

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

STATE OF ALASKA

11
12
13
14

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING
BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS & LAND SURVEYORS**

15
16

**Minutes of Meeting
February 8-9, 2017**

17
18
19
20

By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors held a meeting February 8-9, 2017 in Juneau, AK.

21
22

Wednesday February 8, 2017

23
24

Agenda item 1 - Call to Order and Roll Call

25
26

9:01 a.m. The Chair called the meeting to order.

27
28

Roll call, all present except Kathleen Schedler, excused by the Chair.

29
30

Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board:

- 31
32
33
- Dave Hale, Land Surveyor, Vice Chair
 - Jeffrey Koonce, Architect, Secretary
 - Colin Maynard, PE, SE
 - Catherine Fritz, Architect
 - Eric Eriksen, PE
 - Fred Wallis, PE
 - John Kerr, Land Surveyor
 - Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect
 - Richard Jones, Public Member

34
35

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

- 36
37
38
39
40
41
- Janey Hovenden, Director
 - Martha Hewlett, Administrative Officer II
 - John Savage, Investigator
 - Alysia Jones, Executive Administrator
 - Sarena Hackenmiller, Licensing Examiner

42
43

Members of the Public present for portions of the meeting:

- 44
45
46
47
48
- Pat Tami, President-elect NCEES
 - Jennifer Meyer, representing herself
 - Stephen Nuss, representing ASCE
 - Dale Nelson, representing APDC LLC
 - Daniel Nichols, representing himself

- 1 • Ed Leonetti, representing himself
2

3 The following members of the public attended via telephone for portions of the meeting.
4

- 5 • Peter Flint (teleconference)
6

7 The Chair acknowledges the new Executive Administrator and asks her to introduce herself.
8

9 A. Jones introduces herself as the new Executive Administrator. Previously she had worked on the
10 IRIS (Integrated Resource Information System) for the State of Alaska and was in charge of change
11 management, training, and project communications. Prior to that she was the Curator of Public
12 Programs for the Juneau-Douglas City Museum.
13

14 Board welcomes Jones.
15

16 Chair introduces Pat Tami, president-elect of NCEES who will be speaking later in the meeting.
17 Chair welcomes Tami and appreciates NCEES for taking the time to allow someone to attend our
18 Board meeting.
19

20 **Agenda item 2 - Review and approve agenda.**

21 Fritz requests to add under Item 8, item D, update on Alternative Education Requirements for
22 Architects. Status of BEA.
23

24 **9:04 On a motion duly made by Maynard, Seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it
25 was RESOLVED to accept the agenda as amended.**
26

27 **Agenda item 3 - Ethics reporting.**
28

29 9:06 Chair: I attended the MBA, Member Board Administrators meeting in December and the
30 California Board meeting on behalf of NCEES in December, and I was in Jefferson City, Missouri on
31 behalf NCEES two weeks ago for a board visit and Sarena and I were both in Atlanta last weekend
32 for the BPA forum for NCEES .
33

34 Maynard: I attended the UPLG meeting the first week of January in Panama City, Florida.
35

36 Urfer: I've been working with the Alaska chapter of the ASLA to help them get some information
37 together in support of the sunset bill.
38

39 Note: Committee meetings are fully funded by the respective national organization and the
40 individuals are representing their profession not the Board or State.
41

42 **Agenda item 4 - Review and approve the August 2016 minutes.**
43

44 No edits.
45

46 **9:08 On a motion duly made by Maynard, Seconded by Koonce and passed unanimously it
47 was RESOLVED to approve the November 2016 minutes as amended.** Chair abstained since he
48 was not present at the last meeting.
49

50 The Chair recommended the Board skip to item 8 since we had 14 minutes before John Savage

1 would be calling in to give the Investigator's Report.

2
3 **Agenda item 8 - Regulation Updates**

4 Item A.: Regulation changes to 12 AAC 36.060, .061, .062, .063, .064, .065, .105, and .990.

5
6 Koonce states he made changes to the regulations right after the last meeting and gave to Sarena
7 who came back with some additional revisions.

8
9 Chair: These went out for public notice and we did not receive any comments. Oral comments
10 were not allowed.

11
12 **9: 11 On a motion duly made by Maynard, Seconded by Koonce and passed unanimously it**
13 **was RESOLVED to accept the regulation changes to 12 AAC 36.060, .061, .062, .063, .064,**
14 **.065, .105, and .990 as public noticed.**

15
16 Chair asks when these changes will be in effect.

17
18 Hackenmiller explains it will be 4 to 5 months before the regulations will be in effect.

19 R. Jones adds that it needs to go back through Law and will take effect 30 days after the Lt.
20 Governor signs it. Kerr adds that since the legislature is in town, it will most likely not be signed
21 until after session ends.

22
23 Item 8B: Chair explains this is just email related to Item A.

24
25 Item 8C: Chair asks for comments on the information provided regarding NCEES approval of FE/FS
26 Examinations.

27
28 Maynard says this is how we thought it would be. Applicants enters information and that they
29 attended an ABET accredited school and they don't check to see if they are 75% or graduated. They
30 (NCEES) take them at their word.

31
32 Chair: And we just repealed the eligibility for the FE, so now we can just go with NCEES. As soon as
33 regulation gets signed (and takes effect) we can go with auto approve right?

34
35 Maynard: Correct.

36
37 Item 8D: Regulation changes to broadly experienced architect.

38
39 Fritz: states at the last meeting Vern and I signed up to start working on a regulation project to try
40 to clarify the regulation relative to architect licensing by comity. There are some inconsistencies
41 that both Jeff and I experienced when trying to apply the non NCARB accredited credits and
42 evaluations and it has been rather frustrating to figure out who has met the requirements and who
43 has not. We did not work on any specific regulations together. Vern had contacted me and I wanted
44 to first get familiar with what NCARB was doing. NCARB has been working very hard to streamline
45 processes, simplify application procedures and make a clear path for all applicants. I knew they
46 were working on a new educational guideline and kept checking the website, leaving messages, and
47 emailing to find out the status because they said it would be rolled out in early 2017. Last night I
48 went on line and found the document that Sarena just handed out to everyone. Dated July 2016,
49 however it was just posted to the website recently.

1 Fritz informed this morning that the new education guidelines take effect tomorrow, February 9.
2 Fritz: We now have an NCARB position on education path under their guidelines. As I understand,
3 the reason our regulations changed away from NCARB requirements years ago was because the
4 Board felt NCARB's guidelines were too rigid - not on a fast track to change and there was a lot of
5 frustration in the state. The Board felt had reasonable experience, education and examination to
6 become registered in this state. I think it has created a loop hole in our system where you can
7 become registered in another state without effectively meeting the requirements of a new
8 registrant. So now we have the information we need to figure out if we something different than
9 what NCARB now allows or if we can follow what NCARB allows. That is the discussion that needs
10 to happen. Now that we have the tools I would like to work with Vern and whoever else is to look at
11 how our regulations might change.

12
13 Chair: Is this going to open it up to more people?

14
15 Fritz: I don't think it will effect who it opens it to. From the brief reading last night it provides a
16 clearer picture. For example right now a person submits their transcripts and we as a Board are
17 supposed to go through the transcript and determine whether or not it meets the education
18 eligibility - at a meeting. How am I supposed to know what course content and credits and how
19 many is equivalent, there is nothing that defines this. This gives a nice spreadsheet of exactly what
20 number of credits in what areas of content are required. We could keep system of doing evaluation
21 ourselves or we could have NCARB do it without the expense. Now a path for an \$1100 application
22 fee with NCARB to take on evaluation of transcript and if you are deficient in an area there are
23 multiple ways to meet those requirements. I think they have developed a more efficient and cost
24 effective program for alternatives that we should look at. Whether we require it, model it, I don't
25 know, but at least it provides a basis.

26
27 Chair: So this will be the credentials evaluation basically or education evaluation?

28
29 Fritz: Yes. They have offered it but you had to pay more through an evaluation agency. It is still
30 offered, but more for foreign architects or those who studied at a foreign university. If you have a
31 non-NAAB degree it is easier, through NCARB you can get a certificate.

32
33 Chair: It's not easier, but the process is easier.

34
35 Fritz: Yes, easier for the Board because we won't arbitrarily decide what courses fall into a category.
36 \$1100 fee to NCARB to evaluate - that's the effort it takes, and we're being asked to evaluate the
37 information in a Board meeting. It is a lot of work to assess.

38
39 John Savage joined on the phone.

40
41 R. Jones: The original reason the Board got away from requiring an NCARB certification is because
42 most of these people were licensed in another state that didn't require, so we had architects with
43 decades of experience who could not get licensed without shelling out a ton of money to NCARB. So
44 we changed that regulation to mirror the engineering and surveyor processes where the Board
45 would look at the education and experience and make a determination. This guy has been
46 practicing for years, no sanctions, it's been vetted by another state, so they'd license him.

47
48 Prior to that, requiring the NCARB certificate was just the rubber stamp. NCARB is doing all the
49 work, we're just saying ok. And that takes the Board out of the picture. I think we ought to be able to
50 make a decision without somebody having to shell out a lot of money.

1
2 Maynard: One of the other problems is that back then many of the programs did not have a 5 year
3 program and there is no way for them to go back and get that last year so you can get licensed in the
4 state. There is no reason to think they weren't qualified to do architecture just because they didn't
5 have that additional year that didn't exist when they were in school.
6

7 Chair: I like keeping the door open, Vern so I am glad you're going to be helping. I think it's good to
8 have the Board review it and being able to make at that determination... Sometimes we get people
9 with 30 years of experience who don't meet and education requirement and what, we're going to
10 tell them incomplete, or you need to go get this degree, take this class when they have no action
11 against them? It is a good alternative, this new NCARB process, but I do like the flexibility and keep
12 an open mind when we get to 21H. This will come up again.
13

14 Fritz: I am not discouraging the flexibility, however if the Board wants to have that flexibility we
15 need some standards by which to evaluate. Right now it is extremely arbitrary and it's created a
16 loop hole that has allowed people to get registered in another state that does not have the
17 education and experience level that is not consistent with standards for new applicants in our state
18 and that is unfair to people who have gone through the registration process. So what's happening is
19 people fully living and practicing in Alaska and intending to be here go take the exam in another
20 state and two years later come to this Board and say "Ok I'm ready, I've got 2 years of experience, I
21 want in". Whereas people who went through an NAB program and internship programs to get
22 licensed in Alaska take a much more holistic and rigorous process to get licensed. So there is an
23 inconsistency that I think is unfair.
24

25 The Chair suggested that when reviewing the material consider whether those two years are
26 sufficient or maybe it needs to be more. Fritz agreed and said if we can use some standard basis and
27 maybe not require an NCARB certificate and that is what this project will look at.
28

29 The Chair asked Catherine and Vern to provide and update at the May meeting.
30

31 At 9:26, the Board returned to item 5.
32

33 **Agenda item 5 - Investigative Report**

34 Chair welcomed John Savage, Investigator to the meeting.
35

36
37 Savage asks if the location of the May meeting has been decided. The Chair confirms that it will be in
38 Fairbanks.
39

40 Savage explains that the investigations office will be filling a few vacant positions, so we won't lose
41 any investigative time to other boards. He says we've been pretty busy this winter case wise. Land
42 surveyor issues as it relates to UAV use and COAs are still been an issue. He explained people need
43 to be aware and once they begin to understand what they need in order to practice in Alaska as it
44 relates to the UAVs (drones) these issues will most likely subside.
45

46 Savage: The other issue I'd like to bring up is the title block change that went into effect not too long
47 ago. That's moving along nicely. Slowly but surely people are realizing there what the requirement
48 is when they sealing work. I think in the long haul, once everyone gets above board on that it's
49 going to do two things. 1) It's going to stop a lot of the rubber stamping that's going on and 2) It is
50 making it much easier to identify who the players are in that and that has been huge for us. That has

