reduce the IDP program from 5600
14 credits down to 3740 credits core credits. Their position is that the 1860 elective credits
15 don't add to the Interns experience. What used to take hours can now be done in
16 minutes with a computer. He doesn't agree with it. He feels that NCARB's perspective
17 on that is not correct. They don't want it to be based on time but rather on the quality of
18 the learning they are getting. They don't think we need those 1860 elective credits, but
19 he thinks they do and wants the Board's opinion on that so he can draft a response. He
20 feels that they should put the 1860 hours into the core hours. He asks if anybody has
21 any comments.

22
23 Hanson: Asks if this would shorten the time before licensure.

24
25 Chair: Responds that it would not necessarily shorten the licensure time because now
26 they can start accumulating IDP hours while in school. He adds that NCARB has a pilot
27 program with a state that agreed to do it where someone could get a license the day
28 they graduate. He asks for the Boards approval to go ahead and respond the way he
29 sees it, that it's important to have that additional amount of time and have the elective
30 hours moved into the core hours. He did ask NCARB during the text questions but
31 hasn't received a response yet.

32
33 Kerr: Doesn't see any clear rational in their correspondence and asks why they want to
34 do this.

35
36 Chair: He isn't sure but thinks it may tie back into that alternate path to licensure where
37 someone could actually get licensed in college and that extra year would make it more
38 difficult to do that.

39
40 Kerr: Then why would they want to do that?

41
42 Chair: Well you know that discussion about if you could integrate your experience and
43 your education you might come out in the end knowing more. He always wished he had
44 had more in office experience while he was going to school because then you go back
45 to the education side and say ok, that's what I need know, that's what I need to learn
46 about. It's an experiment they are going to try. He doesn't go along with their rational.

1
2 Hanson: Thinks it may have to do with technology. He adds that technology just
3 enables you to make mistakes quicker. You can make more of them faster. (Laughter)
4

5 Chair: They think that now that technology has changed you don't need that much time
6 just drawing in the office because you can do it right now but that's not the case.
7

8 Hanson: Your rational seem appropriate to me.
9

10 Chair: So, if there's no objection then I'll proceed the way I was going to. The next item
11 is the Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) program. Explains what the BEA program is
12 and that the BEA and the BFEA for foreign architects are very expensive and very
13 cumbersome programs. The BEA requires 6, 8 or 10 years post licensure experience.
14 The BEA is for licensed architects to get an NCARB record. If he doesn't have a NAAB
15 accredited degree this would be his only path to do that. It's usually an architect hat has
16 gone through all the criteria with another jurisdiction that would allow them to not have
17 an NAAB accredited degree. There are 17 jurisdictions that have a path like that but
18 they usually require experience in lieu of the full 5 year degree. So they might have a 4
19 year degree and then they have to have 5, 6 or 10 years of experience to get licensed in
20 that state. On top of that the BEA program was requiring additional experience. It's
21 also an elaborate process to review their education and find out where the deficiencies
22 were in that education. They will still require the A.R.E but will reduce the experience to
23 1 year of licensed practice in a jurisdiction and meet the Board's experience
24 requirement for licensure. With this change they will still have to meet our education
25 and experience requirements. He agrees with this change and thinks it will streamline
26 the BEA program. He then explains that the changes to the BFEA program would be
27 that they would have to document 2 years of licensed practice experience in a another
28 country or document 2 years working in the U.S. under the direct supervision of an a
29 licensed architect in responsible control and they would have to take the A.R.E. What
30 they will not have to do is submit a dossier of their experience to be reviewed by the
31 BEFA Committee and subsequent interview. It was a long and expensive process that
32 was subjective and there are actually very few people that get licensed through this
33 path. You have to be licensed in another country to even be able to come through this
34 path. He thinks that less than half a dozen people a year go through this program. It's
35 not intended to increase the amount of people that go through the BEFA it's to be more
36 consistent with our other requirements and ultimately it's up to the jurisdiction if they
37 want to accept that BEFA credential. They do require that they be from a recognized
38 foreign education program that is similar to the NAAB degree. He thinks the changes
39 are good and will help streamline it and still maintain the education, experience and
40 examination and allow people to go through it without the expense and time of the
41 current process.
42

43 Kerr: Asks if they have to work in the U.S. under a U.S. architect.
44

45 Chair: Reads the requirement and adds that they wouldn't have to work in the U.S. if
46 they had two years of licensed practice in the country that they are licensed in and they

1 have to complete the A.R.E. which is really the equalizer because no matter what path
2 brought them there they still have to pass the A.R.E. and that's based on our practice
3 analysis.
4
5 Kerr: So they can become a licensed architect in the United States with zero
6 experience in the United States?
7
8 Chair: This is to get their NCARB Certificate. It's up to the jurisdictions whether or not
9 they want to accept that NCARB Certificate or have additional requirements to become
10 licensed in their state.
11
12 Kerr: Asks if there are jurisdictions that just accept the NCARB Certificate.
13
14 Chair: Yes.
15
16 Kerr: I think that's a bad idea.
17
18 Chair: Well it doesn't force us to if we don't want to. He points out that in our
19 regulations we have the ability to accept or not accept the NCARB Certificate. It says
20 we may accept not that we will.
21
22 Kerr: This isn't my area of expertise so I will yield to you. He thinks that regional
23 knowledge is important and it seems this will allow someone without any regional
24 knowledge where he wants to practice to get licensed.
25
26 Chair: Thinks that most of the people that get this have been practicing in the United
27 States for quite some time. We are talking about a hand full of people not under the
28 current system. I suppose that could change if this is implemented. Most of these
29 people have a 20 or 30 years career behind them practicing in the United States under
30 a license architect.
31
32 Jones: Points out that although we make them take the arctic engineering course or the
33 AKLS we license engineers and surveyors before they can practice here.
34
35 Chair: Will respond with that concern but otherwise with a non-objection. That's it for
36 those three items. He then comments on the IDP reporting period which will allow 50%
37 credit for beyond the six month rule for 5 years and he doesn't have a problem with that.
38 They got the experience they just lapsed in their reporting.
39
40 The next thing he mentions is that A.R.E. 5.0 which will be coming out and will change
41 to match the IDP credit areas so when they get credit in an area it will relate more to
42 that section of the exam. Also the graphic portion will be discontinued. There may be
43 questions on a graphic but no drawing is required. He thinks this is a good idea and will
44 be out in 2015 or 2016.
45

