

1 **STATE OF ALASKA**

2
3 **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC**
4 **DEVELOPMENT**

5 **DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING**
6 **BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS & LAND**
7 **SURVEYORS**

8
9 **Minutes of Meeting**
10 **May 2-3, 2013**

11
12 By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6,
13 the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors held a meeting May
14 2-3, 2013 in Zach's Board Room at Sophie's Station, 1717 University Avenue, Fairbanks,
15 AK 99701.

16
17 **Thursday May 2, 2013**

18
19 **Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Roll Call**

20
21 8:00 a.m. The Chair called the meeting to order. Roll call, all present except Colin Maynard
22 who missed the meeting due to illness.

23
24 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board:

- 25
26
- 27 • Brian Hanson, Civil Engineer, Chair
 - 28 • Richard Rearick, Architect, Vice-Chair
 - 29 • Eric Eriksen, Electrical Engineer, Secretary
 - 30 • Kathleen Schedler, Mechanical Engineer
 - 31 • Jeffrey Koonce, Architect
 - 32 • David Hale, Land Surveyor,
 - 33 • Donald Shiesl, Public Member
 - 34 • Burdett Lent, Landscape Architect
 - 35 • Keith Walters, Mining Engineer
 - 36 • John Kerr, Land Surveyor

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

- 38
- 39 • Don Habeger, Director CBPL (by telephone)
 - 40 • Sara Chambers, Operations Manager (by telephone)
 - 41 • Vern Jones, Executive Administrator
 - 42 • Alicia Kelly, Licensing Examiner
 - 43 • John Savage, Investigator
 - 44 • Misty Frawley, Administrative Officer II (by telephone)
- 45

46 Members of the public in attendance for portions of the meeting were:

- 47
- 48 • Brett Nelson, PE
 - 49 • Joseph Notkin, AIA Architect
 - 50 • Chris Miller, PE
- 51

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

1 Eriksen: Asks that a discussion on 12 AAC 36.106 be placed under new business due to
2 the fact that it is going to expire at the end of this year.

3
4 Hanson: Places it under 17 C and adds that he would like to also like to add a discussion
5 on outreach.

6
7 Jones: passed out several items that were received after the Board packets and agenda
8 were mailed.

9
10 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Rearick and passed unanimously it**
11 **was RESOLVED to approve the agenda as amended.**

12
13 **Agenda item 3 – Ethics reporting**

14
15 Eriksen: Reports that he did a presentation to the local chapter of IEEE. He updated them
16 on B+30, the grandfather deadline, the status of the investigator bill. While they didn't
17 discuss the subject he advised them that the software engineering regulation is going out for
18 public notice. He mostly just educated them on what the board is, what we do and how to
19 contact us.

20
21 **Agenda item 4 Review and approve the Minutes of the August 2012 meeting.**

22
23 Lent: Provided Jones with several typos.

24
25 **On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Koonce and passed unanimously it**
26 **was RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the February 2013 meeting as amended.**

27
28 Chair: Asks two new members to introduce themselves and provide some background.

29
30 Koonce: Has been in architecture for about 30 years. Has a practice with a couple of
31 partners. He likes Alaska and appreciates the opportunity to serve on the Board.

32
33 Kerr: Has been surveying in the State for over 30 years in both the private and public
34 sectors. Currently is co-owner in a surveying firm. Feels serving on the Board is a great
35 opportunity to be involved.

36
37 Chair: Thanks both and congratulates them on their appointment to the Board.

38
39 **Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report**

40
41 Savage: Passes out his business card. He then comments on the passage of SB16 and
42 hopes the position will be filled soon and funded with travel to do the job. It looks like it will
43 be about 5 to 6 months before this happens. What he is hearing from his chief is that he will
44 be moved into the new position and a new hire will take his other boards. It's undecided if
45 he will also be part time AELS but Savage is going to push for that so we have someone
46 familiar with our Board in case anything happens to him.

47
48 He presents the Board with a hypothetical situation where a Corporation provides placement
49 for engineers. He asks if the engineer has to be licensed on placement and if the placement
50 corporation has to have a COA as an engineering company to place these engineers. He
51 asks the Board to discuss and provide him with feedback. He states that there may be
52 some situations that he will want to look into and needs an opinion from the Board.