1 been just as big as the change years ago where you had to date your seal so we knew exactly when
2 someone sealed the work and then they couldn't come back and say "Oh no I just did that during
3 this timeframe." Either saying a date they knew they were licensed or whatever the case may be. I
4 just wanted to point that out that was all the Board and that has done great things at this end, so I
5 appreciate that. Other than that it's business as usual. Are there any questions of me?
6

7 Chair: I have a comment, so for right now I believe what we are doing with the UAVs as well as the
8 information that goes on the Corporate block is kind of a ping them and see what their stance is on
9 it and then if they're going to come into compliance it is really an advisement letter rather than
10 going straight to a fine?
11

12 Savage: That is exactly right. If they want to keep working in Alaska and they come into compliance
13 and deal with it, then we still have a case number so if six months from now we find the same
14 people doing the same thing then we can act a little differently, but yes, education and compliance is
15 what we are trying to do early on with those two issues.
16

17 Kerr: Do you have a count on complaints you've received related to UAS/UAV Drones?
18

19 Savage: Not an exact count, no, John, but there's have been quite a few. A lot of them are repeat
20 or overlapping. There are quite a few and quite often I'm getting contacted to by people wanting
21 to know what the process is to file a complaint. It's no different than the others. They've done
22 their due diligence to get properly licensed and it just aggravates them when they see people out
23 there advertising or working without the appropriate licensure. It's not a level playing field and
24 that's what we're looking to achieve also is make it fair for everyone.
25

26 Chair: The important message is that we are not regulating the tools, we are regulating the
27 practice.
28

29 Savage: Correct.
30

31 Chair: It's not the drone we are regulating, it's the practice.
32

33 Savage: Right, right. And as time goes I'm quite certain we'll have people spending energy
34 trying to change wording, or wordsmithing when it would be much cheaper for them to get
35 properly licensed and move on.
36

37 Chair: John, I see we had a net gain of 5 cases. It looks like you opened 19 and closed 14.
38 Anything significant there that we need to know about?
39

40 Savage: There are a couple more significant than others. Not anything I can discuss at this time.
41 But we've had some issues happening around town and that, we're always trying to close more
42 than we open monthly so we don't get into the old days of pages and pages and pages of stuff.
43 We try to keep it moving and that helps everybody in the long run - the individuals, respondent,
44 the Board and the investigative unit here.
45

46 Chair: You have a new Chief investigator?
47

48 Savage: She has been here a few years now. Quinn was our Chief investigator and now we have
Angela Birt. We did lose our senior investigator Al Kennedy, who you've met, he got moved

1 over to the Medical side and that's a terrible loss. Now the new senior investigator is a standup
2 guy and hopefully he'll do great things for the Board like Mr. Kennedy did but time will tell.
3 We've had a couple people leave the office, subsequently we are having to hire additional ones
4 and we are keeping fingers crossed that we get that done before we lose any more with the hiring
5 freeze.

6
7 Chair: Any word on the fire marshal end of things?

8
9 Savage: No other than I think we talked about this not too long ago, I know I've coordinated
10 Diana Parks who is supervisor for all plan reviews in the State of Alaska her position is going
11 away July 1st. I can't think of a worst situation given what she has done for this Board and this
12 investigative office. And what a pleasant women she is to work with and to obtain compliance
13 and such things. I am just holding my breath and crossing my fingers that we continue the same
14 road. Luckily the new Fire Marshall is actually someone who has been here years ago and really
15 supportive of the Board and I'm hoping whoever takes over the plan reviews keeps us in mind.
16 We could lose a lot a ground because years ago all they needed was a seal from a licensed design
17 professional it didn't matter if they were working in that grade or whatever. They could seal
18 architectural plans if they were an engineer and I really don't want to go back to those days. I am
19 really hoping we can continue marching along as we have been.

20
21 Chair: Do you have any data on how many complaints we get out of the Fire Marshal's Office?

22
23 Savage explains at least 50% of our cases are from the Fire Marshal's Office and or other
24 deferred jurisdictions. He added that the deferred jurisdictions received orders from Diana Parks
25 (plan review supervisor for SOA mentioned above) and they all want to be on the same page.
26 Savage expressed his concern that with Parks departure he is worried they will go in different
27 directions.

28
29 Chair requested that Savage pull together some data from the Fire Marshal's Office for the
30 Board. Savage agreed.

31
32 Chair: I think we need to write a letter to the Fire Marshal's Office. I know Diana's position is
33 going away, but just to the office in general in supporting their efforts that support our efforts. I
34 agree eight years ago we were not getting complaints like this out of the Fire Marshall's Office
35 when I joined. I know you had just started rebuilding that relationship and it has paid off.

36
37 Savage: When they had things that were sealed by people outside their discipline, they were
38 falling back on the Fire Marshall's statutes and regulations to seal it and people in command
39 positions that were backing that. She (Parks) has done great things as the people who have
40 worked for her too. I will certainly try to get those numbers together and get them to you.

41
42 Maynard: It might be worthwhile for us when ICBO has their annual meeting with all the
43 building officials from around the state, not necessarily just the deferred jurisdictions, but all the
44 other places - to do a seminar/ session at their convention explaining licensure what's required,
45 what's not required. So we can enlist their help as well so they know what the requirements are
46 and maybe do that if there is a State Fire Marshall's convention or meeting and do it at that event

1 as well. And if we can get them the information so they know what to be looking for and we may
2 spot more that way and get more out of the Fire Marshal's Office.

3
4 Savage explained the fire marshals have a meeting next month that he typically attends each year
5 time block to do a Q & A with the deferred jurisdictions and Fire Marshals. Many believe an
6 electrical administrator is the same as an electrical engineer, so he explains the differences, what
7 each person is there to do and what that license means. Savage goes every year and provides
8 copies of our statutes and regulations.

9
10 Savage says he is also working with Department of Labor's mechanical inspection. Al Maegle
11 the Chief Inspector was a big advocate at these forums explaining licensure and getting the
12 appropriate drawings and designs sealed by the appropriate individual. Savage is working with
13 the new chief regarding requirements. He says overall education is doing much more than going
14 on site and handling issues that way. License allows them to inspect that everything is done to
15 code, not do design work.

16
17 The Chair expressed that he and/or other Board members would be willing to go with Savage to
18 the Fire Marshalls meeting next month. Savage agreed this would be a good idea.

19
20 The Chair also mentioned the Board needs to get ahead of the issue regarding mechanical and
21 electrical administrators looking to further expand the exemption. He urged the Board to stay on
22 top of this matter. Savage added that he constantly tries to educate people that the EA and MA
23 licenses allows them to inspect that everything is done to code, but does not include design work
24 or anything else.

25
26 Fritz: Not only fire marshals, but building departments that don't use the Fire Marshal's office
27 also need this support. The building departments aren't really clear on what is required. They
28 want to cooperate/assist but don't feel like they have a lot of authority to do so. I am wondering
29 if John or someone is presenting materials at a meeting or an event of some kind is there a way to
30 develop an outline, PowerPoint, speaking points/ talking points of the major issues that we take
31 this on the road, similar to the surveying practice.

32
33 Fritz suggests content be developed by someone (Board and/or staff) and then shared with the
34 Board so that it reflects what our main messages are and is available for use when we have
35 opportunities to make presentations at meetings, etc. She says the Board has an obligation to
36 report violations, however she believes an educational approach is really what the Board needs to
37 be doing and by educating we reach audiences earlier and it is better for everyone. She also
38 offered to review the content if someone else put it together.

39
40 Savage agrees that education is the best route and mentions that he tells the people he meets at
41 the fire marshals' forum that if they have someone pushing back on following the requirements,
42 he urges the fire marshalls to get the person or persons in contact with him and he'll get on it
43 right away and work with them to be compliant.

44
45 The Board thanks John for all their help.

1 Savage thanks Erik Erickson for his professionalism, guidance and help. Eric thanks John.

2

3 Savage leaves telephone- 9:49 am

4

5 Chair: Will work with John. No. 1 is usually a civil engineer that is stamping everything. Sometimes
6 it is an architect, but it is not a surveyor or electrical engineer stamping everything. It is usually a
7 civil engineer or an architect.

8

9 Board skips to item 18.

10

11 **Agenda item 18 - Board Correspondence Received Since November 2016**

12 Item 18A: CLARB - Urfer: There have been a number of CLARB teleconferences, a lot of them are
13 geared at trying to recruit folks to volunteer. To my observation, they are focused a lot on the
14 jurisdictions with larger licensees. Especially on Region 5 which is the west coast there has been
15 some discussion on how there is not application to some of the smaller jurisdictions. We've been
16 trying to see how to shake some of that out. I can't say that they recognize there is a huge difference
17 between some of the smaller jurisdictions so it is a communication issue that we need to get back to
18 CLARB that there are some issues we need to resolve that just aren't getting covered yet. They have
19 looked at the online licensing program to make sure they are staying current and keep tabs on
20 number of students signing up to get licensed. Every time they give the exam they see the same
21 pattern - the kids coming right out of school are doing much better on passing, at least for the first
22 sections of the exams. It depends on the state if they can take the first sections before. And the last
23 thing that I thought was very interesting from the last teleconference was they brought forth this
24 big deal that NY had put together a guidance manual for landscape architects, and I thought what a
25 novel idea!

26

27 Chair: Practice guidelines?

28

29 Urfer: Yes, exactly. I think it is worth getting a copy to see what they have in it. To see how it maybe
30 correlates with what we are doing and see if there is anything we should add to ours that they have
31 in theirs.

32

33 Hackenmiller mentions it is on page 63 of the packet it is available and offered to download it for
34 the Board.

35

36 Chair: Yes, it looks like it deals with sealing and signing and practice and then client relations.

37

38 Hackenmiller mentions there was a teleconference for CLARB yesterday. She learned Washington is
39 a stand-alone Landscape Architect Board and there is a bill out to deregulate it, which is a trend for
40 this profession. Arizona was the first to go through it and now it is hitting Washington. She
41 mentioned during the teleconference that we are working to make our Landscape Architect seat
42 permanent. She also mentions Hawaii is thinking about doing Pre-Audit, which involves selecting
43 people to be audited prior to renewal. She expresses her concern that if people know three months
44 before renewal they have not been selected that they will be less inclined to complete their CEs.
45 Texas does it and a couple other states. Hawaii has not yet implemented CEs, so they are thinking of
46 ways to do it.

47

48 Urfer: Washington State sent notification of their deregulation out and they are asking folks to come
49 forward and support it and give direction on how to approach it. I responded back to the person
50 and explained what we had done through the ALSA chapter here and sent a copy of the pamphlet

1 they put together.

2
3 Hackenmiller: When Colin brought up meeting with building officials, Washington did speak to that.
4 They came together with the Board of Architects, Board of Engineers, because they are all separate
5 and they did attend a conference all together and they said because they are all different that it was
6 very beneficial for them to come together and attend that conference.

7
8 Chair: Lastly you mentioned they did come together and write a letter of support for making ours a
9 permanent seat which I thought was nice.

10
11 Item B: NCARB. Koonce reports since our last meeting the MRA between the architectural licensing
12 authorities of Australia, New Zealand and the United States was signed. There were 29 states have
13 signed including Alaska. NCARB launched ARE 5.0 and a couple people in his office are participating
14 in that. 5.0 includes combinations/ series of tests and it is structured more like practice using a
15 start to finish model, whereas the previous exam was more scattered.

16
17 Note: MRA stands for Mutual Recognition Arrangement. ARE refers to Architect Registration
18 Examination.

19
20 Fritz mentioned that she and Urfer are planning to go to Jersey City for the regional meeting next
21 month pending funding approval.

22
23 Chair asked about any upcoming elections.

24
25 Koonce states elections are coming up, people move up the ranks.

26
27 Fritz and Koonce both mention there is solicitation for committee members going on right now
28 through the end of February for the continuing education committee

29
30 Board goes back to Item 6.

31
32 **Agenda item 6 - Financial Report**

33
34 Director Janey Hovenden and Administrative Officer Martha Hewlett introduce themselves.

