

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 February 5-6, 2015

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 February 5-
13 6, 2015 in Juneau, AK.

14
15 Thursday February 5, 2015

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 Brian Hanson who
20 was excused by the Chair.

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
 - Eric Eriksen, Electrical Engineer
 - David Hale, Land Surveyor,
 - Jeffrey Koonce, Architect
 - 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

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

- 36
- Martha Hewlett, Administrative Officer II
 - Vernon Jones, Executive Administrator.
 - Sarena Hackenmiller, Licensing Examiner.
 - John Savage, Investigator (via Telephone)
 - Jun Maiquis, Regulations Specialist attended briefly to answer questions.
- 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: Asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Koonce made the motion and Eriksen
49 seconded.

1
2 Maynard: I'd like add under new business item c and that would be to discuss the Governor's
3 Budget that comes out today and see if they're cutting Occupational Licensing fees. We are
4 self-funded and having that disabled doesn't do any good. We need to see what they're doing
5 and write letters to the Governor and Finance Committee if they are cutting us because they are
6 cutting everybody else.
7
8 Chair: So under New Business, as item 17 C the Governor's Budget.
9
10 Chair: Asks if there are any other changes to the agenda.
11
12 Jones: We need to add the disciplinary case.
13
14 Chair: We need to add review of case 2014-002497. Vern, do we want to do it in executive
15 session?
16
17 Jones: Recommends that it be done as part of item 14 before application review.
18
19 Chair: Ok we will do it under agenda item 14.
20
21 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it was**
22 **RESOLVED to approve the agenda as amended.**
23
24 **Agenda item 3 – Ethics reporting**
25
26 Chair: I just attended a committee for NCARB so I'll be submitting report on that. Anybody else
27 have any ethics issues either travel or any conflicts they might have?
28
29 Maynard: I just got back from an UPLG meeting with NCEES and I'll be filing a claim.
30
31 Kerr: I attended an NCEES Surveying Task Force meeting and I'll be filing a disclosure form.
32
33 **Agenda item 4 - Review and approve the Minutes of the November 2014 meeting.**
34
35 Chair: Agenda item 4 review and approve minutes from November 4-5 meeting. Can I have a
36 motion on that?
37
38 Koonce: Makes the motion. Maynard seconds.
39
40 Eriksen: Asks if they are approved as written?
41
42 Chair: Right now they are approved as written; we can do a friendly amendment to motion.
43
44 Maynard: On page 4 lines 14 and 24 instead of rational it should be rationale.
45
46 **On a motion duly made by Koonce seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it was**
47 **RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the November 2014 meeting as amended.**
48
49 Chair: We are going to call in John for the Investigators Report.
50
51 Jones: He said he would ready about a quarter after.

1 **Agenda item 6 – Regulation update**

- 2
- 3 A) Regulations ready for Board review and adoption.
- 4 1. 12 AAC 36.063 Engineering Education and Work Experience Requirements
 - 5 (SE);
 - 6 2. 12 AAC 36.108 Application for Registration as a Structural Engineer;
 - 7 3. 12 AAC 36.180 Seals; and
 - 8 4. 12 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals.
 - 9 5. 12 AAC 36.510 Continuing Education Requirements
- 10

11 Chair: Ok so we'll skip item 5 right now and move to item 6 the regulations. Before we launch

12 into this, Vernon, I'd like to talk about our options that we have.

13

14 Jones: OK, for the structural engineering regulations your options are to adopt them as public

15 noticed. Make changes and adopt them. Make changes and send them back out to public

16 notice. Table them.

17

18 Chair: If we table them does that mean the it dies or does that mean it's just sitting out there.....

19

20 Jones: You can send them back to the committee.

21

22 Chair: And also I want to add on the front end of this that there's a lot of public comment, a lot

23 of diverse comments. The engineering field is a wide area so we got comments from all

24 different areas and some come from the public sector as well. So I think as we move into this

25 we want to go through all the comments and consider them before we do any deliberations on

26 this and make any decision on it and I'd just also like to say we don't have to be hasty in our

27 decision on this. It is a big issue, a lot of people interested in it and we want to make sure that

28 all this input is totally realized and that we are making the best decision. So with that do we

29 actually need the motion to do something, to read the comments or can we just read the

30 comments?

31

32 Jones: You can just read the comments first then make the motion afterward. What you should

33 do is read each comment on the record then ask if there is any discussion.

34

35 Chair: We are not going to read word for word every comment that was out there but we will

36 look through each one.

37

38 **Note:** The Board received the comments via e-mail a week before the meeting so they could

39 review them. Then I handed out a copy for their Board packets on the morning of the meeting.

40 As the Chair went through the comments he paused after reading the date received and name

41 of the commenter to give everyone a chance to read it.

42

43 Chair: So let's go ahead and turn to those and you should have had those in the packet that

44 this morning Vern handed out.

45

46 Koonce: That this copy here, you're talking about?

47

48 Chair: Yes.

49

50 Maynard: This is the same stuff you e-mailed us last week, right?

51

1 Jones: Right. There are a couple of Board packets up there if you Gentlemen want to follow
2 along. (Referring to the two guests from DOT.)
3
4 Koonce: Who was on the committee, Colin you were right?
5
6 Maynard: Yes and Brian, Eric, and Richard.
7
8 Chair: Was this Licensure Implementation?
9
10 Maynard: Yes.
11
12 Jones: That will be under Item 6A.
13
14 Chair: So we should all be looking at these in the same order. If I read the title on something
15 and it's not what you're looking at then raise a flag.
16
17 The first one is from Peter Giessel it's an e-mail dated December 4th (silence while the Board
18 looks at it) any comments on this one?
19
20 Maynard: Well the Grandfathering process was assuming that as of the date this was adopted.
21 Anybody that was able to practice structural engineering up to that date should be able to
22 grandfather themselves in. What he is saying is if you only had your license for 6 months then
23 you shouldn't be grandfathered in because under the new regulations, its two years and I think
24 we are of the opinion and I think the Dept. of Law would agree that you can't stop them from
25 doing what they were doing before. You should allow them a chance to upgrade their license
26 but once we get into this it will be two years.
27
28 Chair: Maybe before we go any further just to do a recap of what the regulations do so as we
29 are reading these comments we.....
30
31 Maynard: Basically what the regulation project does is makes the SE rather than the 16 hour
32 exam PE, makes it a post PE license. So you'll get your PE in whatever branch you get it in and
33 due two years more experience in structural engineering and then apply to take the SE with all
34 the letters of recommendation and all the other stuff you need for the other licenses and then
35 take the 16 hour SE exam. It would also provide a new seal that would say Professional
36 Structural Engineer instead of just Professional Engineer and then it says that you would be
37 required to use an SE on certain significant structures which are typically occupancy class III
38 and IV which are hazardous and essential facilities and other major projects. The significant
39 structures were basically stolen from the States of Oregon and Washington, their lists. And
40 that's pretty much it.
41
42 Chair: Wasn't there some correlation in there to the IBC?
43
44 Maynard: Yes, that's what the occupancy class III and IV is.
45
46 Hale: As far as the grandfathering goes, how's that done?
47
48 Maynard: I don't remember exactly, the dates are blank in the regulation project there now but it
49 will be established as 18 months from when this finally gets adopted. So they have a period of
50 time to apply to us like they did the last two years for all the additional disciplines that were
51 added. So if you're a civil engineer that was doing structural engineering or nuclear engineers

1 doing structural engineering and you wanted to get an SE you could apply to us and we have
2 the same requirements we had under the previous grandfathering process.
3
4 Hale: Does that mean that you were actually stamping structural things previously?
5
6 Maynard: Well you have to have been licensed. You didn't necessarily have to be stamping it
7 because if you're a licensed engineer who is working for a corporation where only the Principles
8 stamp you could provide that work without your stamp on it but then you have to have a letter
9 saying in our firm or our governmental agency we don't stamp drawings, you would be able to
10 get around it that way.
11
12 Hale: So they could be working toward their SE but not have the stamp for structural?
13
14 Maynard: Right, they would have to have at least a civil.
15
16 Chair: Any other comments on that one? Ok let's go ahead with the next. This is December 9th
17 and it's Mohamed Elzafraney (Chair spells his last name) he's a structural engineer. (short
18 period of silence while they look at the comment). The jest of what he's saying here, it looks like
19 he's saying structural engineers already licensed in other states, do they need to re-apply for
20 the SE do they need to provide the plans, the reference letters, that type of thing.
21
22 Maynard: No, they can apply by comity which they can do now.
23
24 Chair: The next one is December 9th and it's from Dale MacCallum and Vern went ahead and
25 answered this and it was a question about the engineers that can attest to the requirements of d
26 and e. (Silence while they review it). That's been answered, anybody have any more
27 comments on that?
28
29 Eriksen: Were supposed to call John at 9:15?
30
31 Jones: He said he would be available any time after 9:15; he's scheduled for 9:30.
32
33 Chair: Let's go ahead and get through some of these and we'll call him at 9:30. The next page
34 is just the back side of that e-mail. So the next one is December 9th, Ronald MacCallum.
35
36 Maynard: That's just the original email.
37
38 Chair: Oh, ok. Some of these are hard to track. Next one is December 11th, Bart Halverson
39 and basically saying that the term "significant structure" needs some more definition and
40 questioning what really a significant structure is and that theme does come up a couple times
41 through these comments. So I think we'll want to have a little bit of discussion on that as we go
42 through.
43
44 Koonce: Is that refereeing to the occupied floor, 4 stories?
45
46 Maynard: And the 45 feet, if you've got this tall parapet that reaches 46 feet.....
47
48 Koonce: If you have a single story building that is 45 feet in height, right?
49
50 Maynard: its 4 stories or 45 feet so if it's one story 46 feet tall then it would require....
51

1 Koonce: For the occupied floor, right?
2
3 Maynard: Right.
4
5 Chair: Anything else on that one? This next one is in letter format, December 11th, Timothy
6 Bardell and his first issue is just the continuing education requirement. He wants it to be
7 dropped and also basically reiterating that engineers shouldn't be working in areas that they are
8 not experienced in any way and he's contesting whether or not the SE would provide for a better
9 building.
10
11 Koonce: Are the continuing education credits for civil engineering if you took 12 or 24 for
12 structural engineering would they overlap to cover all your civil engineering?
13
14 Maynard: Yes they would.
15
16 Koonce: So.....
17
18 Chair: Right but you need a minimum of 24 for the two years. But if you have 5 licenses you
19 need a minimum of 8 in each license.
20
21 Maynard: In this case you would need 24. In theory if you took 8 in structural that would cover
22 both civil and structural but if you had 24 hours in sewer system design then that wouldn't count
23 toward your structural. Not that there's that many people that do both of those.
24
25 Chair: Anything else on that one? Next is December 15th by Nick Rodes, Fire Protection and
26 there's a few technical items in this one. He suggests that the word engineering should be put
27 into some of the language and some additional suggestions for some re-writing. Colin do you
28 have any comments on some of these suggestions in here?
29
30 Maynard: On the comity I think the existing comity rules applies to all of them and I'm not sure it
31 can be changed but I'll go check it when we have a break and yes on item number 3 once
32 someone got their SE they wouldn't necessarily have to keep their CE they could let that lapse
33 but then they would be limited to doing structural engineering work. I'm not sure that we need to
34 define the other two terms because they are terms that are in the IBC. I guess I don't have a
35 problem with seabed verses ground level.
36
37 Chair: There's a later letter on this number 5 regarding the offshore that also addresses
38 whether it's a vessel that's designed by naval architects and whether it's permanently affixed
39 either in the water or on land and some definition on that so I think the whole part dealing with
40 offshore structures we need to revisit a little bit.
41
42 Maynard: We are not talking boats.
43
44 Chair: Right but there's still some definition there, some clarification that they want to see in the
45 proposal. Anything else on that one?
46
47 Eriksen: Did you comment on item 1, Colin?
48
49 Maynard: I don't know if it's necessary but we could add that word.
50
51 Chair: Ok, the next is December 15th, by Ted Creedon.

1
2 Koonce: His comments are on the opposite page.
3
4 Chair: Yes
5
6 Jones: Note the last sentence at the bottom.
7
8 Chair: Yeah I already did note that in my review. (Laughter) Eric maybe you want to comment
9 a little bit on this one. I get a little bit lost on some of the technical requirements regarding
10 electrical but it sounds like the jest of it is, there are certain electrical structures that require you
11 to have some sort of electrical certification in order to inspect them and the typical SE would not
12 have those certifications.
13
14 Eriksen: Well there's a state inspector that does most of those inspections and I don't believe
15 they have those certifications or level of voltage class that I'm aware of. Pretty much anything
16 up to 25 KV that is listed there is a bit of an odd voltage and those are usually utility voltages
17 which are exempt anyway so I'm not sure I'm following what he's saying.
18
19 Maynard: Typically the only, I do seismic work with mechanical and electrical administrators
20 and all it is, is making sure that the piece of equipment doesn't roll down the hall or fall off the
21 roof and so all the structural is doing is looking how it attaches to the building and isn't going to
22 move in an earthquake. We are not looking at how the box is built just attaching it to the
23 structure.
24
25 Eriksen: There are seismic requirements for electrical equipment design of transformers and
26 that and some different set of codes based on the point of where the designation between public
27 and utility is between NESC and NEC code books but it's not important to talk about here.
28
29 Maynard: And in that seismic attachment, quite frankly, that to me is work of a minor nature that
30 if a electrical engineer or mechanical engineer feel confident that they can calculate the seismic
31 loads and design the anchors I see no problem with that but it would have to be on a case by
32 case basis. If someone doesn't know how to do that then they shouldn't be doing it.
33
34 Eriksen: Yeah, I think you know it's pretty routine stuff I think probably the exception maybe if
35 like if some huge electrical equipment was positioned on top of a building or something like that
36 then that would probably require a structural engineer.
37
38 Maynard: Or the tower it's setting on, an antenna tower.
39
40 Eriksen: Yes, I'm not really aware....
41
42 Chair: Have electrical engineers typically, in the past, designed some of those towers?
43
44 Eriksen: Well it depends on, again, it's usually within working within the practice of engineering
45 for smaller structures and stuff it's not uncommon for them to do poles and things and even
46 small stuff when it gets to larger towers are typically referred to a civil engineer.
47
48 Maynard: And maybe just picking it out of a catalog is good for the wind load and you end up
49 having a structural engineer design the foundation for it.
50
51 Eriksen: Yeah, you know a lot of utilities are exempt so it's kind of a practice so there may be

1 some variation between utility practices; all utilities have civil engineers on staff and or
2 consultants. But I'm not sure there is a real defining line other than the area the engineer is
3 experienced enough to practice in but it's not uncommon for them to do some common
4 structures.

5
6 Chair: So as far as all these cell towers that are going up would you anticipate, well currently
7 would you expect that the foundation would have a civil/structural designing it and that the pole
8 itself wasn't designed by an engineer in state or is it something an electrical engineer would put
9 his stamp on or would a structural engineer?

10
11 Eriksen: So like glass towers and stuff are usually, can usually be a multitude of things,
12 common is for a civil/structural engineer to design the members of those and solicit for
13 manufacturing from a reputable manufacturer that works around the world and developed the
14 standards and stuff and that would usually involve a civil or structural engineer.

15
16 Chair: And then would they submit shop drawings that would be stamped by an Alaska civil or
17 structural engineer.

18
19 Eriksen: They may not always stamp because of exemptions but if it was not a utility then it
20 would.

21
22 Chair: Ok, we'll move to the investigative report, item 5.

23 24 **Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report**

25
26 Chair: Morning John

27
28 Savage: How is everything going up there in that busy little town?

29
30 Eriksen: Oh, it's a beautiful sunny day out here, everybody is just happy.

31
32 Maynard: We've got 90 mile an hour winds and it's about to snow like crazy.

33
34 Savage: I saw it was 62 below up in Deadhorse. So where are we at?

35
36 Chair: We are waiting for your report.

37
38 Savage: Ok, well you see my written report. As it stands, this last quarter we've been working
39 on a lot of application issues yes block issues that we've got open files on each one. We should
40 be coming to an end on those soon. And holding our breath, a lot of you saw that the Governor
41 is making his announcements today and we will kind of see where that's going to leave us as far
42 as if there is a hiring freeze or anything like that. We're 4 or 5 slots down now already and they
43 took two of our existing slots and made supervisor slots out of them that aren't going to have a
44 case load so we are just going to have to hope for the best. Hopefully we'll come out at the
45 other end unscathed, but we'll see.

46
47 The other issues I wanted to talk about are what's coming out this afternoon with the money
48 issues. I think more than ever we are going to have to start leaning hard on consent
49 agreements and the civil fine actions that we have as opposed to sending stuff over to the AG's
50 Office with the hourly rate that they're charging and that, but you know it's going to be decided
51 at a food chain above me but we can do at our level we can certainly, you know, when at all

1 possible, go that direction if you know what I mean? So they see that we are doing our part.

2
3 Other than that its business as usual there is an Imposition of Civil Fine that you're going to be
4 looking at later and life is good.

5
6 Chair: Well one thing that we've initiated that might help your job a little bit that we'll be talking
7 about later under New Business is the addition of an address and some other information on
8 stamped documents that will largely assist you in tracking people down and trying to determine
9 who the responsible party is on documents. That's going to be really a first reading of the
10 proposal today.

11
12 Savage: Yeah, I think you guys are calling back into me about 11:40 for that, the Old Business
13 there the use of logos in title blocks so to speak.

14
15 Chair: Yes, that's.....

16
17 Savage: And then tomorrow I'm joining you also at 10 o'clock for New Business concerning
18 direct supervisory control and such things.

19
20 Chair: That's right; it's under Old Business, the use of logos in plans.

21
22 Savage: You know every little bit helps, you know anything we can do to cut our unneeded
23 investigative resources and direct them toward more, and I keep saying this, and I still hopeful
24 even with what's going on, because I truly believe that things are going to straighten themselves
25 out. But we need to get more proactive, you know, a lot more is coming up now like the old
26 days because we're not more proactive, because we're not out there in the field. You guys all
27 know, you hear it when I'm out there rattling cages and working job sites and yanking plans and
28 that. You hear about that, people.....cell phone rings...laughter....hello?....

29
30 Schedler: We were distracted by a cell phone.

31
32 Savage: Oh, ok, I thought we had crossed wires with somebody. So I truly hope that we get
33 back to that space, you know, we've come leaps and bounds with the Building Officials, with the
34 Fire Marshall's Office, with the local Fire Departments that are doing plan review. Those guys
35 have been such a help to us. But we also need to be out there working it from an enforcement
36 standpoint ourselves and that does, it starts receding, it truly does.

37
38 I think that's all I've got as far as the Investigative Report unless anybody else has a question of
39 me or anything like that.

40
41 Chair: Anybody have any questions?

42
43 Maynard: I've got one quick question. There was a case in the AG's Office last meeting, right,
44 and it's disappeared. Did something happen or did they just decide to close and forget it
45 because it was so old?

46
47 Savage: No, actually that was an old one. That took a long, long time to deal with but that
48 individual, I believe, went in front of you on a consent agreement, we can talk about it now it's
49 public record. That was a rather large consent agreement if you remember and that individual is
50 on notice. A lot of people want to say we need to charge more or this or that. For years there's
51 been guys getting away with stuff that have nothing on their records what-so-ever, you know.

1 So to get something on there, they're going to pay their fine they are going to take their
2 reprimand and it's public record and they've been for warned so if we go to a hearing there's not
3 a hearing officer out there that won't say this was a pretty good awakening you had four or five
4 years ago or a year ago or six months ago but that's where that one went and I felt really good
5 about that one going away. You'll notice a few old ones we've got one eleven left and a couple
6 twelves and those are my next victims that I'm going after and I try to give one day a week to old
7 business like that to get them off our books and move them along.

8
9 Maynard: Ok.

10
11 Schedler: That's good.

12
13 Chair: Well John as always we appreciate your efforts and we stand ready to help you any way
14 we can.

15
16 Savage: Well, I appreciate that and I truly from the heart I mean that I see some of these
17 goings on in other Boards and other arenas and stuff and every time I do I want to give each
18 one of you a big hug. I do appreciate the professionalism in which you run your Board.

19
20 Chair: We're all about the hugs so....Laughter.

21
22 Savage: Well you guys take care of yourselves and I'll talk to you again about 11:40.

23
24 Chair: Ok, thanks John.

25
26 Chair: Ok so let's jump back to the comments for the regulation item 6 A. So the next one is
27 December 17th, from Dave Wert.

28
29 Maynard: You skipped one.

30
31 Chair: Oh, did I? Yea, ok, December 16th Dwight Lockwood and he's just saying he is in full
32 support of the regulations to have structural engineering as a separate discipline as proposed.
33 Comments on that one?

34
35 Ok, December 17th, Dave Wert. Now this one was a little bit different one where he does a lot of
36 it looks like he does a lot of connections for truss design. So he had a concern or wanted some
37 clarity on if he would still be able to do that without being a structural engineer under the new
38 regulations if there was a structural engineer for the overall project. It wouldn't just apply to pre-
39 manufactured trusses I think it could be other joists and different components that could be
40 used.

41
42 Maynard: Yeah and that's not clear in the language in the other states or ours. My gut would
43 say that as long as there's a structural engineer who is overall in charge of the project if you had
44 a CE designing the steel joists or the metal plate connected wood trusses or the steel studs that
45 as long as it's being reviewed by the SE that's in charge of the project then it's probably fine.

46
47 Chair: So where there might be a difference though is if they're just designing the component
48 for something but you don't have an SE that's stamping a whole building set and reviewing
49 those it could be that maybe a contractor is ordering some components independently of an
50 overall building package. In that case they may very well need to have the SE.

51

1 Maynard: I don't see where that would occur, you have to have an SE on a project that's a
2 significant structure so you're not going to have a contractor just ordering pieces and parts
3 independent of an SE. On the flip side if you're a pre-engineered metal building manufacturer
4 and you're providing a pre-engineered metal building for a school it's a significant and that
5 would require that it be an SE.
6
7 Chair: Anything else on this one, and I think this maybe comes up again later.
8
9 Jones: Just a note here. On these that answered a question I wasn't allowed to contact the
10 Board, I had to answer it myself so if you don't agree with my answer, sorry about that.
11 (laughter).
12
13 Chair: Thank you Vern. This next one is December 23rd, from Richard Campbell and then
14 answered by Vern the same day. So Colin do you confirm Vern's answer?
15
16 Maynard: Yes if he's taking the SE exam he would be able to get comity and I think the stamp
17 does say Professional Structural Engineer.
18
19 Jones: the version that went out for notice said registered.
20
21 Maynard: That's fine. As far as engineering failures unfortunately it's almost impossible to find
22 out where there have been problems because neither the owner nor the engineer is going to
23 announce that fact due to ongoing litigation.
24
25 Chair: Ok, anything else on this one? The next one is January 2nd, 2015, Don McLaughlin. He
26 brings up the issue of providing stamped plans where it was for an entity that either doesn't
27 require them or they are proprietary and they don't allow you to release them.
28
29 Koonce: There seems to be a lot of comment about significant structure and the definition of
30 that.
31
32 Chair: Yeah that does come up quite a bit in these comments.
33
34 Maynard: We didn't seem to have any problems with people getting documents to send to us
35 over the last two years. They can always submit a document, if they didn't stamp it originally
36 because it wasn't required they can provide us a letter that says it's not stamped because....
37
38 Chair: Yeah, I think there is a way to deal with that, any more comments on that one? January
39 2nd, 2015 Don McLaughlin and that has to do with the significant structures and he just wants us
40 to define significant quantity of explosives.
41
42 Maynard: That's defined in IBC plus the judgment of the engineer.
43
44 Koonce: And the fire codes.
45
46 Chair: But that has.....
47
48 Koonce: Those are under hazards occupancies.
49
50 Maynard: Well hazardous facilities are one's that are occupancy category III so it falls under
51 significant structures.