53
54 Chair: Asks if anyone has a thought on that. They are not offering engineering services

1 right?

2

3 Schedler: Answers that if she were hiring engineers for a position at UAF she would hire
4 them and then give them a period of time to become registered. If they were registered in
5 other states she would give them 6 months to a year. They wouldn't be able to seal
6 documents or anything like that until they were registered.

7

8 Savage: Asks if the corporation providing the applicants has to be registered with the
9 Board. He states that he gets a lot of push-back from licensees that these individuals and
10 companies should be licensed to provide engineering services if they are providing
11 engineers.

12

13 Schedler: Answers that they are a placement firm, they are not offering engineering
14 services.

15

16 Several Board members chimed in with the same opinion.

17

18 Savage: We are talking about engineers licensed in other states and this placement
19 company is providing them with the understanding that they can provide engineering. And
20 many companies do as Kathleen said, hire someone and give them some time to become
21 licensed in Alaska. But the push-back he is getting is that since this placement corporation
22 is providing these people with the understanding that they can provide engineering at some
23 future time, the company is providing engineering services and should have a COA.

24

25 Rearick: Explains that his firm may advertise for an engineer and they may hire someone
26 who is not yet an engineer but they don't call them an engineer until they have that stamp.
27 Additionally there are firms that find employees for other firms and they wouldn't be
28 employees of the placement firm, they might get a fee for finding them, but they would be
29 employees of the firm they were placed. There are also firms, maybe even engineering
30 firms, that farm out employees. So they might farm out employees to work for another firm
31 but they are still employees of the originating firm in that case the originating firm should
32 have a COA but if a company is just doing placement I don't see it as being licensed to do
33 engineering.

34

35 Chair: Asks if we're talking about temp workers.

36

37 Savage: Responds that these are placement companies and he appreciates the Board
38 input. He now knows where we stand on this issue.

39

40 Savage then gives a little training session for new board members and refresher for the rest
41 of the Board covering the Sanctions guidelines and how to handle complaints.

42

43 Rearick: Informs the Board that he presented the Sanctions Guidelines to the WestCARB
44 Board at the meeting in RI in March and most were pretty appreciative of it.

45

46 There was a short discussion on how the guidelines were determined and how they are
47 used.

48

49 Savage: Advises the Board that if anyone calls them with a complaint to immediately stop
50 the conversation and referred them to him. He will send them a complaint packet
51 explaining what we do, how we do it and what to expect. All complaints must be in writing
52 and signed. Any documents included with the complaint form must be copies as they will
53 not be returned. If no action is taken against the license they will only be told that it wasn't a
54 violation and the case is closed. The only time it becomes public is when action is taken

1 against the license or individual.

2
3 Lent: Points out the complaint procedures are in the Guidance Manual.

4
5 Kerr: Asks if there is any limitation on communication with Vern on any of this.

6
7 Savage: No problem, Vern is a sounding board on many of these things and he knows
8 when something is of a level that it needs to be sent to me right away.

9
10 Rearick: Points out that a Board Member would lodge a complaint in the same form that the
11 public would. Get a packet from John fill it out and send it in and not have anything else to
12 do with it.

13
14 Savage: States that this is a good point and emphasizes how important it is to handle every
15 complaint the same way and not give the impression that the Board gets preferential
16 treatment.

17
18 Chair: Advises that the best advice is when asked if something is a violation to refer them to
19 John and explain that we have a process for complaints.

20
21 Savage: Adds that he sometimes sends a regulation booklet to someone who is asking if
22 something is a violation and highlights areas that pertain to their question as he understands
23 it. The biggest complaint he gets from those who file complaints is that he doesn't keep
24 them updated on the progress of any investigation. He isn't able to do this as it would taint
25 the investigation.

26
27 He asks if there are any questions on the Board Report.

28
29 Chair: Notes that the old case has dropped off. He then asks about a couple that dropped
30 off and are not listed as closed.