35
36 Hewlett goes over the FY16 final report line by line pointing out the licensing revenue since it was a
37 renewal year. She explains how the direct expenditures correlate to the object codes provided on
38 page 2. Personal Services are the 1000 series, Travel is the 2000 series and Contractual is the 3000
39 series.

40
41 Hovenden reminds the Board we reduced fees in FY16 to help whittle down the large surplus.

42
43 Erickson recalls there was a discussion or Board policy regarding maintaining a certain surplus
44 level for investigations, etc. The Chair confirmed that the level was one year and in the \$6,000 -
45 \$8,000 range. Fees were adjusted to avoid the "whip saw" of drastically increasing and decreasing
46 the fees and gradually settle in to a cushion. It will take a couple years to settle out. The Board will
47 be doing fee setting again this year, providing recommendations in August and vote in November.

48
49 Hewlett walks the Board through FY17 Budget through the 2nd quarter, which ended December 31,
50 2016. She noted the personal services line will reflect lower than past years due to the timeframe in

1 which the executive position was vacant.
2
3 Kerr requests a breakdown of the membership dues for each of the disciplines.
4
5 *Note:* Hewlett provided this information to the Board on Thursday, February 9th.
6
7 Fritz asks if there was a budget that outlines these items that the board reviews and makes
8 recommendations on how the money is spent. Hewlett explains CBPL (Coporations, Business and
9 Professional Licensing) oversees 41 professional licensing programs, 21 or 22 of which have active
10 Boards. Individual programs are not given their own budgets, however she does do a line item
11 break down for known items, review annual fiscal reports and pull out any costs you've included in
12 it. We look at the list of travel, memberships, costs that you incur annually. Hewlett recommends if
13 you know of an expense ahead of time notify the Executive Administrator a head of time to include
14 it. Printing, copying and other administrative costs are divided out. Hewlett explains if renewal
15 year, which involves a larger amount of printing, they will get a quote to provide in projections.
16
17 Fritz asks about the timeframe in which to provide information to the State regarding funding for a
18 particular project, for example educational outreach to fire marshalls and building officials staff
19 time and printing costs. Budget for FY 18 is somewhat framed, based upon last year's numbers.
20 Legislature is currently looking at this. Let us know and plan to have them done for both staffing
21 and monetary planning. Annual reports are a good place to put them in as the public and legislative
22 offices - achievements and focuses for the coming year.
23
24 Hewlett recommended the Board first report any known budget items through their executive
25 administrator and also include in the annual report. Annual reports are due by July 1st, however
26 these have typically been a little late.
27
28 Martha was excused.
29
30 Hovenden provides an update on the laptops purchased for Board use. Six laptops have shipped to
31 Anchorage and the six slotted for Juneau shipped earlier this week. She had hoped they would here
32 and configured for the Boards use.
33
34 Kerr expressed his frustration with only 6 laptops and does not see how that helps an 11 member
35 Board. Hovenden states there is not enough for a board of your size. Any extras will also be
36 reserved. She had hoped they would be ready for this meeting, but they are currently being
37 configured.
38
39 Kerr does not see the value if the laptop is not accessible for Board business (i.e. review of the
40 board packet) which takes place prior to the Board meeting. The laptops are needed outside the
41 meeting. The board does not have the tools they need to do their work this model does not add up.
42
43 Hovenden mentioned they are looking at board management techniques and the procuring the
44 laptops was just the first step.
45
46 The group discussed measures for keeping content secure.
47
48 The Chair expresses his disappointment with the roll out of moving to electronic Board packets.
49 From a rollout perspective of going electronic, it takes 2 weeks to get information into the system.
50 Appreciate not having to carry around applications. We do not have tools to do work. We are asked

1 to use personal or work. It seems like a big expense to just serve purpose. We were a big proponent
2 of this. \$2000 Tablet would be a reasonable request. We appreciate the update and hope to use
3 them at the next meeting.

4
5 Jones: The roadblock has been IT. Any update on AKLS CBT?

6
7 Hovenden: I do not have an update. Sara was spearheading that and hopefully will pick up where
8 she left when she returns. Alysia Jones offered to follow up with Sara after the meeting regarding
9 this item.

10
11 Hovenden introduced HB90 and provided a packet for the Board to review. The packet included a
12 cover letter as well as information on how to register for the Bill Tracker. HB90 would collect a flat
13 fee from every licensee used to cover the cost of the investigative unit so the fee will not be affected
14 by the volatility of the investigation. She explains some of the smaller programs that have fewer
15 licensees are more heavily impacted by the volatility of investigations. At this time the bill and flat
16 fee has not yet been fully analyzed, but early estimates look like it would be less than \$100 per
17 licensee. This will just be a different way of accounting for your investigator and will be put towards
18 that surcharge instead.

19
20 Maynard says he and Luanne met with Representative Kito yesterday and he did not sell it as an
21 evening out of the fee. Kito said the fee for midwives and big game guides prevents them from
22 getting into the field and this was a way to distribute the costs so all of the licensees cover their
23 investigative costs. They have done numbers, although I am not certain of the accuracy, and
24 determined our investigative costs are now \$13 and if we add on the cost of other boards the cost
25 would go up another \$20. With that \$20 we should be able to underwrite everyone else because it is
26 a good thing to do. Luanne and I did not agree with that approach since we've spent the last 30
27 years trying to get each Board to cover their own costs. If big game guides can't afford it, then
28 charge the people who get hunting licenses to underwrite it. Merge the midwives with the nurses
29 and doctors so you can get rid of a few staff members and distribute it among them and then at
30 least it is the medical profession is paying for the other medical. We have a combined board and I'm
31 guessing the 50 landscape architects don't cover all the expenses related to landscape architecture
32 and we cover those. I am not particularly interested in covering the costs for a bunch of industries
33 just because I have a professional license.

34
35 Chair asked Hovenden where the division stands on support of this. Hovenden explains it is a
36 philosophical discussion and asked for opinions. We have 22 individual boards. And this is how
37 much it costs divided by everyone. Smaller programs, like midwives, maybe don't have any
38 investigations for several years and then they have a costly investigation, so that particular year the
39 money is spent on midwives. Overall investigations need to be covered. We are accounting for
40 everyone's 15 min. of time, overhead, etc. or have a flat

41
42 Peter Flint from Fairbanks, Alaska joined the meeting.

43 Hovenden continued to explain that investigations can sometimes cripple a program. Everyone
44 shares the cost of investigations. Maybe this year it is an architect, next year it is a midwife.
45 Licensing should pay for the investigative unit. She likened it to everyone paying for the fire
46 department.

47
48 Fritz asks if there has been any analysis regarding some of the smaller Boards that are not
49 combined and whether or not they should be. Find out how big of an issue, what is the vulnerability
50 is there a solution that has been considered – feasibility of including them in a group vs. a blanket

1 fire department approach. It is hard for our licensees to accept that if there is a serious
2 investigation for another program that requires a lot of resources that they are responsible for
3 covering the cost. Fritz suggested that other options be explored.
4

5 Hovenden responded that there are different models throughout the U.S. and Board costs are
6 nominal to running the programs. The Board does not have any control on whether or not one of
7 their licensees need to be investigated. The way boards are set up is statutory and out of our hands.
8 We can only manage the way the programs are set up now and they are all individual.
9

10 The Chair says I don't want to put words in your mouth, but the Division is generally supportive of
11 this bill. Hovenden responded generally supportive is all I can say at this time. We do not
12 understand the financial impacts at this time. You have provided the information about how to get
13 into the Bill Tracker and sign up to testify. I think you understand our position
14

15 Hovenden: The bigger Boards are generally not supportive of this bill.
16

17 Chair: That is understandable. We have worked long and hard to get an investigator that we pay for
18 and pretty much that is going to get taken away by the bigger collective. They aren't going to bill us
19 for his time anymore right? We're not paying for him, so actually our investigative costs should go
20 down?
21

22 Hovenden: No, it's not going to get taken away. What representative Kito was probably looking at
23 was direct investigations, not that investigator assigned to you. So if it is all charged to the
24 surcharge, you (the AELS Board) might be ahead.
25

26 Maynard: Regarding your example of the fire department, everyone is charged for that not just the
27 people who sell hoses for example. If investigations are intended for public safety, then have the
28 public pay for the investigations. We don't have lawyers paying for the troopers everyone pays for
29 the troopers, etc. You get my point. In Anchorage if you were in the APD area you don't pay for APD.
30 Same with the Fire Department there is only certain places they go, but then you aren't charged for
31 that. Yes it's only \$20, but it's the philosophy. In my opinion there are other ways to cover this fee.
32

33 Erikson expresses concern that once you centralize all the investigators they will prioritize and we
34 will lose the focus of our investigator.
35

36 Urfer states that this has the possibility to setting a precedent and who's to say other items in our
37 budget won't follow this logic and we would be right back where we started.
38

39 R. Jones: A lot of other states do this and I don't understand why Alaska doesn't. If there is a big
40 investigation and someone is prosecuted and fined, why can't the person who is fined also pay for
41 the investigative costs? Why do we have to foot the bill for him breaking the law and causing us
42 more work? That should be tacked on to the fine and that would solve the issue.
43

44 Hovenden notes there is another issue any fines or penalties are not given back to the program that
45 incurred the investigative cost and that is another issue. The division was hoping there would be a
46 two-prong approach, have this all investigative cost covered in a pool and in addition any fines paid
47 would go back to the program that incurred the cost. We don't actually receive enough to cover the
48 costs of investigations at all, but it's still the point of it.
49

50 Jones: If I break the law and it costs the State \$10,000, I should at least be fined that.

1
2 Chair: We appreciate you coming and giving us the financial report and bringing us this bill.
3
4 Hovenden thanks the board and leaves the meeting.
5
6 Fritz: Before we leave this item is there any action or to do for the Board?
7
8 Chair: It is under New Business Item 21G.
9
10 Board takes a 5 minute recess.
11
12 Chair invites Pat Tami, President-elect from NCEES to speak.
13
14 Tami thanks the Board for inviting him and NCEES to attend meeting. A year ago we looked at the
15 NCARB model and also looked at what we were doing to get to know our member boards. How do
16 we find out what we need to do for you because that's what it is all about. To put on at a national
17 level what is important to you, so we started this program and will be interested in hearing from
18 you, what you liked, what you didn't like, what we could do more.
19
20 Tami provided some background about NCEES history, which began in 1920 with 5 member boards
21 with the goal of mobility. Trying to make it easier once you obtained a license in one state/
22 jurisdiction to get a license in another jurisdiction. We are coming up in our 100th anniversary in a
23 few years and are very excited about that. We now have 70 member boards including all the US
24 states, plus almost all of the territories. Some boards are not combined boards. I like what you have
25 here which is not only engineers, but surveyors, architects and landscape architects. I think that
26 overlap of the professions and having them at the same table. It lends to friendliness to discuss
27 things and help solve problems better for public. I wish we could do that more. All national
28 licensing boards for landscape architects, interior design and architects, we all meet together once a
29 year so we hear about the different professions and attacks on the professions and we can go after
30 them together and help each other out. Right now each board gets one vote at the annual meeting.
31 We have our Zone meeting where we discuss things as the Western zone. That's in April/May. The
32 annual meeting is in August and this year it is in Miami. Our zone meeting is in Denver, which is
33 a joint meeting in Denver with the central zone. We are testing out a couple things. Rather than
34 having individual zone meetings we are looking at possibly doing a mini-annual meeting in
35 2020, our 100th anniversary and do all the boards together for our interim meeting and see if that
36 works. Tami explained there is a lot of effort that goes into putting together those meetings
37 which Sarena and members of the AELS Board were involved with the Western Zone meeting
38 we had last May in Anchorage and did a lot of work. If we have it spread out maybe NCEES
39 staff can help out a little more as we have people on staff who are certified in meeting planning.
40 It also has some negative side effects too. Tami asked the Board for feedback on the combined
41 meeting format.
42 Tami mentioned everyone should have received two postcards 1) invite to the NCEES Zone
43 meeting in Denver; 2) volunteering for committees, we sent out two emails and 165 people who
44 had replied to it as of last week and there are only 8 positions available. Determining who to put
45 on committees is one of the most difficult things I do as President-elect.
46 One of the other big things we did was continuing education. We have a place on the NCEES
47 website where you can sign up for free and log your continuing education, upload any
48 certificates, etc. Tami encourages people take advantage of this as it can be viewed by multiple

1 jurisdictions in a standard format. Tami also mentioned a licensure exchange publication that
2 will be coming out and NCEES reduced the exam fees for FE and FS exams, so hopefully you'll
3 be adjusting yours. The original motion was for a smooth and even net zero to the budget but it
4 was amended on the floor and it is about a \$1.7 million dollar hit to NCEES budget. There was a
5 lot of discussion about why that was accepted and people said we want to get more people in,
6 taking the exam. There are lots of reasons why. This will be the first time to my knowledge that
7 you'll have a negative budget to look at to approve. Brian will be at the meeting next week for
8 the Board of Directors to approve the budget. I'm not used to doing that, I would rather see a
9 neutral budget. Tami mentioned that NCEES does have some reserves and that may be used to
10 soften the hit.