1 There was a short discussion on the A.R.E. past and present and it was noted that it is
2 heavily subsidized by the other programs. The new system will be less expensive to
3 produce. He thinks it will do a much better job of testing comprehension of architecture.
4

5 **Agenda item 18 – Special Committees**

6
7 Licensure Implementation:
8

9 Maynard: Advises that concerning the EIT/LSIT regulations not much has been done
10 except a couple of emails. He asks what are we trying to accomplish and do we need
11 to educate the lawyers about what is happening now and what would happen in the
12 future. He recaps the present system where they ask us to take the exam and we say
13 ok then when they pass they can call themselves a EIT or LSIT and what we were trying
14 to do was let them take the exam then apply so we knew who they are.
15

16 Chair: Notes that architects interns don't have a preliminary exam, they are interns
17 when they graduate. He adds that NCARB has a special committee looking at the titles
18 of intern architects.
19

20 Maynard: Suggests we send a letter to the AG's office and legislative committee telling
21 them what we have been doing since you say we can't regulate interns, well, we are
22 already regulating interns. They take the test and we call them an EIT and they get
23 experience and we let them take the PE exam. All we are doing is letting them apply to
24 someone else and then let us know if they passed it which is basically the same thing,
25 why can't we do this or how, were we following the rules before which I don't think we
26 were because it says the Board will promulgate regulations to facilitate licensure that
27 conform to the standards of a national licensing organization. Well we can show them
28 the two paragraphs that NCEES says this is how you will do it. You apply to States and
29 we let you test or you apply to us so that's their standard. So why is this regulation we
30 tried to pass not within that standard? I don't think we got a good answer to that.
31

32 Hanson: 08.48.101 we don't have a powers and duties of the Board I don't think. It's
33 just we have bylaws, regulations and board of ethics and the Board will adopt
34 regulations to carry out the provisions of this chapter including.....
35

36 Jones: That's the sticking point right there. It shouldn't say including.
37

38 Hanson: Right, it should just say to carry out the provisions of this chapter and that's it
39 but then it goes and lists describing the contents of the examination, we don't do that.
40 Establishing the conduct of the examination, we don't do that. Establishing the
41 minimum score, we don't do that. Establishing bylaws governing its meetings and
42 activities, we do that. Publishing a code of ethics, it's in regulation. Establishing
43 continuing education requirements, we do that and we have to give a report on our
44 activities to the Governor every year, or Vern has to and some of the problems within
45 this are everywhere you look, like at registration and practice it says professional,
46 professional, professional everywhere. Registration upon examination 08.48.181 page

1 4 except as provided etc. for registration as a professional etc. Application for
2 registration. Application as a professional architect....you know that's really the problem
3 here is that they're giving us powers that we don't need or use and then everywhere in
4 the Statute it says for professional when really the intern portion of it is the pathway to
5 become a professional.
6

7 Maynard: Thinks the key is the second sentence in 08.48.181. The procedure and
8 standards shall at least meet the requirements adopted by recognized national
9 examining councils for these professions. The procedure is to take the FE you get more
10 experience then you take the PE and the fact now is we are allowing them to take the
11 FE by going to NCEES, well we are not now but we want to and that is the procedure
12 that is part of that national standard. That would be my argument to the Legislators and
13 I sent them an email saying that but they never responded to it. We could try something
14 else but if we don't get some guidelines from the lawyers about why doesn't this satisfy
15 that sentence we are just going to call them interns, they are called interns now based
16 on the regulations we already have. We've been managing intern architects and intern
17 architects aren't in the regulations and that's no different than the FE & FS. So why are
18 the intern engineers different.
19

20 Hale: Asks why we are regulating them, they can't do anything they have to work under
21 someone who can stamp final documents. Why do we care until they are licensed?
22

23 Maynard: That's another one of my questions, do we care if they pass the FE?
24

25 Hale: Doesn't know why we would until they wanted to sit for the PE.
26

27 Maynard: My only answer is possibly to maybe make John's life easier if they are going
28 comity.
29

30 Hale: Again what does it mean?
31

32 Chair: Points out that you can't imply that you're an engineer in your title unless we
33 recognize that title.
34

35 The conversation continued for a short time on whether or we should care if they have
36 passed the fundamentals exam until they apply for the professional exam. It was
37 suggested that we get rid of the regulation that says you have to apply to us to take the
38 FE and just say you have to apply to NCEES and not worry about it until the apply for
39 the PE. Point made was that there is no public safety issue because the final product is
40 a stamped drawing. The conversation drifted into whether or not people could use EIT
41 or LSIT or Intern and from there to the regulations for reexamination. It was determined
42 that this will be a large regulation project. Maynard will work up a regulation change to
43 clean up the examination regulations.
44

45 Hanson: We also need to do a Statute clean-up on 08.48.101.
46

1 Regulation and Practice:

2
3 Chair: I'm chair of that committee.

4
5 Hanson: So we are not going to require anyone to take the FE?

6
7 Maynard: They have to show that they passed it when they apply to take the PE.

8
9 The conversation continued for a few more minutes.

10
11 Chair: Well let's move on, Registration and Practice, The only that we had under that
12 was the bill that just passed. Also I was asked to look at the requirement of having
13 some type of logo and address in the drawings. I'm about half way through that, looking
14 at the other states. What I've found at this point is that nobody has that. I've only found
15 one state that has an address requirement. I'll keep looking at that as part of my to do
16 list. As I get more into it Colin and Brian can help me with that.

17
18 Hanson: Agrees and adds that we could ask Vern could ask the board via email if
19 anyone requires that.

20
21 The Chair will draft a question for Vern to put on basecamp asking for a response from
22 the other jurisdictions.