1
2 Koonce: So you would find the definition in the fire codes or the oxidizer or.....
3
4 Maynard: Yeah. Basically what we are look at is if it falls under occupancy class III in the IBC it
5 would require an SE. If it doesn't then you wouldn't.
6
7 Chair: The only thing with the quantities in the IBC and the IFC is that it's not necessarily a
8 quantity that says you're a significant structure if you're over this quantity it says if you're over
9 this quantity you might have a couple different options. There might be three different quantity
10 levels that require different action. You know one might require a sprinkler; one might have
11 restrictions on how it's stored. There are some complexities in there so I don't if it's as simple
12 as just saying that whatever is defined in the IBC or the IFC is going to be significant. So that's
13 something we might need to revisit.
14
15 Maynard: Well somehow we're already doing that, it's in chapter it says basically these words,
16 puts you in occupancy class III. Now how they're determining that, usually we ask the architect
17 does it have this and they go yes or no.
18
19 Chair: But's that's for calculation purposes to determine basically how you're going to run your
20 numbers not for whether you need an SE or CE to do that.
21
22 Maynard: Well, if you make a determination that it fits this then the person running those
23 numbers has to be an SE. So that determination gets made early on in the project.
24
25 Chair: So the correlation then for significant quantity, what you're saying, is go back to the IBC
26 and the IFC in making that determination.
27
28 Maynard: Yeah, I don't think a 5 gallon container of gasoline qualifies.
29
30 Chair: January 2nd Don McLaughlin. The seal authorized for use by structural engineers is of
31 the following design or a substantially similar electronic or digital representation of the design
32 and he says need to show an example with the structural PE license. I think the intent is to
33 change that seal so it says Registered Structured Engineer. The initial publication didn't show it
34 that way.
35
36 Jones: Jun had a copy with that on it he just public noticed the wrong one.
37
38 Maynard: And we can change it to Professional Structural Engineer.
39
40 Chair: Ok, this is January 2nd, anonymous and he feels that the estimate of \$520 to submit an
41 application for comity is too low. He's trying to calculate the hours and put a value on the hours
42 that it takes to do that. That 520 that he's referring to, is that the fee?
43
44 Jones: That's the license fee for comity.
45
46 Maynard: Well was there an economic impact statement that went out with it? They just said
47 the 520 they didn't account for time to prepare it.
48
49 Jones: Yeah.
50
51 Chair: Any comments on that one? January 2nd, anonymous and the documents show that it's

1 not going to increase the State agency costs for FY 2015 and beyond. He thinks that it would
2 cost the agency some money.
3
4 Maynard: That's part of our standard operating; we will still be having meetings.....
5
6 Chair: With respect to this Board I don't see any additional effort.
7
8 Jones: The normal SOP, license review.
9
10 Chair: And in respect to investigations as well. You know John's investigating no matter what
11 stamp they fall under. I don't really see that as an issue. Anything else on that? January 7th
12 Laura Kelly and she's in favor of the regulation.
13
14 Jones: She must be a member of the Task Force.
15
16 Chair: It sounds like she is wanting us to have more seismic requirements.
17
18 Koonce: Other than what's normally required?
19
20 Chair: That's what she's suggesting. But, Colin, maybe you could just speak briefly about the
21 seismic education and testing that was due under our regulation.
22
23 Maynard: Well the SE exam has two 8 hour exams. One is on vertical systems, one 8 hours
24 exam is on vertical systems and the other 8 hour exam is on lateral. In the afternoon part of
25 both exams you can either do buildings or bridges. You've got to do the same for the two so if
26 you're doing buildings for vertical you've got to do buildings for lateral and the same with
27 bridges. In terms of education if you don't do some seismic education and practice you're not
28 going to pass that exam.
29
30 Koonce: Is this significantly different than California?
31
32 Maynard: No, it's the same exam. It's a National exam.
33
34 Jones: Can you guys speak a little louder please to make sure we get this on the recorders?
35
36 Maynard: Actually we might want to send her a letter saying could you please inform our
37 investigator about the mechanical that didn't consider seismic design. (Laughter) Because
38 that's a big thing now, properly restraining mechanical and electrical systems especially if they
39 are overhead.
40
41 Chair: And I think some of her comment here kind goes outside of the scope of this regulation
42 and really is taking on another issue that she feels should be required and that's some
43 additional seismic requirements for other types of engineers. We're not addressing that right
44 now. Anything else on that one?
45
46 Moving on, January 11th Ray Serpas. Again he's bringing up the issue of proprietary plans and
47 calculations and suggesting that they could submit a detailed description of the work that was
48 performed. And also under the seal asking that the branch be identified in the seal. Does
49 anybody have any comment on this; we've already touched on that.
50
51 Next item January 12th is Robert (Buzz) Scher and this is from the Alaska Seismic Hazard

1 Safety Commission the following letter. We've actually read quite a bit of information over the
2 last several meetings last year from the Commission. In our prior discussions we felt that this
3 regulation project would satisfy, really, what they're asking for. I do think in some of their prior
4 discussion they talk about other disciplines like mechanical and electrical wanting them to have
5 additional seismic education.
6

7 Maynard: Actually, they were only wanting it for civil engineers. They didn't talk about any other
8 engineers. They wanted to require a seismic course to take the CE exam.
9

10 Koonce: So there's three recommendations at the very end there that sections on the last
11 page.
12

13 Maynard: Yeah, the first one is the same one they asked us to do before that we decided that
14 we weren't going to do.
15

16 Chair: This, really, in my opinion kind of falls outside of this particular regulation project as well.
17 Any more comments on this?
18

19 Maynard: Yeah, you're right none of these fall under the regulation project we are doing now.
20

21 Chair: Ok, the next one is January 15th; Mark Ayers is not in favor of the proposed changes and
22 doesn't really see a justification or substantial support for modifying the licensing requirements.
23 And doesn't want to see continued segregation of civil engineering requirements and basically it
24 doesn't appear like he supported the branches that were previously established. That's the jest
25 of his concern.
26

27 Eriksen: I guess one comment on the concern of dilution, I kind of feel that the division provides
28 more opportunity and not just for structural but the other disciplines provide additional
29 opportunities, I don't know if dilution is really a.....
30

31 Chair: Well it's certainly not the intent.
32

33 Maynard: I think his desire is to be like the other states you just become a PE and then you can
34 do whatever the hell you can do. Of course then it becomes harder to enforce and determine
35 whether you're not doing what you are capable of doing.
36

37 Eriksen: Yeah, but conversely, you know, there was nothing that was impeding an electrical
38 engineer for instance to practice the work they had been practicing but there was a lot of
39 additional specialized disciplines that couldn't qualify under the chapter with their engineering
40 degree that now can be licensed in our state so I think it actually provides more opportunities
41 and it's worth noting that.
42

43 Chair: Just recalling back when we did have the regulation project to add branches. A lot of our
44 reasoning for that was the fact that we are becoming a more technical society and that there are
45 much more specialized education and practice applications out there and NCEES has
46 recognized that and developed additional tests in branches of engineering and those folks that
47 have that specialty should certainly be able to practice in it and not necessarily have to go to
48 another engineer to get a stamp to do their specialty. It's really just recognizing the evolution of
49 our society and the technology that's out there. Anything else on that one?
50

51 Ok, January 15th is Keith Merrick.

1
2 Maynard: It seems like this is another theory there's already an SE. Just making it a little
3 harder to get it and providing an opportunity for comity with Washington and Oregon.
4
5 Chair: Anything else on that one?
6
7 January 15th, Paloma Field.
8
9 Maynard: An electrical engineer.
10
11 Chair: She feels that it would make a limitation on certain work and make it more difficult to
12 expand the skill set but there's really no specifics there. That's a general feeling or general
13 opinion that doesn't really give us anything specifically to speak to.
14
15 Eriksen: Again this is just someone voicing some concern that I don't think is the intent of our
16 current Board.
17
18 Chair: January 17th, Jonathan Kreiner. I'm not sure if he's suggesting some language change
19 in here.
20
21 Maynard: Yeah, item one he's just putting in a date.
22
23 Chair: In item two he's asking for more time, because we had 120 months he has 180 here,
24 even 240. Do you have any comment on that as far as the time frame goes?
25
26 Maynard: I guess if you have to go back more than 10 years to find a project that you did any
27 structural engineering then you're not really a structural engineer. And number 5 where he just
28 wants to say essential facilities that's not in the Washington/Oregon limitations and if you're
29 doing the rural school that is only 10,000 sq. ft., you know a 500 sq. ft. addition do you really
30 need to be a structural engineer to do that? No, but if you're doing a 40,000 or 50,000 sq. ft.
31 school then you do.
32
33 Chair: That's come up in some other correspondence, again the significant structure and the
34 size limitations. Anything else on that?
35
36 Ok, the next one is January 19th, from Bryan Borjesson. Anybody got any comments on that?
37
38 Maynard: He doesn't seem to know that we already have a structural engineering license and
39 there are how many in Alaska? Upward of a 100?
40
41 Jones: We have quite a few.
42
43 Maynard: In reference to frozen ground engineering they still have to take the arctic course.
44
45 Chair: It seemed like he was trying to imply a little bit that we are going to stifle innovation by
46 having this requirement, but a structural engineer regardless of whether they are an SE or doing
47 structural under a PE they can still innovate.
48
49 Maynard: And you don't have to go outside the State of Alaska to find a licensed SE there are
50 lots of them in the State of Alaska.
51

1 Chair: These guys object to additional bureaucracy.....
2
3 Maynard: No we're using the same bureaucrats as before. (Laughter)
4
5 Chair: He state's that more than likely I would have to hire someone from outside the State of
6 Alaska because of the lack of these types of individuals working outside of existing firms. I don't
7 know if there's truth to that or not. I do know that if there's a need it tends to get filled. But he's
8 totally against the new regulation feels that we're heading in the wrong direction. And again I
9 think his focus would be to have the PE have a wide breadth of latitude in the work they do.
10 Anything else for that one?
11
12 Schedule: the next one sings the same song.
13
14 Chair: So the next one is dated January 16th, Michael Gavin. He makes a statement that if you
15 precede with these changes all current licensed civil engineers should be grandfathered. Since
16 we have these privileges now, they should continue with the requirement that 8 hours out of the
17 24 continuing education credits be in structural design.
18
19 Maynard: And he would limit it to professional civil engineer that could take the exam and we
20 decided to any PE to take it because some people are mechanical or other branches that may
21 have experience in structures and may decide after they've gotten their ME or whatever that
22 they want to get into structures and limiting it to civils is kind of shortsighted. I'm pretty sure
23 Washington does not limit it to civil, California does.
24
25 Chair: He did have a discussion on that second page about the size of the pier and that showed
26 up a couple times, I think, as well in various comments. And that looks like a technical item. If
27 we feel that's ambiguous, I don't know that much about the particular item he's talking about.
28
29 Maynard: That language is straight out of the Washington Regulation.
30
31 Chair: Ok, but that doesn't necessarily mean it's clear. And there are a couple more bridge
32 designer folks responded that bring up the issue of the pier. Anything else on that one?
33
34 Ok, January 20th, William Van Hemert. And Vernon you responded back to this it looks like,
35 having to do with the CE's again.
36
37 Jones: Yeah.
38
39 Maynard: That's part of this regulation project to. It changes to 8 hours minimum.
40
41 Chair: Any comments on that? It's the same as we had before I think.
42
43 January 21st, Vern responded to this as well. This is Mike Pellock. And really just clarifying that
44 if this regulation becomes law then an SE stamp would be required on certain types of
45 structures.
46
47 Jones: Trusses, he was asking.....
48
49 Chair: Oh, this is the trusses.
50
51 Maynard: Steel trusses and wood trusses.

1
2 Chair: Then that kind of comes back to the other buys comment as well that had to do with the
3 truss design. And it really depends on the type of facility they are doing. If it falls into the....
4
5 Maynard: Yeah, and I'm torn between the two. If you've got a truss that's spanning a certain
6 distance the only thing that would be affected by it's being in a hazardous or whatever, the
7 important factor is snow which doesn't change it much, it's not effected by seismic or, well wind
8 a little bit for wind uplift but I can see that the components could be designed by a civil as long
9 as there's a structural that's doing to overall design of the building and reviewing it to make sure
10 it meets the requirements.
11
12 Chair: The structural would actually be doing the connection of the truss to the structure?
13
14 Maynard: Yeah they would probably do the studs. The designer of the building would join the
15 trusses to the structure but the steel joist that meets SJI requirements wouldn't necessarily have
16 to have a structural.
17
18 Chair: Anymore comments on this?
19
20 January 21st, and this is David Thornton. This actually has a letter on the following pages.
21
22 Maynard: He's has a question about the proposed changes effecting design, modification or
23 maintenance of pressurized equipment use in oil production, transportation, and refining piping
24 systems and oil refining facilities. And I would probably say no because that's not necessarily
25 structural it's mechanical or chemical.
26
27 Chair: Yeah and he did get into a lot of discussion here about pressure vessels. And it says
28 such codes and standards include those developed by the American Society of Mechanical
29 Engineering. Boiler and Pressure Vessel Codes and codes/standards developed by the
30 committees of the American petroleum Institute. Most of the pressurized equipment items that
31 contain hazardous or explosive substances operate at elevated temperatures and pressures,
32 with a variety of potential damage mechanisms. Design and maintenance of such equipment
33 requires knowledge of and experience with these damage mechanisms. So they have a whole
34 specialty of engineering that goes along with these types of pressure vessels. And I don't think
35 it's the intent for the structural engineer to take over that specialty.
36
37 Maynard: It may be that the structural system that supports all that might need to be a structural
38 engineer but the tank itself doesn't necessarily have to be. Because the only tanks we're talking
39 about are for fire protection. Unless they think that exposure of hazardous materials in this
40 facility contain a substance that would be a danger to the safety of the public if released.
41
42 Chair: Down near the bottom he is proposing that the definition of significant structure be
43 revised to exclude the requirement that that the design of pressurized equipment and storage
44 tanks that contain petroleum or its refined products have a structural engineering seal. Any
45 comment on the proposed language there?
46
47 Jones: We've got a Financial Report at 10:30 if you want to take a break before then.
48
49 Chair: Yeah, why don't we do that, let's go ahead and take a 10 minute break then we'll start
50 with the Financial Report.
51 .

1 10:20 a.m. Break

2

3 10:30 a.m. On record.

4

5 **Agenda Item 7 – Financial Report**

6

7 Chair: Ok, we are going to jump ahead to item 7 the Financial Report. Ok, why don't you go
8 ahead and introduce yourself.

9

10 Hewlett: Good morning everyone my name is Martha Hewlett and I'm the Admin Officer for
11 CBPL.

12

13 Chair: And were we going to have anybody else attending?

14

15 Jones: No they've got a board training going on over here and Sara and Colleen are tied up
16 with uh Sara's tied up with that, Colleen's tied up with our IT project.

17

18 Chair: Ok, would you like to go ahead and just walk us through the numbers a little bit?

19

20 Hewlett: Yes, so last time we met in November we went over your 4th quarter final for FY14. So
21 today you've got in front of you your FY15 first and second quarter. Would you prefer to go over
22 them both separately or just go over the combined 2nd quarter?

23

24 Chair: Combined.

25

26 Maynard: Kathleen? (Laughter)

27

28 Hewlett: So for FY15 at the end of the 2nd quarter which ended December 31st you guys have
29 brought in \$160,440 in license revenue. For 3rd party reimbursements, if you have received any
30 3rd party reimbursements you won't see them reflected yet since we have to wait until close to
31 the end of the year. We're keeping track of them separately. But we're not reporting them on
32 the Board Reports until they're all brought in and we've allocated the \$20K out in a fair manner
33 to each of the programs. So you'll see that reflected towards the end of the year.

34

35 Moving to your direct expenses, your personal services for direct expenses is at \$132,909.
36 Your direct personal services would be time that Vern puts into your program, it would be time
37 the Investigator specifically worked on cases for you or the Regulations Specialist, Paralegal,
38 any of those people who, by the quarter hour kept track of time they put into your program
39 specifically.

40

41 Next down your travel is at \$13,739 and that is comprised of Board meetings as well as some
42 training conferences that were attended in the first two quarters.

43

44 Your contractual at the end of the 2nd ended at \$24,330. And if you would like to see a
45 breakdown of what that is if you would refer to the 2nd and 3rd pages of your report that gives the
46 detailed account of the breakdown of your direct expenses. The 71 thousand comprises
47 personal services. 72 thousand is your travel and if you look at the 73 thousand, it begins about
48 an inch up from the bottom of the second page there, that's your 73 thousand series which
49 comprises your contractual. So the \$1,850 Training/Conferences for three people to attend
50 conferences, I believe two attended one and there was a separate conference that was
51 attended by one person. Memberships, \$15,985 I believe there are three out of four of the

1 memberships that you guys pay annually. There is one more that hasn't reflected yet.
2
3 Jones: That's \$6,500 it just came in the other day.
4
5 Hewlett: oh, excellent. And then you see \$78 in postage, \$627 in advertising for your public
6 meetings, \$65 in print/copy and graphics, and in the I/A legal amount of the \$5,397, \$3,794 was
7 due to investigations and \$1,602 of that was for regulations and advise to the Board. The I/A
8 commission sales at \$64 those would be the US Travel traveler fees that are paid when we
9 book travel or hotels through the State contract, and \$264 in Hearing Mediation.
10
11 Lastly you'll see \$694 in your supplies line. That's' comprised of your 74 thousand series which
12 breaks up to #322 in business supplies and \$373 in food supplies which would be the coffee,
13 tea and snacks you have at board meetings.
14
15 Jones: That doesn't include snacks, just coffee and tea.
16
17 Hewlett: Ok, I wasn't sure I just saw the snacks apparently somebody is just nice to you guys.
18
19 Chair: Vern is.
20
21 Hewlett: Does anyone have any questions on your direct expenses?
22
23 Christensen: Group Health Care Jumped quite a bit. The previous one was about \$20K and
24 the other one was... I guess that was indicative of the new Health Care provider, its \$46K for
25 the year.
26
27 Hewlett: Well and this report for the second quarter would be halfway through the year, I would
28 have to pull up my old report, you said for 4th quarter it was \$46K? Ok then that would be
29 reasonable for being midway through the year.
30
31 At the last meeting you guys asked me to find out what the credit card fees, the amount you
32 paid for was. Now you don't see any of those reflected in your report yet since that allocation is
33 just happening January/February so you'll see that reflected in your 3rd quarter report. I did find
34 out for the revenues we bring in the credit card fees can range anywhere from .02% up to 4%.
35 There's a number of variables that go into that, it can be is the card present or are we manually
36 entering it. What type of credit card the person is using. Whether, that credit card requires us
37 to type in a zip code or not. And then after we've hit \$5K in revenue that we've brought in on
38 the credit cards for the month, our fees drop. The exact amount of drop varies as well
39 depending on what type of card and variables I just mentioned.
40
41 Christensen: How does the zip code play into that?
42
43 Hewlett: I'm not exactly sure how different places set up their credit cards but when we're
44 running a credit card, most of them you swipe and it simply asks you for a dollar amount and
45 you run through. Other cards, when you swipe them, it'll require you to put in a zip code or the
46 three digit security code on the back. Some, for whatever reason, will pop up another screen
47 that will ask you to give a total and separate the tax out. So depending on the card there's a
48 few variables on how it processes through.
49
50 Christensen: Yeah, I have a debit/credit card and the only time it asks for that is when I go to
51 the debit. They'll want the security code and the zip in there.

1
2 Hewlett: And that may be it. I can ask my staff who process credit cards on a regular basis. I
3 myself rarely would be using that, only in a real pinch hitting moment would somebody want me
4 to help them at the front desk.

5
6 So the direct expenses all combined ended up the 2nd quarter at \$171,673. Next down you see
7 your indirect. It's estimated through the 2nd quarter at \$149,729. Just a reminder this is a place
8 holder. We include this so that Boards aren't surprised at the end of the year when the indirect
9 allocation is journal entered out to bill everyone for their portion. We want people to know
10 ahead of time that they are going to be incurring that expense. It's based on your indirect from
11 last year and then divided out by four and put down on a quarterly basis for what you can
12 expect.

13
14 Chair: That's really an estimate at this time?

15
16 Hewlett: It's an estimate to give you a place holder of what you can expect. The actuals will be
17 calculated and figured out at the end of the year and reflected in your 4th quarter finals.

18
19 Schedler: Can we stop a minute, I'm unable to follow along. The numbers don't match anything
20 I have.

21
22 Jones: I gave you a new one this morning.

23
24 Hewlett: I have the FY15 1st and 2nd quarter and there should be three pages to the report.

25
26 Jones: She's got it here

27
28 Hewlett: The first one being the budget summary and the 2nd two being the direct expense
29 detail.

30
31 Schedler: Ok, I've got it now.

32
33 Christensen: You're on the front page of the indirect expenses. \$171,673.

34
35 Hewlett: That would be the total of your direct expenses and right below that you'll see
36 \$149,729. That's the estimated indirect expenses through the 2nd quarter.

37
38 Christensen: Ok, so then that's the end of the 2nd quarter so at the end of the year we can
39 expect some more around \$290,000, \$300,000 or so?

40
41 Hewlett: Yes, we based it on last year's so if we were to be exactly on track like we were last
42 year you would again see the \$290,377 you see at the end of FY14. It'll be reasonably close to
43 that. Certainly not on the dot as you know year to year different items change.

44
45 So that all being said your total expenses combined are estimated at \$321,402 which does
46 leave an annual surplus/deficit of a deficit of \$160,962. However this is normal considering you
47 are in a non-renewal year, at the end of the year though you still have a cumulative surplus at
48 the end of December 31· 2014 of \$846,386.

49
50 Maynard: So we should have \$500,000 left over.

51

1 Parady: Good Morning, might I interrupt for a moment? I just want to introduce myself, I'm Fred
2 Parady I'm the acting Commissioner of the Department of Commerce but I'm normally and will
3 return to be the Deputy Commissioner so CBPL's one of my Divisions. So I think this is the
4 newest professional licensing in the state and we just wanted to welcome you to the DCCED
5 family and I know you'll find our staff helpful. Vern's got the best candy dish on the floor, if you
6 didn't catch that detail. (Laughter) And just, welcome and if there's anything we can do to help
7 you get organized and underway, that's what we're here to do. Have a great meeting.

8
9 Chair: Thank you

10
11 Hewlett: Have a good day Fred.

12
13 Chair: I had a question on the indirect. If the state had some overriding litigation that's not
14 specific to any board then does then does the cost of that litigation end up in the indirect?

15
16 Hewlett: You're correct in that if CBPL as a Division had any need that we went to the
17 Department of Law for legal advice on something, if it was an item that would encompass or
18 benefit the entire Division then that would be part of the indirect allocation. However, we have
19 been striving to make sure that legal costs stay down. We have reduced them roughly 33 –
20 34% from FY11 through FY14 and we plan on continuing to do so. In FY15 so far we haven't
21 incurred any legal expenses that would have fallen to admin and became indirect. In FY14 the
22 amount that fell into there was extremely minimal. Last year we spent maybe a couple
23 thousand dollars on legal advice that would encompass all programs. And that was talking to
24 them researching things about, uh I'm not sure if it had to do with this board or not but there was
25 a situation where the Board was offered a meeting space, but by somebody who had a nexus to
26 the board. So it became a question of is it ethical for us to take this and if so do we have to
27 represent it as a gift. So that was one where just because of the way the conversation went on
28 and because it could have affected numerous boards. In it we did end up couple who
29 mentioned they did have those opportunities and wanted to know if they could use it. So we did
30 get a small amount of regulations advice that would have affected all programs that went
31 through that but like I said it was maybe a couple thousand dollars, very minimal.

32
33 Chair: And generally is there, would you expect that the number that we have to maintain
34 reasonably close or is there any other state expenditures of a significant nature that are
35 unanticipated that might affect that?

36
37 Hewlett: No, the things that may be different this year are due to the space standards that
38 brought into effect under Governor Parnell we have finished a couple of areas. You noticed the
39 front desk and the Business Licensing and Corporations over here, that's part of the new space
40 standards that put everyone in smaller cubical and more open windowed areas. Now if you look
41 at the Professional Licensing side here, this area has not been renovated yet. It is slated to be
42 renovated at the end of FY15. At the end of FY14 I did encumber money to cover a good
43 portion of that and that portion would be something that would then be indirect allocated. It
44 would be part of the indirect costs since it's something that would be affecting all programs.

45
46 In our last meeting, forgive me but I have so many boards I can't keep track of who I went over
47 what with exactly. We met the first week of November did we go over the FY14 indirect
48 methodology packet?

49
50 Chair: You know we've gone through that before but I think you were looking at.... the state
51 was looking at a revision on how that was going to be allocated, if I recall.

1
2 Hewlett: Yeah, in FY14 we did do a couple of analysis and come up with methodologies to be
3 more accurate in how indirect costs were allocated out to different programs. In early
4 November you all were to receive an e-mail of this packet from Director Chambers and in your
5 board packets you may have a small group of the same items. No, ok.
6

7 So I'm not sure if we went over this, just some highlights, we went over how the indirect costs
8 break out between Statewide, Department wide and Division level and what those different
9 areas encompass. The new things that we incorporated are historically anything that fell into
10 admin and was part of the direct allocation was allocated by license numbers. Now when we
11 looked at that we realized that we could use some more accurate and detailed methods and
12 also come in line more with how the rest of the State Agencies work. An example of one
13 change that we made would be the front desk staff that I oversee here and in Anchorage. They
14 are answering phone calls, answering questions forwarding them to the correct examiners or
15 executives through the day. They receipt all of the incoming money. Now in the past that was
16 allocated by license count but this last year we switched and we pulled reports that show exactly
17 how many transactions we processed for each program. Then based on the number of
18 transactions we process for you and that the account staff who cleared those deposits and such
19 from the accounting system those were all allocated out by transaction count. It's more of a fair
20 and straight line methodology there. An example of where this could make a difference is if you
21 have a board that have tons of licensees but really don't have that many transactions
22 throughout the year, then in that case by license count you may be paying a higher amount but
23 when it's the actual transactions we processed for you it could go to a lower amount. Where
24 some boards have much more higher traffic therefor they would be paying a higher percentage
25 of those folks time for what they put in. If you glance at the FY14 you can see that you indirect
26 expenditures ended extremely lower than the prior year. FY13 your indirect ended at \$431,000
27 and FY14 with the methodology that we incorporated it lowered you guys to \$290,000. So that
28 was an incredible savings to your board specifically. The other change we made in our
29 methodology was, when you look at some of our overhead such as the space that we pick up,
30 the computers, utilities, phones, IT support, HR support, ADA compliance, insurance, all of
31 those things that are required by the state to keep us running and operational. Again, in the
32 past that was by license count but we have some boards such as yours where you have two
33 employees that are working for you but then we have Board of Nursing that has six employees
34 that are dedicated to their program. So instead of allocating out by license count we looked at
35 how many people do you have putting time in for you and so on things like that because you
36 have two people you end up paying for their two spaces whereas based on your license count
37 made it look you had more of an area. So again it comes down to trying to pinpoint and make it
38 as accurate as possible. That methodology, actually both methodologies I mentioned are very
39 standard accounting practices across the State of Alaska. So we're just furthering the steps to
40 come in line with that and to have as fine-tuned an accounting practice as possible.
41

42 Jones: I just wanted to note that our renewal is at the end of odd numbered years so our
43 transaction count is going to be up at the end of this year compared to what it was at the end of
44 2014 because everybody will be renewing.
45

46 Hewlett: What month is that going to be in?
47

48 Jones: December 2015.
49

50 Maynard: Actually that would fall under FY....
51

1 Hewlett: That will fall under FY16 for you so you won't see that reflected in FY15 numbers.
2 State year 15 which we are in right now began on June 30th and it will end July 1st.

3
4 Jones: Right but the transaction count is going to go up was the point I was trying to make so
5 everyone didn't say what happened.

6
7 Hewlett: Right, ok, so when you're in a non-renewal year it's likely the number of transactions
8 we'll process are going to be far minimal compared to the last year. Therefore the amount of
9 the front desk staff time that you're allocated will be minimal in comparison to the prior year
10 whereas next year when you're in renewal again we're going to be processing a lot more
11 transactions for you, the indirect expense for that front desk therefore will be higher in proportion
12 to the number of transactions we did.

13
14 Maynard: But the indirect expenses for FY14 would include the transactions for our last
15 renewal, right?

16
17 Hewlett: Yes, in FY14 the indirect you paid for the front desk staff was a reflection of your
18 transaction count. And that's why I make a point of mentioning that when we put in this amount
19 here it's a place holder to let you know what's going to be, it's a rough estimate since we can't
20 calculate ahead of time and pinpoint exactly what that's going to be before all the expenses
21 have come in. Much of our overhead we are not billed for until the end of the year so I
22 encumber the money but the Department of Administration doesn't send me a bill to cover our
23 use space and our IT support and all these other varied things that are Statewide and
24 Department wide until close to the end of the State year. So at that point you'll see a whole
25 bundle of the overhead expenses hit all at once. So instead of having boards see that they
26 have no indirect expenses through the year and then be hit with a large portion at the end we
27 put that place holder in just to give you a visual queue there's going to be something coming in.

28
29 Chair: Anybody have any questions?

30
31 Schedler: I definitely appreciate the change in methodology. It definitely has benefited this
32 Board and I think that addresses a lot of the questions we had initially in regards to the indirect.
33 I have a question in regards to the contractual and I beg your patience if you already explained
34 it and I was looking for the correct document but I noticed that the contractual in FY14 was quite
35 a bit higher and it goes back to comparing to what it was in FY11, what happened in those years
36 to make those contractual numbers that high?