11
12 The FE is our number one exam. It is about 70% of all exam fees. And Exam fees is about 70%
13 of all our income. When you reduce those fees, it has a huge impact on us. But maybe this will
14 help those who are struggling to take the exam. There are people that may see the cost as a
15 barrier. Tami opened up the discussion for questions.

16
17
18 Fritz. Thank you for the "first-timers invitation" at the Indianapolis conference. I've never had to
19 understand where the engineers' education, experience and exams come from and it was
20 invaluable and understanding the way NCEES works. Hearing that was important is exactly the
21 types of things we want to hear. A lot of Boards are experiencing the restrictions on travel, so it
22 is good to hear about how the other side works.

23
24 Hale disapproves of the way in which HB90 was brought up from the floor as floor discussions
25 devolve. He explains it should go somewhere and be pondered rather than voted on right away.
26 Tami asks if it would be appropriate for us to ask if it's going to make an impact of a certain
27 amount for example then should it wait until next day or provided some timeframe to consider it
28 fully.

29
30 Kerr likes the idea of implementing something at meetings where if it has a fiscal impact, get it
31 out to people and hold the vote until 3rd day of the conference to allow for full consideration.

32
33 Tami makes charges for the committees next year and I'm in the process of doing that right now
34 but really it should come from member boards. MBA is where the rubber meets the road. You
35 have to implement these policies. I really enjoy hearing from the administrators and the Boards,
36 if you have thoughts or ideas, please let me know.

37
38 Luanne attended the annual meeting in Seattle years ago. There was a lot of discussion at the
39 tables people were asking about the interaction of our board as a multidisciplinary board. There
40 is a lot of interest on how boards work as multidiscipline. The other thing I wanted to bring to
41 your attention was the MBA Guam mentioned he would like some input on landscape architects
42 and how that will interact with their engineering professions.

43
44 Tami attended another combined board in Guam. One of their board members was the head
45 building inspector it is a designated spot on their board so any plans in the island go through that
46 office. So having that position on the Board really helped with compliance. In some states that

1 wouldn't work, but maybe here you might think about the Fire Marshall as a spot on your Board
2 and if that would work for you.

3
4 Eriksen: Thank you for being here. Do you have an idea of what we may anticipate? The
5 direction of the Board in a 10-year period?

6
7 Tami said it depends on what the member boards want. That's what [NCEES] vision should be.
8 He started hearing concerns about whether there were going to be professions in the future?
9 Obama Administration put out a White Paper that said you are restricting trade. In California,
10 Little Hoover commission came out and said licensing is restricting trade and is a bad thing.
11 Tami mentioned there is a huge movement to deregulate. We are defending the need for having
12 licensure in the first place. We need to have a defense ready or talking points we can use
13 universally as this is at a federal level. The other item is looking at is the exam committees. Who
14 is on there, how long, diversity? When was the last time someone from Alaska worked on an
15 exam? So you know you're protecting the public here. How do we bounce that around yet keep
16 consistency to the exam. Tami would like to work on policies for exam development.

17
18 Hale: Advocates for a national licensure?

19
20 Tami: I'm not in favor of national licensure. I'd like us to find a base level we can all agree on
21 and then once that base level is met make it easier for that person to go from jurisdiction to
22 jurisdiction. That being said, I think your Arctic course here is extremely important – they need
23 that information before they practice. Having a good state-specific exam is a good idea.

24
25 Hale: We have specialties in Alaska vs. Arkansas, so even having a national exam would not
26 preclude you from having a specialty.

27
28 Tami: We meet with our counterparts in foreign countries and they don't understand why there
29 are different licenses per state. Most other jurisdictions though are the size of our counties.

30
31 Maynard: In Washington, for a structural license, the NCEES exam is not enough, they want to
32 know that you have experience actually designing structures for what used to be zone 4
33 earthquake zone like a special brace frame. If all you've done is ordinary frames they won't give
34 you a license in WA. You can't build those in WA because you can't build those in Washington.
35 There is a big diff between the two. We have a seismic hazard commission and they have asked
36 us a couple times to create a seismic exam or offer the CA one but we have declined so far. We
37 have 52% of the US' earthquakes, 80% are 5 and above. Since '64 we haven't had (stuff fall
38 down). But we are trying to raise the bar and that's why we went to requiring the structural
39 exam. Other states don't offer the SE, so getting comity is going to be very difficult.

40
41 Tami: mentions the next Licensure Exchange has a great article on "Significant Structures".

42
43 Maynard: states he listened in to the NCSEA committee and they had difficulty coming up with a
44 policy for SE licensing coalition. They finally decided we will leave it up for each jurisdiction.

45
46 Chair comments from a Board perspective. Travel is a big concern for our Board. Having the 3

1 funded delegates makes travel for us a lot easier and more available to us and we appreciate the
2 extra person. As I indicated earlier, our dues nowhere cover our costs and we understand that.
3 \$6500 does not cover six trips from Alaska (zone meeting and annual meeting for 3 people).
4 Also the one vote/2 vote, I know several other Boards have jumped on that as well. Being a
5 combined board, we only have 1 vote on the council floor and this does not accurately represent
6 us. Separated boards have two. They do pay 2 dues as well so there is a cost.

7
8 Tami explains California is going to present a motion at the Western Zone meeting to restudy to
9 change the 1 Board 1Vote. Tami explains CA examinees are responsible for taking 25% of all
10 exams NCEES gives and gets one vote. Rhode Island gets 2 votes and their examinees make up
11 less than 1%. There is a tiered level, so Boards that have a larger number of licensees pay more
12 and so they don't even pay the same dues.

13
14 Chair: At BPA. Limiting the number of times individuals could take the examination. I think that
15 will continue to bubble around. Right now in Alaska we have a 5 strike rule and then re-apply.
16 What they are talking about it is take it X number of times and then you could no longer take it
17 again. If NCEES proposes this, I think it should be based on data, statistics, some concrete
18 reason because the Boards will have to defend that decision. I would voice opposition. A
19 significant study would need to be undertaken to justify that.

20
21 Chair: We appreciate you coming to Alaska, and with my involvement with NCEES we asked
22 the Board of Directors and they felt it would be good to have someone else's perspective. I wrote
23 a few things down that I can incorporate. Thank you.

24
25 Urfer: asks about partnership with FARB.

26
27 Tami explains NCEES is in the process of leaving an organization like that because they are not
28 promoting the value of licensure and that is at the core of NCEES. We are not ready to jump into
29 another organization in the midst of potentially making another one mad, but yes, this is
30 something we are looking at, but spending money after that 1.7 million dollar hit is not where we
31 want to go right now. Yes, it is on the radar.

32 Tami thanks

33
34 Chair: Thanks Tami again for coming and for volunteering to speak at the APDC luncheon. It's a
35 great opportunity for folks in Alaska.

36
37 Eriksen mentions he will be speaking at the Chamber of Commerce luncheon tomorrow at the same
38 place we are going today for the APDC luncheon.
39 11:30 a.m. recessed for lunch.

40
41 The Board attends the APDC luncheon where Tami and Maynard both speak.

42
43 1:14 p.m. on record. Roll Call, all present except Schedler.

44
45 **Agenda item 11 – Public Comment**

46 Jennifer Meyer speaks and is representing herself. She explains she is an engineer with the City of
47 Fairbanks and is Vice President of the ACE Fairbanks Branch. I had previously applied for approval

1 for the PE Exam in 2015, with 6 years, and now in April 2017 I will have 8 years of work
2 experience. When I applied in 2015 I was found Incomplete and the response was degree is non-
3 ABET and is not in civil engineering. No path for licensure without getting a civil engineering
4 degree. I am now aware that at the time of my application in 2015 an oversight occurred and my
5 fundamentals of engineering exam information was not in my file. This information would have
6 indicated that I initially applied for the FE prior to June 30, 2010 and that the AELS Board
7 approved my application for the FE which I took and passed in Alaska. To speak to the non-
8 ABET engineering degree I received in 2008. I'd like to point out that the program was ABET
9 approved in 2009 and is now an ABET accredited degree and the program is not substantially
10 different between 2008 and 2009. With regard to a pathway for licensure, I am aware that
11 regulation changes for land surveyors recently occurred and as such the Board has already made
12 provisions for the land surveyor applicants to receive licensure under grandfathered regulations. I
13 should not be any different. I submitted my initial application for the FE prior to June 30, 2010,
14 thereby starting my path to licensure under the regulations at that time. I am also aware the LS
15 applicants have a 5 year timeline however Table A of 12 AAC 36.063 requires 6 years work
16 experience for a non-ABET degree in the branch applied for or 8 years of experience and ABET
17 accredited course work, no degree. Either way it would have been impossible for me to meet
18 5 year deadline and should not be applicable. I have now met the 8 year work experience
19 requirement. As you will see in my file and I have already indicated my engineering program is
20 now ABET accredited. Aside from that I'd like to speak the inconsistency in the regulation
21 language. 12 AAC 36.062 5) states an applicant may sit for the FE exam with a non-ABET
22 accredited B.S. degree in engineering. However, in 12 AAC 36.063 Application for the
23 Professional Engineering exam it states non-ABET accredited degree in the branch applied for. I
24 can only hope the Board is not aware of the inconsistent language and knowingly approved my
25 application for the FE exam without a path to professional licensure or without ever intending to
26 allow me to sit for the PE exam. I would hope that if the Board had found my application, work
27 experience and degree incomplete or unacceptable that I would have been denied the ability to
28 take the FE exam and directed to make appropriate pathways corrections before completing
29 years of work experience to take the PE exam. In closing I ask the Board to look at the entire
30 picture when evaluating my file and considering my application to take the PE exam. I ask that
31 the Board provide me a pathway. Thank you in advance for reviewing my application.

32
33 Chair: We don't usually provide feedback, but in this case I will say we will review your application.
34 I know in the past we have run across individuals who would never meet the professional licensure
35 criteria when they are applying for the FE and in those situations we attempted to let them know.
36 We appreciate you coming in and talking to us. You are welcome to submit your comments in
37 writing if you'd like.