23
24 Licensure Mobility:

25
26 Chair: I'm chair of that. Other than what we talked about in the past re the Canadian
27 issues we don't really have anything going on there.

28
29 Maynard: Notes that the NCEES Task Force on Mobility addressed the issue of
30 whether the different continuing education requirements from state to state was limiting
31 mobility.

32
33 Mining Engineers/Geologists:

34
35 Nothing to report.

36
37 Social Networking Options:

38
39 Hale: Thinks everyone seen the letter.

40
41 Jones: The position at the Department that takes care of social networking is presently
42 vacant. (Laughter)

43
44 Enforcement Enhancement:

45
46 Nothing to report

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Chair: Standing Committees.

Investigative Advisory Committee:

Hanson: I met with John pretty much every month. He thinks there are a couple they are considering consent agreements other than that they are all advisory letters.

Guidance Manual

Urfer: Refers the board to the introduction she submitted as item 18 and asks if they are on the right track and should proceed?

Hale: Asks if she got all his red lines.

Urfer: Yes, She emphasizes the importance of organizing the information that is presently scattered throughout the manual.

Hale: So this is just cleaning things up.

Urfer: This is just the first two pages, kind of the introduction to the manual.

Chair: it would be helpful to see where you corrected things even though it's going to be a messy document.

Jones: If you will send me your changes, I have it electronically, and I will do it just like a regulation I will bracket and capitalize what's coming out and bold and underline what's going in.

Chair: Reminds her that she can rely on the other committee member to help with that.

Urfer: Right, this was just a stab at the beginning.

Chair: It's been tweaked through the years quite a bit and I suspect there are things in there that are pretty messy a complete overhaul is probably in order.

Legislative Liaison:

Chair: Eric's not here. Other than the one reg project we have pending there is nothing new.

Emeritus Status:

Chair: We have no retiring board members.

Budget Committee:

1
2 Chair: Jeff is not here. I don't think we have anything to report other than what we
3 talked about yesterday which was that we have old information.

4
5 Hanson: Asks if his comments under 11f went to the Division.

6
7 Chair: That is what you brought up yesterday.

8
9 Jones: I didn't give her a copy.

10
11 There was a short discussion rehashing yesterday's conversation and what are direct
12 costs and indirect costs and whether or not direct costs are an accurate indication of
13 what it takes to administer a program. It was pointed out that we can express our
14 opinion but they are in control. What we are talking about is corporate overhead and
15 that can be done by revenue or direct expenses for each department however you want
16 to parse it whether it's personnel or contractual or whatever.

17
18 Continuing Education:

19
20 Hanson: Nothing to report.

21
22 IDP Liaison

23
24 Chair: The only thing to report is that NCARB will be making a change in the program
25 and there will be a transition period but it's far enough out that we don't need to be
26 discussing it now.

27
28 **Agenda item 19 – Board travel**

29
30 Chair Asks who is going to the NCEES Annual next week:

31
32 Jones: Colin, Kerr, Jones, Urfer, Savage and Eriksen.

33
34 Chair: We will be well represented. The CLARB Annual next month in Reston VA.

35
36 Urfer: Will be attending

37
38 Jones: I will not be going to that one.

39
40 Chair: NCARB regional in Long Beach hasn't been authorized yet. Then Western Zone
41 in Scottsdale, NCEES Annual in Williamsburg and CLARB Annual in September 2015.
42 And at our next meeting we will know what the new travel rules will be.

43
44 Jones: In the Annual Report I put in over \$100K for travel so we will see. So far we
45 haven't had any travel disapproved.

46

1 **Agenda Item 20 – National meeting reports.**

2
3 Western Zone May 15-17, 2014

4
5 Maynard: Reports that the various committees reported on what will be discussed at
6 the Annual meeting and notes that Oklahoma wants to get rid of 20/20 in the model law,
7 Vermont agree but wants to do it differently. He explains that the Model Law 20/20 will
8 require a BS plus additional education such as a Masters just an additional 30 credits
9 they are still trying to figure that out. Anyway we will already be off the Board by then.

10
11 Hanson: Adds that from the time the regulations goes into effect people those who are
12 already in the system should be allowed time to finish their education and experience
13 like we did with the surveyor education change. Anyway it will be 20/22 now.

14
15 Maynard: Asks if we want to adopt it.

16
17 Hanson: Doesn't see anyone pushing for it. He adds that the reason this is an issue is
18 that some states automatically license Model Law Engineers and what could happen is
19 on December 31st you could be a Model Law Engineer and On January 1st you might
20 not be and they don't have a provision for grandfathering.

21
22 Chair: Asks what the new requirement is.

23
24 Hanson: it will be plus 30 credits. We don't use Model Law Engineer. It would be
25 simpler for us if we did. If NCEES says they are Model Law we could just approve
26 them. You wouldn't have to get transcripts or verification of tests we would just get the
27 NCEES record and approve them.

28
29 Chair: Asks if this is something this Board should do.

30
31 Hanson: If it's going to happen it will take a while to get through.

32
33 Kerr: Asks if the new engineers that we are license not up to the level that we expect
34 them to be.

35
36 Maynard: Explains that back in the 50's, 60's you needed 150 credit hours to get an
37 engineering degree. Now it's closer to 120. He explains that there was a lot of
38 pressure to get the costs of education down.

39
40 Chair: It sounds like a non-action by this Board for now and you guys can just continue
41 to monitor.

42
43 Kerr: Asks if we want to take a position as a board whether or not to support it at the
44 NCEES level.

45
46 Hanson: Advises that this has already passed, they are just changing the dates.

1
2 Maynard: This is basically taking 20/20 out of the Model Law and putting in a policy and
3 what that means I don't know.

4
5 Hanson: Adds that he made an unsuccessful run for Zone VP and is assistant VP by
6 default. He will be on for 2 years.