37
38 Hewlett: Let me get back to that page. Ok, so at the end of FY14 your contractual line ended at
39 \$88K. And if we look at the back-up, at the end your training/conferences ended at a little over
40 \$6K, a little under \$9K in Test Monitor/proctoring, \$18K in memberships, your
41 accounting/auditing, that would be your credit card fees, that is allocated out based on the
42 number of transactions we processed for you specifically as well. And then your I/A mail was at
43 \$5,119 that was increased in FY14 because you were in a renewal year so we sent out a lot
44 more mail and had a lot more processing for your board due to the large mail outs and legal
45 ended a little over \$6K.

46
47 Scheduler: That still doesn't sound anywhere near \$88K.

48
49 Hewlett: The large one would be the accounting and auditing for the credit card fees. That was
50 another item that I pinpointed that should be direct billed based on the number of transactions
51 and in past years that was allocated out as part of the indirect expenses by license count.

1
2 Schedler: So how much was that in FY14?
3
4 Hewlett: In FY14 your credit card fees totaled \$34,715 and you'll see that under account code
5 73051 Accounting/Auditing.
6
7 Schedler: So that was almost half of it?
8
9 Hewlett: Right and that's something again where it was one of the areas where I looked at
10 everything, line by line I went through the expenses and determined, is allocating by license
11 count really the best method for this or is there something that is more fair and equitable to the
12 programs. In cases like credit card fees and the front desk staff where we have the ability to
13 see exactly what we did for you by transaction count it makes more sense to bill that out based
14 on that. So that will be another item that in past years you would have seen as indirect. In
15 FY14 we changed that method and put it to direct so that you are only getting billed for your fair
16 share.
17
18 Schedler: So for 14 we were only billed for the transactions?
19
20 Hewlett: Just for the transactions that were done on your behalf.
21
22 Schedler: And it was still that high?
23
24 Jones: That was a renewal year.
25
26 Schedler: I'm just trying to project and see what it would look like in 16 because that's not what
27 it looked like in, you know, the other years.
28
29 Hewlett: Well in FY13 and the past that \$34K that went into accounting/auditing. That would
30 have actually been part of your indirect expenses in prior years. So that's one thing where
31 instead of continuing to allocate that by license count and include it in the indirect, we have the
32 ability of pulling a report from the machine that tells us exactly how many credit cards we
33 processed for you verses nursing or construction contractors. So based on that from the credit
34 card machine instead of it being part of your indirect you are only going to pay the portion that
35 was run on your behalf.
36
37 Schedler: So when was it in indirect?
38
39 Hewlett: FY13 and prior I believe it would have been. I know in FY13 it was part of the indirect.
40 I started just when FY14 was beginning for the State so I saw the end of FY13 financials.
41 However, I wasn't here back then so I would have to do some research if we need more detail
42 on that.
43
44 Schedler: No that's fine I'm just trying to project FY16 as we get more licensees those credit
45 card fees are going to continue to increase.
46
47 Christensen: Most of your indirect falls in 73? You've got 71, 72 and 73 right?
48
49 Hewlett: Let me take a quick glance at this and make sure I'm right.
50
51 Christensen: And 74, you've got 74 also so which one is it; it looks like most of them are in 73

1 or 74.

2

3 Hewlett: The indirect is actually a combination of all of the account code series. This is where if
4 you have this report available, this is one you would have received in e-mail in November. And I
5 believe we did go over it in the last meeting.

6

7 Christensen: We did, yeah we did go over that.

8

9 Hewlett: This report here that you're looking that gives the detailed breakdown. Within this
10 packet we get the same thing for all the indirect charges. So for the end of year report that we
11 gave you have the same level of account code breakdown for the indirect costs so you can see
12 specifically how the personnel services, travel, contractual, supplies broke down at the Division
13 level before it was allocated out.

14

15 Christensen: So it could fit into any one of the four categories.

16

17 Hewlett: Yes if you go back and look at this you'll see that there is a large amount of personal
18 services. That would be management such as myself, and the Director and the Operations
19 Manager. What we do for the Division everyday affects all the programs.

20

21 Christensen: And you have categories under that for personnel time of and that?

22

23 Hewlett: Yes and there's a fairly minimal amount in the indirect for travel. Which again is
24 general management. We have staff here and in Anchorage and we rotate through there so
25 that some management is doing on site visits with the staff and attending meetings, board
26 meetings and such there. Last year Director Chambers also attended a CLEAR training that is
27 something that would have been of benefit to all programs and so that again was part of the
28 indirect.

29

30 Chair: That report there at the end of our last meeting that was e-mailed out to us so we have
31 that more detailed information it just wasn't at our meeting.

32

33 Hewlett: Oh, I'm sorry I could not remember if we had it in hand at that last meeting or not. I
34 believe we have about 22 boards so every quarter I'm attending 22 different meetings so over
35 time it's a little difficult for me to keep track of who I went over what piece with for the exact
36 financial plans. But this report gives you a very detailed explanation of how the different indirect
37 methodologies work and show you how that all pans out in terms of affecting your program. As
38 I said it will also give you the breakdown of all the charges that went into indirect and were
39 allocated out to you so you can see specifically what that was comprised of.

40

41 Chair: I think you did a great job of just hitting all the highlights of this for us and answering our
42 questions very distinct and specifically for us. I appreciate that.

43

44 Hewlett: If you guys have any further questions please don't hesitate to contact myself or
45 Director Chambers, we're always available.

46

47 Chair: Ok, well thank you very much.

48

49 Hewlett: You have a very good rest of your meeting and stay in Juneau and good luck getting
50 out of town. (Laughter)

51

1 Chair: Ok, so we're definitely falling behind a little bit here on this schedule but it's important
2 that we go through all of these public comments and so we'll jump right back into that and
3 continue where we left off and after we, let's see it's almost 11 now, unless somebody needs a
4 break ok we'll go ahead and push forward and our other agenda items will slide. Once we get
5 back from lunch we'll go into the Public Comment at 1:15 and immediately following the Public
6 Comment we'll go into Executive Session.

7
8 So we're back on agenda item 6 Regulation Update A and we're reading through the public
9 written comments. I think we left off; we are on Willy Van Hemert's January 21st.

10
11 Maynard: That's just replying to Vern's response to him.

12
13 Chair: And that was dealing with the CE's.

14
15 January 21st Mike Quimby. Let's see this looks like another response. It just looks like, oh he's
16 got a letter attached.

17
18 Koonce: In the very last paragraph he summarizes his position.

19
20 Chair: He is not in favor of the regulation he feels that it penalizes current structural engineers
21 practicing in Alaska. And the desire to make comity with other states easier is somewhat
22 irrelevant as many Alaska structural engineers.....

23
24 Maynard: For full disclosure, he works for me.

25
26 Chair: Ok, this is the EIT?

27
28 Maynard: And he has an application for the CE structural.

29
30 Chair: Any comments?

31
32 Ok, this is January 19th Harry Keller and he is adamantly opposed to the proposed changes.
33 And he suggests that, although he's opposed if it is adopted that all persons currently holding a
34 civil engineers license at the effective date of the establishment of the structural engineers
35 license be exempt from the requirements. And he feels like if not it would strip individuals of
36 lawful rights they have enjoyed for many years.

37
38 Eriksen: Colin he's basically challenging the need for change. Can you describe briefly why we
39 need....

40
41 Maynard: Basically structural engineering is becoming more and more complex. The code
42 requirements are getting more and more complex. And it is the feeling of not only the Seismic
43 Hazards Safety Commission but the structural engineering profession in general that there
44 should be an SE license that is separate from a PE. And when the State adopted the SE,
45 actually just first looked at doing the SE back in 2007. The Structural Engineers Association of
46 Alaska wanted it to be post PE. The Board decided at that time not to deal with that issue for
47 one reason or another. It's still the desire of the Structural Engineers Association of Alaska and
48 the Structural Engineers Licensing coalition which is an organization of four structural
49 engineering groups that the SE be post PE and separate from the PE.

50
51 Chair: Any other comments? OK, January 22nd Alfred Mangus and there were a couple of

1 things on this one that caught my attention.
2
3 Maynard: I know some of the stuff he's talking about and he's incorrect in most of it.
4
5 Chair: Ok,
6
7 Maynard: There was only one school not four; they used the wrong seismic factor. And they
8 used .33 instead of 1.33 (unintelligible) in open parentheses. I also disagree that most of the
9 complex infrastructure is designed by out of state non-resident engineers. That's not the case.
10
11 Chair: He suggests that uh, in here that a better way would to have a law or provision that
12 would require peer review but that's not, that's really a separate issue and it doesn't really fall
13 under this particular regulation change.
14
15 Maynard: He's suggesting that west coast engineers would be given grandfathering preference
16 and what we will by doing is allowing them to apply by comity.
17
18 Chair: Yeah, that's what they have to do. We don't have any mechanism to grandfather
19 somebody that's not already licensed in the state already.
20
21 The next one is the same thing again.
22
23 Maynard: It has the pictures in it.
24
25 Chair: Ok, so then we jump to January 22nd Steve Lee. I'm not sure; he's saying revise
26 proposed regulation, significant structures (F) and lists the different bridges. So that 43 F what's
27 that falling under?
28
29 Maynard: That's the bridges that are over 200 foot span.
30
31 Chair: So what's his comment? I'm not seeing that.
32
33 Maynard: His comment is to revise it to say single span bridges, multi span bridges, cellular
34 and box bridges, etc. etc. So under that a ten foot bridge would require an SE because it's a
35 single span bridge.
36
37 Chair: Yeah. Comment on it? Anybody? Ok.
38
39 January 22nd Pat Eberhardt. And he's representing his firm, it looks like. This is the one that
40 dealt with the mobile offshore drilling, and uh, moored structures, floating and land borne. And it
41 looks like he's looking for just some clarity and more definition whether those would be
42 considered structures requiring a PE rather than an SE. Colin for drill rigs right out in the Inlet is
43 that regulated by this board?
44
45 Maynard: I think it would be if it's within the three mile limit. If it's outside of that then no
46 because that's outside the State.
47
48 Chair: So when they bring one of those rigs up and put it out there then the whole thing would
49 need to have an Alaska SE?
50
51 Eriksen: Wouldn't it fall under the industrial exemption?

1
2 Maynard: It might fall under the industrial exemption because it's a facility for the company
3 that's doing the drilling.
4
5 Chair: I mean I know that there are companies that.....
6
7 Eriksen: It's not for the public.
8
9 Maynard: Yeah, it's not for public...
10
11 Chair: There are companies that do design work, structural design work on those rigs but the
12 rigs themselves as a whole unit, if they actually are engineered by an Alaska engineer, I kind of
13 doubt that they are but all individual components are. But, maybe we need some clarity about
14 that or some research to find out if this would include them or not.
15
16 Maynard: It could be left for a case by case basis.
17
18 Koonce: Isn't this to deal with seismic activity and seismic design and regional components of a
19 land based structure?
20
21 Eriksen: it somehow becomes a question of naval architecture would design this....
22
23 Maynard: Yeah, if it's Conoco Phillips drilling rig and Conoco Phillips is using it then it doesn't
24 apply because they've got the industrial exemption. I think most of them would fall under that,
25 however, I guess if some company was building one to sell to Conoco Phillips then they would
26 probably have to have an Alaska licensed.
27
28 Chair: Ok, any other comments on this one?
29
30 January 22nd Kirk Miller and there's an attached letter on this. He is general urging less
31 licensing restriction rather than more. But if more restrictions are considered then he'd rather
32 they be limited to high profile public structures. And again he brings up the marine off shore
33 structures are highly specialized structures that require additional training and expertise in
34 ocean and marine engineering such as wave and vessel impact and mooring forces.
35 Comments?
36
37 January 22nd, this is the same, no this is Karl Mielke. He's questioning the reasoning for the
38 proposed regulation in the first place. He brings up that term "span" again. Any comments?
39
40 January 19th Chris Miller. Maybe you can speak, Colin, to what he's suggesting down here in
41 his recommendation in the bottom paragraph.
42
43 Maynard: Well, basically he wants to leave it the way it is. You can take the SE exam and you
44 get to be and SE but don't limit the civils. He's suggests that since the State of Alaska doesn't
45 review structural drawings that we shouldn't require structural engineers on major projects and I
46 would think it would be the other way around. Since they don't review it, it would be more
47 important to have some who has shown through testing and experience that they have that
48 ability.
49
50 Chair: So, basically he supports having a structural engineering license like we have now but
51 he doesn't support restricting civil engineers from doing structural engineering.

1
2 January 23rd Richard Pratt has the following letter representing the Department of
3 Transportation and Public Facilities and proposing that they, under F, bridges having a total
4 span of more than 200 feet and piers having a total surface area greater than 10,000 sq. ft. be
5 deleted from the proposed regulation, feels that, that language is unreasonable and limits DOT's
6 ability to design, construct, inspect and maintain bridges across the State providing no
7 improvement to bridge safety. It goes on to expand how many bridges fall under the purview of
8 DOT and that it would result in higher costs to the State and a higher level of effort to administer
9 the bridge program. This next item is one that I thought had some relevance with respect to the
10 IBC, the structural engineering registration throughout the United States is a "building-centric"
11 examination and licensing process. Now I haven't been through that process so I can't speak
12 direct to it but I do know that often times in our office we do have structural engineers there will
13 get a project that doesn't quite fit in the IBC very well and trying to make some determination on
14 exactly what levels, for lack of a better term, to use in the design of some of those things.
15

16 Maynard: Well first of all the SE has two tracks, there's one bridge and there's one building so
17 in the afternoon you would do the building section or you would do the bridge section and that
18 applies to both the vertical and horizontal. The morning sessions, I think, are the same for both.
19 So it's not true that it's a "building-centric" exam there is a bridge AASHTO code section of it or
20 a path for it. When this first came up in 2007 the Bridge Division didn't like it then either and I
21 think the first three applications for grandfathering came from the Bridge Division. So they have
22 some SE's in the Division that can handle the 200 ft. span bridges. I don't know how many
23 there are.
24

25 Koonce: There are thousands of bridges.
26

27 Maynard: Not that are 200 ft. long, 200 ft. span.
28

29 Koonce: Total bridges.
30

31 Maynard: Yeah, well for most of them they wouldn't need an SE
32

33 Koonce: Doesn't the Federal Transportation Administration require certain regulations that far
34 exceed the seismic or take into consideration seismic elements in the design of bridges and
35 such? I have no idea.
36

37 Maynard: No, they require it designed to AASHTO which has requirements for bridges.
38

39 Koonce: But not regionally 1, 2, 3, 4 like they do for buildings?
40

41 Maynard: Well they have that kind of part of them that determine the seismic design loads.
42 Seismic zones 1, 2, 3, and 4 don't exist anymore and haven't since 1998.
43

44 Jones: How would somebody in a supervisory position that hasn't done design work for quite
45 some time be grandfathered in, how could they provide something to show that they are
46 qualified?
47

48 Maynard: I guess it would depend on what you're talking about supervising. If all they are
49 doing is management then they would have a hard time doing it but if they're supervising the
50 design of a project.....
51

1 Jones: Reviewing and approving but not necessarily stamping.
2
3 Maynard: As long as they're in responsible charge of that project whether they stamped it or not
4 they could probably submit it with a letter that said I was in charge of this job or supervised the
5 design of this project and the letter should reference or would state what their roll was.
6
7 Chair: Any other comments on this letter?
8
9 Alright January 23rd Richard Pratt. This has some of the same items that we've seen, one is the
10 120 month experience limitation, he felt like 15 years would be more appropriate. He feels like it
11 would restrict his area of practice.
12
13 Maynard: Again, the calculations don't have to be, have been done by the person applying.
14 They just have to be done for that project. They have to have been in responsible charge of
15 their preparation.
16
17 Chair: He feels like the bridges having a total span of more than 200 feet and piers having a
18 surface are greater than ten thousand square feet is ambiguous, arbitrary and illogical and asks
19 for clarification of total span. It seems that there may be some discrepancy on how people
20 measure span.
21
22 Chair: Do you think that need any clarification on span? Ok.
23
24 January 23rd Jay Baxter. He suggests that the existing language does not need to be clarified
25 but I think the difference in the language is that we've got minimum of 24.
26
27 Maynard: For the guys that have more than three licenses.
28
29 Chair: Any comment on that? Ok,
30
31 January 23rd Matthew Reckard. He's just basically challenging the need for it, the justification
32 for it.
33
34 Maynard: Verses PE, you can do whatever you want. It's never been that way in this State.
35
36 Chair: You know we see a lot of these comments about dealing with the need and, you know,
37 show me the history of the failures which certainly needs to be considered but often times
38 regulations to prevent the failure in the future especially in the changing technical requirements
39 so although that's a valid point it's not the governing reason why we change regulations.
40
41 Maynard: I guess if we waited for failures we wouldn't be doing our job.
42
43 Chair: Yeah, if you waited for failures there would be a lot of regulation changes, but it's too
44 late.
45
46 Ok, this is January 23rd Greg Kinney and he's requesting a 90 day extension to comments for
47 the reasons stated in his letter which.....
48
49 Schedler: Then all the following pages are just the minutes of their meeting.
50
51 Chair: Is this the one where they did the poll?

1
2 Maynard: No that's the next one.
3
4 Chair: Ok, so basically this is the minutes of the meeting where their board asked for an
5 extension.
6
7 Maynard: it was 60 days wasn't it?
8
9 Chair: Yeah, we had a 60 day comment period. I think he's basically for it so that they have
10 time to really get input from their membership and then deal with actions on their board level
11 and it does take time to do that.
12
13 January 23rd John Pekar and this is the Alaska Society of Professional Engineers. This is the
14 one where they had the survey. They said common points from the 44 percent in general
15 opposition, common points of issue with the proposed regulation are the definition of "significant
16 structure" and general opposition to branch specific licensure of professional engineers.
17
18 Eriksen: It almost would be good to send a reply back to these folks it seems like making such
19 a good effort deserves recognition.
20
21 Chair: I don't think we really do that on public comment, replies back.
22
23 Eriksen: Well you replied to all these other, a bunch of these other ones.
24
25 Maynard: That was a response to questions.
26
27 Chair: Yeah, from the sense that it was a response not an accolade of whether they did a good
28 job. Point's well taken.
29
30 Eriksen: It's not necessarily inappropriate to encourage them to continue doing that, it doesn't
31 seem like.
32
33 Urfer: Call them up.
34
35 Maynard: I'm a member of the ASPE, I'll tell them that.
36
37 Schedler: Yeah, there you go.
38
39 Eriksen: I guess it should go, it seems like it should be recognized.
40
41 Urfer:
42
43 Chair: Did anybody pull out any specific topics from this survey discussion that they want to talk
44 about?
45
46 Hale: It seems like they got an overwhelming response, 47.
47
48 Eriksen: What's their membership, probably 300 or something?
49
50 Maynard: Yeah, about that.
51

1 Eriksen: So, 47 out of a membership of 300?
2
3 Chair: Well I had a couple of things that I just put a flag next to that I just wanted to look at
4 again. Their number one item at the top was that an ethical engineer can only design works
5 within his competency. There is no need to define "significance" in this regulation. Alaska's
6 owners, building officials, and fire marshals will require the SE seal when they believe it is
7 required.
8
9 Jones: We're supposed to call John in three minutes. You want me to call him and postpone
10 this other until maybe tomorrow sometime so we can finish this?
11
12 Chair: Yeah, let's do that if we can get through this before lunch that would be great. Item 5 he
13 says engineers should be a self-regulating group. The list of requirements for when an SE
14 should stamp something is rather arbitrary, at best copied from other states. It seems like the
15 Board isn't qualified to judge when an SE is needed based on that list. Also, with the
16 grandfathering of SE's the Board has watered down the meaning of SE. SE should take the 16
17 hour exam to show they have advanced knowledge beyond the 8 hour exam for the PE.
18
19 Well as far as self-regulating group goes, the State has opted to impose certain regulations on
20 the group and then enforce those regulations. As individual registered engineers they certainly
21 need to practice within their expertise of their license. And he brings up again that significant
22 structures could be broadly interpreted and I know that there was some specific things
23 referenced but I can't really speak as to how board those items can be interpreted. And he
24 makes the statement that does granting an SE license automatically allow an engineer to work
25 on bridges even though they've never worked on bridges before or would they still be required
26 to practice within the scope of their expertise. I think the regulations, applying to all engineers
27 requires them to only practice within their expertise. If they've never designed a bridge before
28 and don't have the knowledge and experience to do that then they would have to solicit those
29 that do. He says he supports the SE as a post PE
30
31 Maynard: Those are the different comments from the different survey takers.
32
33 Chair: Ok, there different people commenting on that same, ok.
34
35 Maynard: That's why some of them are for it and some of them are against it. John's not that
36 schizophrenic. (laughter)
37
38 Chair: Those were the only specific things that I highlighted on that. Anybody else have
39 anything they want to add.
40
41 Maynard: I did like comment number 24 that no one has ever died because a parking lot didn't
42 drain properly. (laughter) Constructions are different.
43
44 Chair: Unless it had ice on it.
45
46 So this one, this is Albert Swank January 23rd and I think what he's done is he has gone through
47 and he's pulled out portions of the regulations and then added his comments at the beginning of
48 them.
49
50 Koonce: This is the 19 page one? There is a highlighted component at the beginning of each
51 comment that talks about content.

1
2 Chair: Ok, so maybe we'll get through those here. But in general he's opposed to the change.
3 He thinks it'll cause a shift in financial gain from one group of licensed engineers to another. He
4 thinks a conflict of interest exists with regard to these proposed changes within the current
5 licensing board for engineers.

6
7 Maynard: Yeah, he thinks I'm trying to feather my nest.

8
9 Chair: That's what it sounds like. So, and he goes on to say that several different times that
10 there is a conflict of interest. And he's running out of time to comment. Ok comment number
11 one, just because this is sort of a long convoluted document I want to just touch on each of
12 these and see if there is anything we want to comment on.

13
14 Comment one. This definition is being used in the proposed changes to limit such work to only
15 structural licenses and not civil licenses, comments on that? We're just going to step through
16 these comments because they are all buried in portions of our regulations.

17
18 Comment two. These existing statutes do not limit work to only "structural licenses and not civil
19 licenses" as other sections within the existing statutes allow civil licenses to perform structural
20 engineering. These issues only affect a person who "wishes" to obtain a structural specialty
21 license.

22
23 Maynard: That's true. So is comment number three which is basically the same one.

24
25 Chair: So is he basically just trying to reiterate that a civil can still perform aspects of structural
26 engineering.

27
28 Maynard: Sure as long as it's not a significant they can continue to do structural engineering for
29 it.

30
31 Chair: Comment four. This portion of the existing conflict of interest statutes will address even
32 board members as they are subject to such statutes. And what he's cited here is if a registrant
33 is in public service as a member, advisor, or employee of a government body, the registrant
34 may not review work previously performed by the registrant or the registrant's former private
35 sector employer. I'm not quite sure how that comes back and applies to us.

36
37 Maynard: I couldn't understand how that could apply either.

38
39 Chair: Comment five. This portion of the existing statutes address that professionally licensed
40 civil engineers can perform any and all structural engineering as has existed in the State of
41 Alaska since the adoption of professional engineering licensing. I will also point out that
42 historical and existing university education and degrees issued for Civil engineering teach all
43 structural engineering and he cited the 4 out of regulations under the definition civil engineering
44 means the branch of professional engineering that embraces studies and activities relating to
45 research, design and construction of fixed works for irrigation, drainage, waterpower, water
46 supply and treatment, flood control, inland waterways, harbors, municipal improvements,
47 railroads, highways, tunnels, airports and airways, sewerage, refuse disposal, foundations,
48 structures, and bridges, and the organizational and economic aspects of these studies and
49 activities.

50
51 Maynard: Which is how it was modified when we adopted all the additional branches.

1
2 Chair: Comments on that? Comment six. This defines the unlimited scope and practice of
3 structural engineering that can be performed by professionally licensed civil engineers.
4
5 Maynard: That was true, or is true at this date.
6
7 Chair: Any comments on that? And then I think he's just attached the whole proposed
8 regulation. Comment eight.
9
10 Eriksen: There is a comment seven.
11
12 Chair: Where's seven at, oh ok. Adoption of these changes will not enable me to obtain a
13 "structural license" by grandfather rights as I am a sole practitioner who works alone without
14 other professional engineers. Colin, comment on that one.
15
16 Maynard: Well, I, you could have a couple other engineers that you know review your project
17 and say yes this meets the standards of a structural engineer or if he was working with an
18 architect could send a letter of recommendation saying that yes he worked hard on this project
19 and did a great job. I think there is a way for him to get grandfathering if he wants to.
20
21 Kerr: How could you have someone like an architect, nothing against architects, (laughter)
22 determine whether the work they did was valid?
23
24 Maynard: They wouldn't. They would say that this person did the structural engineering on that
25 project.
26
27 Chair: Just attest to the fact that he did it.
28
29 Maynard: Did that he did that work and then another structural or civil engineer would say that
30 yes that work looks like it meets current standards is within the standard of practice. I think
31 there is a way to get there.
32
33 Chair: Comment eight. This portion of the proposed changes defines and removes the right for
34 professional licensed civil engineers to perform structural engineering.
35
36 Maynard: On significant structures.
37
38 Chair: Comment nine. This portion of the proposed changes further define and removes the
39 right for professional licensed civil engineers to perform structural engineering. Again significant
40 structures so it is limiting them to do structural engineering except for significant structures
41 unless they have the SE under the new regulations.
42
43 And it looks like there's one more. So this is January 23rd Elmer Marx. He says it appears to be
44 self-serving to those preferring exclusivity in their discipline. That pursuit of sub-licensure
45 appears to be financially motivated.
46
47 Again on a lot of these they are asserting intent that's their opinion and not substantiated by
48 anything.
49
50 So that's all of them I think. Before we, uh, do we have to have a motion in play in order to have
51 a discussion?