38
39 Dale Nelson representing APDC (Alaska Professional Design Council) Legislative Committee. Here
40 to let you know what we are doing in town. To give you some background, I've been a registered
41 professional civil engineer in the state since the 70s. I am basically retired, but you wouldn't know it
42 with my busy schedule. I am also an active AFC member and sit on the national board. What I gave
43 to Brian is our position statement and our first order of business is the HB 48 reauthorization of the
44 AELS Board and we are in support of that. I will be testifying this afternoon at 3:15, in support of it
45 and as I told everyone at our meeting this morning I am going to speak in support of it and not go
46 down into any issues because we've been there and done that. I just want to get it approved and
47 move on. The other thing that doesn't particularly pertain to you, but it is HB50 QBS, one that we've
48 been working on for long time - Qualification Based Selection. That one we are working on and

1 we'll be testifying and that is always a hard one, but we keep working on it. The other things we are
2 in town for are infrastructure funding, education funding – education ties back into a lot of what
3 you guys talk about. The continuing education of engineers, land surveyors architects, landscape
4 architects, you name it. The University of Alaska Engineering President Johnson spoke at RDC and
5 he said we have one billion for infrastructure work that we have to do. I did not realize it was that
6 much. And also the educational facilities at the high schools, grade schools, middle schools and
7 we're here to help you that's our point when we meet with the legislators, use us as a resource. And
8 we've said the same to the AELS Board. Let us know if there something with that we can help with.
9 Thank you for your time.

10
11 Chair: Do we anything for APDC?

12
13 Maynard: I have a question. When did you start being LRC Chair?

14
15 Nelson: Right after you.

16
17 Maynard. No, Sam was in between us.

18
19 Nelson: Right, well a long time ago. In the 70s I was the president of the Anchorage branch and we
20 saw the need for someone to be involved in legislative activities. Up until that point there was a
21 gentlemen by the name of Don Dent but he was retiring so we formed this in the late 70s, so that's
22 how long APDC has been going.

23
24 Chair: As you are aware we are trying to make the landscape architect position on the Board
25 permanent. I don't know if you'd support that and I don't want to put you on the spot, but

26
27 Nelson: It is embedded within this (HB 48) bill so if this goes then we get the seat too.

28
29 Chair: The other item I would bring up that was just brought to our attention is HB90, which is
30 having to do with the investigators, so if you guys could take a look at that. Just to bring it up it's
31 been introduced. We just found out about it this morning. It potentially has a monetary impact on
32 our Board.

33
34 Nelson: I think we would probably be interested in it. We were in support of having an investigator
35 for this Board, so if there are any changes to that then we'd be very interested in being involved.
36 Nelson asked when it was introduced and the Board responded a few days ago and that it was
37 brought to the Board's attention only this morning.

38
39 Peter Flint speaks via teleconference. I am in Fairbanks. I am a registered land surveyor. I would
40 like to talk about two things today. The first being about the land surveyor flowchart in 48.341 and
41 the 2nd the need for the Board to clarify and take a public position on the eligibility requirements for
42 taking the PE and PS exams in lieu of recent regulations. So, first, I was reading through the last
43 Board meeting minutes and I saw a bunch of references to this flowchart and was thinking I'd never
44 seen anything like that before and I'm a member of the ASPLS Board of Directors and I'm President
45 of the Fairbanks chapter and I'd never seen anything like this before so I contacted Sarena and she
46 sent me a copy of it. I would first like to commend the Board for taking to clarify the definition. The
47 fact that we need a flowchart to clarify our run on sentence with 12 commas in the first place is a
48 little discerning it seems like a problem and this is a great step forward and with all the recent
49 confusion at regarding the definition and those at operating at UAS and producing maps and
50 practicing surveying or not practicing surveying and I think there needs to be more work done in

1 this area. This Board needs to actively involve the UAS and GIS communities in this discussion and
2 kind of tying it into the gentlemen from NCEES who was speaking before lunch about recent legal
3 battles involving licensing boards restricting competition and free trade. I think by not actively
4 involving the other professions, the Board could potentially open itself up for a similar lawsuit and
5 to some of us in the surveying community the definition is being overly generalized to specifically
6 exclude some of our state and national testing standards, some of us don't feel we're even been kept
7 up to speed. I think we need to involve all the communities so we can have a cohesive community
8 that can come together and not be at each other's throats. For my second item, I am specifically
9 going to relate to the surveyors because it happened more recently. What I am talking about
10 specifically is that the Board changed the requirements for the fundamentals and professional
11 exams on the same day of the same year while failing to mention anything about what would
12 happen to people caught in between the changes and I know I personally know I was kind of in the
13 middle of this change and I sought clarification and there was never really any specific clarification.
14 At one point I was told it was going to be a subsection of the regulations that would say what was
15 supposed to happen, a specific timeframe, but especially after hearing Jessica speak, I think it is
16 important to really clarify that and put it down in writing so people aren't just guessing what's
17 going to happen to them. Letting someone take their FS or FE and then they work for six years and
18 then you don't let them take the PE test after that. They should know going into that so they can
19 remedy that situation beforehand. I feel like the Board should really take a public stance on that and
20 lay that out for people so they know what is expected of them. And that's all I've got for you today.

21
22 Chair: Thank you very much for your comments.

23
24 Daniel Nichols speaks: Hello I'm Daniel Nicolas and I've been a licensed civil engineer in the State of
25 Alaska for over 12 years now. Though I am a member of ASCE, but I am not representing them here
26 at this meeting. Thank you for coming and talking at lunch, I appreciate you making yourselves
27 available to the engineers. It is always nice to hear the Board and have that interaction with them.
28 I'd like to talk about increased educational requirements for the licensing and the discussion of
29 having a Master's level of education. I am personally pro-this.

30
31 Master's level education. I am pro-this. I received a Master's back in the 2002 and it was a very
32 valuable experience for me having that additional education. As I'm involved with younger
33 engineers, it seems as we have gotten more specialized and at the same time broader, there is less
34 and less understanding of the basics and fields in Civil Eng. Because of this I am finding young
35 engineers aren't able to see issues or problems outside the few design classes that they had in
36 their undergrad work or seen in their first job. I would expect them to know when to call in a
37 specialist and I'm not seeing that. I would advocate having additional education program, I think
38 it was the right decision to move towards the CE program is good and I'd think this would be an
39 extension of this towards a broader understanding of the field as a whole. In an earlier discussion
40 we talked about the uncoupling of the test with the experience. I have some concerns with that
41 because I think having the test later on in your experience actually refreshes some of the basics
42 and forces people to go back to review what you are learned in general areas so they are not
43 strictly specialized in one area and have some broader understanding of the fields around them.
44 Thank you for hearing me.

45
46 Maynard: I just wanted to let you know where NCEES is on the "raise the bar". I know ASCE is
47 very forward on that. Other engineering societies are not so in favor of it. A lot of them do not
48 have the body of knowledge developed that ASCE has for the civil engineers. So NCEES is

1 working with them to develop that so you don't necessarily have to go to a university to get that
2 additional hours. If you work for DuPont you are going to spend the first six months being
3 trained by them on what they have and so for chemical engineers it is different than civil
4 engineers, so it might be a different method. It is no longer part of our model law, it is part of our
5 policy and we're working on it, but it is going to take a number of years to work out all the
6 kinks.

7
8 Dale Nelson of APDC requested to speak again. HB90 what I am asking for a point of contact to
9 work with. We'll put a position paper together and I'd like to send it for comments.

10
11 Chair: We will have a chair of the committee by the end of our meeting.

12
13 Nelson: At ASCE we are revisiting raise the bar. I do reviews of Washington State University
14 and you can immediately tell which ones have had internships – they shine just that much more.

15
16 The Board discusses what item to address based upon the readiness of the application materials
17 for application review and who needs to leave to attend the HB48 Public Testimony. A. Jones
18 recommended going back to Item 18.

19
20 Chair: NCEES Board of Directors report. First working meeting for the board occurred right
21 after the annual meeting and more housekeeping/ setting up. There was a strategic planning
22 session that took place which guides the organization over the next five years. A lot of good stuff
23 came out of that and action items will be reviewed at the next meeting. Chair mentions
24 candidates typically announce they are running before the zone meetings and we'll have an
25 opportunity to go over this at the May meeting. Chemical exam is going computer-based. That is
26 important for us because we offer that exam. We will not be offering it in October and will not
27 affect the Board, but may affect Board staff with people calling in asking about the exam and
28 when they can take it. It is one of the first tests to go that route, so it will be exciting.

29
30 Item D: Stamping of plans

31 Maynard explains this came about through an email received by Alysia from UAF who had this
32 project design that we could not afford to complete in its entirety so now we want to do another
33 part of it without going back to the people who stamped the drawing. Jones explained that she
34 notified the individual that it would be discussed at the meeting and we'd follow up afterwards.
35 Maynard read the response from the consultant and explains the project was not phased, but they
36 wanted to building portions because of funding.

37
38 The whole project is being constructed, but they are proposing to bid it out to multiple people at
39 different times. In the end, if the whole project is being constructed as designed, then the same
40 people are

41
42 Fritz: How is it being broken up, will it be occupied while the other portion will be constructed.
43 The Chair reminds the board is not concerned with liability, but practice.

44
45 Hale says it looks like they picked and chose what to build due to funding limits. Basic concept
46 is there is a design package and you can't just break it up, the designer – person who stamped the

1 drawings needs to repackage.
2
3 Kerr: What is the timeframe for beginning and stopping the work? If they progressed along the
4 plan and then stopped because of loss of funding.
5
6 Maynard: Picked parts of plan. If you want to reduce the scope you need to work with the person
7 to re-scope.
8
9 Hale: Pulling pieces out you have a different final deliverable.
10
11 The Chair shares past experience, where we developed X and they thought they had the money
12 for X, but in fact they had the money for M which was less than X, so we went through the
13 process. Client said to repackage so the contractors were very clear about the criteria. This
14 happens on civil projects and building projects where you think you have enough to do a whole
15 project and then you realize you don't.
16
17 Chair: I think Colin's response was correct – you shouldn't do this. Is anyone uncomfortable
18 with that?
19
20 Fritz: I am. I totally agree with statements that if they excerpt certain things that make it unsafe
21 or a code problem or they tried to use the scope for something that wasn't whole then there is a
22 licensing issue there now, but if it was simply to say we are hiring contractor X to do this and
23 then when we have more money we'll hire contractor Y and then well have the whole project
24 stamped the way. If the design was not modified, then it is maintained – intact as they initially
25 designed it.
26
27 The Board discusses this issue at length considering scope, modifications, potential changes in
28 codes depending upon the timeframe and who is taking responsibility for it. Kerr and Fritz do not
29 feel that they have enough information about the specific project and timeframe to make a
30 decision. After further discussion, the group comes to an agreement that the best option
31 regardless of timeframe and the specific type of project is for the person who did the original
32 designs to re-scope it. The Chair asks Maynard to revise his response.
33
34 Item 18 E: Sara Chamber's email to P. Seaton.
35 Maynard: I was tasked to write a letter to Rep. Seaton but Sara has already said everything.
36 These people are licensed to do this and not this. They have to be building based on the
37 drawings/ designs by a licensed person. Maynard believes the individual misread the
38 information. The Chair asks if everyone understands what this is about. Board said yes.
39 I have not seen a bill introduces, so they may have figured out this was not the way to go.
40
41 Board returns to Public Comment.
42
43 Ed Leonetti speaks. My name is Ed Leonetti and I'm here in support of HB 48 that continues the
44 sunseting of the AELS Board and makes the landscape architect as a permanent voting seat. I
45 am happy to entertain any questions.
46

1 The Chair asks for the record if he is a landscape architect. Leonetti responds that he is and that
2 he has been in the State since the fall of 2000 so he has been here since almost the beginning of
3 this issue.

4
5 **Agenda Item 19 - Correspondence sent since November 2016.**
6

7 Kerr explains this is a by-product of our outreach, someone from Alaska Aerial Media, a drone
8 company. They were at the UAS meeting and they were previously aware of the need for
9 licensure. They are not licensed and they are moving towards getting licensed and they wanted to
10 discuss some things about licensure and I said we needed to do it in a public forum in order to
11 keep things even. Sarena tells me they now have a licensed land surveyor on their staff and have
12 applied for their Certificate of Authorization. So success story.

13
14 Hackenmiller adds that they (Alaska Aerial Media) are trying to get compliant because they want
15 to be the company that is in compliance at the surveying and mapping conference next week.
16 Gives them an edge.