7
8 Kerr: Reports on the surveying forum where the definition of engineering surveying was
9 discussed and a language change was recommended and rejected. It will be discussed
10 at National but is not on the Consent Agenda. As part of the group that looked at the
11 definition he looked at some of the engineering degrees to see if they were teaching
12 enough core classes to function at any lever or at some lever as a surveyor and while
13 his research was not exhaustive what he found was that the programs did not have
14 surveying at any meaningful level however, there were a few exceptions that did have a
15 pretty good survey background. He adds that there are some people coming through
16 engineering programs that may be able to competently preform surveying. He expects
17 that to be a heated discussion. The other thing he learned was that the Western Zone
18 2017 would be in Guam.

19
20 Hanson: Well for right now it'll be in Guam. The 2016 is in Alaska. It's going to be at
21 the Marriott.

22
23 There was a short discussion on what role the Board would have in planning and
24 helping out etc. It was noted that NCEES will do most of the planning and
25 arrangements but they do look to the Board for guidance.

26
27 They then announced their committee assignments. Hanson is on the EPE Committee
28 and Maynard on the UPLG Committee and Kerr on the Future of Surveying Task Force.

29
30 NCARB National June 18-21 2014

31
32 Chair: Attended along with Vern and Jeff. He has already talked about most of the
33 items discussed at that meeting. One more item he wants to bring up which was
34 controversial and a lot of discussion from the floor was the requirement that all of the
35 NCARB Board Members have an NCARB Certificate. Right now it's not required. New
36 York battled pretty hard to not have a certificate requirement. It passed so they are now
37 required to have the certificate.

38
39 We will skip lunch, item 21.

40
41 **Agenda item 22 - Licensing Examiner Report**

42
43 Jones: We do not have a report.

44
45 Hale: Asks if we are going to discuss at some point the subject the Fairbanks folks
46 brought up.

1
2 Chair: We can do that now before we read in the applications. He isn't sure we will
3 have a resolution on it today but it's worth it to discuss.
4
5 Hale: Just wasn't sure where we should go from here. It's a big issue and has been for
6 a long time. He asks if there was anyone that thought that there was not a boundary
7 component to as build surveys.
8
9 Chair: Agrees with everything they said yesterday. He also recognizes there are things
10 being done out there in the mortgage area that don't meet that criteria, I'm not sure
11 where we go from here though.
12
13 Kerr: Would like to have the opportunity to present the situation to ASPLS looking at
14 from a supply/demand perspective. He thinks there is definitely a demand for mortgage
15 inspections that purport to show the relationship of improvements on boundaries and if
16 it's acceptable to the mortgage companies to use something that doesn't really do it and
17 it's clear to them that that's what they are getting then I think they should let anybody
18 that wants to do them do them. They can be approved by the mortgage companies or
19 Banks whoever is doing them they just have to not be depicted as a survey, if that's
20 what they want. He would like to propose some solution where there is something....I
21 don't think that the mortgage companies and banks would accept this but they need to
22 come to terms internally. Their demand for these is driving this type activity. If they
23 only want to spend \$500 or \$250 whatever it is their spending these, that's their
24 prerogative but they should understand what they are getting.
25
26 Chair: If they truly want what they are asking for then they should have a licensed
27 surveyor out there doing it and they're going to pay a lot more for it.
28
29 Hanson: Points out that the lenders don't pay anything nor does the title insurance
30 company it's the home owner or purchaser who pays.
31
32 Kerr: The consumer gets hurt because they're the ones left holding the bag. The
33 mortgage company and the title company and banks are the ones that tell the home
34 owner that they have to have these.
35
36 Hanson: It's a requirement and it protects their interest, the mortgage company. He
37 was complete correct in his statement that it's a document paid for by the customer or
38 purchaser to protect the title company and to protect the mortgage company and even
39 ASPLS says it's just to verify that the improvements are actually located on the land
40 covered by the legal description in the mortgage and that the said mortgage survey is a
41 professional service provided by professional surveyors.
42
43 Hale: Well it's incomplete (unintelligible) for the land owner.
44
45 Hanson: I agree with you but not according to ASLPS mortgage location surveys.
46

1 Hale: There are bits and pieces of this for everybody.
2
3 Hanson: Exactly, that's why it's so confusing.
4
5 Maynard: If you look at page three it's not a boundary survey it's you know this isn't a
6 real survey it's... you're saying it is a boundary but the document that your organization,
7 I don't know if they actually this but you folk put out there for review say no it's not.
8
9 Kerr: Right and that needs to be dealt with internally at ASPLS. There is the demand
10 and this all needs to be reconciled. But I don't think there is anything wrong with our
11 current law. I don't think that there's any doubt under our current law that this is
12 boundary surveying.
13
14 Chair: The gentlemen yesterday said basically that they are relying on physical
15 monuments of some sort out on the property and running a string between the two and
16 measuring off of that. That could off and they have no way of knowing that without fully
17 doing a survey you could have a situation where you have a building that is right on the
18 property line and they just pull their string and it works. But the reality is if those are off,
19 if the boundary is off then the building is on the other property.
20
21 Kerr: Adds that the bank doesn't care how poor the survey is, how misleading it is.
22 They've met their objective they've transferred their risk to the surveyor that's producing
23 that drawing. Then it becomes a problem for the surveyor and the home owner.
24
25 Hale: Points out that a lot of the time the corners are missing and asks what they are
26 doing to reset those corners.
27
28 Hanson: Adds that he has gotten a lot of these done and the last one he had to send
29 back to the PLS three times because it had errors in it. And he had another where you
30 could not physically locate the building on the property. There was nothing to locate the
31 building within the boundary of the property. It had a boundary and it had a building and
32 said yes it's there but you didn't know where within the boundary of the property. And
33 I've gotten some that were excellent but everyone was signed by a PLS.
34
35 Hale: Me too, I haven't seen an engineering stamp on one ever.
36
37 Hanson: Thinks the way the Board should proceed, he knows this is a National issue
38 but he would like to enlist the help of the ASPLS....Maynard adds and ASCE....yes to
39 tackle this and come up with a policy. It's much more reaching than one individual
40 profession.
41
42 Chair: Thinks this is going to take some time and while we are gathering information
43 from the organizations should we respond with our position that this is surveying?
44
45 Hale: Knows that this is the ASPLS position. In 2010 the ASPLS sent all the title
46 companies up there a letter that they were aware that some engineering were stamping

1 them and that it was illegal. They did that to make everyone aware and that's why this
2 title person forwarded it to the Board. So the ASPLS really feels that's it is out of
3 practice.