31
32 Savage: Explains that they could be Juneau cases or Corporate. He advises that the
33 present program is not as trustworthy as the old system and that he has been told that after
34 1 June that will change. Investigator Susan Winton helps him put this together each quarter.
35 If he were to try and run a report using the new program it wouldn't be accurate.

36
37 Savage: Asks if there are any other questions. He continues that hopefully by next meeting
38 we will know how if and when the investigator position will be filled. He adds that the Chief
39 Investigator is "top shelf". He holds him in high regard and states that what he says will
40 happen is exactly what we want to happen. But of course, he only has so much input so we
41 will see if it comes to be or not.

42 43 **Agenda item 7 – Regulation Update**

44 45 A) Statute Changes

- 46
47 1) AS 08.48.055 Executive Secretary of the Board and AS 08.58.091 Written
48 Examinations.

49
50 Passed and is awaiting transmission to the Governor.

- 51
52
53 2) HB 167 Sponsor: Representative Kurt Olson
54 a. AS 08.48.221 Seals

- b. AS 08.48.281 Prohibitive Practice
- c. AS 08.48.341 Definitions
- d. AS 08.48.331 Exemptions

HB 167 is presently in the Labor and Commerce Committee.

Chair: Notes that SB16 passed and is awaiting transmission to the Governor. He explains to the new members that it the bill for a full time investigator and a cleanup item for our exam statute.

Rearick: Asks if HB 167 passed.

Jones: No it will be there next session.

Rearick: Will it have to be reintroduced?

Jones: No, they will pick up where they left off. If it doesn't pass next session then it will have to be reintroduced.

Chair: Asks if anyone had a sense if it was going to pass. He felt that they were getting hung up on some of the language in it.

Jones: Thinks there will be some amendments but that it will pass.

Chair: There was no public opposition to it that I heard of it was all internal.

Jones: The only opposition I heard of was to the change from 4plex to 3plex.

3) HB 187 Concerning licensing fees. Sponsor: Labor and Commerce.

HB 187 is presently in the Finance Committee.

Chair: Asks if anyone has any questions on this.

Jones: Don will be in on the conference call and will probably answer questions then.

B) Regulations project update:

- 1) 12 AAC 36.068. Eligibility for Landscape Architect Registration by Examination.
- 2) AAC 36.040. Simplified Application for Re-examination
- 3) 12 AAC 36.050. Application Deadlines.

Jones: Reports that all three have been signed by the Lt. Governor and will become effective May 4, 2013.

Chair: Notes that these are effective Saturday.

Lent: Explains the early testing change for the LARE examinees. He has notified the local chapters and CLARB and appreciates the fast work on this change.

4) 12 AAC 36.063. Engineering Education and Work Experience Requirements

No report

1
2 5) Changes to 12 AAC 36.180 and 36.990 re Software Engineering.
3

4 Jones: Advises that 5 and 6 have been sent to the Regulations Specialist for public
5 comment and that they should be noticed soon.
6

7 Eriksen: Has come up with some language to add that would allow grandfathering.
8

9 6) 12 AAC 36.071 Standards of Practice for Land Surveyors.
10

11 7) Changes to 12 AAC 36.062 and 12 AAC 36.064 EIT/SIT requirements.
12

13 Jones: Explains that the FE and FS will go to CBT in January. Presently an applicant has
14 to take the exam in the State where they apply. Once CBT goes into effect an applicant will
15 be able to take the exam in any Pearson Vue test center in the country. He requests the
16 Board change the regulation to allow for automatic exam approval which would allow
17 examinees to register directly with NCEES and then if they want to practice in Alaska they
18 would apply to the Board. He explains that this would reduce the staff workload
19 significantly. It could reduce revenue somewhat because those who intend to take the exam
20 would not have to apply before taking it but the reduced work load would also delay the
21 need for an additional Licensing Examiner.
22

23 Chair: Shares some information he obtained at the Western Zone meeting in April and
24 advises that a lot of states are already using the automatic system. He points out that it will
25 be a drop in revenue as UAF requires the FE to graduate but doesn't think that should
26 dissuade us from going to the automatic system.
27