17
18 Chair: Thank you for taking this on John. It's good to be giving the same message, so I am glad
19 that you guys are tackling this and going to these groups. It's nice to see we have someone who
20 is licensed now. I think for the most part everyone's been fairly good about it and wanting to do
21 the right thing or figure out the path to do the right thing.

22
23 Kerr: Also this letter mentions that Oregon has their task force on remote sensing and they are
24 trying to education the same group we are. He was hoping Oregon would just send a PowerPoint
25 presentation he could use, but it looks like it might be the other way around.

26
27 Eriksen is grateful for the outreach and that John is being proactive.

28
29 Kerr: When you buy a drone there is a card in the box that says "be a mapper" and there's a
30 website where you can send your imagery off and they can sell mapping. It was interesting.

31
32 Maynard: Did you write a letter to the person who wrote that card and ask them if they are
33 licensed in Alaska?

34
35 Chair: I'll be visiting with the Oregon Board next month if you have any comments you want me
36 to take to them.

37
38 Board takes a short recess.

39
40 2:32 p.m. Back on record.

41 **On a motion duly made by Hale and passed unanimously it was RESOLVED to go into**
42 **Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310 (c)(3) to review disciplinary case**
43 **number 2016-001053, 2016-001100 and the Continuing Education documentation of**
44 **Ingrahim. We invite Charles Ward, Marilyn Zimmerman, Alysia Jones and Sarena**
45 **Hackenmiller to join.**
46

1 3:52 p.m. back on record. Roll call, all present except Schedler, excused by the Chair.

2
3 **3:53 p.m. On a motion duly made by Hale and passed unanimously, the Alaska State Board**
4 **of Registration for Land Surveyors [Architects] Engineers, and Landscape Architects**
5 **having examined the Voluntary Surrender of Land Surveyor Registration No. AELL8684,**
6 **in the matter of Earnest Schaaf, Land Surveyor Registration No. AELL8684, Case Number**
7 **2016-001053 hereby adopts the surrender in its entirety, effective immediately.**

8
9 Roll call vote. Jones abstains. Schedler is absent. Motion carries with 1 abstention.

10
11 **On a motion duly made by Hale and passed unanimously, the Alaska State Board of**
12 **Registration for Architects, Engineers, and Land Surveyors for the State of Alaska, having**
13 **examined the Consent Agreement and Proposed Decision and Order in Case No. 2016-**
14 **001100, Roy W. Gallea, Professional Civil Engineer Registration Number 13028, hereby**
15 **adopts the Consent Agreement and Decision and Order in this matter.**

16
17 **The Consent Agreement, Decision and Order take immediate effect upon signature of the**
18 **Order in accordance with the approval of the Alaska State Board of Registration for**
19 **Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors.**

20
21 Roll call vote. Jones abstains. Schedler is absent. Motion carries with 1 abstention.

22
23 **Item 14: Application Review**

24 The Board begins application review. A total of 121 applications for registration including:
25 36 by comity,
26 61 by examination
27 8 by grandfathering

28
29 5:00 p.m. recessed for the day.

30

1
2
3
4 **Thursday, February 9, 2017**

5 8:56 a.m. Board reconvened. Roll call. Fritz, Hanson, Jones, Koonce, Maynard, and Wallis present.
6 Eriksen arrived at 8:59 a.m., Hale, Kerr and Urfer arrived at 9:05 a.m. Schedler is excused by the
7 Chair.

8 Board continues with application review.

9
10 11:28 a.m. recesses for lunch.

11
12 1:19 p.m. back on record. Roll call. Fritz, Hale, Hanson, Jones, Kerr, Maynard, and Urfer present.
13 Eriksen arrived at 1:26 p.m. Koonce, Schedler, and Wallis excused by the Chair.

14
15 **Item 20 – Old Business**

16 Item A. Arctic Engineering Course Letters

17 Chair: AELS will be sending out letters to universities offering Arctic Engineering courses. We have
18 given them until April to respond. He asks if anyone had any revisions. No revisions suggested.
19 Letters will be printed this afternoon and will be sent out following the meeting.

20
21 Item B. HB 48.

22 Chair: Public testimony was yesterday. When's the next hearing?

23
24 A. Jones: There will be an additional public testimony tomorrow at 3:15pm. Alysia will attend and
25 Colin agreed to call in or attend at the ALO.

26
27 Item C. Board received a thank you email for the honorary PLS for Sarah Graves.

28
29 Item D. UAS Meeting Summary

30 Kerr provides a brief update on Alaska UAS users Group Annual Meeting.

31
32 **Item 21 – New Business**

33 Item A. Letter of support from Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB) for
34 the landscape architect position.

35
36 **1:26 On a motion duly made by Maynard, Seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
37 **RESOLVED that the AELS Board send a letter of support for making the landscape architect**
38 **position permanent and voting.**

39
40 A. Jones comments on the appropriate procedures for handling letters of support. The appropriate
41 channel for submitting any letters of support should be to send them directly to legislators rather
42 than to Board staff to forward on. Board staff can assist with providing the correct contact
43 information and mailing address and would appreciate being cc:ed or otherwise notified of support
44 letters, but letters should not be coming from the State for future reference.

45
46 Maynard agrees to draft the letter of support for the Chair to review.

47
48 Item B. Adding orthographic imagery document to guidance manual.

49 Maynard: There was a request to explain how orthophotos and orthomosaic imagery where under
50 the definition of land surveying they were or were not. So I put this together for inclusion in the

1 guidance manual. I propose it without the last paragraph for the guidance manual.
2 Hale proposed he and Colin worked on the revisions outside the meeting.
3
4 Maynard: I'd like to go through it now so that I can hand it out at the mapping and surveying
5 meeting next week.
6
7 A long discussion follows about how the imagery is used. The Board agrees the goal is to protect the
8 public and discusses the intended audience and legitimate uses of published photos.
9
10 Chair explains if it is prepared under a professional land surveyor or landscape architect, etc. and
11 someone uses it without their permission, they are in violation of the regulations.
12
13 Kerr stresses that the goal is to protect the public and that putting it out there, that lets the public
14 make the best decision and raises the bar so they best information is put out there. There is a huge
15 issue with people misusing information and this is intended to help make the data people rely on
16 better. The Board discusses several situations in how the photo may be used and what the Board's
17 responsibility is.
18
19 Hale asks if we can reword it in line with our regulations and revise so it is positive and change to
20 "must" since it relates to our regulations.
21
22 The Chair says it needs to be directed to "our people" meaning architects, engineers, land surveyors,
23 etc. licensed individuals.
24
25 Urfer adds municipalities often give us their data ad they say use this and they ask us to come up
26 with additional information based on that data and it is not a survey document.
27
28 Fritz reads a statement: If orthoimagery and mapping is will be relied upon or used for the
29 activities covered under AS 08.48.34, such imagery must be prepared under the direct
30 supervision of a PLS.
31
32 The Board agrees with this statement.
33
34 Kerr: One of the goals in the paragraph we are abandoning is to address publicly distributed
35 products.
36
37 Eriksen: I think that can be addressed through other channels or education. It doesn't miss that
38 information. I think you just need to interpret it based on the audience. We can still go out and
39 message that through other channels or opportunities.
40
41 The Board discussed revisions to the fourth paragraph in regards to the use of the word
42 accountability and strike the last paragraph.
43
44 Urfer mentions that if we want to include some of this additional information it could be in a Q&A
45 format within the guidance manual, and this document could be placed elsewhere in the manual.
46
47 Item C: Changes to 12 AAC 36.100
48 Hackenmiller explains that this is an item she has worked with Jeff on regarding the use of the
49 terms "blue cover" and "green cover" in our regulations, which is the old NCARB terminology.

1
2 The Chair asks if we need to public notice.
3
4 Hackenmiller confirms that we will need to move to public notice.
5
6 R. Jones asks if this means we are going back to requiring a council record.
7
8 Hackenmiller: No, this is just a clean up to what it is called because it is not called a blue cover or
9 green cover anymore. It is just a little housekeeping and has nothing to do with the regulations of
10 how you can become registered in Alaska.
11
12 R. Jones says it sounds like we are asking that all education must be verified by NCARB.
13
14 Fritz reviews the NCARB education guidelines, introduced earlier in this meeting, so Vern may have
15 a point. She suggests we wait on making these updates until the new guidelines are fully reviewed.
16
17 Hackenmiller speaks to why this came about. Jeff noticed this at our last meeting - on our summary
18 sheets for an architect we ask that you sign off on a council record and that's a green book or blue
19 book and that's what has change. We no longer have those covers, so it's just changing the
20 terminology.
21
22 Kerr: All this is doing is changing is adding the words 'application deadline' and then changing the
23 green cover to summary and changing blue book to council certificate.
24
25 The motion was withdrawn and the issue is tabled until our next meeting.
26
27 Item D: Vote to add Alysia Jones to NCEES
28 Kerr asks if Sarena is an associate member and suggests the Board make both of them associate
29 members.
30
31 **2:23 p.m. On a motion duly made by Hale, Seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it**
32 **was RESOLVED to add Alysia Jones and Sarena Hackenmiller as associate members of NCEES.**
33
34 Item E: EBAS – Ethics exam for disciplinary cases
35 Company selling ethics exam for the Board's information.
36
37 The Chair asks if anyone is interested in this.
38
39 R. Jones says it can be tailored to any profession and thinks it would be good for disciplinary tool.
40
41 Kerr mentions it is \$1,500 to take the exam and then \$300 each additional time. We've already got
42 them complaining about the \$2,000 fine and then if they have to do this on top of that. I'm not
43 thinking we are going to have a whole lot of people happy with us.
44
45 The Chair, I can follow up with Joyce and ask why they went with this a while ago. There is a reason
46 Colorado is using it, but I don't know what that is. I'm not so much worried about what it costs the
47 individual. Is it a good product and useful in these cases.
48
49 Item F: Software Engineering revisit
50 Eriksen: I don't think it is as complicated as everyone makes it. If you recall at our last meeting

1 someone inquired whether there was a licensure path for software engineers. I think the first time
2 it came up was in 2013. I think that's when NCEES started administering exams for software
3 engineers and I think we had some discussions software engineering being crucial to so many
4 projects. The Board should regulate its practice to protect the safety and welfare of the public.
5 I think that's true. I think that it's important. The rationale we used when we went to general
6 licensure providing those additional opportunities for pathways as well as unique education
7 experience that come to our State is important and I think we should stick to that rationale and
8

9 We should consider licensing software engineers. There has been some opposition and concern
10 from electrical engineers, etc. and how it will impact current practices. It is my understanding that
11 it is not the intent of the Board to change what electrical engineers do.
12

13 Maynard: So the information provided in the packet was initially put together in 2012/ 2013?
14

15 Eriksen: There is some initial information
16

17 Maynard: In our regulations we list all professions that we currently offer their exam for and in this
18 material I did not see a definition that we can put in our regulations and until we see that -
19

20 Eriksen says there was a proposed definition/ regulation changes and there were some
21 amendments to that. Eriksen says it's available and explains why this died last time there is not a
22 high demand and there was some concern from our existing registrants how that impacts them, so I
23 think that was swaying us towards not considering this adoption and some misunderstanding of
24 the definition. I disagree. I think we are over complicating the issue.
25

26 Hackenmiller directs the Board to Item21 (F) (11) in the Board packet.
27

28 Maynard voices his concern that this definition is overly broad and needs to be more specific and I
29 suggest the Board open up a new regulation project.
30

31 R. Jones says the definition can be written similar to the new structural regulations and you can
32 state what projects would require a software engineer.
33

34 Maynard does not think we'd be very successful with that. Do we know of any discipline specific
35 states? Do they have a definition we can steal?
36

37 Hackenmiller hands out the most recent responses from Basecamp regarding which includes 18
38 responses.
39

40 The Chair says when this initially came about, he believes we didn't know if it would survive as it
41 was fairly new. We're not sure right now, but they are on the watch list.
42