4
5 Kerr: Asks if anyone feels that it's not out of practice.

6
7 Chair: It looks like survey work to me.

8
9 Hale: That's ASPLS's official position, I have a letter in one of my emails that I can
10 forward to everybody.

11
12 Kerr: Thinks we should not delay in telling them that it's out of practice. The problem
13 needs clearing up, the standards, that's a separate problem. Maybe someone else
14 feels that it could fall under civil engineering.

15
16 Hanson: I'm torn because I have a lot of surveying experience as an engineer.

17
18 Hale: That's a separate issue too, when you're addressing engineering surveys and the
19 type of work that they can do, I think that there's a way to address that. Engineers like
20 you can do that type of work, if they are qualified for it. But again it's a separate issue
21 than stamping mortgage surveys that are traditionally done by surveyors.

22
23 Kerr: If we are going to put people in big buckets like civil engineer or land surveyor
24 then there's a problem because you have to pick one bucket or the other then you
25 wouldn't fall into the surveyor bucket. So if we need to look at creating another bucket
26 for people who are engineers who do have the experience and education to do certain
27 types of survey work and they want to keep doing it then that's a bigger problem which
28 we should probably address. Because I think there are those people out there but if
29 you're going to say civil engineers can do this and they can't do this then this would
30 definitely have to fall into the can that you can't do this. Now if you want to sub divide
31 something out to, we want to create more buckets that's a huge project but it may have
32 merit. Because like I said there are schools that teaching civil engineers solid
33 background information to do a lot of what we do and those people may be working with
34 surveyors who were mentoring them and they may be developing competence but
35 under our current model we don't have a way to accommodate them.

36
37 Maynard: Disagrees. There isn't this bucket and that bucket, there is overlap between
38 buckets. So it comes down to the person, what their background is and what they can
39 do and if all it is, if following a string from one corner marker to another corner marker
40 that has been laid by a surveyor at some point you can assume that it's in the right
41 place and then measuring from that string to where the corner of the building is, I don't
42 see any reason why a civil engineer that has some surveying experience can't do that.
43 Because that's probably what the surveyor is going to do anyway. He's not going to go
44 back to the marker 200 yards away and verify that those are the right spots.

45
46 Kerr: You have to.

1
2 Maynard: But they don't.

3
4 Kerr: Well then it's incompetence. That does not mean that what they are doing is ok
5 or protecting the public. It is not uncommon and the surveyors should know that and
6 hopefully the surveyors that are doing that sort of thing are disappearing, retiring, going
7 away, but it's not uncommon to find two corners that are in proper relationship to each
8 other but not in the right place in subdivisions. And it's because of those people that do
9 that work. Those two corners may match to the 100ths of where should be relative to
10 each other but they're far out of place relative to the rest of the subdivision and
11 adjoining lots. And that is incompetence that, you know, I don't what to say. There are
12 people who would do it, definitely, I can't disagree with that but incompetence by
13 common report, by common vote doesn't make it competent.

14
15 Hale: But neither does the simplicity of the Fairbanks, the argument of it's just a simple
16 boundary survey, that doesn't make it any less, really. You can measure it with a tape,
17 you can shoot it with a gun regardless of what your answer is, what you're reporting is
18 what you are certifying. It's a boundary regardless if a chimpanzee can do it or not.
19 Really they're not authorized to but.. (laughter)

20
21 Kerr: Thinks there are too many things that are problematic that the vast majority of civil
22 engineers don't know about and it looks simple in certain, and Brian may know about all
23 these issues, you had a lot of experience with this stuff, you're correcting stuff that you
24 put up with incompetent surveyors doing this work. Hopefully they'll eventually go away
25 and the profession will get better and better. But perpetuating this doesn't help that at
26 all in the long term and yes if everybody did adhered to the maxim of only practicing
27 where they had competence it would be a non-issue.

28
29 Chair: Asks the Board if they would object to the surveyors responding to this
30 gentleman's email.

31
32 Hanson: We already told them they can't do this.

33
34 Hail: Thinks they are waiting for a response.

35
36 Chair: I could issue it but I'd like you guys to write it. Because you understand this
37 better than I do.

38
39 There was a short discussion on whether or not to respond in writing and it was decided
40 the Kerr would draft a letter and rout it through Hale and Hanson to the Chair.

41
42 **Agenda Item 23 – Board Tasks (to do list)**

43
44 Chair: I have notes here, for mine I'll just go ahead and go through. A letter to NCARB
45 regarding the agreement with Canada, actually that was Eric was drafting a response
46 and I was sending him the agreement. I was tasked with looking at the EIT regulations

1 and I had mentioned that NCARB created some sort of task force to look at title free
2 insurance and I'll report back on that when they actually develop something. I wrote a
3 response to NCARB on the IDP changes. I was tasked with look at the logo issue and
4 that is not completed. And then I had another letter to NCARB. As far as the new stuff I
5 have to do I need to draft a letter about the Statute change to mechanical and electrical
6 administrators. I need to contact NCARB, Kimberly regarding her visit to Alaska during
7 the AIA conference. I need to respond to NCARB on the proposed changes that I
8 discussed earlier about the IDP, BEA and BEFA. And draft questions so you can
9 request information from the other boards about their logo and address requirements on
10 drawings. That's all I had written down for my task list.

11
12 Hanson: Colin had the letter to the seismic task force and the training, EIT statutes.
13 Eric had response to Colin smith and he was helping with the seismic task force and he
14 was also a letter to Sara regarding travel, that's done and then the mentorship project.
15 Dave you had social networking which is ongoing engineering surveying definition, code
16 of conduct. That went to the guidance manual.

17
18 Myself I had DEC regard drawing group. Nothing else has come of that. Either they
19 took care of it or they didn't like what they heard. Engineering surveying, that's ongoing.
20 Training regulations, that's ongoing. I need to get a policy for the fines and penalties for
21 addresses. So I'll have a policy suggestion for the next board meeting.