1
2 Jones: Yeah.
3
4 Maynard: I will move that after careful consideration of the comments received from the public I
5 move to adopt the changes to: 12 AAC 36.063; 12 AAC 36.108; 12 AAC 36.180; 12 AAC
6 36.185; 12 AAC 36.510 as public noticed.
7
8 Chair: Is there a second?
9
10 Schedler: Second.
11
12 Chair: Ok, before we have any discussion on this, if this motion fails then can another motion
13 be proposed?
14
15 Maynard: We can amend it.
16
17 Jones: This one can be amended to include any of those items in those other examples I gave
18 you. For example changes you can make amendments to change certain aspects of it.
19
20 Chair: Ok, so this motion is on the floor I'd like you to run through it one more time, the options
21 available to us if this motion doesn't pass.
22
23 Jones; Ok, the options are to adopt them as public noticed, to adopt them with changes, to
24 extend the public notice period, or to refer them back to the committee.
25
26 Chair: Do we have to have justification to extend the public notice?
27
28 Jones: Uh...No.
29
30 Christensen: I believe ASPE asked for that, didn't they?
31
32 Chair: Yeah, they're actually a couple people did.
33
34 Eriksen: Can you read the motion more time?
35
36 Maynard: It's basically to adopt the regulation as public noticed. It's just to get the discussion
37 started.
38
39 Jones: After careful consideration of the comments received from the public I move to adopt the
40 changes to 12 AAC 36.063 Engineering Education and Work Experience Requirements (SE),
41 12 AAC 36.180 Application for Registration as a Structural Engineer, 12 AAC 36.180 Seals, 12
42 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals, 12 AAC 36.510 Continuing Education Requirements as public
43 noticed.
44
45 Chair: So now we can have a discussion on these.
46
47 Maynard: And is somebody wants to amend the language they can propose an amendment to
48 that to change certain provisions.
49
50 Christensen: Colin could you read that question again on your proposal?
51

1 Maynard: It's to adopt the regulations as proposed.
2
3 Chair: That's what's on the table now.
4
5 Maynard: It's on the table and if anybody wants to modify any of the provisions or if you want to
6 send it back out for public comment then make an amend motion to do that.
7
8 Koonce: I was just curious, when you do this process then would you incorporate all the valid
9 comments that are made by this document and then send it back out for public notice again?
10
11 Chair: I think we need to talk about the comments that we think are valid that we would want to
12 be incorporated in.
13
14 Koonce: Can the committee do that or.....
15
16 Chair: We do that right now.
17
18 Eriksen: We can make those changes and adopt it with those changes as long as they're minor
19 changes.
20
21 Chair: Well, there's two ways to do it. One is that we actually come up with the language right
22 now to amend this and amend the motion or we can table it and send it back to the committee to
23 recraft it based upon our input here and whatever else they're able to determine.
24
25 Koonce: I would propose that it be tabled and put back to the committee.
26
27 Maynard: Well then you better tell us what you want to change.
28
29 Koonce: Right, but there needs to be a more studious or more focused incorporation of some of
30 the components of language that.....
31
32 Christensen: We need to re-visit I would think the question, the primary question in there
33 seismic and structure and one the other.....
34
35 Eriksen: There were a lot of questions that were asked that need clarification.
36
37 Urfer: If it goes back to the committee does it have to go back out to public notice?
38
39 Maynard: Yeah.
40
41 Jones: If it goes back to the committee it does. You can make changes and adopt them and
42 then from here once you do that it goes to Law and if Law if they consider them to be minor
43 changes that are ok then they can pass it on through or if they decide that they are significant
44 changes then it needs to be re-public noticed and they'll send it back to the Board.
45
46 Eriksen: Well there are a few points that people have made in discussions like the naval
47 architecture kind of stuff that maybe, Colin, is there some of those kind of thing that you can
48 collect and maybe bring it back to us?
49
50 Eriksen: Do we have a list like that right now, there's a lot of information here.
51

1 Maynard: First I'd have to be able to read your minds and figure out which ones you want
2 responded too. I wasn't swayed by many of them. We can change that to not moored offshore
3 structures if that's the language you want to do. But without indication from the rest of you of
4 what you want changed I don't think I can go through all of these and come up with a whole
5 laundry list responding to everyone and then come to find out that you don't really care about
6 that. So if anybody has a particular issue that they want to address, then let's do that by
7 amending the language or say send it back to committee to address a particular point and we
8 can do that. But just sending the whole thing back to the committee to change it willy-nilly
9 without some input about where you want it to go, I don't see much point in it.

10
11 Koonce: During this board session we took 4 hours to go through each of them just to say ok....

12
13 Eriksen: I guess we all just heard a lot of this discussion where the 43 questions came up that
14 we feel requires more discussion.

15
16 Koonce: I don't know about more discussion but incorporating elements like describing the
17 building type, for instance, was one them I felt was kind of ambiguous, that maybe a more
18 thoughtful description of that and what that pertains to. It seemed like that was a common
19 thread, clarification of continuing education units. Maybe that's something I just don't
20 understand could be clearer and other components.....

21
22 Maynard: That's completely separate from structural. That was.....

23
24 Chair: It is and I think it actually pretty clear to change.....

25
26 Maynard: Basically there are some engineers that have more than three licenses and we want
27 to make sure that they have at least 8 in each of those licenses. So they may have to do 48
28 hours of CE. So yeah that's a whole different ball game. If you're going to change that then
29 you've got to send that to his committee I think.

30
31 Hale: The only thing I really had besides cost impact is financial considerations and people that
32 just don't like change was the definition of significant structures like Jeff said. Do we feel like
33 that's defined well enough?

34
35 Koonce: Well this is an IBC.....

36
37 Maynard: Yeah, and it's been in the State of Washington for at least 4 years and I don't think
38 they've changed it so it seems to work.

39
40 Hale: Realizing that we're not going have anything perfect ever that will make everybody happy
41 is this as good as we can do?

42
43 Maynard: I think so, now if you want to do a little of word-smiting and say clear span of the
44 bridge or make it non-moored offshore structure to address particular comments then I think we
45 can do that fairly quickly in this session. But just to send it back to the committee to address all
46 the concerns without some direction about which concerns you want to address is just delaying
47 this for no real good reason.

48
49 Koonce: The intent of my comment was that there seemed to be three or four focused
50 comments in here that are common throughout all of them. I was wondering if maybe in a brief
51 discussion we can address those. Since DOTPF does all the bridges so why do we need

1 bridges in there?
2
3 Maynard: Because basically it's in the State of Washington Law and we copied theirs.
4
5 Koonce: I don't know what their regulations are but.....
6
7 Maynard: And I think bridges are significant structures too if they're long span.
8
9 Koonce: They are but is it redundant to have this Board and the State and Federal Agencies in
10 oversight?
11
12 Christensen: I think there were some real important comments on bridges in there from DOT
13 who's in charge of them. Federal law got to be in there somewhere because they're using
14 Federal money to build them and they have certain requirements so.....
15
16 Koonce: I just didn't know if we're overstepping boundaries.
17
18 Maynard: If you're working for a State Agency and you're doing engineering you have to be
19 licensed in accordance with the State laws and that applies to DEC and Environmental.
20
21 Chair: I think, you know, perception is that there's a couple areas out there in engineering that
22 are kind of specialized that it's really not just enough to say a structural engineer but somebody
23 that deals with that particular type of design and so we've heard stuff about the bridges,
24 pressure vessels, offshore....
25
26 Christensen: Steel components.....and all that stuff.
27
28 Koonce: Well there's the industrial exemption, I don't know that's defined.
29
30 Maynard: It's in Statute.
31
32 Chair: And you know when we start a regulation project like this part of the process is not to say
33 we're going to develop the regulation and that's what we're going to push through. We have
34 public comment, we get the comments then we need to decide whether or not those comments
35 are valid. Whether or not they're technical in nature or wordsmithing or whether they're just
36 opinion that's not based on any fact or anything else. We got a lot of comments on this one by
37 a quite varied group of engineers. So we can't take it lightly, there's some good points made
38 and I'm not totally comfortable that our umbrella should be cast quite so large. So I have a little
39 bit of hesitation with just accepting it exactly the way it is. But uh.....
40
41 Kerr: One of the common themes that I saw was that people didn't understand the rationale for
42 the proposed changes. Have we provided the public with the rationale as to why we undertook
43 this regulation project?
44
45 Chair: Yeah, there was some rationale. Some of them didn't feel it was adequate rationale or
46 didn't agree with the rationale.
47
48 Maynard: And some didn't realize that we already had an SE in the State.
49
50 Kerr: And another thing, I realize we received a lot of comments but there was a request for
51 additional comment time. I don't know that, that would yield any new information, I suspect not

1 given the volume of comments and some of the detailed responses. Do we want to consider
2 extending the comment period or do we have sufficient comments?
3

4 Chair: I think we, you know we did have a, I think, a sufficient comment period of 60 days. It
5 didn't overlap any of our Board Meetings for those that may have wanted to have oral testimony.
6 We got a good representation of comments on this quite varied, they weren't all saying the
7 same thing. So in that respect it covers a lot of ground. Whether there's some people out there
8 that didn't comment, that maybe heard about it late and wanted to I don't know. Whether their
9 comments would be different than these, who knows but it seems like these were fairly
10 representative of just about every different angle you could take on this.
11

12 Maynard: Let me make a suggestion that we, I guess, table this until the morning and then let
13 everybody on the Board pick out the comments that they think we need to address by changing
14 language and then in the morning we can start hammering out amendments to this and then, so
15 there's a possibility of adopting it tomorrow sometime.
16

17 Chair: I think that's a good idea but if we do that, you know, one thing to keep in mind is that we
18 can't talk amongst ourselves on this. You know all of our Board business needs to be done in
19 public so.
20

21 Maynard: That would give everybody an opportunity to go through, you know flip through and
22 say this makes sense we should change this or change that and it may mean that when we are
23 all said and done there are so many changes that you want to send it back to the committee and
24 that's fine. But,
25

26 Chair: I would appreciate having an evening to go back and reflect on some of this.
27

28 Kerr: Another thing that would do is that will allow the public testimony period to occur before
29 we act on this.
30

31 Maynard, Yeah but they can't talk about this.
32

33 Schedler: They can't talk about it at all.
34

35 Chair: They can talk about it; we're prohibited from taking....
36

37 Koonce: So the two areas that I kind of heard everybody say and I read were one maybe a
38 more thoughtfully put together statement about the justification for the regulation that is broad
39 and more defined and the significant structure definition, maybe those two components.
40

41 Maynard: Well, the rationale at this point doesn't matter because we're either going to adopt it
42 or not adopt it. Unless we send it out for more public comment then we, but there was a
43 rationale document that you were given in November that was sent out with this and I don't
44 know what more we can tell them.
45

46 Koonce: This is not part of the regulation?
47

48 Maynard: No, we don't adopt that as part of the regulation.
49

50 Chair: Our options right now on the table are to adopt it as is or make some friendly
51 amendments top it prior to voting on it.

1
2 Koonce: I think Colin's point is a good point let everybody go back and knowing what they know
3 right now read it one more time to make sure that what they heard was understood correctly.
4
5 Chair: Yeah, and I would encourage everybody to go ahead and outline a few of those items
6 that are seen as a sticking point and it would be nice to go through it tomorrow person by
7 person and see if each individual has specific items that they have some concerns with. And
8 granted, you know, we're not all structural engineers. We don't necessarily know all the
9 particulars of structural engineering but as a Board we still can identify things that, from what we
10 read, and that's in the proposed regulations that we might want some more discussion on or
11 may need to solicit more expertise on.
12
13 Eriksen: Vern can you kind of summarize one more time the process that this has gone through
14 to get to this point as far as how long the comment period has been and so we can get some
15 feel for how much opportunity, how much education the public had on this.
16
17 Jones: Well, the normal minimum public notice is 30 days. We public noticed this for 60 days
18 because we knew there was going to be a lot of interest in it. And now that the public notice is
19 closed that's when you can either take action on it or defer it to a later day or whatever. Right
20 now you cannot take any oral comments on it. To do that would automatically put it back out for
21 public notice. So if you wanted to extend the public notice you could do it for however long you
22 think or...
23
24 Eriksen: I was just going to say it seems like, you know, we received some pretty thoughtful
25 comments back from some of the societies, engineering societies and stuff so it seemed like
26 they were informed and tried to pull information from their membership and things like that so it
27 seem like we had good representation to the engineers.
28
29 Jones: But in addition to, now this public notice we mailed this out to all the licensees.
30 Everybody got a copy of it in the mail. It was also published in the Anchorage paper and it's on
31 the State's Public Notice Website and it was on our website so the information was out there.
32
33 Hale: How many licensees was that Vern?
34
35 Jones: We sent out over 5000 letters. We sent it to everybody because it had the CE
36 regulations in it and that affects everybody.
37
38 Kerr: So 6A1-5 is what was mailed out, correct? And the reason for the proposed action, that's
39 our rationale for what's listed here, item 5.
40
41 Maynard: There was actually a one page rationale that I prepared for last meeting which was
42 sent along with as I recall.
43
44 Koonce: Is that in the brief description here in the box or is that something.....
45
46 Maynard: No, it's different and I don't see it in here but I'm pretty sure it went out.
47
48 Koonce: Was that in our last binder?
49
50 Maynard: Yes, it was and it talked about comity and more complexity.
51

1 Eriksen: I like Colin's suggestion on having an opportunity for all of us to think about some of
2 these comments and provide some opportunity for feedback in the morning. I guess in general
3 there was good notification and in reading this and some of the discussion on the process and I
4 don't anticipate any reason to change other than some minor adjustment or wordsmithing or
5 something that hopefully we can come up with in the morning.
6

7 Maynard: I'm not sure we would get any new information by extending it another 60 or 90 days.
8 We would have to read another 90 submittals that say pretty much the same thing.
9

10 Chair: So Vern with the motion made do we have to do anything?
11

12 Jones: You can table it until tomorrow.
13

14 Chair: Ok,
15

16 Christensen: Can I make a motion to put this on the table until tomorrow morning?
17

18 Maynard: I second it.
19

20 Chair: Any discussion on that? All in favor, all opposed any abstentions? Ok, so we'll table
21 that until tomorrow morning. It's 12:10 so we can break for lunch. I'd like everybody to be back
22 by one because 1:15 is when public comment starts and we want to start that on time. And
23 again just a reminder that we shouldn't be talking about this regulations amongst ourselves
24 outside of this room.
25

26 Jones: Ok, secure the recorders.
27

28 12:10p.m. The Board recessed for lunch.
29

30 1:15p.m. The Board reconvened, roll call, all present except Hanson.
31

32 **Agenda Item 13 – Public Comment** 33

34 Chair: Ok, we are going to go to item 13 which is public comment and before we start just want
35 to remind you not to speak about anything having to do with the regulation project currently on
36 the table other than that, it's Rich Pratt, you can pull up a chair.
37

38 Mr. Pratt: Is it ok if I stand, I'm a toastmaster so I'm used to standing when I speak. My name is
39 Rich Pratt; I'm the Chief Bridge Engineer for the State of Alaska, Department of Transportation.
40 So you probably noticed me sitting over here all morning and I wanted you to know who it was
41 that was sitting here and why they are sitting here. I want to talk about a couple of things. First
42 I was reading through the Statutes and Regulations last week and was trying to figure out where
43 this darn statement was and I finally I found it in the Guidance Manual. I think this is a real
44 telling thing. Registered Professional may not perform design services outside their area of
45 expertise or registration. Sealing of plans for which you do not have the expertise or registration
46 is a violation of AS 08.48. I looked through 08.48, I couldn't fine it. I will admit I didn't do a
47 comprehensive search, I didn't skim every line but I noticed that here this is supposed to work
48 with the regulation and statutes but the other documents take precedence. So I just think it's
49 important to remember that those of us who work in the profession, we really work based on
50 what's in those Statutes and Regulations. When it comes right down to it guidance is guidance
51 and law is law and I think it's important for you to remember that as you go through working on

1 any of your projects you're working on, it affects those of us working in the profession on a daily
2 basis. This is important stuff to us and affects how we do our jobs, it affects the cost of us doing
3 our jobs, it affects the quality of the work that comes out in the end. So that was the first I
4 wanted to mention.

5
6 The other thing, I thought I'd just take advantage since I have a few minutes here was to just
7 describe the DOT Bridge Office and its responsibilities.

8
9 Chair: Hang on a second. Is that an area we really should.....

10
11 Jones: I wasn't listening, what did he say?

12
13 Eriksen: He can talk about what his office does just not reference it to make the connection, to
14 the regulations, right:

15
16 Jones: Just keep in mind that anything you say that concerns that regulation or what it pertains
17 to cannot be considered by the Board.

18
19 Chair: And we don't want you to address the items in the regulations.

20
21 Mr. Pratt: No, I'm not going to, I'll stay away from that. So, the Bridge Office at DOT is made up
22 of 23 individuals, two CAD Drafters, two Hydrologist people and the rest are all either registered
23 engineers, certainly all degreed engineers with the exception of one person. We're responsible
24 for designing all new state highway bridges in the State. We either do it ourselves or it's done
25 be consultants that we review but predominantly we do it ourselves. We use consultants
26 occasionally but not very much. The other primary focus of our office is bridge inspection. So
27 we go out to in service bridges and we inspect them every 24 months in accordance with the
28 Code of Federal Regulations. Those regulations require us to have some certifications, some
29 education, ongoing education to be certified as bridge inspectors. I still as the Office Chief go
30 out on bridge inspections every summer in fact last year I did Fairbanks. The year before that I
31 did Seward and the Seward Highway up through about Moose Pass or Canyon Creek or that
32 area. The Federal Highway Administration oversees and funds the majority of our operations
33 and through Congress they are being directed to monitor our work extremely closely. There's
34 about 23 metrics where they're look at our bridge inspection practices, load rating practices,
35 how we calculate the capacity of a bridge to support load, our load posting practices. Do we put
36 up a load limit sign, do we put up the appropriate sign and is it put up in a timely manner. The
37 other thing that comes out of the Code of Federal Regulations is, all public highway bridges in
38 the State other than those owned by the Federal Government, we're held accountable for. So if
39 there's a Municipality of Anchorage bridge the Federal Highway Commission doesn't go the
40 Municipality about that bridge, they come to us. My head's the one on the chopping block on
41 these things. So what's in between there, design, inspection in service, and construction. So
42 the Department hires these construction contractors to build this new bridge or to perform
43 rehabilitation work our role in that is to provide interpretation our designs and specifications so
44 we tend to be pretty good at writing contracts. Bottom line, this is what design and
45 specifications are, is writing the contracts. That's why I come back to my original point. As we
46 read these things, as we read Statute and Regulation these have the force of law. We read
47 those from the perspective of someone writing a contract. Essentially, what would I call it, a
48 paralegal maybe. So we're not attorneys, but we're writing contracts just like an attorney would.
49 So I just thought that might be beneficial to the Board to know a little bit about their Department
50 of Transportation Bridge Office, our responsibilities, what we do, there are roughly a thousand
51 bridges in this State that we take care of in one way or another and we are accountable for.

1 Thank you for your time.

2

3 Chair: Thank you.

4

5 Koonce: How many Federal Bridges are there?

6

7 Mr. Pratt: I don't know the number from the Federal Government right off hand. But I saw
8 something recently, I was in a conversation with the Forest Service as they have about 450
9 mostly in the Tongass, they tend to be logging bridges for lack of a better term. We end up
10 inheriting some of those. For some reason the State deems it wise to take on ownership of
11 some of the Federal forest roads over time. So we end up with these sort of goofy bridges
12 sometimes, these log bridges but I will say in the end they actually do quite well for getting
13 somebody out berry picking or hunting or recreational activities so in that regard they are a
14 benefit to the people of the State.

15

16 Chair: Thank you, Jesse?

17

18 Mr. Escamilla: I'm Jesse Escamilla I'm fairly new to Alaska; I've only been here for about a
19 year. About ten years I interned year and I thought I'd come back here so I just came full circle.
20 Since I can't talk about it directly, since I've got time I'll just talk about myself. So I graduated
21 from Texas A & M, went to school for two years in Dallas worked for a company referred to as
22 AECOM, followed my girlfriend to Phoenix work for a company called TYL International
23 designing bridges all over the country. I've worked on bridges that were at one the world's
24 widest bridge the Port Man Bridge in Canada I worked on that for two years. I've work on
25 bridges in Panama, international bridges I worked metric of course English all across the
26 country. In the end I chose to come back to Alaska because I cherish my family and have kids
27 coming up. I have two kids now and you know one of the most rewarding things I did back in
28 Phoenix was our office was right next to ASU so in my spare time I would volunteer at ASU and
29 I'd gest lecture there. They had a cool capstone program where they brought professional in to
30 come talk to them about what they do and they did their portion of teaching so they had a big
31 civil team and one person designed a bridge so I'd come and I'd teach the bridge and I'd show
32 them how their engineering fundamentals translated into bridge design. And the cool thing
33 about it was that whenever, uh, you'd see it click with the students and it'd be like oh, they get it.
34 I'd tell them how you design a bridge and loads come here and they go down to the girder and
35 then they go to the abutments and so the good thing about bridges is that, I have an example,
36 this is like a 160 foot bridge that we would have them design. And that was really cool because
37 they would go and actually see where, oh and this is real practice and the beauty of it is that
38 whenever they ask well how do you accomplish this? Oh, well because its fundamentals and
39 you have a simple span, you can put another span next to it and all of a sudden you have a 400
40 foot bridge or a 330 foot bridge that's still designed the exact same way. And when it clicked
41 with them with that they were like, oh. So we designed longer bridges the same way as we
42 design smaller bridges exactly you break it up into this and this and this and you have a longer
43 span. Sure there's more seismic issues and that's where you get more complicated. But the
44 good thing was that I was getting them excited about engineering. In the end that was about the
45 most rewarding part of my thing so far. I have to work to make money but I really encourage
46 that and I believe that the board can probably help out with that. Maybe encourage it more
47 often. Help to teach the students, you know, it's a surprise to me that what I learned in school
48 could be applied to practice. So, that's about it really, I still do that here. I volunteer at E week,
49 Engineers Week. And I volunteer with that and I still volunteer and go to elementary schools
50 now and teach that we can get excited about engineering and it can be applied. An application
51 that works for smaller pieces can be applied to big pieces and it's the same fundamental thing.

1 It doesn't change.
2
3 Chair: Thank you. Alright and I think with that we'll be going into Executive Session so we will
4 need a motion.
5
6 Maynard: So moved.
7
8 Eriksen: Second.
9
10 **On a Motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Eriksen and unanimously approved it**
11 **was RESOLVED to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310 (c) (3) to**
12 **review an Imposition of Civil fine and to review applicant files.**
13
14 Chair: Ok so we've got a motion and a second. All those in favor of going into Executive
15 Session say Aye, opposed, abstain, motion passes.
16
17 1:32p.m. In Executive Session
18
19 4:55p.m. Out of Executive Session, back on record.
20
21 Chair: So we're back out of Executive Session, Vern do we need to do a roll call? Colin do you
22 want to make a motion?
23
24 Maynard: I move to accept the consent agreement in case number 2014 002497.
25
26 Eriksen: Second.
27
28 Chair: So we don't even discuss we just vote right Vern? We need to do this by roll call.
29
30 Jones: We should, yeah, Eriksen yes, Hale yes, Hanson – absent, Kerr yes, Koonce abstain,
31 Maynard yes, Rearick yes, Schedler yes, Christensen yes, Walters yes. The yes's have it.
32
33 Chair: Motion passes. Is there anything else we might want to cover or shall we, its 5 O'clock.
34
35 Koonce: Can we revisit our charge for tomorrow so that we're thoughtfully giving Colin direction
36 for tomorrow morning? Can we do that without being in Executive Session?
37
38 Maynard: Yes. I think what the charge is, is to review the comments or at least pick out the
39 ones that you think would require a change to the language and come back with at least
40 identifying those and if you can come up with the change to the language that you like that
41 would be good too. But certainly identify what issues you want me to address and we can
42 discuss them and come up with verbiage or if we decide we can't then we'll give it back to the
43 committee propose some.
44
45 Koonce: I don't know where to get the technical description of essential structures.
46
47 Eriksen: Well you copied that description was from Washington, right, verbatim wasn't it?
48
49 Maynard: No it was almost verbatim but I also used Oregon and kind of merged the two.
50
51 Koonce: Is there something nationally that's already established that?

1
2 Maynard: No, even the Structural Engineering Licensing Coalition which includes the National
3 Council of Structural Engineering Associations the PASE which is part of APDC, structural
4 engineers, the Structural Engineering Institute of ASCE, and the Structural Engineering
5 Certification Board when they set it up they recommended defining significant structures but
6 they decided not to define it, leave it up to the States to define what's a significant to them.
7
8 (Note: There was a side conversation between the Chair and Jones about resuming the
9 discussion after the executive session on Friday and also bringing the Regulations Specialist in
10 tomorrow when it's time for the vote.
11
12 Chair: So the charge is to look at and go back and revisit testimony that we receive as far as
13 the items that you had some question about or wanted to delve into a little deeper and bring
14 those issues tomorrow. After we come out of Executive Session tomorrow then we'll have the
15 discussion about those and then after that we'll vote on it.
16
17 Eriksen: It seem like the three things I kind of remember was the definition of significant
18 structures, and I'm not sure I guess one way the question think about that too is there anything
19 unique about Alaska that might be different than other places when it comes to structures. I'm
20 not sure there is but otherwise....
21
22 Koonce: We have a large coast line so there's a lot of marine and offshore elements.
23
24 Eriksen: Yeah so there's a couple of things I guess that definition whether it applies to the other
25 part of that marine aspect.
26
27 Maynard: Quite frankly Washington does not have the marine structures but we did have a
28 question, I don't know, a year and a half ago from somebody asking us if we were going to be, if
29 marine structures were under our aegis and whether we were going to be looking at it and it
30 made since for us to add that since we do have off shore drilling and other things that might be
31 within our three mile limit.
32
33 Eriksen: You know there might be some value in having it a little ambiguous too because there
34 may be things that we aren't able to comprehend.
35
36 Koonce: Well I'm sure there will be. But the industrial exemption in a lot ways cures some of
37 those, right? So other than that I guess we can.....
38
39 Jones: Well you've got permafrost and you've routinely got hurricane force winds, especially
40 here.
41
42 Maynard: And we have 52% of the US's earthquakes. And part of this was also to satisfy the
43 Seismic Hazard Commission that we didn't need to add a seismic course and we want to make
44 it easier for comity between the states so if we can match them a little better then it's easier.
45
46 Koonce: But people weren't getting that.
47
48 Chair: Do you know right off hand how many states have the SE?
49
50 Maynard: I think, well as a separate license? I think there are seven, Hawaii, California,
51 Nevada, Arizona, Washington, Oregon and Illinois.