43 Eriksen says it is a common pathway to have a combined degree in computer and software
44 engineering.
45

46 Chair: We had someone come speak to us in August, right? And I think our board packet 21F9 is
47 another individual or corporation and if you read the very end he mentions a way to get around it
48 and that's not what we're about.
49

50 Maynard says we need to narrow it down to what we want it to cover. Not include Microsoft. It

1 needs to be sufficiently detailed so when John Savage has to decide if someone is practicing
2 software engineering or not practicing software engineering that we've covered that.
3
4 Eriksen: I propose make updates and bring it back to the Board with the proposed changes.
5
6 Kerr: Before we have a committee can anyone verbalize what it is that we are trying to regulate?
7
8 Maynard: My understanding is software programs that run refineries, chemical plants, you know
9 control system is a sub-part of software engineering.
10
11 Kerr: So software that runs mechanical engineering?
12
13 Maynard: It has to be an engineered system, not a laptop.
14
15 Eriksen: Maybe it excludes certain products.
16
17 The Board discussed the use of different design programs.
18
19 Maynard: If it is going to operate a plant, etc. then it needs to be done by a software engineering.
20
21 Eriksen: We run the risk of excluding someone, maybe at a later date we can further define, but I
22 think a little broader right now is good.
23
24 Kerr believes as it is currently written it is too broad.
25
26 Fritz asks if the group is familiar with ATS. They install control security systems, they are an Alaska
27 company. One of the first services they offer on their website is engineering, but I don't think they
28 are licensed engineers, develop software, etc.
29
30 The Chair suggests we mull this over and come up with a definition that everyone can agree upon.
31
32 Kerr: So you are thinking it has to control something?
33
34 Hale: If you are using as a design tool then that is not a control function.
35
36 Eriksen says we did reach out to the Alaska section of triple E and mentioned we had some interest
37 in this and it was one of the agenda items for the Board. I think the past director was the one who
38 voiced the most concern and he still has some concern, but as I understand it, it is more about the
39 impact to current engineers not the opportunity to new engineers.
40
41 Maynard and Eriksen discuss how that might be addressed or communicated.
42
43 Hackenmiller comments that most of the responses from Basecamp came back from non-discipline
44 specific states, so it's really hard to find a definition from those that will accept it at all. It's going to
45 be a challenge, but one of the things we can ask is if you do have this definition can you please let us
46 know so we have a good place to start.
47
48 2:45 p.m. **On a motion duly made by Eriksen, Seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously**
49 **it was RESOLVED to start a regulation project to implement a licensure pathway for software**
50 **engineers.**

1
2
3 **Item G: HB 90 “Licensing and Administrative”**

4 The Chair asked if everyone was up to speed on that. Everyone says yes.

5
6 A. Jones adds that she emailed the Board the information Janey handed out yesterday.

7
8 **Item H: Regulation review.**

9 Chair: I don't know that we've ever done a global look at our regulations, but we have made some
10 significant changes. What I really wanted to talk about is regulation review of .62-.65. We just
11 eliminated a bunch of those, cleaned up some stuff and it's going to take 90 days or so for those to
12 take effect. It's going to take a while.

13
14 And also .103 through .109 which are the comity regulations we have at this time. So this ties to
15 architects as well as engineers a little bit with education requirements. I found several oddities
16 we'll just say that. For example under land surveyor I found a statement that says they don't have to
17 take an examination. Also for comity, I handed out the new NCEES council record, it's called E3
18 system. This is not an NCARB certificate, however it does go through the process of evaluating
19 education, experience and examination and it's a tool that we can use as a board to verify this
20 information. It is much more robust than the old system. Where you used to just mail your
21 information in and it was just compiled. I think they may have reviewed it and made sure it was
22 correct. Now you send your information in and your experience is actually evaluated by two
23 licensed individuals. They verify your FE and they verify your PE, those will be electronic records
24 and almost automatic if you start an account with them. Looking at our regulations, we don't
25 reference using the NCEES document for anything. The NCEES record has been around for a long
26 time and a lot of folks are using their record. It is an updated system. It is kind of a better system
27 than the old system. One of the big changes that's happening now that NCEES is providing it to
28 licensed individuals there are a lot of unlicensed individuals that want to be a part of the system
29 and as soon as they get out of school they because they are required to sign up through NCEES to
30 take the exam, so they graduate and then they are like where do I send the transcripts? Well, you
31 need to apply to your board. Alaska is no longer doing that and we're not going to get any of that FE
32 information anymore. There is no connection with the students anymore, so NCEES is our only
33 connection with graduates. I could see in the very near future that NCEES could work as the new
34 repository for their information. It is not an option right now but I could see that in the near future.
35 It has all of your information in it that we require.

36
37 The Chair walks through the handout which shows if their education is ABET accredited. It also
38 shows experience and disciplinary action. We still rely on the applicant to relay that information. At
39 the Western Zone meeting coming up we're going to have a meeting to talk about expedited comity,
40 that's probably the easiest way to say it. Potentially looking at certain states that agree to certain
41 requirements and look to see if somebody can just give you an application and it is not automatic
42 licensure, but, right now we are having schools send us transcripts and the Florida Board may or
43 may not get us the FE exam. We're having NCEES verify the PE exam - we are having a lot of data
44 coming from a lot of sources and that just takes time. And I believe a little bit of wasted time.

45
46 Kerr: Why wouldn't we utilize this?

47
48 Chair: I'm not disagreeing.

49
50 R. Jones: We've always used the NCEES council record to verify the education and exam and

1 licensure. At one time we took the MLE designation for experience, but we found out the MLE
2 designation was not discipline specific. And that came about because an electrical engineer put in
3 application for a mechanical license or vice versa and so that's when we stopped taking the
4 experience out of the council record. I have no problem taking that record but I don't think it should
5 be required.

6
7 Chair: Ok. Now to address the discipline question. We were at the MBA meeting last week. There
8 are actually a lot of states that use discipline specific experience and that is not currently in the
9 system. Based on feedback received we are trying to get them to add at least what are they licensed
10 in. What was there original license in, what are they practicing in because you're right there are a
11 lot of states where you're just an engineer.

12
13 Maynard asks who is verifying that the references are current.

14
15 Chair explains that everything is electronic and the references are often the same as those verifying
16 work experience and it is coming from their email addresses. They are discussing having people
17 update references every five years and this was a big issue with the new system. People were
18 concerned their references would be wiped out. Their system is at least as good as our system.
19 Several mention that it is probably better.

20
21 Maynard suggests reminding applicants to make sure their NCEES record and make sure you're
22 references are up-to-date when they apply.

23
24 Jones mentions one of the problems was references is there was usually very little detail about the
25 actual work of the applicant.

26
27 Eriksen: Just some general thoughts. I am a supporter of mobility and I think this is a large step
28 towards mobility nationally and internationally. We've heard the concerns about losing licensure
29 due to competition, commerce and other things. I think it is more important now given the issues
30 surrounding licensure. I think it would be very wise of the Board to find a way to integrate this into
31 our system. I think you are on mark to consider incorporating some of this.

32
33 Fritz: My question is do applicants pay a fee to get one of these developed? They do with NCARB.

34
35 Chair: There is no fee to develop the record. There is a fee to transmit the record.

36
37 Fritz: That might be how it is with NCARB.

38
39 Chair: The first transmittal is \$175 and it's don't quote me, but I believe it is \$75 for each additional.

40
41 Tami mentions that the subsequent transmittal fee is being looked at.

42
43 Fritz: So my point is it is putting the responsibility on the applicant and I think that is a good thing,
44 for the applicant, it should be their responsibility and a good thing for the Board, especially
45 considering how much time it takes to prepare these packets for us to review. If it helps us
46 streamline what we need to review and helps minimize what staff need to do to prepare for our
47 review and it is the applicant that is responsible for the associated costs. I think everything is in the
48 appropriate place.

49
50 Chair: The thing I like about the NCEES record and Vern can hopefully back me up here is usually

1 when we get an NCEES record as the backup – first off- the old one had a cover sheet and right up
2 front it said ABET degree, FE, PE and we didn't care about the model law engineer, 20 to 100 pages
3 of documentation - all the backup was there and then we had the work experience verification. So it
4 was all there. It just makes it- the information is all organized and now they have professional
5 engineers reviewing work experience. So I am not saying we have to take any action today or go
6 solely to taking the NCEES record, but I think it is a tool that we should be advertising that we
7 accept much like the NCARB.

8
9 Fritz: Well and NCARB, we say it's required, unless it's by comity.

10
11 Chair: I guess today I'm not proposing. Maybe that's where we end up.

12
13 Fritz: I don't think we need to be afraid of that. If the standards are there. If you still have a
14 mechanism for dealing with exceptions, but there are no exceptions if you are coming into the State
15 for the first time through examination as an architect. You go to NCARB.

16
17 Jones: Our first shot at the FE/FS thing we stated something to that effect that they required
18 something from NCEES and the legislature threw it right back in our face and said 'No! You are not
19 give Alaska's authority to an outside agency. And I'm really surprised they haven't said anything
20 about us requiring the NCARB record for architects. So keep that in mind.

21
22 Chair: I think the difference is we're saying NCEES was going to approve folks to take the FE or
23 something along those lines versus what the NCARB says you must submit this so the Board may
24 verify your boom – boom - boom. I don't propose we use NCEES at this point to vet our candidates
25 but they can at least provide us the information.

26
27 Eriksen: Yeah, I recommend some further thought in developing this at the NCEES meeting. Some
28 states have different requirements like the arctic course and because we're the customers see if
29 they'd be willing to track all the unique things for each state some way too.

30
31 Maynard: I think this would be a good tool for us, but maybe we say you must provide this, this and
32 this or an NCEES record and then we're fine and were happy. We may decide it only works for their
33 education and testing and we still need to verify their work experience to make sure it is in the right
34 field. Especially if they are coming from a non-discipline specific state, but we may decide we just
35 accept it at its face. I don't know we want to go there but we certainly should give them the option
36 to submit that to back up their stuff.

37
38 R. Jones: In our regulations the instructions for our applications already state that. You can NCEES
39 record covers this, this and this. Again, I have no problem accepting an NCEES record – it's great. I
40 just don't think it should be required for licensure.

41
42 Urfer: CLARB has been trying to pull this mess together the same way. We were talking about it two
43 to three meetings ago I said I was going to look into mostly the work verification which doesn't
44 meet our standards at all. If you can use the rest of the record and that's a pretty important piece of
45 it we can't get them to comply with the pieces we need -

46
47 Chair: Right. Understanding that there are some statues that they are going to have to submit an
48 application on our form. The work experience I haven't really looked at whether it needs to be
49 provided on a form that we provide but for example, page 6 of the handout I provided shows an
50 example of the work experience and this is kind of a typical example of a work experience. It is

1 actually pages 6 and 7. The tasks that the individual has completed the projects they have
2 completed. The name of the verifier. They also rate the experience as sub-professional, professional,
3 responsible charge. The professional engineer or professional land surveyor reviewer can assign a
4 rating to that experience when they are evaluating that write up.
5

6 Chair states he'd like to start a regulation project to clean up our regulations. He adds that there
7 needs to be mobility and allowance of other records. He adds there will be more about E3 at the
8 annual meeting that will answer a lot of questions.
9

10 Fritz warns that NCARB rolled out their system too quickly and there some resistance in regards to
11 comity. As a result there were some regulation changes. She adds it took NCARB a long time to
12 come up with an alternative path. Fritz believes we should get on board with simplifying and
13 modernizing regulations and that it increases the opportunity for mobility and is good for building
14 relationships and is our responsibility to our professions.
15

16 Chair explains among the 70 boards there is only one pathway for licensure that they all accept –the
17 ABET accredited four year degree, four years of experience, PE pathway. In total there are 79
18 unique pathways to licensure and the various pathways boards will accept vary. The Chair shares
19 that the MBA Board committee is currently looking for commonalities, which is beyond our scope,
20 but good to know.
21

22 3:14 p.m. **On a motion duly made by Maynard, Seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously**
23 **it was RESOLVED to start a regulation project to incorporate the use of the NCEES record in**
24 **applications.**
25

26 Chair states that he will take the lead on this project and get some help from Vern as well. Copies of
27 the handout for this discussion were returned to the Chair.
28

29 **On a motion duly made by Hale and passed unanimously it was RESOLVED to go into**
30 **Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310 (c)(3) to review disciplinary case**
31 **number 2016-001053, 2016-001100 and the Continuing Education documentation of**
32 **Ingrahim. We invite Charles Ward, Marilyn Zimmerman, Alysia Jones and Sarena**
33 **Hackenmiller to join.**
34

35 Chair asks if anyone has anything to report on special committees.
36

37 **Special Committees**

38 Licensure Implementation – no updates.
39

40 Land Surveyor Outreach – all material was covered in correspondence.
41

42 **Standing Committees**

43 Investigative Advisory Team – The Chair discussed several investigations with John.
44 Maynard assisted with a few.
45

46 Licensure Mobility - no updates.
47

48
49 Guidance Manual - no updates.