22
23 John Kerr Engineering surveying, ongoing.

24
25 Koonce was the travel which we worked on that together with Eric, done.

26
27 Luanne, Guidance Manual, that's ongoing. Then you were going to help us with the EIT
28 regulations.

29
30 Kathleen, outreach to UAF on CBT.

31
32 Schedler: It's drafted and I'm going to send it as soon as they come back from summer.

33
34 Hanson: Christensen, Guidance manual, ongoing and then the EIT regulations.

35
36 Walters, he's helping out on the Guidance manual.

37
38 Vern had the contact which we got for social networking. Look at Centralized
39 Regulations, I don't remember what that was.

40
41 Jones: There are provisions to charge late fees for a month or so but I didn't see
42 anything about if it went for several years.

43
44 Hanson: Right some jurisdictions may you pay all the way back too, and that had....

45

1 Jones: That wouldn't be appropriate for us because a lot of our licensees are out of
2 state and they only keep their licenses active when they have work up here.

3
4 Hanson: You can retire it.

5
6 Jones: If you want to retire it it's a onetime fee of \$50 then you can use the title but you
7 can't practice.

8
9 Hanson: Then if you want to reinstate it.

10
11 Jones: Then you pay whatever the current fee is. I talked to John about having a
12 board member at the building official forum and he does not believe that's a good idea
13 because a lot of the discussions at those meeting involve violations and that would taint
14 that board member. And talk to the AAG about the intern situation, I did not do that
15 because they charge \$150 an hour.

16
17 Schedler: Vern is supposed to give us the online number for verification of
18 reimbursements.

19
20 **Agenda item 24 – Read Applications into Record**

21
22 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it**
23 **was RESOLVED to find the following list of applicants for registration by comity,**
24 **examination, or additional branches INCOMPLETE with the stipulation that the**
25 **information in the applicant files will take precedence over the information in the**
26 **minutes.**

27
28 *The following subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*
29 *meanings:*

30 'FE': refers to the NCEES Fundamentals of Engineering Examination

31 'FS': refers to the Fundamentals of Surveying Examination

32 'PE': exam': refers to the NCEES Principals and Practice of Engineering Examination

33 'PS': exam: refers to the NCEES Principals and Practice of Surveying Examination

34 'AKLS': refers to the Alaska Land Surveyors Examination

35 The title of 'Professional' is understood to precede the designation of engineer,
36 surveyor, or architect.

37 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

38 'Arctic course' denotes a Board-approved arctic engineering course

39

The following candidates are found <i>Incomplete</i> , pending completion of all required			
---	--	--	--

documentation & fees.			
Baginski, Sean Joseph	Structural	Gfthr.	Incom/Project letter for Artic Mini Mall or Calcs for Muldoon
Canik, Paul Andrew	FS		Incomplete/SECON work does not qualify. Needs 29 points under AS08.48.341 or 12AAC 36.065/\$
Carpenter, Wesley	Control Systems	Comity	Requesting FE waiver. Approved/\$
Clemenz, Bryan W.	Control Systems	Gfthr.	Incomplete/ref ltrs from Kittle & BP Tech Authority
Croasmun, William R.	Civil	Comity	Incomplete/JQ & investigation report, Verification by PE, of additional responsible charge
Evans, Simon Andrew	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Calcs
Faschan, John H.	Control Systems	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Provide calcs
Fawcett, Daniel Wade	Fire Protection	Gfthr.	Incomplete/no calcs included/\$
Gabbert, Paul S.	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Project Questionnaire but no plans & specs
Glaves, Eric F.	Surveyor	Exam	Incomplete/Need evidence of 2 yrs course Bd Approved Curr in Land surveying & 36 months responsible charge
Goudarzi, Ardeshir S.	Mechanical	Comity	Incomplete/2 nd reference that has known him 5 years
Hargesheimer, John	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Stop sending duplicate letters saying he was in responsible charge for both projects
Heer, Kirk L.	Mechanical	Comity	Incomplete/Reference discipline on work experience form
Hopkins, Donald L.	Control Systems	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Supporting documentation for pump station project
Howlett, Garth K.	Structural	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Calcs for Rig Tenders Dock Improvements/\$
Hulsey, J. Leroy	Structural	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Seal on drawings/Drawings of Drs Microwave Tower

Jacobson Gregory N.	Structural	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Calcs for projects
Jeannet, Charles P.	Structural	Gfthr.	NO ACTION
Johnson, Edwin Ellis	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Provide 1 additional Project
Johnson, Lee Alan	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/ No calcs provided
Jones, Gregory V.	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Still no calcs-all data in one file/\$
Keniston-Longrie, Joy Lynn	Environmental	Comity	Resubmit after receiving transcript
Krysinski, Nicholas E.	Mechanical	Exam	Incomplete/no exper of responsible charge in mech. Under PE, JP & FE/\$
Ligozio, Christopher A.	Structural	Comity	Incomplete/additional ref/Artic
Lindell, Larry Gene	Structural	Comity	Incomplete/Artic,JPQ, Educa/ FE/PE Exam
Miller, Chris H.	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Prof ref for Denali Princess water & waste water treatment project/\$
Nyman, David M.	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Signed, sealed dated calcs & plans as per 12AAC 36.106(e)
Presler, Wendy A.	Civil	Exam	Incomplete/9 months additional exp/\$
Serlin, Brett Merrick	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/need to see calculations that lead to decisions/stamped plans
Shonsey, Cara W.	Civil	Exam	Incomplete/Needs additional 8 months responsibility charge/\$
Snyder, Edward E.	Mechanical	Comity	Incomplete/Need Resp charge ref in mechanical
Sterling, David Robert	Structural	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Two projects designed by applicant including plans, calcs & references
Warton, Nicholas J.	Civil	Exam	Incomplete/Work exp verification was signed 12/18/13. However verifies through 4/11/14/JP requirement
Wike, Vanessa Blevins	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Signed,sealed and dated plans & calculations as for 12 AAC 36.106(e)
Xu, Qi	Chemical	Exam	Incomplete/show total of 60 months' work experience/\$