1
2 Chair: And the other states that don't have it, it's just.....
3
4 Maynard: Oh, Utah as well, some of them it's just like another PE, you take the 16 hours exam
5 instead of the 8 hour exam and get a PE which is kind of what we have now.
6
7 Eriksen: But the seismic thing was kind of one of the driving factors?
8
9 Maynard: Yeah, we are a seismically active area. We have a lot of high winds so significant
10 structures arguably should be designed by somebody who has shown that they have a little
11 more expertise.
12
13 Eriksen: The other thing that kind of seemed to be in there that was brought to us was bridges
14 and whether there's any consideration....
15
16 Chair: John had his hand up a minute ago.
17
18 Kerr: Are you going to talk about bridges Jeff?
19
20 Koonce: Without understanding the Federal oversight and restrictions at the national level that
21 they have to comply with in bridge design, if there's an overlap there that's unnecessary or....
22
23 Maynard: I don't think so. Bridges are designed to the AASHTO code which is basically the
24 bridge version of the IBC.
25
26 Koonce: And there's bridge options in the exam right?
27
28 Maynard: Yes.
29
30 Eriksen: And I guess that probably one of the biggest, you know next to a big building or
31 something, are one of the biggest public safety hazards.
32
33 Maynard: And quite frankly when we made all state engineering jobs required to have a license
34 we were hearing this in DOT and DEC at the same time, we'll never get any engineer and it's,
35 several years ago when it first came up that was the first thing they said, we'll never get any
36 engineers we'll never get testing, they were the first three applications in the door.
37
38 Koonce: It doesn't have anything to do with horizontal, right, just vertical?
39
40 Maynard: No, the SE exam has 8 hours on vertical loads and 8 hours on horizontal loads.
41
42 Koonce: So anything.....(unintelligible)
43
44 Maynard: Well vertical loads are dead loads, live loads, snow loads, you know, gravity loads.
45 Horizontal is wind driven.
46
47 Koonce: Horizontal construction....(unintelligible).
48
49 Maynard: Well, roads no but bridges yes. Buildings or bridges.
50
51 Kerr: In one of the comments they said that you'd have to be a structural engineer if you

1 designed a buoy floating in 51 feet of water, anchored to the bottom. Is there any truth to that?
2
3 Maynard: If anybody required that I'd be very, very surprised.
4
5 Eriksen: Well I think some of it is what risk would it propose to the public?
6
7 Koonce: Would there be any seismic consideration for an anchored buoy?
8
9 Kerr: Well none but that.....
10
11 Maynard: Well wave action.
12
13 Kerr: There were comments that the regulations would cover that as written.
14
15 Eriksen: There were several comments that were just being simply opposed you know and you
16 know I guess from the discussion I never felt like there was any compelling argument on that
17 everything was mostly just that
18
19 Koonce: There was some clarity on the essential facilities thing I saw but other than that....
20
21 Walters: It sounds you've got many civil engineers that think they are doing essentially
22 structural work now and in order to keep doing that they are going to have to get an SE. If that's
23 the case, maybe for some things it would.....
24
25 Maynard: It would depend on the work they are doing. If they are doing non-significant
26 structures then, no they don't have to. Now if they're doing Taco Bells and McDonalds, even
27 small additions to schools there's a certain square footage that kicks it in but if it's less than that
28 then they don't need to but for the larger structures then it would kick in.
29
30 Chair: Now there are those that say, you know, I can do this today and then if this passes
31 tomorrow I can't do it, however, there is the avenue for them to get licensed as the SE if they're
32 civil doing that type of work right now.
33
34 Walters: I think that's what people don't understand.
35
36 Maynard: And if they're not doing the work right now but they have the ability to just because of
37 the way it is you may think that they probably shouldn't be doing it because they're not qualified.
38
39 Koonce: So it's no longer an entitlement you have to get licensed.
40
41 Chair: And, you know, what they'll say, in some of these things they say it's an additional
42 bureaucratic step and burden to them for something that they've already been licensed for and
43 should be able to continue doing. So that comes up time and time again.
44
45 Koonce: I read that. Well times change. I mean we're getting more and more sophisticated in
46 analysis and design and lateral wind analysis and all that should be applied.
47
48 Chair: One thing that's come up in these is that the Board is acting with some other motivation
49 and I reject that from what I know of this Board, however, I do think that we should consider that
50 as far as whether or not we want to abstain from voting and the general rule for abstention is
51 that you can't abstain just because you don't want to vote. You have to vote as a member of

1 this Board unless you do have a conflict of interest then you should abstain.
2
3 Jones: And I would add that in our society perception trumps truth so if it's perceived that you
4 have a conflict of interest, you do.
5
6 Chair: We can talk about this more tomorrow after we've had a little bit more time individually to
7 look at it. So we can take as much time as we need to.
8
9 Koonce: Do you have that document, can we pass around a copy of that November document.
10
11 Chair: The one with the explanation on the front?
12
13 Koonce: Yeah just kind of like the, I don't it.....
14
15 Maynard: I'm sure Vern can print you out a copy of the rationale paper. I didn't bring one with
16 me.
17
18 Walters: It seems like it's going to be more beneficial for a civil engineer to become an SE who
19 wants to go work outside, it's going to be easier for Alaskan's to go work somewhere else.
20
21 Koonce: Is it a matter of taking the exam to get structural engineer, is that all it is, and an
22 application?
23
24 Maynard: Well other than the grandfathering if you'll get a PE in whatever you're going to get a
25 PE in and then you do two more years of structural work and then take the 16 hours SE exam.
26
27 Koonce: So if I'm already a civil engineer and I've been doing structures for 30 years....
28
29 Maynard: Then you can be grandfathered in.
30
31 Chair: But you have to get those additional two years or have those additional two years of.....
32
33 Maynard: Not for the grandfathering.
34
35 Koonce: Just apply for grandfathering
36
37 Maynard: Correct, just like we were doing for the additional branches for the last two years.
38
39 Chair: So that's just for comity?
40
41 Maynard: That's for grandfathering.
42
43 Chair: I thought you said for grandfathering you don't have to do the additional two years if
44 you've been practicing already.
45
46 Maynard: For comity you would have already passed the SE somewhere so you just have to
47 show that you passed the SE. Now whether we're going to make them go and take the civil
48 engineer exam to make it the same which is what California does. I don't know if Washington
49 does, I haven't found out.
50
51 Chair: So when is the additional two years required?

1
2 Maynard: After your PE, before your.....
3
4 Chair: So if you haven't been doing structural work as a PE already. You're more of a newly
5 licensed PE.
6
7 Maynard: Right. Or if you just came out of school this year and you work for four years you
8 take the PE test and then you work for two more years after that, after you pass it and then you
9 take the SE.
10
11 Koonce: How do I prove to the Board that I'm grandfatherable?
12
13 Maynard: The same way we did all the additional disciplines. A letter of recommendation,
14 submit two projects that show that you know what you're doing, with calculations.
15
16 Koonce: Alright.
17
18 Maynard: And we actually mandated that they be significant structures. And you only submit
19 the structural drawings. And I think we also stipulated that they have to be on a disc or thumb
20 drive.
21
22 Schedler: (Laughter) Smart.
23
24 Koonce: Right
25
26 Chair: We'll see if Vern prints us a copy of that before we leave.
27
28 Koonce: I just want one copy of that.
29
30 Chair: You know while we are waiting we could go ahead and go through some of the board
31 correspondence which are largely our different organizations.
32
33 **Agenda item 9 – Board Correspondence Received Since November 2014.**
34
35 Chair: So item 9 board correspondence received since November 2014. So Luann there's
36 CLARB correspondence, is there anything you want to comment on?
37
38 Urfer: A lot of it was elections which aren't terribly exciting one way or another....
39
40 Maynard: What are you running for?
41
42 Urfer: I will tell you that they tried to recruit me about four times at the Annual Meeting to
43 becoming a representative. Ummmm I think I have stuff to do. They do a lot of the CLEAR
44 training as well so that's kind of, the big deal I guess with LA is trying to get more people to get
45 registered. We have a lot of the same problems that the other professionals are sharing
46 especially for women. They get into it then they end up having children, they drop out of the
47 profession for a while, don't feel like they have the experience to be able to qualify for the exam
48 either that or sometimes they even do get licensed then drop out and never come back. I think I
49 told you about how we sat down to get that whole demographic thing, looked at what the
50 population would be and took a look at how to maybe encourage the kids who are coming up to
51 get involved in the profession. What would entice them into it what are the misconceptions

1 about it and also trying to get them to understand like anything they have to work for it.
2 (unintelligible) So I see those as the recurrent themes, it's a lot of what's going on.
3

4 Chair: The next item "B" is NCARB and I'm going to deal with all of these as one big chunk.
5 Which to basically say, most of the current items I talked about at length at our last meeting and
6 they're still evolving. We won't vote on those until our June meeting and between now and then
7 we'll have another region meeting with the rest of the regions where we'll see the final format of
8 some of those proposed changes both the Broadly Experienced Architect, Broadly Experience
9 Foreign Architect and changes to the IDP program and a few other proposals. So at our next
10 meeting I will present those and solicit the Board's response. There's another item later in the
11 agenda, I think it's under new items that has to do with an alternate path to licensure that
12 combines education, training and really kind of the testing all together and I'll talk about that
13 later in the agenda. But the rest of the items, there's several correspondence from people
14 running for office and mostly just the BOD updates on those things we've been talking about
15 now for a year and will come to fruition here at the Annual Meeting in June.
16

17 NCEES, anybody want to report on any of these items?
18

19 Maynard: Well I think as we told you at the November meeting the bachelors plus 30 or
20 Masters or equivalent or whatever they're calling it now was put into policy and out of the
21 uniform rules law. Other than that CBT seems to be going pretty well they're looking to head
22 towards CBT for the PE exam which they're going to do piece meal and I don't remember which
23 one they'll start with. They have changed some of the test standards that have been printed
24 and are included here.
25

26 Jones: I can't find it either.
27

28 Koonce: That's alright
29

30 Jones: Do you still have it on your computer?
31

32 Maynard: Maybe.
33

34 Chair: I probably do.
35

36 Maynard: I think it's on our office computer.
37

38 Koonce: It's in our last book, right?
39

40 Chair: Yeah and I brought some of the stuff from our last book but I don't think I brought that.
41

42 Maynard: I think I handed it out, it wasn't in the book.
43

44 Schedler: So when you say they will do computerized exam piece meal you mean by
45 discipline?
46

47 Maynard: Yeah, and I think they're doing them in groups and the most popular ones will go first
48 that they've got enough questions already developed, because you have to have like three to
49 four times the amount of questions when you're doing it by computer testing. The other thing is
50 you have to have an ability to compare questions and make sure you don't have two questions
51 that are practically identical on the same test. So there's a lot of work that goes into it.

1
2 Chair: I do see one other item that, the item that I thought was further on in the agenda is
3 included in 9 B 14 and they're calling it the accelerated path for architectural licensure right now.
4 They were calling it an alternate path. And what they did is they sent out an RFP to all the
5 universities, the NAAB accredited universities. This outlines what that RFP included to find out,
6 it was really just a pre-qualification of interest in developing a program that got buy off from their
7 State Boards. It included IDP work into every program so that they would actually be working
8 with professionals rather than just educators with the idea that at the end of it they could take
9 the exams and they would be licensed. Now how long a period that is isn't defined and a lot is
10 really left to be developed at this point. But they've done the initial step. At the end of, I think
11 it's in August, where the universities would be actually submitting their true proposal, not just
12 their letter of interest. At first I was a little hesitant of this but I think it, I think it's a program
13 that's not going to be widely used. There's only going to be certain people who are motivated to
14 go through a program like this. There's going to be few places that it's really, you're actually
15 able to do it and I think it's a good experiment to see if there's another way to do it where you
16 actually can integrate some of that real life experience. The students would be working with
17 professionals and complying with all laws as pay goes so they would be able to earn part of
18 their college education as they are going through this. It might be a longer program. The one
19 aspect of it that I'm not sure I totally buy off on is they want to reduce the intern hours basically
20 down to two years and get rid of all the elective credits rather than the core credits and just have
21 it be the core credits. So there's still a lot of discussion on that and uh....

22
23 Eriksen: It sounds a little bit like what some of the Scandinavian programs are like that where
24 they have an apprenticeship for engineering licensure and stuff where their high school isn't just
25 a board as our high school. By the time they're in high school they kind of pick whether they're
26 going to be in a technical field or not. So they get a lot of that elective kind of stuff and then they
27 go through a combination of 8 years of work experience education are kind of intermixed for that
28 8 years but it's more of an apprenticeship sort of thing.

29
30 Chair: And they also realigned the intern development areas and the A.R.E. areas to match
31 what you'd go through in a practice. So I think it has a lot of merit and at this point in time I'm
32 generally in support of it I'll have more information after our March meeting.

33
34 Chair: So Vern while you were getting that information for us we went ahead and went through
35 9 A, B and C which basically is our Board, NCARB, CLARB and NCEES kind of stuff.

36
37 Jones: You went through that that fast?

38
39 Chair: It was a lot of correspondence but there's not a lot of detailed information we need to
40 discuss right now. So, shall we call it a day? Then we're meeting in the morning at 9 and we'll
41 be going let's see we'll basically be going into Executive Session.

42
43 Jones: If there's a need too.

44
45 Chair: Well we'll go into Executive Session to review, well we're done reviewing all of the
46 applications. You're right we might not be going into Executive Session at all.

47
48 Jones: We'll be able to get through some of the other stuff before we call John.

49
50 Maynard: We can get through 6 b and c and there's still some regulation projects we need to
51 highlight.

1
2 Chair: And whatever discussions....
3
4 Koonce: Did we ever get a budget?
5
6 Chair: Well we'll wait until 10.
7
8 Jones: Wait until they arrive. As soon as they arrive we should be able to get started.
9
10 Eriksen: So, we'll probably be done around noon or so.
11
12 Schedler: No, that's the target
13
14 Chair: Well you may not be able to get out of town but we might be able to get through it all.
15
16 Maynard: Take the afternoon off and go visit your Legislators.
17
18 Koonce: Well if you were to catch the 1:30 flight when should you be departing?
19
20 Eriksen: Noon.
21
22 Chair: Ok then we will adjourn for the day and we'll see you all in the morning and dinner
23 tonight at 6:30.
24
25 Jones: Dinner at Salt at 6:30.
26
27 Chair: And where is salt at?
28
29 Jones: It's on Seward.
30
31 Maynard: It's right next to the Silver Bow, the old Zephyr.
32
33 5:26 p.m. Recessed for the day.
34
35 **Friday February 6, 2015**
36
37 9:00 a.m. Meeting called to order.
38
39 Chair: Vern you want to do a roll call.
40
41 Jones: Turn the recorders on. Eriksen, Hale here, Hanson, Kerr here, Koonce here, Urfer here,
42 Maynard here, Rearick here, Schedler here, Christensen here, Walters here. We have a
43 quorum.
44
45 Chair: We have finished with Executive Session; we got through all the applications so I don't
46 think we need to go back into executive session for anything this morning. We are going to hold
47 off until probably about 10 to do our discussion and vote on 6 a. So I think we should go back
48 and pick up on the agenda where we left off.
49
50 Maynard: Why don't we go back to 6 b and do those?
51

1 Chair: Six b, yeah we can do that. So 6 b is the regulation changes forwarded to the Governor
2 for approval for public notice and they included 12 AAC 36.040 Application for Reexamination.
3 12 AAC 36.062 Eligibility for Fundamentals of Engineering Examination. 12 AAC 36.063
4 Engineering Education and Work Experience Requirements. 12 AAC 36.064 Eligibility for
5 Fundamental of Land Surveying Examination. 12 AAC 36.065 Eligibility for Professional Land
6 Surveyor Examination. 12 AAC 36.990 Definitions, engineer surveys and changes to the AELS
7 Bylaws.

8
9 Maynard: They're probably a little busy right now.

10
11 Chair: What?

12
13 Maynard: The Governor's Office is a little busy now trying to figure out budgets and staffing.

14
15 Chair: So we probably don't have any good idea when those will actually be.....

16
17 Jones: Well right at the beginning of six I put a couple of sheets in there that shows you what
18 the process is to get it up through to the Governor's Office and the finally to public notice. So
19 that is the steps in the regulation process.

20
21 Chair: Does anybody have anything on that? Basically we're just waiting for it to be public
22 noticed at this time.

23
24 We finished 7, 8, 9 d is where we left on that under board correspondence.

25
26 Jones: 9 d?

27
28 Chair: 9 d, we got thorough a, b and c yesterday.

29
30 Jones: This is an email from Chris Miller again asking us to put everything online and to put the
31 minutes out there before the Board approves them. The same one he sends every meeting.

32
33 Maynard: Although he did spot a couple of things that were in error on the webpage, right? Did
34 those get corrected?

35
36 Jones: Yeah, they did.

37
38 Chair: Ok, 9 e, email string between a surveyor applicant and staff. That's related to as
39 discussion about supervisor verifying work experience.

40
41 Hale: Well it seems like it's pretty clear, is it not? The work needs to be under a licensed land
42 surveyor.

43
44 Kerr: Or someone that demonstrates that they're qualified to do those activities.

45
46 Jones: So, would one of you guys like to draft a response to him?

47
48 Hale: Sure.

49
50 Jones: Send it to me and I'll put it on letterhead for the Chair.

51

1 Chair: And 9 f, email from James Armstrong regarding CE. So he's appealing his uh.....
2
3 Jones: Well he had asked if, he'd been assigned a task by his supervisor to do some research
4 and he was asking if that would be ok for CE credits. And I told him that well since it was
5 assigned by your supervisor it's probably part of your job so, no and I asked Brian and Brian
6 said no. Now he's appealing that decision.
7
8 Maynard: I don't have a problem with that because typically if I do some research that's part of
9 my project while I'm sitting at my desk and I don't get any CEU's for it either I feel like I'm
10 educating myself but I don't expect to get any CEU's for it.
11
12 Jones: And part of this is that he makes presentations to the people that this stuff involves.
13
14 Maynard: The rest of their staff and the people that have to deal with them?
15
16 Jones: Yeah.
17
18 Maynard: Like professors they don't get credit for writing papers because it's part of their job.
19
20 Hale: Right and the PDH's have to come outside of that.
21
22 Schedler: (reads from the email) "Applicants are being paid to attend events or write a paper". I
23 suppose if you're on a committee for a National Organization and you're being paid by your
24 employer while you're there and get educational credits for that but it's not part of your job.
25
26 Maynard: Nowhere that I've worked when we've done articles for CE Magazine or one of the
27 others, has that been on company time, its outside.
28
29 Schedler: Right but attending committee meetings....
30
31 Chair: But even if it was on company time you're doing it for an outside entity that's different
32 than just in house expression.
33
34 Schedler: Right. Didn't we have this before where we looked at the list of attendees and they
35 were all in-house?
36
37 Chair: Now as an attendee in-house they could get credit if they had somebody come in and
38 even if it was an in-house employee that was doing a presentation I know we give credit for that.
39
40 Jones: One time, one presentation.
41
42 Chair: One presentation, yeah not, if they're going to the same one every week that doesn't
43 count and some companies do have project management type education. Sometimes they're
44 bringing somebody from outside sometimes they're big enough that they actually have their own
45 in-house person that does those presentations but they should be structured and organized, not
46 just somebody up there rambling on.
47
48 Jones: This is what I'll tell him. The Board doesn't preapprove courses or providers, however,
49 submit it and the board will take a look at it but I would advise you not to base your entire CE
50 requirement on that item because you may only get partial credit if any.
51

1 Chair: I think that's a fair way to reply.
2
3 Schedler: But isn't he appealing a decision that's already been made?
4
5 Maynard: I think he asked the question and was told no he couldn't do it and is appealing that,
6 he didn't like the answer.
7
8 Jones: Yeah he didn't like the answer.
9
10 Maynard: He hasn't been audited has he?
11
12 Jones: No.
13
14 Chair: Ok Vern is going to reply to that.
15
16 **Agenda item 10 – Correspondence Sent Since November 2014**
17
18 Chair: Item 10 is correspondence sent since November 2014. 10 a, is a letter from the Chair to
19 Mr. JEON, I don't know how to pronounce that last name.
20
21 Jones: He's the Korean Counsel General.
22
23 Chair: Yeah, and that was just me responding back saying we don't currently have any
24 reciprocity with any other jurisdictions.
25
26 Maynard: I'm pretty sure there is no a in Dimond Blvd.
27
28 Jones: This one was a request to know about the conflict of interest and I thought I had
29 responded earlier but I couldn't find any proof of it so I went ahead and did it again. It's a
30 response to a question he had asked back in November.
31
32 Chair: We had talked about this one at the last meeting I think.
33
34 **Agenda item 11 – Old Business**
35
36 Chair: Ok item 11 old business, use of Logo's. That was John, we were going to call for that,
37 you want to skip that now and come to it after we....
38
39 Jones: Yeah, he wants to be in on that one.
40
41 Chair: Let's see, so we can jump down to....
42
43 Maynard: Lunch? (laughter)
44
45 Chair: Nope john wants to be in on 17 as well. So we go 18....
46
47 Jones: He wants to be involved in that one too.
48
49 Chair: We could go ahead and do 17 b and do our elections. We don't have Erick or Brian here
50 but I think we can still do our elections; I don't those guys.....
51

1 Jones: You can dump everything on them then. (laughter)
2
3 Maynard: Been there, done that.
4
5 Chair: So we have the Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary so I will open the floor for nominations.
6
7 Hale: I would be willing to do the Secretary nobody had objections to it.
8
9 Chair: So, Dave is going to nominate himself.
10
11 Schedler: I was just going to say can you run again?
12
13 Kerr: I will nominate Dave Hale for Secretary.
14
15 Chair: I don't think there's anything in our Bylaws that says you can't run again, typically....
16
17 Maynard: I'll nominate Kathleen as Secretary.
18
19 Jones: Alright we get to have a real election this time. (laughter)
20
21 Chair: Kathleen are you sure you don't want to run for Vice Chair?
22
23 Schedler: I'm sure. Well, what does Vice Chair have to do, then you become chair...
24
25 Chair: You don't have to.
26
27 Maynard: Your term might run out before then.
28
29 Chair: I actually was Vice Chair for two years before I was Chair.
30
31 Schedler: What's vice do?
32
33 Maynard: Run the meetings if the Chair doesn't show up.
34
35 Chair: Ok, so we have the Chair position and the Vice Chair. I would nominate Colin for Chair if
36 he's willing to.
37
38 Maynard: I agree to do it of course I might not be here the last three months of my term if I don't
39 get reappointed then the vice Chair can take over. But you might not be here either because
40 your term ends the same time mine does.
41
42 Chair: So we still have no nomination for vice Chair.
43
44 Schedler: I nominate Keith.
45
46 Chair: Did you hear that Keith?
47
48 Schedler: Keith, I nominate you.
49
50 Walters: That'd be fine.
51

1 Maynard: John are you interested in vice Chair?
2
3 Kerr: I'd vote for Keith.
4
5 The Chair asks Luann if she wanted to nominate someone and she responds no, she didn't
6 know if she could.
7
8 Chair: Any other nominations?
9
10 Maynard: you just can't vote for them.
11
12 Chair: Ok, we will close the nominations and go to the election. We have nominee for Chair,
13 Colin, nominee for vice Chair, Keith and nominees for Secretary Dave and Kathleen. So.....
14
15 Jones: Everybody grab a pad and we'll so a silent vote. Put your vote on it, fold it and bring it
16 up here.
17
18 Kathleen: Do we list all three?
19
20 Maynard: No just write Kathleen or Dave.
21
22 Chair: It's just for the Secretary, the other two we'll....
23
24 Urfer: I'm the banned one.
25
26 Maynard: What instrument do you play?
27
28 Urfer: I'm going to make a statement about that today
29
30 Jones: Is that all of them? Eight? Yeah that's right, eight. Ok....
31
32 Maynard: Well, now that Stoltz doesn't have a Chair we might be able to get it through.
33
34 Chair: Whoever voted yes has to change that to a person. (laughter) either Dave or Kathleen.
35
36 Maynard: Was it a tie?
37
38 Chair: No just Dave or Kathleen, one or the other for Secretary.
39
40 Chair: Let's hope we don't have to do a run-off. We've got to do a run-off?
41
42 Jones: Yep
43
44 Chair: Four to four.
45
46 Hale: I'd be happy for Kathleen to do it again I guess.
47
48 Maynard: Actually he voted for Kathleen.
49
50 Hale: I did vote for Kathleen, (laughter) I didn't know you wanted to do it again.
51

1 Jones: Congratulations, speech.
2
3 Chair: So with the other two positions they are just automatically....
4
5 Jones: Yeah, so who's it going to be now? It's going to be....
6
7 Chair: The Chair is going to be Colin, vice Chair will be Keith and the Secretary will be
8 Kathleen.
9
10 Chair: Ok, the Governor's budget, we added 17 c that Colin wanted to talk about.
11
12 Maynard: I looked at the Governor's budget this morning, it took me a while to find the actual
13 Division's budget and they cut it by, like a half of percent or something like that. That's \$80K I
14 don't know if that's just because they're getting more efficient or what but it's not the 25 to 100
15 percent that some of the other Divisions and programs were. I don't think we need to get too
16 upset but we probably need to watch it and make sure the Legislature doesn't start axing stuff.
17
18 Jones: What did they cut, was it just one position that's not filled or something?
19
20 Maynard: That could be something like that. Instead of two million five hundred and forty it's
21 two million two hundred and eighty or something like that. So it's a sixty thousand dollar
22 difference so it's probably one position that's not filled yet.
23
24 Jones: All of our travel funds.
25
26 Maynard: Or all of our travel funds, yeah. If that's the case then we go to the Legislature and
27 get it put back in. It's definitely worth looking at and finding out the details.
28
29 Chair: Good Colin, so we'll go to special committees.
30
31 **Agenda item 18 - Special Committees**
32
33 Chair: So Licensure Implementation. Colin you chair that one.
34
35 Maynard: Yeah and the only thing we have is items 6 a. and b.
36
37 Chair: Ok, Registration and Practice, I'm the chair of that. I so have one item that we'll be
38 talking about under old business I guess. The use of Logo's on plans.
39
40 Licensure Mobility. I don't have anything new to report on that, I don't know if anybody else has
41 heard anything from their respective organizations about that.
42
43 Jones: Colin Smith stopped by to see us earlier when the session first started. He's the guy
44 from BC. And it was the usual, well the uh you know you're talking apples and oranges our
45 exam is so much different than yours etc. and they're not going to waive it. He talked to Eric to
46 but I don't know what they discussed. He just stopped by mostly to say hi and offer his same
47 argument.
48
49 Maynard: A stone wall.
50
51 Urfer: Can in interject a little bit on that too? CLARB has been talking to a couple of the, I

1 guess I would say the Asian countries. Everything seems to be based on a current exam that is
2 administered through CLARB itself and it's the same one that Canada uses so it's almost like
3 they set the standard and everybody is trying to comply with that. It's kind of interesting how
4 that.....