1
2 Legislative Liaison – covered in other agenda items.

3
4 Emeritus Status - no updates.

5
6 Budget Committee – no updates.

7
8 Continuing Education - no updates.

9
10 AXP Liaison - no updates.

11
12 National Meeting Reports

13 NCEES Board President’s Assembly (BPA) – The Chair and Hackenmiller attended this
14 meeting last week. Hackenmiller provided a brief write up in the Board packet. She
15 mentioned there were a lot of interesting statistics and is very pleased with the updates for
16 E3 which she and Alysia use to pull information. Hackenmiller also mentions she spoke with
17 Steven Matthews the IT Director about her concern that the references are not discipline
18 specific and Matthews agreed to look into it to see if a drop down menu or some other
19 feature could be added, so the references can add that information.

20
21 Hackenmiller asks the Board about sending information regarding the NCEES CPE registry
22 out to our listserv. The information is unverified, but you can easily record your CPE and is
23 free. The Chair recommends we wait until the formal press release from NCEES goes out
24 and then we can pass along the information to our listserv.

25
26 Hackenmiller adds they talked about a combined zone meeting in 2020, and decoupling of
27 education and experience. There was also a lot of discussion regarding land surveyor CBT,
28 which is proving to be difficult since most are state specific. They also talked about the
29 release of the CBT exams. Chemical engineering will be released in January 2018, with the
30 last paper and pencil exam being offered this April. The CBTs will be released in groups.
31 The Board has to approve the schedule and this is there projection. It will be helpful for
32 Board staff and balance out applications.

33
34 Tami explains there will be a gap between the last paper and pencil exam and the release of
35 the CBT because you don’t want to be grading in both systems, but the gap will be no more
36 than 6 months.

37
38 Hackenmiller says it was a great meeting and the statistics about what other Boards are
39 dealing with was very interesting.

40
41 **On a motion duly made by Hale and passed unanimously it was RESOLVED to go into**
42 **Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310 (c)(3) to review disciplinary case**
43 **number 2016-001056. We invite Charles Ward, Marilyn Zimmerman, Alysia Jones and**
44 **Sarena Hackenmiller to join.**

45
46 3:24 p.m. Board goes into Executive Session.

47
48 3:43 p.m. Back on record.

1 **Agenda item 25: Licensing Examiner's Report**

2 In the interest of time, Hackenmiller recommends the Board members read the report at their
3 convenience.

4
5 **Agenda item 26: Board Tasks (To Do List)**

6 No comments.

7
8 Board skips to Item 28.

9
10 **Agenda item 28: Review Calendar of Events**

11 National Meetings

- 12 • NCARB Regional Summit in Jersey City, March 10-11th Catherine and Luanne are
13 scheduled to attend. ,
- 14 • NCEES Western Zone in Denver, May 18-20th. Colin, John and Alysia are the three
15 funded delegates. Based upon the budget recommendations included in the FY 2016
16 Annual Report, the Board decided to add Dave and Sarena to the travel request as
17 well.
- 18 • NCARB Annual in Boston, June 21-23. Alysia, Jeff, Catherine and Vern if available.
- 19 • NCEES Annual – will be decide at the May meeting
- 20 • CLARB Annual – will be decided at the May meeting

21
22 Board Meeting Dates

- 23 • May 4-5, 2017 Fairbanks.
24 R. Jones asks if it would be possible to change the dates of the next meeting. The Board
25 discusses and tentatively agrees on April 24-25. The Chair requests that an email be sent out.
26 Alysia says she'll follow up with John, Fred, and Kathleen to confirm and follow up with the
27 Chair.
- 28 • August 3-4, 2017 Anchorage
- 29 • November 2-3, 2017 Anchorage
- 30 • February 7-8, 2018 Juneau

31
32 **Agenda item 27: Read Applications into Record**

33
34 **On a motion duly made by Hale, seconded by R. Jones and passed unanimously 6 it was**
35 **RESOLVED to APPROVE the following list of applicants for registration by comity,**
36 **examination and in additional branches of engineering with the 8 stipulation that the**
37 **information in the applicants' files will take precedence over 9 the information in the**
38 **minutes.**

BERNARDINI, JESSICA
BEST, DONALD EDWARD
BOETTCHER, SCOTT
BORTHWICK, KEVIN
BUSEY, STEVEN N.
CLARE, JOSEPH
ELDRIDGE, RYAN
ELLINGSON, GARRET E.

ENGLISH, CHRISTOPHER
FARLEY, JAMES K.
GRIFFIN, JAY LAMBRO
GRIFFITH, MORGAN
GUENTHER, PAUL
GUENTHER, PAUL
HAMLIN, JEFFREY
HOUSTON, KATHRYN
HOWELL, THOMAS DONALD
KREINER, JONATHAN
KUBIC, ANDY
MACKENZIE, GUIDO
MAGANA, ARTURO
MARSZALIK, AGNIESZKA
MARTINEAU, PAUL
MURRAY, NICHOLAS
PARKER, MARC
PERRI, JUAN FRANCISCO
PICKERING, DANIEL JAY
QUIMBY, MICHAEL JAMES
ROBERTSON, IAN HARVEY
SCHULTZ, NATHANIEL
TERVORT, AARON
TESTA, SEAN
THORNLEY, ERIC
WARREN, THOMAS JAY
WISMER, JR., FREDRICK S.

1
2

The following are CONDITIONALLY APPROVED pending the completion of certain items.

BUONO, JOSHUA MICHAEL
CARLSON, DAVID L.
COFFEE, NATHAN
COOLIDGE, DUSTIN R.
COOPER, MARTIN
DOUGHERTY, CHARLES W.
DOWELL, THERESA
EASTON, PHILLIP
FINK, REBECCA ANN
FOX, DANIEL
KANEKO, THERESA
KENNEDY, JOHN
PIERCEY, MARTIN

PURTEE, MICHAEL
PYON, MATTHEW
SARASWATHY DEVI, DEEPA NAIR
SIMMONS, PRISCILLA
VORON, REGINA
WIBOWO, ARI
WOLLUM, JASON
APPERSON, DAVID
BALZARINI, MATTHEW
BILLINGS, MATTHEW
BLAKE, PETER
BOUNDS, MEGAN
<i>BRANDON, PATRICK</i>
BRANNAN, THOMAS
BROOKINS, CHRISTINE
CAMAHUALI-OCHOA, OSSIP IVAN
CIUFO, JAKE
COBURN, MATTHEW
DARRINGTON, DAVID
DICKERSON, JULIANNE
DONOVAN, TRAVIS
DYBDAHL, BRADFORD
EGGER, JAMES
FOREMAN, GRAHAM
GALTERIO, JEFFREY
GRAY, JOSHUA
GREY, DELENORA
GUNDERSEN, ERIK
HAMMAN, CALEB
HICKEL, JUSTIN
HOLMSTROM, BENJAMIN
HOMERDING, KRISTOPHER
JOHNSTON, IAN BAILEY
JORDT, ERIK
KAEPPELE, ANDRE
KAISER, JOE E.
KALLEVIG, JOSEF NIKOLAS
KING, AMANDA
KING, DANIEL
KRUSE, STEPHANIE
KWIATKOWSKI, JASON

LARSEN, AVERIAN A.
LEE, SOPHIA
LEWIS, LAURA
MAASE, AFSHAN I.S.
MEYER, JENNIFER
MILLER, RICK
PECK, KATHERINE
PETERSEN, IDA RUTH
POLLOCK, ANGELICA BROOKE
RICHARDSON, DONALD
ROELFS, ERIC
ROBINSON, AMANDA
SCHIRACK, ANDREW
SPANGLER, ALLAN
WEAVER, RYAN
WHITEHEAD, JARED
WRIGHT, JENNIFER
YOUNG, COLIN
YOUNT, NICOLE
KOIV, VELLO

1
2 **On a motion duly made by Hale, seconded by R. Jones and passed unanimously it was**
3 **RESOLVED to find the following list of applicants for registration by comity, examination and**
4 **in additional branches of engineering INCOMPLETE with the stipulation that the information**
5 **in the applicant’s files will take precedence over the information in the minutes**
6

ABUTRAB, ANTHONY
BRADY, JOHN
ENGIDA, ENDALE
FOX, SAMANTHA
FREEMAN, JARED ROBERT
HALL, JAMES
HAN, JIABIN
HUPPERT, LOGAN
MATHIS, CHARLES
ROZIER, RANDALL SCOT
WELLS, GAVIN

7
8 **Agenda item 29: Board Member Comments**
9 Maynard says it was a good meeting and alerts the Board that APDC is working on a letter regarding
10 the one line in the seals about a registrant in every office. APDC agrees with our interpretation but
11 says the language is not clear to them and are concerned it may be interpreted differently down the
12 road.
13

1 Hackenmiller thanks the Board for coming to Juneau because it is nice to have resources here. She
2 says thank you to Eric for his expertise and work on the Board and wishes his all the best. Thanks
3 Pat for coming and asks for feedback about our meeting.
4
5 Fritz thanks everyone, welcomes Alysia, wishes Eric well and thanks Pat for coming.
6
7 Urfer thanks Colin and Brian for their work in pushing the landscape architect as a permanent seat
8 forward.
9
10 R. Jones thanks everyone and tells Eric he will be missed.
11
12 A. Jones thanks everyone for making her first Board experience a good one. She thanks Sarena and
13 Vern for all of their help and for being wonderful resources. She wishes Eric well and thanks Pat for
14 coming and looks forward to being more involved in the next meeting.
15
16 Eriksen says it has been an honor and privilege to serve on the Board and is happy about the
17 changes we've made for the good of our professions. Reflects it has been an exemplary experience
18 for him.
19
20 Kerr thanks Eric for being on the board and expresses his appreciation for Eric's attitude and
21 perspective. Thanks the whole Board for their ability to discuss and 'hammer things' out and thanks
22 Pat for coming to see how our Board operates and looks forward to hearing his feedback. He
23 welcomes Alysia and is glad Vern has joined the Board as a public member.
24
25 Hale says it has been great working with Eric and appreciates learning from everyone. He welcomes
26 Alysia and thanks Pat for attending.
27
28 The Chair thanks everyone for the good discussion and appreciates everyone's ability to share their
29 perspective and build relationships given the multi-discipline makeup of the Board. Welcomes
30 Alysia to the Board and is glad they are able to retain Vern's expertise. The Chair feels it adds value
31 to have someone else to do the NCEES presentation and hopes to have NCEES visit future meetings.
32
33 The Chair asks Eric to come up. He thanks him for his years of service and appreciates the
34 perspective of an electrical engineer that Eric has brought to the Board. He presents him with a
35 certificate.
36
37 Eric thanks everyone.
38
39 Adjourned 4:04 p.m.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50


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

Respectfully submitted:



Alysia D. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:



Brian Hanson, PE Chair
Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers and Land Surveyors

Date: 4/24/17