1
2 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it**
3 **was RESOLVED to approve the following list of applicants for registration with the**
4 **stipulation that the information in the applicant's files will take precedence over the**
5 **information in the minutes:**
6

The following candidates are Approved by Examination, Comity, or Additional Branch, pending completion of all required documentation and fees.			
Alexander, Seth	FE		
Alshammari, Fahad			
Anderson, Michael N.	Environmenta I	Gfthr.	Approved
Antwiler, Douglas Dean	Structural	Comity	Approved
Arrington, Lynn, III	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPO, Artic Eng
Badgett, Robert Keller	Environmenta I	Gfthr.	Approved
Bailey, Richard	FE		
Balstad, Logan	FE		
Bannow, Josh R.	FS		Approved
Barnett, Robert Blair	FE		
Baumgartner, Milaud	FE		
Belway, Sarah L.	Environmenta I	Gfthr.	Approved
Berg, Sean	FE		
Bergerson, Ryan	FE		
Bernardi, Adam	FE		
Billman, Daniel W.	Environmenta I	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Bishop, John Scott	Structural	Comity	Conditional/JQ
Bobo, Brett Alan	Civil	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Boerger, Jared Thomas	FE		
Bojko, Veronica L.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved/\$
Bott, James Wescott	Environmenta I	Gfthr.	Approved
Calkins, Justin	FE		

Campbell, Peter John	Environmenta l	Comity	Approved
Campfield, Michael Jonathan	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Conditional/Verify professional practice area is environmental
Carlson, Ryan William	Mechanical	Comity	Conditional/JP
Carter, Eric Mitchell	FE		
Chadwick, Benjamin R.	Civil	Comity	Conditional/Proof educ & JP
Chin, Michael G.	Civil	Comity	Conditional/FE,JP,Artic
Clark, Daniel J.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/JQ
Coisman, Charles	FE		
Colquhoun, Jason	Fire Protection	Gfthr.	Approved
Comerio, Anthony K.	Civil	Comity	Conditional/Artic
Critchett, Denali	FE		
Critchett, Denali	FE		
Croft, Christopher S.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Cuanzon, Ronald	FE		
Cullen, Kodiak	FE		
Cunningham, Daniel J.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/JQ
Dahl, Michael Dean	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Deibler, Nathaniel Mark	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Denton, Jonathan Davis	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Dey, Collin Lewis	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Dukowitz, Austin	FE		
Duval, John Ivor	Civil	Comity	Conditional/Artic Engin & JPO
Eliason, Samuel MacArthur	Civil	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Ellingson, Dalton Brian	FE		
Esch, Bradley M.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/Verification of exam, registration, Educ, Artic Engineering
Esmaili, Ali A.	Mechanical	Comity	Conditional/JP/NU
Farnham, Adam D.	Fire Protection	Comity	Conditional/JP
Ferebauer, Robert Lyndon	Mechanical	Comity	Conditional/JP
Fletcher, Mathew A.	Structural	Comity	Approved
Florey, James Russell	Mechanical	Comity	Conditional/JP & Artic
Francois, Kris Ellen	Structural	Comity	Approved/\$

Freese, David A.	Civil	Exam	Conditional/JPO Exam
Gastrock, Brian T.	Environmental	Gfthr.	Approved
Gilliland, Amanda L.	Civil	Exam	Conditional/Passing PE/\$
Gotschall, Howard Nelson	Structural	Comity	Conditional/Artic Engineering
Gould, Timothy Francis	Environmental	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Hall, Jordan R.	Civil	Exam	Conditional/Exam, ABET Degree in civil/\$
Hanson, Carolyn	Civil	Comity	Approved
Harren, Paul Otto	FE		
Harris, Marcia D.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/JQ
Harriss, Brian E.	Structural	Comity	Approved
Hart, Michael N.	Mechanical	Commit y	Approved
Havenar, Thomas E.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/JQ
Hinds, Cory L.	Environmental	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Hnilicka, Charles	FE		
Hoffman, Sarah R	FE		
Hopkins, Donald L.	Fire Protection	Gfthr.	Approved
Hoskins, Stephen Paul	Electrical	Comity	Conditional/Artic/JP
Hunt, Glen L., III	Structural	Comity	Approved
Husein, Zaid S.	Civil	Exam	Conditional pending JPO/\$
Huynh, Khoi Duc	Electrical	Comity	Approved/\$
Ivanov, Vladimir I.	Structural	Comity	Conditional upon Artic, JPO
Keener, Julie Ann	Environmental	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Kemp, Beaux Michael	FE		
Kiddle, Fraser Wood	Mechanical	Exam	Approved/\$
Kidney, Scott Matheson	Petroleum	Exam	Conditional/JP & Verify FE/\$
Kocher, Erik Johann	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPO & Artic
Kovel, Jeffrey Scott	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Kulbaga, John	Mechanical	Comity	Conditional/JP
Lasich, Andrew M.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/Artic & JQ

Laurent, Thomas H.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Lies, Kenneth M.	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPO/\$
Lips, Edwin C.	Mining	Comity	Conditional/Proof FE exam, Artic, JP
Logan, Jeffrey N.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Lucas, Warren K.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Lundin, David	Enviro	Gramps	Approved
Malone, Chad J.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Maney, Duane C.	Civil	Exam	Conditional/Proof degree/\$
Marcum, Samuel J.	Environmenta I	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Martino, Brett	FE		
Mason, Thad	Electrical	Comity	Approved
Mawson, Simon John	Environmenta I	Gfthr.	Approved
McDonald, William M.	Control Systems	Gfthr.	Approved
McDonnell, Terry R.	Structural	Comity	Approved
McNulty, Michael G.	Civil	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Meeks, Andrea D.	Environmenta I	Gfthr.	Approved
Melendez, Victor M.	Electrical	Exam	Approval upon passing exam
Menough, Jon M.	Environmenta I	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Merrick, Steven B.	Electrical	Comity	Conditional/JP/\$
Meyring, Justin T.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Mork, David Mitchell	Civil	Exam	Conditional/exam, JPO/\$
Nash, Adam S.	FS		Approved
Nash, Adam S.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved/\$Approved to take Exam
Nelson, Andrew John	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Nelson, Derek Sven	Civil	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Newell, Aaron Dahlberg	Civil	Comity	Conditional/JPO/\$
Odom, Kristine	FE		
Ohrt, Andrew W.	Environmenta I	Comity	Approved
Olszewski, Peter J.	Civil	Comity	Approved/\$