28 Discussion continued with the following points made. It would still be necessary to apply to
29 practice in Alaska no matter where the exam was taken. CLARB and NCARB are presently
30 working on the same type of automatic exam approval system. There is no testing center in
31 Juneau due to the low number of applicants. Juneau applicants could fly to Anchorage or
32 Seattle to take the exam. It was asked if there was any danger of not having a test center in
33 Alaska and the response was that many boards and professions use the test centers. All
34 the Pearson Vue centers will be the same in layout, testing procedures and security. The
35 FE and FS exams will be reduced to 6 hours.
36

37 The discussion was stopped to call Juneau for the Expenditure Report.
38

39 **Agenda item 6 – Expenditure Report**

40

41 Frawley: Asks if there were any specific questions on the report. She explains a couple of
42 bumps in the contractual line but the rest of the lines seem to be on target for normal
43 expenditures.
44

45 Chair: Asks if we are running at a deficit.
46

47 Frawley: Responds that we will probably end up with a slight deficit.
48

49 Chair: Asks if we make fee adjustments this fall since we are coming into a renewal cycle.
50

51 Chambers: Advises that the fee analysis for the December renewals will begin in the next
52 month or so and they will communicate with the Boards with any fee change
53 recommendations and that since this is a renewal year the Board will be bringing in revenue
54 that will offset that temporary deficit.

1
2 Chair: Asks if there is any sense of where we increase or decrease fees.
3

4 Chambers: Responds that since the analysis hasn't been done now it would be speculative.
5 She adds that it will be very valuable to get the Board's opinion on whatever the
6 recommendation is. She recapped that during last renewal in 2011 there were several
7 boards that captured the attention of the Administration and the Legislature and that this
8 time the Division is ramping up the communications with the Boards so as to not have any
9 surprises so that there is no collateral damage which is what happened to this Board in
10 2011.
11

12 Jones: Adds that in the fall of 2011 we were slated to go up \$25.
13

14 Chair: Feels that looking at the trend we are looking at a slight fee increase this year. He
15 then asks if the information that the travel budget for the Division was increased is correct.
16

17 Chambers: Responds that we will have to wait and see if the budget is approved but that
18 the Legislature has recommended a \$200K increase in the Divisions travel budget which
19 would be for all of the Divisions travel, primarily for Board travel but also including staff and
20 investigative travel. So that answers many of the concerns that Boards including AELS
21 have had. She adds that there are conversations ongoing that would allow third party
22 reimbursements to flow back into the Board's travel fund. They also have a conversation
23 ongoing to allow travel that is included in dues to National Organizations to be considered
24 paid and usable by the Boards. She gives a brief overview of HB187 which is presently in
25 the Finance Committee and that it would give the Division some more flexibility in how it sets
26 fees with the hope that it would take out some of the spikes and valleys that many Boards
27 experience due to investigative and legal costs. The Division passed to the Legislature
28 information to show how those costs affect the fee structure and expenses of the Boards.
29 She encourages the Board to provide input to the Division or directly to the Legislature.
30

31 Chair: Was surprised to see HB 187 introduced just as we were fighting so hard to get our
32 own investigator and then the Division introduces this to put all investigators under General
33 Fund money and asks if the Division has any comments on that.
34

35 Chambers: We don't see those as being in conflict with each other. The investigator for
36 AELS will provide support for the case load. If it passes and maintains that flexibility to
37 provide some other funding sources I would see that as a win, win because it would stabilize
38 your fees as well as continue support for the case load.
39

40 Chair: Asks if our investigator would remain with the Board but would get paid out of the
41 General Fund.
42

43 Chambers: The investigator would remain with the Board because that is in Statute so that
44 cannot change. The spirit behind 187 is that a portion of investigative fees would be offset
45 by the General Fund but the way the bill is worded simply gives some flexibility for fees to be
46 set having more tools in the tool box. So it might be premature for me to say that if this
47 passes investigators will be funded out of the General Fund but that is one of the points in
48 the spirit behind 187 so the public shares in those costs. The Legislature has put into law
49 that you will have a dedicated investigator just as you have a dedicated executive so those
50 things cannot change unless the Legislature changes them.
51