5

6 Chair: So the International is trying to get CLARB.....

7

8 Urfer: Right, they're trying to match us so they can get reciprocity that way.

9

10 Maynard: They're a number of other countries that NCEES offers the test; some of them are
11 suspended though

12

13 Jones: Quite a few, there's about seven I think.

14

15 Maynard: Suspended while the government is in an uproar. Egypt is one of the Middle Eastern
16 countries that....

17

18 Jones: Yeah they're suspended because of security.

19

20 Maynard: Yeah they don't want to send anybody over there, they might not come back.

21

22 Chair: Ok, Social Networking, Dave?

23

24 Hale: I've done nothing with that.

25

26 Koonce: Shall we strike it?

27

28 Chair: I think we left it on there last time just because there may be something in the future.
29 But it's really highly dependent on what the State decides to allow or decides to do. So it's not
30 going to be a real active committee. We wouldn't necessarily even have to keep that, it is a
31 special committee so if we're not going to do anything we can just drop it.

32

33 Maynard: Well can't we have Dave just create a Facebook page and you be the moderator for it
34 and not get the state system (laughter) then when he's off the board he just turns it over to the
35 next person.

36

37 Chair: Not a bit, not our board

38

39 Hale: I think it's something that Vern's keeping an eye on it so if there's any movement he
40 would be the first to know.

41

42 Chair: So you think we should just go ahead and strike that committee and if there's
43 movement....

44

45 Hale: And I think as soon as Vern hears something we can create the committee again.

46

47 Chair: Ok, everybody good with that? Ok, so we'll strike that committee.

48

49 And we have our standing committees. Investigative Advisory Committee is really the whole
50 Board at large. I know that John contacts Brian a lot. I haven't heard much from him this last
51 quarter. Guidance Manual.

1
2 Urfer: I've made zero headway. I haven't had any time to work on it. But it is something,
3 obvious, from the comment by the folks from DOT, we need to look at and make sure that
4 references actually exist or references to sections actually exist. So I suppose I should probably
5 move forward more quickly than I am.
6
7 Chair: Yeah, you know that's a problem I, uh, the biggest problem with the Guidance Manual is
8 that we have inaccurate information in there so it does need that kind of constant updating. So
9 yeah, as you get time and that relates to the Board at large, you know any help we can give in
10 that regard, we should and just send your comments to Luanne and she can incorporate them
11 into her master.
12
13 Urfer: Asks Hale to resent some information he provided for the Guidance Manual.
14
15 Chair: So Dave did have some comments that he sent you? Ok
16
17 Legislative Liaison, Eric's not here....
18
19 Jones: Can I say something about the Guidance Manual? If something's in there that's just a
20 Board policy, it should be very clear that it's just a policy and anything else should reference the
21 regulation that it applies to.
22
23 Maynard: Or if it's in Statute it should specify down to the last letter, where instead of just
24 08.48.
25
26 Chair: Yeah, I agree.
27
28 Maynard: I suppose for Legislative Liaison we don't have any bills over there. So the only thing
29 we'd be looking for is watching finance unless we want to tackle making Luanne permanent.
30
31 Jones: Yeah, I was going to say I got a call from Bert the other day and that was his question.
32 Has there been any discussion on that and I'm thinking that when we don't have anything else
33 in front of them might be a good time to put that out there that way we're not jeopardizing
34 anything else if there's a lot of push back.
35
36 Maynard: And quite frankly APDC does not have a whole lot of items on their agenda so they
37 can help us with that.
38
39 Chair: Ok, Emeritus Status.....
40
41 Maynard: We need to find out if everybody wants to do that first.
42
43 Chair: Do what?
44
45 Maynard: We want to find if it's a consensus of the Board that they want to do that. Some of us
46 might not want to.
47
48 Jones: Yeah, there should probably a motion to start a Statute change.
49
50 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Schedler and unanimously passed it**
51 **was RESOLVED to go to the Legislature to make the Landscape Architect position a**

1 **permanent voting position.**
2
3 Urfer: Good I can say my little spiel.
4
5 Schedler: Does anyone know the history of why it was non-voting?
6
7 Chair: Vern probably does.
8
9 Jones: There was uh, it's been put through at once or twice to make it a permanent voting seat
10 but one of the Representatives or somebody, a Senator, one of them stopped it. He was
11 evidently a committee head, Bert knows who it was, somebody from Anchorage I think.
12
13 Maynard: Yeah, I worked with Duane Adams when we got all this landscape architect actually
14 licensed. And at that time they didn't know how many landscape architects there would be and
15 whether they would deserve a full seat. Since they didn't have any they decided to make it
16 temporary non-voting at that point. We've approached the Legislature at least twice since and
17 at that point the Legislator that it was referred to was head of either finance or rules and he
18 doesn't like landscape architects for some reason so he stopped it. He is now no longer in the
19 House he's in the Senate and I don't know if he chairs a committee that would see this bill so
20 hopefully we can get it through.
21
22 Urfer: First of all I'd like to say I really appreciate this. It's been what 15 years at least, that
23 we've been registered in the State and like every other discipline it's become more complex.
24 And I think it's really hard for a lot of landscape architects to pay into, basically, a board that
25 they have no representation on to be able to actually make a decision, not that we're a deciding
26 factor but I think it's one of those things where it's an awful lot of money being spent without any
27 way to say we really object. Thank you.
28
29 Kerr: What is required to make a change to the name of the Board?
30
31 Urfer: Vern isn't there, we had a proposal at one time and someone made a comment one time
32 and someone said in AELS that the L goes to land surveyor and the S to landscape architects.
33 (laughter)
34
35 Jones: Well we, they're working on a new program and we're going to change to two letter
36 designations. The old program would only accept one letter so we've got a bunch of oddball
37 letters representing different branches of engineering.....
38
39 Hale: It should say Alaska Executive Land Surveyor. (laughter)
40
41 Jones: So, in the new system it'll be LA. Then everybody will think you're from Southern
42 California.
43
44 Urfer: Oh, they already do.
45
46 Chair: Well I think the change makes sense and why it was done as a non-voting seat I don't
47 quite understand it certainly makes sense that.....
48
49 Maynard: And it doesn't make any difference in our budget. Non-voting, we're paying for you
50 anyway so there's no fiscal note attached to it.
51

1 Chair: Ok, any other comments? Do we need to re-read that?
2
3 Jones: We have a motion by Colin, seconded by Kathleen. Move to go to the Legislature to
4 make the landscape architect position a permanent voting position.
5
6 Chair: And do we need to do that by individual vote?
7
8 Jones: Not necessarily.
9
10 Chair: Ok, all those in favor say aye, all those opposed, abstentions. It passes.
11
12 Jones: Who's going to coordinate with APDC?
13
14 Maynard: I will.
15
16 Chair: Ok, Budget Committee Jeff anything to report?
17
18 Koonce: Nothing to report other than I ran into Sara Chambers last night in the elevator and
19 she said that the budget doesn't appear to be damaging.
20
21 Chair: Continuing Education, that's Brian and I don't know that he really has anything.
22
23 Jones: That change that's pending public notice is all.
24
25 Chair: Anybody else have anything on continuing education?
26
27 Maynard: The continuing education change may have gotten lost in the structural engineering
28 language. There were only two people who commented on it.
29
30 Jones: It went out to everybody.
31
32 Maynard: Yeah I know but that doesn't mean they read it, they probably noticed the structural
33 engineering and tossed it.
34
35 Jones: We always get a lot of them back as undeliverable.
36
37 Chair: IDP Liaison. That's me and I really don't have too much to report. I did mention
38 yesterday that NCARB is looking at a reduction in the IDP hours and basically getting rid of the
39 elective hours and going with the core hours and I'll keep you posted on that after our March
40 meeting with NCARB.
41
42 **Agenda item 19 – Board Travel**
43
44 Chair: So, 19 is Board travel and so that NCARB coming up March 13th and 14th is a Regional
45 meeting not the National and Vern and I are both planning to attend and Jeff you can't make
46 that one right?
47
48 Koonce: Right.
49
50 Chair: NCEES Western Zone, Scottsdale May 14th through 16th do we know who wants to
51 attend that yet?

1
2 Schedler: I'd like to go, I haven't been to any.
3
4 Jones: Yeah, I put a thing out, I got a response from Brian, Colin and Dave and John Kerr and
5 Kathleen also.
6
7 Maynard: Brian will get paid by the Region won't he?
8
9 Jones: Right, Brian is, he's an officer so they will fund him.
10
11 Maynard: And I need to give UPLG Committee report so that's why I'd like to go. I will be going
12 no matter if the State is paying or not.
13
14 John: Yours won't be funded since you're.....
15
16 Maynard: Not for a committee, no they send you to the committee meetings. I think the Chair
17 might get funded but if I don't go one of the other committee members that have to attend will
18 give the report, I volunteered.
19
20 Jones: Ok, I'll get the travel request in next week sometime hopefully.
21
22 Schedler: So who's on the list to go? Brian, Colin.....
23
24 Jones: Brian, but Brian is funded as an officer and we have two funded delegates' slots. So,
25 we've got Colin, Dave, John and you.
26
27 Schedler: So one person can't go?
28
29 Jones: Well it depends, the State may fund some.
30
31 Maynard: Yeah, the funded slots are NCEES is paying the State back for it. So the State would
32 only be paying for two.
33
34 Schedler: Ok, I see.
35
36 Chair: And Vern are you going to that one?
37
38 Jones: I don't know, I might.
39
40 Chair: Then we've got the NCARB Annual meeting June 17th through the 20th and I'd like to go
41 to that.
42
43 Koonce: I'd like to go to that also.
44
45 Chair: And Vern are you going to try to go to that one also?
46
47 Koonce: Do they make assignments of committees?
48
49 Chair: Well you've got your application in right now, uh, yes, yes they do.
50
51 Koonce: So I'll have a committee assignment prior to that....

1
2 Chair: Usually its right at the first of June is when they send out the notices of these
3 assignments if I remember. You usually won't meet with your committee at the Annual it'll be
4 sometime after that, August, sometimes October it depends on the committee.
5
6 D is NCEES Annual Williamsburg, VA August 19th through the 22nd. Colin, who else would like
7 to go?
8
9 Kerr: I'd like to go, Dave?
10
11 Jones: Who else? Dave, John, that's it?
12
13 Chair: I don't know about Brian.
14
15 Maynard: And again he'll be funded.
16
17 Chair: Eric, I don't know if he will want to go sometimes he has some conflicts.
18
19 Jones: Then the CLARB Annual in September.
20
21 Urfer: yep.
22
23 Jones: I'll try to go to that one too. I haven't been to a CLARB meeting for about 2 ½ years now
24 so...
25
26 Urfer: Yeah and we have a good location.
27
28 Chair: Where is it?
29
30 Jones: New Orleans.
31
32 Maynard: Yeah the weather will probably be better in September than in June.
33
34 Jones: Why, what happens in June?
35
36 Maynard: Hot and muggy.
37
38 **Agenda item 20 – National Meeting Reports.**
39
40 Chair: So we're on item 20 National Meeting Reports.
41
42 Kerr: On Board Travel I'll also be traveling to the NCEES Surveying Task Force Meeting at the
43 end of February.
44
45 Jones: They fund that right?
46
47 Kerr: Yeah, they fund that.
48
49 Schedler: Can we talk about the NCEES Annual meeting in August?
50
51 Jones: Did you want to be on the list for that one too?

1
2 Schedler: I would like to but August seems a long way off for planning.....
3
4 Chair: Vern can put in the request and that doesn't necessarily mean you have to go to it.
5
6 Schedler: Let me know when you get approval and I'll look at it.
7
8 Christensen: Put me down on the CLARB meeting.
9
10 Chair: We're on 20 which is the National Meeting Reports and a. is the Western Zone.
11
12 Maynard: Which we reported on at the August meeting and then we went to the National
13 Meeting in August which we reported on at the November meeting. We haven't gone to any
14 meetings between November and now.
15
16 Chair: And the CLARB?
17
18 Urfer: Same thing.
19
20 Chair: You reported last time? Ok, and I went to the CLARB Board Chair meeting and that was
21 right before our last meeting and I think I did discuss that.
22
23 Maynard: And Brian's at the NCEES Presidents meeting right now.
24
25 Jones: Is that where he's at?
26
27 Chair: I think that's where he's at and....
28
29 Maynard: He tried to get me to go.
30
31 Chair: Just thinking back on the Board Chair meeting again some of those same things that I
32 did talk about at length last meeting, the BEA, BFEA, IDP changes were talked about quite a bit
33 at that Board Chairs meeting and they're still evolving. They haven't come up with the final
34 language that they're going to propose to the membership yet so after the meeting in Long
35 Beach in March we'll probably have a pretty good look at what they're going to propose in June.
36 So after that meeting I'll go ahead and report again on it rather than keep you posted with the
37 various language that they come up with.
38
39 Maynard: Is it close enough to 10 to call John?
40
41 Jones: If you want to do John before the other one.
42
43 Chair: Yes
44
45 Jones: I'll call him and tell him to go to the fish bowl.
46
47 Chair: I think what we'll jump to next is item 11 a.
48 **Agenda item 11 – Old Business**
49
50 Maynard: I think 17 we can probably just mention and not really discuss that much because
51 they've got to actually approach us with something. They're still working their way through that.

1
2 Chair: It was put in here, actually 18 is the handout of the proposed regulation under committee
3 of registration and practice. But it really is agenda item 11 a. but in your packets it's 18.

4
5 Note: Called John Savage for teleconference on 11 a.

6
7 Chair: Hello John we're going to start out with what was called old business 11, use of logos on
8 plans. Did you get a copy of that draft regulation language?

9
10 Savage: I may have, I don't have it handy here with me.

11
12 Chair: I'll read it. The reason that this regulation project was initiated was because of problems
13 that John has had trying to identify the responsible parties on the plans, how to locate them,
14 their address, what the company name is, those sorts of things. So this regulation project was
15 started to assist in investigations and properly, individuals properly identifying them and their
16 company on their documents. At first we had talked about logos, company names and we
17 talked about drawings. The way I approached it was just to say that all documents that are
18 required to be signed and sealed. So I'll go ahead and read this right now. It's a proposed
19 change to 12 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals and is amended by adding new subsections h to i to
20 read,

21
22 (h) The registrant shall include on all documents that are required to be signed and sealed its
23 (1) business name, physical address and phone number; (2) project name or identification; (3)
24 project address/location; and (4) certificate of authorization number issued to the corporation,
25 limited liability company, or limited liability partnership to practice architecture, engineering, land
26 surveying, or landscape architecture, if applicable.

27
28 And (i) On documents where multiple entities that are authorized to practice architecture,
29 engineering, land surveying, or landscape architecture are indicated, the registrant shall clearly
30 identify the sole proprietor, partnership, corporation, limited liability company, or limited liability
31 partnership, or other authorized entity responsible for the work.

32
33 What my intent was was to make it clear when you have multiple registrants' firm names on a
34 document who that registrant is actually working for. So when he puts his stamp on you might
35 have two companies that provide the same type of engineering and one is prime and one is a
36 sub-consultant but only the sub-consultant is doing the work on that particular drawing or that
37 document so I would want them to identify which company that stamp was associated with and
38 then also in cases where you have a, uh, oh say like a shop drawing or a pre-engineered metal
39 building manufacturer submitting documents, structural engineering documents and there's a
40 stamp on that and a company name on it, it's not very clear if that person is working for that
41 company as an employee or if their working as their own company as a consultant to them
42 because they very rarely put a company name on there. It's just the company that's doing the
43 actual construction work of the building. So I think this would add clarity. Colin and I went back
44 and forth on some language and he took exception to some of the things I had in here so I
45 tweaked it a little bit and decided to go ahead and throw it out there and see what everybody
46 thought. I welcome comments on it and welcome the discussion. One thing, when I was
47 looking at this there was about 5 states that had similar language but didn't go quite as far as
48 we did but I think that's because those states also, some of those states also have laws that
49 require them to have the name of the discipline in their company name. So it had to be X
50 architects it couldn't be just X company that does architecture. One state had an example of
51 what their intent was on the title block situation and I didn't want to use the word title block I

1 didn't want to put it directly to drawings because I wanted to leave flexibility for the type of
2 document and how people end up arranging things on their drawings. But typically like on this
3 particular one they had the name of the architect and then down below it they had the
4 authorization number, so their corporate number to practice architecture in that state and they
5 listed their consultants and their consultants had their authorization numbers as well. The only
6 problem is you really can't tell from this who the person works for, if they're working for the one
7 on top or one of the consultants. And I didn't want to be too prescriptive on it and say, you
8 know, it has to be one inch way, just leave it up to them to figure out how they are going to
9 identify themselves with the firm they are working for. So with that I welcome some comment.

10
11 Savage: I have one if no one else is raising their hand Richard.

12
13 Chair: No one is raising their hand, go ahead John.

14
15 Savage: Here recently, and a couple of you have worked with me on these, but here recently
16 and I'm just attesting to the validity of how bad we need this in place. We've had a couple
17 issues with a corporate authorization. I mean we've had companies coming in here that didn't
18 even have a business license or a corporate authorization, oh but you know our engineer had a
19 license or our architect or our land surveyor, whatever. But it was like peeling back the skins of
20 an onion and I mean literally it eats us so much of our resource time, I mean, you know, you call
21 this company and no I don't have any such employee and that and you try to find somebody that
22 knows what project you're talking about and then you get a lead to another company and nope
23 never heard of the guy and that and you go and you go and you go and finally you find the
24 individual who has this and he's a sole proprietor and it's expired and you come to find out he
25 had changed to a corporation or chanted from a corporation back to a sole proprietor, it's just
26 very, very frustrating and time consuming and this will help clearing it up. I never quite
27 understood why we had a specific call out on a site adaptation of design drawings where you
28 have to re-release them with your title block and I always kind of, at times I took that when it
29 says with your title block, that was kind of saying that the original one should have had the title
30 block of the individual who was originally sealing them. You know sometimes I didn't get much
31 yardage out of that but this is going to be great having that in there.

32
33 Chair: Is there anything about the particular language that you saw either as a problem or you'd
34 rather see different information requested?

35
36 Savage: No, I mean, for right now it certainly looks good Richard. I'll flip through here and take
37 a look at it again later today and send you an email if I see anything but a lot of times we don't
38 find those things out until we've got it on the street and then darn it, you know, guys are saying
39 but it says this, type of thing or whatever but I'll certainly take a look at it again.

40
41 Maynard: Some of the architects we work with will have a cover sheet where they will list all
42 their sub-consultants with addresses and contact people, I guess they could put the corporate
43 authorizations where that's appropriate on that, would that work rather than putting it on every
44 single sheet?

45
46 Savage: You know because of the way these things get split up and that on jobs sites or
47 someone makes a complaint and they're sending me the example, they're send me, you know,
48 five sheets from a project. That cover sheet, Colin, if that's who I'm talking to, that's usually,
49 you've seen them out on job sites, that's the first thing that's destroyed and gone. I've gone into
50 half of those, ripped in half or whatever when I'm in there doing a site visit and that, it seems
51 like, so me personally, I think, you know, just as a rule of thumb I think, on the sheet they're

1 sealing would be the best way so I don't have to make no assumptions of, ok all the landscape
2 architect stuff's going to be sealed by this gentleman when in fact they had another individual
3 that was sealing some of them. Does that make sense?
4

5 Chair: It does to me, I don't know if it makes sense to Colin or not.
6

7 Maynard: Yes, the one that usually has the building department stamp that says these are the
8 official drawings that they have to build too. So in my experience they hang on to that so they
9 know that that's the official one. But I don't have an argument that great.
10

11 Chair: Well in looking at this I thought about the burden it would put on the firm or individual to
12 do it and I really didn't see that it's really any different than the other information that we typically
13 already put, I mean we typically already put our business name and our business address on
14 there so it'd be one more little line under there that had their corporate authorization. The main
15 thing would be that then they would need to identify though that stamp is being associated with
16 whatever business so they might have to add something right next to the stamp that says the
17 name of their company.
18

19 Koonce: Could you just put the number inside the little square where you put your stamp along
20 with the date?
21

22 Chair: Yeah, you could do that. I didn't want to change the stamp itself, make any changes to
23 that and I didn't want to be too prescriptive by saying it needs to be an inch away or anything
24 like that because it could be you're the only consultant name on the document and in that case
25 it's clear. You've got your stamp on there, you've got your company name and somewhere on
26 there you've got your corporate authorization. Now on things like a, uh, another type of
27 document maybe a report. In that case that's dealt with a little bit differently in our regulations
28 and you could have your stamp on the cover or second page and have your company name in
29 there. You don't have to stamp every page of it. And that's why I didn't want to say drawings or
30 specs or anything like that just on all documents that are required to be signed and sealed. If
31 they're not required to be signed and sealed, you don't have to put it.
32

33 Kerr: This is kind of an out layer case but when we are doing drawings for a condemnation of
34 land they have to be on 8 ½ by 11 and they're really shoe horned in there and this would
35 consume a fair percentage of the available space on the page. It would be, in the one's we are
36 currently doing right now it would be very difficult for us to do this.
37

38 Chair: So you would really just have room for your stamp, is that what you're saying?
39

40 Kerr: Yeah, it's very, very, very tight.
41

42 Koonce: Could you just put the number right next to your stamp?
43

44 Chair: Well there's.....
45

46 Kerr: Well you've got to have the business name, physical address, phone number.
47

48 Koonce: Isn't that already on the document?
49

50 Kerr: Not on condemnation sheets, no.
51

1 Maynard: I guess what I would suggest in that situation would be similar to a report where your
2 letterhead starts with your name and all that stuff at the top of the first page. It's not repeated
3 on the next 23 pages the stamp is going to be next to the signature on the last page. It's one
4 document. You could have a cover sheet that has your name stamp the cover sheet and say
5 this applies to the sheets one through nine. You don't have to stamp every sheet.
6
7 Kerr: On those, they are going to the court, we do stamp every sheet. But that would work to
8 put this on the first page if that was acceptable. Now I.....
9
10 Chair: Well that's why I did want to leave a little bit of latitude about where that goes. As long
11 as you're clear about who's responsible for it.
12
13 Kerr: Well we can definitely do that, I mean they get so tight we break out a separate page,
14 there's a lot, all the notes are on one page. There's no room for even the basic notes on these.
15
16 Chair: So it's a, is the format a standard format that is required for legal purposes? Is that.....
17
18 Kerr: So I'm told. I would very much like to be on 8 ½ by 14 but the attorney are telling me 8 ½
19 by 11.
20
21 Hale: We use legal size. You can record legal or but hey specify what they want.
22
23 Kerr: For condemnation?
24
25 Hale: Yes, I don't know why you couldn't use legal.
26
27 Kerr: I don't know, I asked someone who worked with the court and he said all their files right
28 now at the court are 8 ½ by 11 so I don't know if they've done away with legal size paper.
29
30 Maynard: Do it 11 by 17.
31
32 Kerr: I like that idea; I'd love to have 11 by 17.
33
34 Hale: The problem is they go in with a lot of other legal documents that we're not maybe
35 generating in the exhibit.
36
37 Kerr: Yeah, but we can add a sheet that has all this information, I don't have a problem with
38 adding more sheets if we're stamping each page we couldn't put this on each page
39
40 Koonce: It would be nice to put it on the cover sheet because then you have a directory of
41 everybody that is involved with this project and the contact....
42
43
44 Chair: The thing with that is, you know, on the cover sheet of a set of drawings it still doesn't
45 identify just who is involved with the project. But just like this title block here that list all the
46 consultants it doesn't associate any of the stamps with any particular company.
47
48 Maynard: Well you can. A number of our clients say that architecture company A, address,
49 contact name and the person that's in responsible charge and they're the ones that stamped all
50 those drawings. Structural engineering BBFM Engineers, address, name, phone number, so
51 adding the C whatever for the corporate authorization where it applies would be no big deal and

1 then John could look at the cover sheet and it says ok the mechanical engineering which ever it
2 was, that's the company, that's the person. And that would, I think, solve the problem assuming
3 of course that he gets a cover page.
4

5 Savage: Just to be clear Colin as long as I see the name somewhere. Too many times the
6 bores of those drawings have, you know, XYZ Engineers and they're overseeing the project or
7 XYZ Architecture and the people sealing it have nothing to do with that company and it's taken
8 me a week to find out who they work for, what their company is, is it a sole proprietor, if so what
9 licensing do they have but if it's a corporation do they have the corporate authorization. And
10 that happens more times now days than I like to think.
11

12 Koonce: But if it was on the cover sheet John....
13

14 Savage: Yeah, if it's on the cover sheet, I'm not trying to be anal I'm just saying there are a lot
15 of times when I go to a project that they're pretty beat up or missing but we can work around
16 that. It's going to be a small percentage compared to what we're dealing with now.
17

18 Koonce: Well if it's not a big deal then to put it in the water mark or whatever. We could do
19 something like that maybe.
20

21 Chair: For the corporations and limited liability companies to add that authorization number
22 adjacent to the stamp to me is easy. We're not specifying a size, it could just be put right next
23 to it. But when you talk about sole proprietors or the other partnerships that aren't limited
24 liability partnerships it's a little bit different because they're not issued that corporate
25 authorization number. So then it's hard to just associate that stamp with a particular company.
26 I was just, you know, I see it all the time. I saw some little pre-engineered building, real small
27 kind of building a drawing with structural information on it and it had a stamp of a structural
28 engineer on it or it might have been a civil and it had the name of this company that builds these
29 things down in the states. So I don't know if that engineer is working as an employee for that
30 company or if he's a consultant for that company. In that case that should be represented.
31 Otherwise I'm going to say that the company needs to have corporate authorization because
32 they're offering engineering services under a corporation and not only that there's no
33 information other than the stamp that identifies how to get ahold of that person that stamped the
34 drawings.
35

36 Savage: That's exactly what I'm talking about. Telecommunication is huge with that, these
37 towers go up and you've got engineering you've got land surveying and these companies, you
38 know, Verizon, GCI and all their affiliates, they have nothing to do with this guy and that it's so
39 many layers down in the onion that it does, it virtually takes up a ton of man hours.
40

41 Koonce: So the number of the engineers stamp is not, you can't track that back?
42

43 Chair: You don't know who he's working for though. You could track it back to his address but
44 he might be working as an employee for somebody else. If you look at my stamp you're going
45 to see my home address not my company address. Unless you go to my companies corporate
46 authorization then you'll see my name.
47

48 Savage: And a lot of our licensing files don't even have phone numbers in them. So you're
49 starting a letter writing campaign on something that should be an open and shut, you know, we
50 either have a case or we don't. But it would be a lot more effective and cleaner, you know,
51 putting something like this in there.