Oot, Ryan Harold	Civil	Exam	Conditional/exam/\$
Ostbo, Bruce I.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/Verification of exam, registration, PLQ, Educ
Pace, Roy N.	Control Systems	Gfthr.	Approved
Pannone, Steven R.	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Pepe, John A.	Control Systems	Gfthr.	Approved
Perrin, Andre' J.	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Pfitzinger, Joel B.	Structural	Comity	Approved
Phillips, Matthew Everette	Civil	Comity	Approved
Pirvulescu, Maria	Electrical	Comity	Approved
Platt, Wilson Tucker	FE		
Polasek, Thomas	FE		
Rahimi, Faramarz	Control Systems	Comity	Approved/\$
Read, Alexander L.	Civil	Exam	Conditional/exam/\$
Richmond, Peter Michael	Electrical	Comity	Conditional/FE, Verification PE, JP
Ringler, Chad E.	FE		
Roberts, Michael Garrett	Environmenta l	Comity	Conditional/JP
Robertson, Jeffrey S.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Roelfs, Scott Thackery	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Roseberry, Mark Joseph	FE		
Sande, Trevor Scott	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Sande, Trevor Scott	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Sadow, Patrick	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Sauve, Summer M.	Civil	Exam	Conditional on exam/\$
Schanne, Joel David	Civil	Exam	Conditional pending exam, JPO/\$
Sirois, Nathan M.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
SlatonBarker, Tony B.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Smith Nicholai J.W.	Electrical	Exam	Conditional/FE, fees, Artic, JP/\$
Solan, John P.	Mechanical	Comity	Conditional/Artic & JP
Stark, Jeremy D.	Civil	Exam	Conditional upon JQ

Steiner, Dan Edward	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Stoughtenger, Samantha	Civil	Comity	Approved
Swanson, Christine A.	Fire Protection	Comity	Approved
Tauriainen, Michael J.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Thevenot, Toby M.	Control Systems	Comity	Conditional/JP/\$
Tierney, Todd A.	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Torrents, Jeannette M.	Structural	Comity	Approved
Triandafilou, Nicholas	Structural	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Tsogtsaikhan, Tsakhiur	FE		
Tyrell, William A.	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Underhill, Gregory C.	Civil	Comity	Conditional/Exam, JO, Registration
Vinberg, Hubert, Jr.	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Vincent, John F.	Structural	Comity	Approved/\$
Wagner, Natalie M.	Environmenta l	Comity	Approved
Ward, Rachel	FE		
Webb, Jason L.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Westervelt, Warren Winslow	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Whitehead, Jared G.	FS		
Wooten, Shawn Lee	FE		
Wyatt, Scott T.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/Artic Engineering
Xie, Bin	Chemical	Comity	Approved
Zimmer, Raymond	FE		

1

2 **Agenda item 25 – Review Calendar of Events**

3

4 Chair: We have a board meeting November 4th and 5th in Anchorage. We have our Juneau
5 meeting on February 5th and 6th. And we scheduled our Fairbanks meeting May 7th and 8th. So
6 you want to wait to schedule August and November or go ahead and get them on the calendar?
7 We could go ahead and pencil them in and then next meeting if we need to adjust we will.

8

9 It was decided to tentatively schedule August 2015 for August 6th and 7th and November 5th and
10 6th.

11

12 Chair: We already went through the National meeting dates so Board Comments?

1
2 **Agenda item 26 – Board Comments.**
3

4 Hanson: Good meeting, new chair this meeting. I hope we get our budget stuff figured out by
5 the next meeting. He's looking forward to the NCEES meeting in Seattle next week. He thinks
6 the outreach event scheduled for Saturday is the first time they've done that. See everybody in
7 November.
8

9 Hale: Thanks Vern, welcome Sarena, thanks everybody, good meeting.
10

11 Christensen: Yes, good meeting, we got a lot done.
12

13 Walters: Welcome Sarena and thanks for a well run meeting.
14

15 Schedler: Welcome Sarena, good meeting.
16

17 Urfer: Welcome Sarena, it was a good meeting.
18

19 Maynard: Welcome Sarena. I was hoping I would have the structural stuff enacted before I
20 took on another big task. He will start working on the EIT thing.
21

22 Jones: Everything went fine, Sarena picks things up fast and is doing a good job.
23

24 Chair: Welcomes Sarena, you've stepped in and learned a lot in a short period of time and I
25 think you're going to do great. My advice would be not to take your vacation just before the
26 meeting and drive up from Skagway. (laughter) And yesterday presenting the regulations as
27 you understand them, I think you did a real good job.
28

29 Kathleen as always the budgetarian (laughter) We want them to know we want that information,
30 we're paying attention and thank you all and we'll see you in November.
31

32 Jones: Asks again if they want him to put all the financial reports during the year in each Board
33 Packet.
34

35 Schedler: Does not want them reading from something that we don't have. It was frustrating for
36 her to have Martha reading something she didn't have because that was three months ago and
37 she didn't remember it.
38

39 Chair: Not necessarily all the reports but the most current one you have.
40

41 Jones: I didn't expect her to do that, I thought she would just say that they didn't have the
42 numbers yet.
43

44 Schedler: So if all they have is what they had last time I would say yes, give it to us again.
45

46 Jones: Just email me your receipts that way I've got it electronically and you still have a copy.
47

48 1:31p.m. Meeting adjourned.
49
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

Richard Rearick, AIA, Chair
Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers and Land Surveyors

Date: _____