52 Chair: Asks what percentage the Board will get.
53

54 Chambers: We will set those numbers based on the number of licensees at the end of this

1 fiscal year. She adds that that is the figure that they use to allot travel funds however, there
2 are other factors that come into play also. One of which is the size of the Board and the
3 AELS Board has the most members and you also govern several professions which means
4 you have a variety of conferences to attend that are sort of mutually exclusive of one
5 another and we understand that and when we are setting those goal number we respect that
6 you may have a higher demand than some other Boards to maintain your fiduciary
7 responsibilities. Those are some of the other soft intangibles that go into that goal number.
8 Again I use that term "goal" because it is kind of fluid depending on what crops up. We do
9 have staff executive and investigative travel that has to come out of that same budget. So if
10 we need to fund investigative travel or have to shift executives between offices we need to
11 shift those funds but Board travel is the highest priority.

12
13 Chair: Asks if there is any Board Member training planned for FY14.

14
15 Chambers: We are considering that, it's something that Don and I have talked about. We
16 want to see how the FY13 travel budget lands and also what we actually receive for FY14
17 and may also poll the Boards to see what the interest is. Several boards have expressed an
18 interest. If we continue to get positive interest we will likely pull something together like we
19 did last year although we will probably not bring in trainers we will use the existing resources
20 we have been accumulating. Is that something your Board would be interested in again?

21
22 Chair: I found it valuable to me and Richard is nodding here and says yes as well. I don't
23 want to speak for everyone but I thought it was good, I learned some stuff and I thought it
24 was appropriate training especially for newer members.

25
26 Hale: I wasn't able to make the meeting last year but got the packet which was helpful as
27 well.

28
29 Chair: Asks if there are any other questions. You got off easy this time Sara and Misty.

30
31 Chambers: Thanks the Board for their input and advises that they will notify Vern and the
32 Board when they have a more firm timeline for the fee setting.

33
34 Jones: Asks Sara if Don had a change of plans.

35
36 Chambers: As you are asking that he is walking in so good timing Vern. She advises that
37 Don will be traveling next week so he has a lot on his plate today. She brings him up to date
38 on what was discussed.

39
40 Habeger: He asks if 187 was covered and upon receiving an affirmative response
41 addresses the Board. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board I have nothing else to add
42 at the moment. The Legislative session was successful on a couple of bills and in response
43 to concerns by a number of Boards getting 187 introduced and if you've already talked
44 about it, nothing else to add. Do you have any question for me?

45
46 Chair: I think they have all been answered. Burt?

47
48 Lent: Thanks Don regarding the regulation change.

49
50 Teleconference was terminated.

51
52 Hale: Who sets the fees if we decide on an increase? Who makes that decision?

53
54 Jones: The Division does. They take the Board recommendation into consideration. He

1 then explains how the fees are supposed to meet expenses without any overage over time
2 or any deficit. He continues explaining the accounting glitches that caused a large surplus
3 and the fee reduction to reduce the surplus.
4

5 Savage: Voices concerns that HB187 will reduce investigations and enforcement due to the
6 effect a similar bill had on the Department of Labor in the past.
7

8 Jones: Believes that only a portion of the investigations funding would be shifted to the
9 General Fund.
10

11 Savage: Responds that they are being told different. That their funding would come from
12 the General Fund.
13

14 Jones: Suggests that the Board send a letter recommending John's attendance at the
15 NCEES Annual in San Antonio. He adds that he will not be able to attend.
16

17 Chair: Back to 7 B 7.
18

19 Jones: Explains the proposed changes.
20

21 Koonce: Asks if it would be necessary to have a certificate to practice after this change and
22 if employers have been notified.
23

24 Jones: Explains the present system and that we don't presently issue EIT or SIT
25 certificates.
26

27 Chair: Asks if it would just be by examination or would it apply to comity?
28

29 Jones: It wouldn't apply to comity.
30

31 Schedler: Suggests a numbering system so the certificates can't be produced by anyone.
32

33 Koonce: Asks how employers will be able to check to see if someone has passed the FE.
34

35 Jones: They can check online to see if they have a certificate.
36

37 Kerr: Suggested that and EIT or SIT has to work under a licensed professional so why the
38 certificate.
39

40 Jones: Many states require the certificate the same as licenses. I don't propose that they
41 be renewed, just a onetime certificate but it's up to the Board.
42