1
2 Kerr: Would all of this be solved if the licensing files had current phone numbers for people?
3
4 Chair: No, it wouldn't.
5
6 Savage: No, not really because we're tracking the guy, I mean we can't even get current
7 addresses so I doubt we're going to be able to get current phone numbers on a 100% basis or
8 even a big percentage of it. People renew and they just assume that we've got all that, but no it
9 wouldn't be, there would still be a matter of contacting every one of them and finding out who
10 you working for and what company, you know this is actually my company but b. I was actually
11 working for this company when I sealed that. As opposed to just me getting on the database
12 checking it and driving on.
13
14 Maynard: I had problems with what you first came up with but I think what you have here now
15 allows us the flexibility to, if we consider the drawing set as a document and you put it on the
16 front page and list everybody whose responsible for which disciplines and then go and you find
17 an M4 with Joe Blow's stamp on it and you go, yeah, he's a mechanical and he works for so and
18 so and he's got this organization it resolves what John problem is. Now the problem of not
19 getting the cover sheet is a different one altogether but at least he knows what project he can
20 get this set from, whoever and then track it that way. So I think this works. It gives us the
21 flexibility to deal with putting a cover sheet on your stuff. Now, I do a lot of work for a steel
22 fabricator and right now my stamp goes on his drawing and it has just their manufacturers name
23 on it. Now then we'll, if this goes through then we'll add our logo on those sheets and that's not
24 a big deal although sometimes they don't give me enough room to get my stamp on it but.
25
26 Koonce: Well when we have renewals which are coming up and they put in their application
27 and pay their fees don't they have to update their information?
28
29 Chair: They do but having the information associated with your license is different than having
30 the information associated with your stamp on the documents that you're stamping. So say in
31 my case I work for a corporation. And we have a corporate authorization. So if I stamp a
32 drawing for company X then it's assumed that I'm working for company X. There's nothing that
33 says I can't moonlight and go stamp other stuff so if I put my stamp on another drawing how do
34 they know who I'm representing when I stamp it.
35
36 Koonce: I'm not talking about that I'm talking about current information in your files when you
37 update your license.
38
39 Chair: Yeah, that is required that they have current information.
40
41 Koonce: And you would not be able to renew your license unless you had.....
42
43 Chair: Well you have to certify that it is accurate information that you're providing the State.
44 You're going to be renewed either way because Vern's not going to check every single address
45 and phone number to make sure it's current when they renew licenses. It's the responsibility of
46 the registrant to provide that current information.
47
48 Luanne: What if people don't update in between? In a two year span you could.....
49
50 Chair: Not typically but you could have, you know, changed jobs three times in that period
51 working for different companies and for John to try to track them down it would at least be nice if

1 he could see the company they're working at when they signed those documents.
2
3 Luanne: I'd like to make one suggestion. It seems like the ones we have the most trouble with
4 is somebody that's a sole proprietor if therefore they don't have a business number. Maybe we
5 just need a distinction for those people to put on theirs along with their stamp that just says
6 they're a sole proprietor.
7
8 Chair: Well it's not just that really and I should have brought an example. So in the case that
9 Colin just said where he's, fabrication company is having him stamp shop drawings.....
10
11 Maynard: Actually I don't stamp shop drawings I stamp the erection drawings...
12
13 Chair: Ok, but say it was a shop drawing and you were doing the calculations for it and
14 stamping it. So I see that and I see Colin's stamp on it and I see Fabrication Company is the
15 company. So is Fabrication Company actually doing structural engineering work or are they
16 hiring a consultant and having the consultant stamping it? It's very unclear and John you can
17 probably speak to this where you tried to track down registrants that have stamped drawings
18 from outside manufacturers etc. on shop drawings.
19
20 Savage: Yeah, it's huge its very time consuming and I don't know that we want somebody just
21 being able to write on there that they're a sole proprietor. I want what's your business name,
22 what name are you doing business in the State of Alaska under and we start running it from
23 there. We start at the business license level, check that, you know, and if it's a business license
24 and they're listed as a corporate business then that changes which a lot of times it does and,
25 oh, I didn't realize we had incorporated and that, well whatever. But yeah it, to have the
26 business name on there and the contact information would be huge it truly would.
27
28 Maynard: I figured we might as well get moving on this so.
29
30 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
31 **RESOLVED to forward the regulation project for 12 AAC 36.185 Seals regarding**
32 **information to be included on documents.**
33
34 Chair: Any additional discussion on this? All those in favor, all those opposed abstentions? So
35 the motion passes and it can do to Jun?
36
37 Jones: To Jun. This is from our mail out regarding our fee increase back in 2011. These are
38 the ones that came back (Jones holds up a box containing approximately 115 letters that were
39 returned undeliverable.) and this happens every time we do a mail out.
40
41 Schedler: Why do we have to mail them out?
42
43 Jones: And a lot of these, well just about all of them are active licenses.
44
45 Schedler: Why do we have to mail these, I mean I just look at this and its four pages of paper
46 and stamps and.....
47
48 Jones: Because people don't read newspapers anymore and if we don't they say well I didn't
49 know, and we still get a lot of people that say, when did this happen?
50
51 Koonce: So all those people don't have accurate addresses.

1
2 Schedler: So now they don't know anyway. Why can't it be done by email, why can't it be done
3 by a notice on our website and advertised in the newspaper?
4
5 Jones: We did. The one for structural engineers, we put it on our webpage, we put it in the
6 Anchorage paper, we put it on the State of Alaska notices page and we mailed a copy to
7 everybody that has a license.
8
9 Maynard: And you emailed it to everybody that is on the listserv?
10
11 Jones: Yeah, we emailed to everybody on listserv.
12
13 Chair: Well while we have John on the line I want to cover 17 a. which is the letter from ACEC
14 regarding professional knowledge and direct supervisory control.
15
16 Maynard: Can I jump in here? Yeah this is the letter to APDC. APDC has not actually formed
17 their official position yet unless they did it yesterday at their meeting at noon. So I would say it's
18 for information at this point but they're going to probably send us something similar saying just
19 that if we have an office in Palmer we want to be able to manage it from Anchorage without
20 having a PE in that office.
21
22 Chair: And we've talked a little bit about this in the past, you know, with the change in
23 technology and how, not just the change in technology but multiple offices at different locations
24 that there still is the ability to have direct supervisory control and not be in the same physical
25 office. I think this is a topic that we are going to have to address. I don't think we need to take
26 action on this but they bring us some very relevant points.
27
28 Kerr: This was brought to my attention in that the thing that was of interest to me is the lines
29 that says based on recent experience two our member firms, the Licensing Board has
30 interpreted "direct professional knowledge or direct supervisory control" to that an engineer in
31 responsible charge must be collocated in the same physical location or office as the subordinate
32 staff working on the project. I don't know, has the Licensing Board made that interpretation. Is
33 that a factual statement?
34
35 Jones: This came up before and it was determined that an individual had to spend at least 50%
36 of his time in that office.
37
38 Savage: And this is usually coming up as a topic from complaints of your fellow licensees that
39 they're doing a, they use this as an example but they're doing a project on ALESKA Pipeline
40 and another companies responsible charge has been in Canada and hasn't been out of Canada
41 in 20 years and never seen the pipe line. They have a problem with that. Our other Boards we
42 have, I tried to dig up the language today and I couldn't find it but when I do I'll send it to Vern.
43 But some of the other Boards like the Mechanical Administrators and the Electrical
44 Administrators, for their personal supervision before walls are closed up, concrete poured,
45 things like that. That has to be in person when they're overseeing sites like that. Just to throw
46 that in there in case that lends credence one way or the other they can't do it via SKYPE,
47 FaceTime, pictures, you know, email, anything like that.
48
49 Kerr: So that statement they are making here is correct?
50
51 Maynard: I think we were asked a question by somebody that well we have an office in Homer

1 but the engineer quit, can we still have that office there even though the only engineers we have
2 are in our Anchorage head office and we said that, well you have to have an engineer there at
3 least half the time. And that was a couple years ago.

4
5 Hale: This isn't for a temporary office is it?

6
7 Maynard: No this is for a permanent office and it's not for somebody who works from home, you
8 know they're on maternity leave or ill or whatever, you know it's not a permanent office.

9
10 Chair: I guess a kind of comment on this, as far as interns basically learning about engineering,
11 architecture, landscape, whatever it is there is a lot of value there to be in the same office and to
12 gain a lot of knowledge from people by just being right there in the same office but I also feel
13 that you can be in responsible control and can monitor a project remotely if there's an updated
14 exchange going on. I just don't think the person, the non-registrant is really going to glean all
15 the education they could from their mentors, supervisors.

16
17 Kerr: There was other language I don't see it right here where they were saying that the Board
18 was using this to prevent the use of experts outside the State.

19
20 Chair: I've never heard anything like that, ever. I don't even recall any sort of discussion
21 around that.

22
23 Kerr: Yeah, that seems implausible and counter to the mission of the Board and I had a hard
24 time, I asked for additional information and nothing was forthcoming.

25
26 Chair: Yeah people fabricate statements like that all the time that have no merit or basis. It's
27 just something they say or think and, uh, that's just not true.

28
29 Maynard: I guess my gut reaction to this at the start was that I think it is of value to have other
30 professionals in that office and I go back to the mentoring program that we allow. We don't
31 allow somebody to do engineering in an office that doesn't have any engineers. They may have
32 engineers that are not mechanical and they're mechanical so they're mentor is, you know a
33 hundred miles away but there is a civil engineer or somebody who is a licensed professional
34 who can help them along. They're not just out there doing work by themselves. And I have a
35 hard time buying that you can actually monitor somebody from afar unless you are there on a
36 regular basis. Because otherwise why couldn't somebody just have one office in Anchorage
37 and have offices in 50 different communities with drafters doing all the engineering and sending
38 him stuff and he just looks at it and stamp's it. It's no different than getting a project from
39 Verizon or McDonalds that's already been designed by somebody outside you just look it over
40 and stamp it and ship it off, we don't allow that either. You have to take ownership, be in
41 responsible charge. I don't think you're in responsible charge if you're hundreds of miles away
42 and basically just see the final documents.

43
44 Kerr: I like the general guideline of an individual 50% of the time in the office for the folks
45 they're supervising but I also like the ambiguity in the language where if somebody did have the
46 technology, did have the methodology, you know, maybe they have a full time FaceTime
47 situation or one of those robots that goes around the office with a monitor on it. There are
48 technologies that allow the conscientious person to have direct professional knowledge and
49 direct supervisory control from a remote location. And I think that if, I think we should leave it
50 open to if a person can demonstrate that they have that, I wouldn't want to close the door on
51 that possibility but by default I think that the burden of demonstrating it should be on the person

1 who may not have the control that they think they do.
2
3 Koonce: On projects where you use riverbed and it's a streaming program that allows you have
4 one model and three or four different offices are all using that model at the same time. So
5 there's different components that work off of that but you could do that and have real time
6 documents that you're working on with others. I wouldn't want to have one of my offices in the
7 valley or whatever and not have either my partner or myself there running it. It seems kind of
8 remiss to have another office there and not have someone in responsible charge.
9
10 Chair: In the end the person that's in responsible charge is taking ownership of whatever they
11 stamp that they know what's going into it, it was at their direction, you know, the complexity of it
12 may require them to be interacting more frequently than they would on a simple project, you
13 know, there's projects in the office that I've got somebody drafting in another room. That
14 doesn't mean that I need to touch base with them even on a daily basis if I'm following the
15 project I know what I'm expecting them to do and I'm periodically reviewing that to make sure
16 it's what I intended. Is there any more discussion on this? So I think on this unless somebody
17 thinks otherwise we can just follow it right now. I think probably at some point we'll want to do a
18 regulation project to clarify and just have a little bit more consistency on what these firms can
19 do.
20
21 Ok was there anything else that John wanted to be onboard with? John was there anything else
22 that we were going to cover that you wanted to be online with us.
23
24 Savage: No, I think those were the two items.
25
26 Chair: Ok, well thanks for your input, we appreciate it.
27
28 Savage: Thanks for having me and you guys all have safe travels back home and good luck on
29 the rest of the meeting.
30
31 Chair: I think what we will do now is. Do you want to take a quick break before we launch into
32 this? So why don't we take a 10 minute break and then when we come back we will get on the
33 6 a.
34
35 Jones: Pause your recorders.
36
37 10:33 Break
38
39 10:45 back on record.
40
41 Chair: Ok, we're back on agenda item 6 a. we have a motion on the table to adopt the
42 regulations as they were public noticed. We had some discussion yesterday I'd like to go
43 around the table and find out if there's any more discussion, concerns or amendments that we
44 would like to suggest to the regulation before we vote on it. So Kathleen we will start with you.
45
46 Jones: If you have an amendment put it on a motion sheet so that we've got it as written.
47
48 Schedler: This is about the structural engineering license regulation project? First of all I'd like
49 to commend the committee or specifically Colin for all the hard work that went into it. I know it's
50 not an easy thing to do nor is it easy to synopsize all of the comments into useful comments
51 because they come from everything from useful to quasi useful to out in left field. I feel that I

1 have enough confidence in Colin to make whatever small specific changes to the work that
2 they've done per the comments that he deems necessary that at this late date and by my non-
3 involvement in the project that it would be like micromanaging and I may take it in a direction
4 that it was not intended. And I would not be in favor of putting it back out for public comment
5 and for that reason I would probably be in favor of making minor amendments and approving it
6 go forward.
7

8 Urfer: Since I can't actually make specific suggestions if you guys choose I would say there are
9 a couple of things where there's language maybe you should add a work such as they were
10 worried that it should say structural engineer in a couple places and the only other thing is there
11 seemed to be constant questions about span's, spans on the deck and how that translated so I
12 would just say if you feel those need to be clarified. I don't know enough about it to make a
13 suggestion. But they seemed to be repetitive questions.
14

15 Koonce: Yeah, I've got some comments that I'm proposing. In regards to that handout 6 a. in
16 the description, Number 1 defines hazardous facilities ad defined in the current edition of the
17 IBC chapter 3. Delete number 2. Number 3 define essential facilities as defined in the current
18 edition of IBC chapter 16 category 3 and 4. No changes in 4 5 or 6. And on number 7 add
19 excluding those with industrial exemption.
20

21 Maynard: You don't need to do that, it's already, its industrial exemption.
22

23 Chair: Could you go through those one more time.
24

25 Koonce: Certainly. Number one hazardous facilities as defined in the current edition of the IBC
26 chapter 3.
27

28 Maynard: Could we leave the chapter out so that if the IBC re-does the chapter we don't have
29 to do a regulation change?
30

31 Koonce: Absolutely. Just put it in for reference. Number 2, delete that one.
32

33 Chair: So delete special occupancy structures?
34

35 Koonce: Right. Number 3 it's defined in essential facilities in the current edition of the IBC
36 chapter 16 category 3 and 4.
37

38 Maynard: Are you leaving the area and height limitations in on number 3?
39

40 Koonce: I wasn't but I thought it was already identified in essential facilities. But it can be.
41

42 Maynard: If you do a 200 sq. ft. addition to a school it's an essential facility but would not be
43 covered under this. You would be allowed to do it as a CE. But if you want to make every
44 addition to a school require an SE if that's your desire we can leave the area and height
45 limitations off.
46

47 Koonce: I know they are included in the IBC so it wouldn't be the same as...right?
48

49 Maynard: Well the loads aren't different, no. A smaller addition is less complex I would guess.
50

51 Koonce: But it's still an essential facility. There's still the same risk to the occupant load.

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
47
48
49
50
51

Chair: So, we would need a motion to amend that we'd have to vote on first.

Koonce: Want me to try to fill this out?

Chair: Yeah, you fill that out and we'll continue going around.

Walters: I think that, I don't have anything I would like to change. I think we should go ahead and accept this with some of the minor amendments. I think that some of the biggest concerns that I've heard in comments are from people that are civil engineers not being to continue on with their work without becoming an SE but I think our Board is efficient enough that we can take care of that when it needs to change with grandfathering. It looks very doable it's doesn't look very onerous. Good work.

Christensen: Ok, I would like to refer it back to committee and I agree with Colin I don't want them to go back and go through every paragraph, chapter and verse. I think some areas that we ought to look to are one the grandfather clause and it would behoove us to have them notify us that they want to be grandfathered back in and not have to go in there with all the paper work that he does. The other was the bridge issue. I'd like to see them look at that a little closer, a, uh, any bridge whether it's 200 ft. or if you go up to Seward you've got one bridge that's only 60 Feet. If that goes out you're out of business anyway so either do them all or don't do any of them because they're governed by the Federal Highway Transportation Board sub-chapter to each one of the different areas bridges and structures like that. But I'd like to see them revisit that and maybe give an exemption in there. I know it's essential but if any bridge goes out its essential period. And if they're governed by any Federal funds they've got to have oversight from the Federal Transportation people so that's the two wishes I had, just the grandfather clause and make sure that the paperwork isn't onerous on the engineers. Just like getting a license put a note to it that you'd like to be grandfathered in and it comes around every season so they don't just pop up and say I've got to be grandfathered in later one. I know it's kind of a moot point but it just puts paperwork on john's desk so those are the only two comments I had.

Hale: I think it's essentially a good regulation and I hate to see it go back to committee or back out to public comment because I'm not sure we're going to get any better comments. I think it's a good idea to maybe shore up the language a little. I'd hate to see it go back into the process.

Kerr: It's definitely a complex and adding in the additional IBC sounds really good on the surface. I'm not sure how the language dove tails and if that really works but that's just because of my ignorance on the IBC. Do we know, I'd like to definitely see it reviewed prior to voting on it with the proposed changes to make sure that everything does flow and make sure that we address the common theme comments that we're getting regarding specifically bridges and significant structures so.....

Chair: You're saying that you would rather see it go back to committee?

Kerr: I think it has to go back to committee in order to verify that inserting these additional sections will work and do what we want to do unless, from my perspective but maybe those that already know those codes very well can say yeah, this is definitely going to do what we want it to do.

Koonce: Those sections of the IBC are really, go into detail for instance H talks about oxidizers and all the methods and formulas for H. It's pretty extensive and it's also got national standards

1 to go with that in reference and then in chapter 16 for essential facilities categories 3 and 4
2 similarly it has some back ground for it and there's some basis for it in mean it's not just put in
3 there arbitrarily.

4
5 Christensen: I think my primacy will be would the states adopt the IBC regulation? Some states
6 can be for stringent than that but not less stringent.

7
8 Kerr: It's not the content or quality of the content. It looked to me, and you guys can tell me it's
9 different, but it looked to me to be a list of definitions and does that work with the language that
10 you're proposing that it's just a list of definitions? It categorizes that in great detail but is it, are
11 we saying if you got to have your structural engineer stamp to design anything that is a certain
12 class of hazardous facility or all hazardous facilities as defined in chapter 3. In chapter 3 is
13 that, uh, it looks like there are different tiers of hazardous materials in there and are we saying
14 everything in chapter 3? All levels of hazardous materials require the SE?

15
16 Christensen: Not really cause go to section 262 in CFR40 you'll find most of them in there that
17 probably have oxidizers and would be flammable. I mean, it covers about everything even table
18 salt. So you'd have to define, each building could have something different.

19
20 Chair: My only problem with tying it back to the IBC on the H occupancies as necessitating a
21 structural engineer under this regulation is that some of the stuff in the IBC under the H
22 occupancies deals more with other controls for that substance it might be the type of container it
23 needs to be stored in it might be a requirement for a sprinkler system and the actual structure
24 itself other than the type of construction whether it's concrete or wood or steel or whatever might
25 not be the main issue that the H occupancies is dealing with. It could be a ventilation system or
26 something like that so I don't know if there's a real direct correlation between those hazardous
27 substances in a hazardous facility.

28
29 Koonce: Well the number 1 currently it's ambiguous it doesn't really tell you what hazardous is.
30 It's up to the court to make that determination and they would fall back to statutes and
31 regulations that are current in use in the jurisdiction. So if you're going to go backward, if you
32 want to exclude certain H occupancies because of their level of severity of danger or whatever
33 you could probably go through and maybe exclude, or only include H 4 through 6 or whatever
34 you want, whatever you feel but Colin kind of, you grabbed the Oregon and Washington ones
35 and they, this is kind of what they said, right?

36
37 Maynard: Yeah, that's exactly what they say.

38
39 Koonce: You could get into it a little bit more and help define it but I think that these definitions
40 or referencing these definitions.

41
42 Chair: Yeah, I guess I'd favor referencing the IBC in that regard that we actually have some
43 quantities instead of sufficient quantities because that is really ambiguous.

44
45 Koonce: It is, if you had a situation where you had to make a ruling on it. You'd have to go to
46 some document or some reference document or whatever, I don't know, that NFPA 101 has that
47 or not but you'd have to go to some document and make a reference to it otherwise you have no
48 basis for a decision really. We could fine tune that.

49
50 Christensen: Well most of those have to be marked anyway. They have a placard on them of
51 what's in the building so that's just for the first responders and the fire people so it's a, that's a

1 given but I think you're right about the quantity, how much can go in there and you'd be
2 surprised what you find in some of them.

3
4 Koonce: Well if you have a structure that requires a little bit more, I don't know if the loads
5 would be any different in the H or B The essential facilities is where you usually see that
6 increase in the primary structural core, right, the multipliers or whatever.....

7
8 Maynard: Hazardous facility would probably fall under IBC category 3. Those are called
9 hazardous facilities so it may be redundant that you've added that. My only comment about it is
10 what you call the nebulas, we have a number of places in both statute and regulations where we
11 say that where public safety is affected and kind of leave it up to whoever is going to be
12 reviewing it to determine whether the public safety is affected or not and we haven't defined it,
13 like especially with landscape architecture and some of the others it's kind of, yeah you may
14 need one and you may not need one. It's kind of on a case by case basis.

15
16 Kerr: What about, is this going to be enforceable or are people going to be building buildings for
17 non-hazardous purposes and then occupy them with hazardous materials. How do you control
18 that?

19
20 (You can't from several sources.)

21
22 Koonce: What you can do is set basics, what's important is that the facility that houses
23 hazardous material is designed by a structural engineer or by a civil engineer that took that
24 exam.

25
26 Chair: The municipality of Anchorage requires that if you change the occupancy of the building
27 that you get a permit and in particular if you change the occupancy that would change certain
28 things about that building. Now often times there's warehouse type buildings that are
29 constructed, they might be permitted as an S1 occupancy and then somewhere along the line
30 somebody decides to store a bunch of tires in there or store some other hazardous materials or
31 combustible materials or whatever and they never go back to the municipality so their
32 technically in violation of the municipality's laws. It happens all the time. It's hard to control it. It
33 really comes back to whoever owns and is using and leasing that facility to follow the law.

34
35 Maynard: That's a good point. I worked on a project, on a, it was a retail facility, it was a pre-
36 engineered metal building and then it was sold and they wanted to put a bingo parlor in there
37 which is an assembly occupancy so we had to go back in there and verify that, that existing
38 structure would meet that higher occupancy with the importance factors that are associated with
39 that and it became a child care center after that which, the same thing we had to verify that that
40 structure that was not designed for "I" of 1-5 or for 2-5 would be able to accept that and it turns
41 that the metal couldn't so we had to do some minor retrofit work on it. Same thing would be with
42 the hazardous it would take you to a higher "I" factor. You would have to do those upgrades if
43 you were going to make it a hazardous facility.

44
45 Koonce: I think it's important that it's defined. It would save people a lot of grief. It needs to be
46 spelled out in black and white so the State Fire Marshall and local jurisdictions all use, the State
47 has their own and of course the municipalities have got theirs. I think it would help verify
48 everything.

49
50 Chair: My comments are really on the last two items which are the bridges and the off shore
51 structures. I feel like they are kind of a specialty thing and I, uh, I feel like having structural

1 engineers in this State is important. But I also see that there's a system in place to provide safe
2 bridges. And off shore structure I just. I'm not sure where they'd even fall in there. If we would
3 end up in some very gray area with that or if they would end up being an industrial exemption.
4 So I would rather see those two items pulled out.

5
6 Jones: I asked Jun to sit in incase there were any questions on what would be, what the result
7 of changes or tabling it until next meeting would be.

8
9 Chair: Ok, so Jun right now what we have is, it's the regulation as published, we have the
10 motion on the table and so we're going to vote on that with proposed amendments. So I guess
11 procedurally we'd vote on any amendments and then vote on the main motion and if that motion
12 fails then what are our options.

13
14 Maiquis: Good morning Mr. Chairman I'm Jun Maiquis, for the record, the regulations specialist
15 for the Division. The Board has a few options with the proposed regulation. You have, option
16 one, to adopt as public noticed. Second you can amend and adopt so long as the amendment
17 is within the scope of the notice. If it's a major change I would advise the Board to re-public
18 notice with the amendments. Third, you could drop the regulation, take no action at all. So
19 those are your options, at this point, I don't know if Vern has shared the advice of the
20 Department of Law to hold off on it, it's your choice, you can table it and discuss it some more at
21 your next meeting, or set up a teleconference whatever the board feels.

22
23
24
25 Maiquis: Yeah it's on the table; if nothing happened it will be further discussed at the next
26 scheduled meeting whether it's teleconferenced or a regular face to face meeting. You have
27 those options. You have one year for this regulation there is a staleness date period from the
28 date it was published to the newspaper. If nothing happens after one year passed by the Board
29 has to either withdraw the regulations or re-public notice, do a supplemental notice.

30
31 Koonce: So, after it's approved, that's if this Board approves it, it goes to legal?

32
33 Maiquis: Yeah, what I'll need is an excerpt from the minutes the adoption order from the
34 Chairman I will send the final package to the Department of Law. The assigned attorney for this
35 is Todd Araujo, he will do his review if he sees something that is not in the spirit of the Statute it
36 will go back to the Board for reconsideration. If everything looks ok it meets the Statute it goes
37 to the regulations legislation section of the Department for another review to make sure then it
38 goes to the LT Governor for filing. If after review by the Governor there are no problems it goes
39 to the LT Governor and becomes effective 30 days after he signs it.

40
41 Maynard: Well it seems that there is a fair amount of wordsmithing that needs to happen so
42 what I propose is that we table this thing until the May meeting and that you send me emails
43 with your desired changes and I can come up with individual amendments that we can deal with
44 one after the other rather than one lump sum so we can decide whether we want to do this, this
45 way or the other way and verify that the IBC meets what we're looking at and then come back at
46 the May meeting and go from there and see if we can adopt this.

47
48 Koonce: So maybe do some track changes and go over something?

49
50 Maynard: Yeah, I would come up with, look at hazardous facilities that's H3 6 or something so it
51 meets the original intent but defines it better. Because I think 1 and 2 are basically occupancy

1 category 3 but I'll double check that.

2

3 Chair: But if we do that and it's significant enough and it sounds like it would be then we would
4 need to re-public notice it.

5

6 Maynard: I don't think it will be a significant enough. If we are just defining hazardous facilities
7 better that's not a significant change. If we change the bridges to clear span instead of span
8 where we add engineering after or between structural and experience that's not a big change,
9 its fine tuning to me. It doesn't change the intent. It's not something out of left field. It's
10 basically responding to comments you know deleting 6 and 7 if that's what we decide to do is
11 not a major change that requires more public notice, to me anyway.

12

13 Maiquis: It's your option. You guys are the decision makers or the jury and judge of your Board.
14 If you feel like the others, I believe you guys got a good amount of response on the proposal. If
15 the Board feels that hey our, bring back out to the public the amendments and extend the
16 written comment to your next scheduled meeting that's also an option. But there are costs to be
17 considered. I believe there was like 8K mail out of this.

18

19 Jones: Jun, can they adopt the CE portion of the regulations and table the rest of it?

20

21 Maiquis: Yeah you can, you can adopt a section which will be part one and part two is whatever
22 you guys table.

23

24 Chair: So that would be written up as a separate motion. I think we'll go ahead and do that and
25 get that out of the way. Then we can see what the Board wants to do from there.

26

27 Maynard: I move to table the regulation project until the next meeting and pass the continuing
28 education regulation change as public noticed.

29

30 Koonce: Second

31

32 Christensen: Asks if he can repeat the motion.

33

34 Maynard: Re-reads the motion.

35

36 Chair: Do you need to put the specific section numbers in that?

37

38 Jones: Yes, I will do that.

39

40 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Koonce and passed unanimously it**
41 **was RESOLVED to Table the changes to 12 AAC 36.063 Engineering Education and Work**
42 **Experience Requirements (SE), 12 AAC 36.108 Application for Registration as a**
43 **Structural Engineer, 12 AAC 36.180 Seals, 12 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals and adopt the**
44 **changes to 12 AAC 36.510 Continuing Education.**

45

46 Chair: So we'll continue with this regulation project at our next meeting. Minor changes, do you
47 want people to email?

48

49 Maynard: Yeah, send me with either the topic you want addressed or the language that you
50 would suggest and I'll amalgamate the comments and come back with specific amendments on
51 a specific topic and I might have one that says clear span and one that says delete bridges

1 altogether and we'll figure out which one we want.
2
3 Kerr: Can you email out the specific IBC sections?
4
5 Koonce: Yeah, I'll send them out to you, be happy too.
6
7 Christensen: And if I understand that correctly the period between now and the next meeting
8 will be the comment period?
9
10 No there is no comment period (from several members)
11
12 Christensen: Not until we do the.....
13
14 Maiquis: No comment is completely closed. If the Board decides to consider more comments
15 you'll have to open it again.
16
17 Chair: I think just about every Board Member has expressed that the comments we got were
18 very comprehensive. We got quite a few comments and they covered a lot of different areas of
19 the regulation project so unless anybody has an objection to it then I would suggest that we
20 don't re-public comment.
21
22 Kerr: I agree.
23
24 Jones: Now once you make your changes to it and it goes to Law they may decide that it needs
25 to be re-public noticed.
26
27 Maynard: And if that's the case, fine.
28
29 Maiquis: Yeah they'll inform me and I'll let Vern know that this needs to go back to the Board
30 and that the changes the Board made were a little bit outside the line of the initial notice and
31 feels like it needs to be put back to the public to take another shot at it.
32
33 Chair: Then we really don't need to do anymore on that. (He thanks Jun and the two engineers
34 from DOT for attending.)
35
36 Maynard: Let's just skip lunch and go to the License Examiners report.
37
38 Hackenmiller: There's nothing new and exciting like last time when NCEES update all exams
39 post 2010 are available for any board to find them on their national website. That was last time
40 new there's nothing exciting like that so I just put a lot of data in here again. You can see that
41 most of our application for this Board meeting came in in February in the last week. I also
42 added, uh, the licenses issued in the last four months November after the Board meeting and
43 then December was after we got the results from the PE exam. That's why we've got so many
44 licensees and the third table is our PE and PS examinees for October and their results. And the
45 last box is just the FE and FS examinees. And that number that number is going to go up quite
46 a bit in the spring in the third quarter and fourth quarter because UAF has graduates that must
47 take the FE to graduate. So we got a whole lot of applications which, by the way they still think
48 they have to go to the Board so I got 30 applications for FE in January but I can approve them
49 which is great. The total number of application reviewed at this Board meeting actually went up
50 to 147.
51

1 Is there anything you guys would like to see?
2
3 Schedler: Some changes that I think you would be in favor of as well.
4
5 Hackenmiller: Can I talk about that? The work experience form for engineers I would love if we
6 could put the section which has the dates on that second page so it's all on one page because I
7 have to chase people down for that first page. Applicants don't send that to their supervisors
8 and Kathleen and I spoke about how sometimes they just put the year.
9
10 Schedler: It just says from and to and they just say from 2011 to 2013. We need month year,
11 month year.
12
13 Hackenmiller: So putting some sort of format in there, like you said, forces them to put the
14 month and year format. Some people are very detailed and put the day as well but we would
15 only need the month and year. I would really like the work experience verification forms for
16 engineers to be on one page. I mean we can have the informational page that says these are
17 the definitions this is what you need but having those dates separate, the dates on page one
18 and the supervisor verifies on page two. People don't send the first page to their supervisors
19 and he don't know how many days or what month. And it would just be a lot easier and then
20 that second page of information would ultimately be less paper in the application and....
21
22 Chair: I think you can just work that out with Vern.
23
24 Maynard: And maybe you could make it more clear to the person filling it out that the number
25 above responsible charge has to be greater the responsible charge or greater than or equal. A
26 lot of them have that second line as zero, and of the zero he has 12 months of responsible
27 charge.
28
29 Hackenmiller: Right, well I would like to have it tabbed. All we have to do is tab it, indent,
30 responsible charge, enough said and it would show that.
31
32 Kerr: What do you think of a calendar format summary that the applicant has to fill out that
33 would show by the month, you have twelve boxes out there in a row and they fill in whatever
34 year that they have experience for and then they mark in every month whether their getting
35 education or work experience or responsible charge because that's potentially what we end up
36 doing is sequencing all the work information. Why not have them deliver that message in that
37 format. Is that.....
38
39 Hackemiller: Well usually we don't have any conflicts with education everything's separate...
40
41 Kerr: We do.....
42
43 Hackenmiller: Well we don't approve people who have concurrent, right, you guys don't you
44 have to do all the work. But when they do have in our guidelines or no our board policies where
45 the board can count any years after 4 years education and if they took 5 years they can petition
46 basically that last year and say hey I was working full time and had one class at night but there
47 no format for that free form so you would just use an excel work sheet, is that what you mean?
48
49 Kerr: Yeah.
50
51 Hale: we can address that when we update our application.

1
2 Hackenmiller: But if we had a form it would be more official.
3
4 Hale: What's happening is they're just throwing it all at us and saying tell me what I need to do.
5
6 Hackenmiller: It's hard to come in and see what I see and not have a road map.
7
8 Kerr: We had one application this time that had 16 work verification forms. And....
9
10 Hackenmiller: she had a retention file for ever. So that is why there were so many they sent
11 them in every three months.
12
13 Kerr: And scattered in between there were various months of schooling or....
14
15 Schedler: Or maybe when it gets that complex you send it back to her and say why don't you
16 put this in an excel spread sheet for our Board.
17
18 Hackenmiller: Right, but think, John are you saying we should have an official format?
19 Because then I would agree.
20
21 Kerr: I think that would be nice for me to see the same thing instead of everybody's home
22 grown spread sheets, they might be great but they would all be different.
23
24 Hale: If we could work it into the application, say you sort it out and tell us.
25
26 Hackenmiller: Yeah, so if you took more than 4 years here's the form to explain your work
27 experience in your final year of education.
28
29 Kerr: And this would be different than the work verification form because it would be a summary
30 so it's kind of a new thing.
31
32 Hackenmiller: Should it be like a petition?
33
34 Schedler: I'm not sure I would open that great big door there's a lot of 5 year people that think it
35 took me five years to get my degree now I need 4 years of experience.
36
37 Kerr: Well there are lots of those if you had this in calendar format and somebody just wrote
38 that down to help them organize their experience it's a 10 minute project on a simple situation or
39 a five minute project and you see that 4 and 4 or 5 and 4.
40
41 Urfer: I love that idea. And I want it to say before you do your work experience, you're
42 graduated and all this experience has to be after that date.
43
44 Jones: We have some people we had one this last time that are very creative when it comes to
45 that. This guy had like, took 5 years to get his education so what he did is he counted up, well I
46 have this many months of education and I have this many months of work experience and he
47 was working during the summers. I don't think we ever did get it through to him that, that's not
48 going to count.
49
50 The conversation continued for several minutes with the end result that maybe the Board could
51 look at re-doing the application. Sarena will redo the check off sheet.

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
47
48
49
50
51

Agenda item 23 – Board Tasks

Chair: Let's move to the to do list. Brian's not here he had keeping address updated. I think that was just making sure that everyone had their current address. I'm not sure what he was going to do with that.

Maynard: He was also going to do a regulation project on what we will do to them if they don't. Suspend their license automatically or something like that.

Chair: Can you put something on the website about the.....

Jones: Yes we put a copy of the regulation that says you have to keep a current address on file.

Kerr: Did that result in any flurry of updates?

Jones: No, I did get one or two people say they had just seen that.

Chair: His number two was work on AS 08.48.101 with Eric but I don't know what that was about.

Maynard: That was the regulations that say the Board may adopt regulations and it lists a bunch of stuff.

Chair: Next is mine and I think the logo issue and address change I think are the same issue with, it was the regulation project that I was doing. And the info letter on the recent statute change, I did get that done. That was going to be the letter basically just informing people about the statute change in particular some of the exceptions we had before are not gone. I wasn't really clear who I should format that letter to though.

Maynard: I would probably send it to the Mechanical Administrators Board and let them know and Electrical Administrators. And let them pass it on to their licensees.

Chair: That would probably be the best approach. Ok, I'll do that and I wasn't sure on this letter to AIDC I think it was the letter that you gave under the response to 10 b. Looking through my notes I couldn't see exactly what that was for.

Maynard: What is AIDC?

Chair: I don't know.

Maynard: I know what AIDEC is.

Jones: That one was about somebody working for a government body, they can't review plans that they've done and how long does that last.

Koonce: You answered that Vern didn't you?

Chair: And his email is at AIDEA so that's probably the one so that was done by Vern and Jeff you didn't have anything assigned....

1
2 Koonce: I have a question though. I'm licensed here and in other jurisdictions and I'm on an
3 email with all those. Pretty much all the contact and all the information and everything like that
4 is via email. I really don't get a letter or any hard copies from Texas or Oregon. If you don't
5 respond in email and have the email address you don't.....
6
7 Jones: Our new licensing program will have a field for email addresses and phone numbers.
8 And those will be required fields on the application.
9
10 Koonce: Right, so then those notifications can all go out to email addresses instead of hard
11 copy?
12
13 Jones: Yeah we can do that.
14
15 Chair: Back to my, to do stuff as far as new to do, do you recall what I had? I'll just have that
16 letter on the statute change. So Jeff was there anything assigned to you?
17
18 Koonce: I was just going to work on this research for the SE regulations.
19
20 Chair: Colin?
21
22 Maynard: The FE/FS project is in Jun's hands, I think over in the Governor's office or
23 somewhere and the SE regulation project I will amalgamate the suggestions and come up with
24 some amendments. I think that's all I've got. Although I may go through the Guidance Manual
25 to see if I spot anything that Luann needs help with.
26
27 Koonce: Can we work on this regulation project outside of the Board?
28
29 Chair: We can't debate it or anything like that so we don't want you to do back and forth on it.
30
31 Koonce: But I can provide information on it, right? Ok.
32
33 Maynard: And we can't vote until we get back in the meeting.
34
35 Chair: Eric is again on that 08.48.101 with Brian. John Kerr you had updating LS work
36 experience form.
37
38 Kerr: Yes, it's ongoing. We're adding an education and experience summary for it.
39
40 Chair: So Dave your still
41
42 Hale: Yeah, the same also the Guidance Manual. I'll probably revisit it a little bit before I send it
43 to Luanne. And I'm going to write a letter of response to 9 e. and get it to Vern and I think that's
44 it.
45
46 Luanne: Obviously the Guidance Manual needs help and I'm assuming that everyone read the
47 section that I destroyed. It's a little shorter, it probably need a little wordsmithing. If anybody
48 has a near and dear love for any of the sections please feel free to take them on. I'm also going
49 to take a look at LA applications and work verification forms those need to be revised.
50
51 Maynard: Under Eric and I you should put landscape architect position Statute.

1
2 Walters: I haven't made any comments or changes but I've read the manual and I'll make an
3 effort to get Luanne some ideas.

4
5 Chair: Kathleen you didn't have anything assigned. John?

6
7 Christensen: Comments? No my job assignment has hasn't been too fulfilling so I'll get with
8 the Chair now and legislative liaison, I could do some work there if we have some questions.

9
10 Chair: I don't think we have anything right now that we need to be pushing. Vern?

11
12 Jones: Both of those are done.

13
14 Chair: Did we have anything new for you?

15
16 Jones: Yeah, I'm going to respond to one of these, 9 f. And then Dave was going to write a
17 response to one of those and send it to me.

18
19 Chair: Are we ready to read the applications into the record?

20
21 Jones: She wants to do approved first.

22
23 Maynard: It's on top so that's perfect.

24
25 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Koonce and passed unanimously it**
26 **was RESOLVED to APPROVE the following list or applicants for registration by comity,**
27 **examination and in additional branches of engineering with the stipulation that the**
28 **information in the applicant's file will take precedence over the information in the**
29 **minutes:**

30
31 *The following subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*
32 *meanings:*

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

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

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

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

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

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

40 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

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

42

| | Applicant | Branch | Ex/Com | Board Action | NEEDS: |
|--|------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|
|--|------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---------------|--------|----------|--|
| | Smith, Garrett Eugene | Mechanical | Comity | Approved | |
| | Apodaca, Victor | Land Surveyor | Comity | Approved | |
| | Bockelman, Joseph | Mechanical | Comity | Approved | |
| | Botz, James J. | Civil | Comity | Approved | |
| | Candelaria, Alejandro | Civil | Comity | Approved | |
| | Davis, Duane | Civil | Exam | Approved | |
| | Enders, Chad Eric | Civil | Comity | Approved | |
| | English, Daryl S. | Structural | Comity | Approved | |
| | Fanberg, Morgan | Mechanical | Comity | Approved | |
| | Fink, Timothy | Electrical | Comity | Approved | |
| | Gerloff, James R. | Structural | Comity | Approved | |
| | hagar, lynn | structural | Comity | Approved | |
| | Hughes, Kraig | Structural | Grand. | Approved | |
| | Iqbal, Mohammed Asif | Civil | Comity | Approved | |
| | Johnson, Bridger | Civil | Comity | Approved | |
| | Kokesh, Christopher M. | Civil | Comity | Approved | |
| | Leavitt, Jared M. | Land Surveyor | Comity | Approved | |
| | Mazza, Albert P. | Electrical | Comity | Approved | |
| | Miller, Matthew Stephen | NAME | Comity | Approved | |
| | O'Callaghan, Robin | Mechanical | Comity | Approved | |
| | Rabosky, darren R. | Electrical | Comity | Approved | |
| | Sack, Daniel M. | Civil | Comity | Approved | |
| | Sim, Solavann | Civil | Comity | Approved | |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------|--------|----------|--|
| | Stippel, Joseph | Civil | Comity | Approved | |
| | Strackeljahn, Samuel | Mechanical | Comity | Approved | |
| | Stringer, Stuart | Civil | Comity | Approved | |
| | Tagge, Frank W. | Fire Pro | Comity | Approved | |
| | Webster, Cory C. | Structural | Comity | Approved | |
| | Welsh, Brendan | Land Surveyor | Comity | Approved | |
| | Williams, Nathaniel | Civil | Comity | Approved | |
| | | | | | |
| | Gudavalli, Subba | Civil | Comity | CA | Arctic, JPQ |
| | Stewart, Clinton B> | Civil | Comity | CA | Arctic |
| | Berry, Dennis L. | Structural | Comity | CA | JPQ |
| | Booth, Daniel L. | Structural | Comity | CA | 3 additional references, pg 2 of app, arctic JPQ |
| | Bramer, Mark C. | Electrical | Comity | CA | ALL items |
| | Bruff, Bradley | Mechanical | Comity | CA | Arctic, JPQ |
| | Bruner, Sam R. | Land Surveyor | Comity | CA | Exams |
| | Chang, Joseph K. | Civil | Comity | CA | FE |
| | Cook, Jeremy M. | Civil | Comity | CA | PE, jpq, arctic |
| | Din, Bernard Sy | Control Systems | Comity | CA | JPQ |
| | Flynn, Anthony | Mechanical | Comity | CA | 16 months experience |
| | Gervelis, Gary | Land Surveyor | Comity | CA | Pass AKLS |
| | Gibson, Gregory William | Land Surveyor | Comity | CA | Exams |
| | hardister, William D. | Architect | Comity | CA | JPQ, Arctic |
| | Higinbotham, Scott | Structural | Comity | CA | erification of sE exam, arcitc |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------|--------|----|-------------------------------------|
| | Hinds, James Kevin | Civil | Comity | CA | Arctic, JPQ, FE/PE Ver, Tx |
| | Inoa Alvarez, Guido | Electrical | Comity | CA | Arctic, JPQ, FE & PE verification |
| | Jalbert, Loren A. | Civil | Comity | CA | Transcripts, investigations, arctic |
| | Johnson, Gayle Scott | Civil | Comity | CA | Arctic |
| | Kan, Steven S. | Chemical | Comity | CA | JPQ |
| | Kelsey, Christopher | Civil | Comity | CA | Arctic |
| | King, James Cordell III | Civil | Comity | CA | Arctic |
| | Koehn, Andrew J. | Civil | Comity | CA | Arctic |
| | Lobato, cameron | Civil | Comity | CA | Arctic |
| | McCullough, Craig R. | Land Surveyor | Comity | CA | Pass AKLS |
| | Michaud, Alexis Koiv | Civil | Comity | CA | Verification of FE |
| | Noetzel, Juergen Karl | Mechanical | Comity | CA | Arctic |
| | North, Roger B. | Civil | Comity | CA | All items |
| | Primm, Brit L. | Land Surveyor | Comity | CA | AKLS |
| | Primm, Keith P. | Land Surveyor | Comity | CA | AKLS |
| | Purtteman, Jester J.P. | Mechanical | Comity | CA | Verification of PE |
| | Quilala, Alfonso S. | Civil | Comity | CA | Educational Evaluation, JPQ |
| | Rahe, Edward S. | Civil | Comity | CA | JPQ |
| | Rice, Craig | Electrical | Comity | CA | JPQ |
| | Salter, Scott W. | Electrical | Comity | CA | Arctic |
| | Sibani, Laura | Electrical | Comity | CA | JPQ, Arctic |
| | Sirois, Aaron | Mechanical | Comity | CA | Arctic |
| | Wellen, Jeffrey | Mechanical | Comity | CA | FE/PE and Arctic |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---------------|--------|----|---|
| | Yamasaki, Kenji | Civil | Comity | CA | Jpq, fe |
| | Harton, Samuel C. | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Loewen, Mitch | Mechanical | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Allen, David T. | Civil | Exam | CA | JPQ, Transcripts, Arctic on transcripts |
| | Ballou, Cornelia | Environmental | exam | CA | Exam |
| | Banzhaff, Clinton | Civil | Exam | CA | PE Exam |
| | Barak, Jared D. | ARE | exam | CA | ARE IDP Arctic Eng. , |
| | Beckett, Ryan Gary | mechanical | Exam | CA | Money money moneyyyy |
| | Bentti, Steven C. | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Bermejo, Gil | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam, Arctic |
| | Burbank, Winston Starr | Chemical | Exam | CA | remainder of fees |
| | Butterer, Aaron | Land Surveyor | Exam | CA | Exams |
| | Caguioa, Jeffrey | ARE | Exam | CA | ARE, IDP |
| | DeRaeve, Matthew Z. | Civil | Exam | CA | exam, jq |
| | Douglas, Carlie | ARE | Exam | CA | Need 3 Arch references, IDP, ARE JPQ Arctic |
| | Downing, Randy | mechanical | Exam | CA | Exam, FE, JQ |
| | Echiverri, Russel Tan | ARE | Exam | CA | ARE, JPQ, Arctic |
| | Eklund, Sara Marie | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Fischer, Cory J. | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Flint, Peter J. | Land Surveyor | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Gabriel, James G. | Electrical | Exam | CA | PE, money |
| | Garrod, Miles Frank | ARE | Exam | CA | ARE, Arctic Engineering |
| | Graff, Craig J. | Chemical | Exam | CA | Exam |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------|------|----|---|
| | Greva, ramadan | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Henry, Chism | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Imperial, Jon Miguel Sy | ARE | Exam | CA | ARE, IDP, Arctic, JPQ, need 5th reference |
| | Ivanovski, Dimitar L. | FE | Exam | CA | FE Exam |
| | Johnson, Michael Maurice | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Koweluk, Stephan A. | Electrical | Exam | CA | Exam, JPQ |
| | Kuipers, Jeremy J. | Land Surveyor | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Laughlin, Andrew T. | Electrical | Exam | CA | Exam, Arctic, JPQ |
| | Lestochi, Tracy E. | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Lund, Matthew | Electrical | exam | CA | Exam |
| | MacDonald, Steven J. | Land Surveyor | Exam | CA | Exams |
| | Martin, Brett Courtney | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam, Transcripts |
| | Masson, Roger M. | Mechanical | Exam | CA | Exam, Arctic |
| | McClure, Krystin K. | Environmental | Exam | CA | Arctic, Exam |
| | Menzel, Kyle S. | Electrical | Exam | CA | Exam, JPQ |
| | Morrow, Mark | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam, JPQ |
| | nabong, Jr., Loretta | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam, JPQ |
| | Nguyen, Binh Thanh | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Oakland, Bryan | Mechanical | Exam | CA | FE, JPQ, Exam |
| | Pate, Vernon D. | Civil | Exam | CA | Arctic, Exam, JPQ |
| | Pempek, Alissa T. | Land Surveyor | Exam | CA | Exams |
| | Piburn, Christopher | FS | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Piburn, Christopher | Land Surveyor | Exam | CA | Exam |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---------------|------|----|--------------|
| | Presler, Wendy | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Quimby, Michael J. | Structural | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Rucinski, Michael Gary | Land Surveyor | Exam | CA | Exams |
| | Saliz, Buku | Land Surveyor | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Sandberg, Ingrid | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Santiago, Vivian Faustino | FE | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Svanda, Tracy | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Tencza, Michael | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Theurich, Jakob M. | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam, jPQ |
| | Thompson, Ryan K. | Petroleum | Exam | CA | Exam, Arctic |
| | Wasson, Matthew J. | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Weathers, Daniel C. | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam, Arctic |
| | Weller, Andrew | Environmental | Exam | CA | Arctic, JPQ |
| | Yager, Garrett C. | Civil | exam | CA | Exam |
| | Yagudina, Olga | structural | Exam | CA | Exam |
| | Yoo, Peter | Civil | exam | CA | Exam |
| | Pepin, Jennifer C. | Civil | Exam | CA | Exam |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was RESOLVED to find the following list of applicants for registration by comity, examination and in additional branches of engineering INCOMPLETE with the stipulation that the information in the applicant files will take precedence over the information in the minutes.

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------|--------|------------|--|
| | Bergeron, Alex John Paul | Mechanical | Exam | Incomplete | more professional work needed |
| | Fama, Nicholas P. | Civil | Exam | Incomplete | 4 more months of experience (past May) |
| | Faschan, John H. | Control Systems | Grand. | Incomplete | |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---------------|--------|------------|---|
| | Ferree, Nicholas B. | Civil | Exam | Incomplete | Need more experience |
| | Gilliland, Simon | Civil | Exam | Incomplete | Needs 13 mo experience |
| | Hanson, Brian | Civil | Exam | Incomplete | More professional work experience needed |
| | Hickey, Dylan M. | Land Surveyor | Exam | Incomplete | Needs 17 months RC and 25 total exp under PLS |
| | Hipsak, Stacy | Land Surveyor | Exam | Incomplete | Experience |
| | Holland, Andrew | Civil | Exam | Incomplete | Needs 4 more months experience |
| | Johnson, Edwin | Environmental | G'fthr | Incomplete | Try another way - this won't work. |
| | Meyers, Jr. Paul R. | Mechanical | Comity | Incomplete | What dicipline do you have? |
| | Miller, Joseph Michael | Electrical | Exam | Incomplete | need 9 months responsible charge |
| | Smith, David Bryan | Land Surveyor | Comity | Incomplete | More coursework |
| | Turletes, Irene S. | Civil | Exam | Incomplete | Need additional experience 16 months |
| | Minnema, Nathaniel J. | Electrical | Exam | Incomplete | Need more experience |
| | Grey, Delenora May | Land Surveyor | Exam | | |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Agenda item 26 – Board Comments.

Chair: Colin you want to start us off.

Maynard: I think it was a good meeting we made a lot of progress Hopefully we'll get the SE regulation project done by May and if the stuff that's in the Governor's office gets public noticed between now and then we can deal with that.

Kerr: Good Meeting. Definitely the SE issue is complicated and I'm glad we're going to have a little more to digest and revise it.

Hale: Appreciate everybody's work especially Vern and Sarena for keeping everybody straight.

Christensen: It was a good meeting I like the input from all the members of the Board to step back and take a look at the regulations, and I think that's good, think on it, sleep on and make a decision.

Sarena: Thanks guys for letting me come in and walk around during the executive session I hope everything's getting more consistent and I'm here for you.

Walters: Good meeting appreciate everyone's help especially Sarena and Vern during the

1 application review and it's a lot of help having you guys know a lot about it.

2
3 Luanne: It was a good meeting and a lot was accomplished on a complex statute. I really
4 appreciate you guys moving forward on the landscape architect and if I can do anything to help.

5
6 Schedler: Good meeting, Thank you for your direction and good interactions it's a great group
7 and enjoy the staff and all the support they give us.

8
9 Jones: Well, good job guys. I was a little apprehensive coming into this with all the hubbub
10 about the regulation change. But I think you're doing the best thing. As usual the meeting went
11 smoothly and good luck getting home. (laughter)

12
13 Chair: Vern and Sarena, appreciate your efforts as always and I really feel like you guys do a
14 great job and Sarena you stepped into the position and figured things out in short order and it's
15 getting better and better so you know I knew this regulation project would be a tough issue to
16 tackle and to get through the comments was quite exhausting. (laughter) And I really
17 appreciate every body's participation and input on these issues. And you know sometimes the
18 person that maybe isn't the expert in the field has some of the most relevant things to say. So I
19 encourage you to speak up whether it's an issue you know a lot about or not and it was a good
20 meeting and thank you all for coming. Meeting adjourned.

21
22
23 11:50a.m. Meeting Adjourned.

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
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

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

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

Date: _____