43 Chair: Suggests that we don't have to make the decision today and asks the Board to think
44 about it. There is still time before this takes effect. He notes that going automatic
45 significantly lowers the work load of the staff.
46

47 Jones: Adds that this would eliminate the calls every February of the graduates of UAF that
48 miss the deadline and that we have taken a hard line on them and he then gets calls from
49 parents and legislators asking that we allow them to apply late.
50

51 A short free for all discussion continued. Points of interest were that Alaska would lose one
52 test center, Juneau, as there are not enough applicants here to justify one. The exams
53 would be reduced from 8 hours to 6 hours. The cost of the exam would increase to \$225.
54 The Board may lose some revenue since examinees would no longer have to apply to the

1 Board before taking the exam. However the reduction in workload would put off or
2 eliminate the need to hire another licensing examiner. No action would be taken at this
3 meeting and members should review the proposed regulations and be prepared to take
4 action in August.

5
6 9:47a.m. Break

7
8 10:00a.m. Back on record.

9
10 **Agenda item 9 – Correspondence Received Since February 2013.**

11
12 A) 1 and 2: CLARB.

13
14 Lent: Comments on the registration window for the LARE and the timing of the early testing
15 regulation change that will become effective on the 4th of May. He also notes that more
16 candidates are using the Council Record.

17
18 B) 1 thru 13. NCARB.

19
20 Rearick: Commented on NCARB's credential evaluation service that was used for
21 evaluating foreign degree programs could now be used for domestic programs. He added
22 that the Model Law had been tweaked to allow the use of electronic seals.

23
24 Chair: Notes that at the NCEES Annual Conference there will be a discussion on electronic
25 seals.

26
27 C) 1 thru 8. NCEES

28
29 Chair: Notes that Richard Heieren is the Assistant VP of Western Zone and that Dave Hale
30 was re appointed to the nomination committee.

31
32 Jones: Draws attention to C 4 which is a power point on the CBT exam approval methods.

33
34 Chair: Comments on Ohio's request to amend the bylaws to allow combined boards
35 (engineer and surveyor) to have two votes and two funded delegates at meetings in addition
36 to a first time attendee. We need to make a decision by the August meeting on whether we
37 support that or not.

38
39 Jones: Points out that State Travel Policy doesn't allow us to take advantage of the funded
40 delegate program.

41
42 Eriksen: Asks if our dues cover the funded delegate program.

43
44 Jones: Explains that our dues are figured on the number of licensed engineers and
45 surveyors. NCEES developed the funded delegate program to ensure attendance at
46 meetings. They have many revenue sources and don't have to include that in the dues.

47
48 Chair: Adds that they also want to extend the length of time Boards have to take advantage
49 of the funded first time attendee from 18 months to 24 months.

50
51 Jones: Comments that there has been some discussion on combining all the Zone
52 meetings into one.

53
54 Rearick: Notes that NCARB is also considering having all the Regional meetings at the

1 same time and location and having NCARB take care of the meeting planning to take the
2 burden off the Regions. There is fear that it would then become just another National
3 meeting and some Regions don't want that. They want to be able to deal with the special
4 issues that occur in their Region.

5
6 D) Email from Nick Bakic re FPE's – response is item 10 B.

7 E) Email from Foley Eng re Jurisdiction.

8
9 Chair: Advises that this is just like a lab report and we don't stamp lab reports so the answer
10 is that he doesn't need to be licensed.

11
12 F) Email from John Hallinan re exemptions.

13
14 Jones: Explains that the situation is that BP is contracting him to do some work for them
15 and telling him that the industrial exemption applies. However that is not the case since he
16 is not an employee of BP and must follow all the regulations re stamping.

17
18 G) Email from Max Schillinger re use of EI and EIT.

19
20 Jones: Explains that Mr. Schillinger felt that the individual was misleading the public by
21 using the title EI and then under that "transportation engineer". Board policy allows the use
22 of EI or EIT so there is really no violation here. Mr. Schillinger feels that there are not that
23 many people familiar with EI and that it shouldn't be used.

24
25 Chair: We have a policy on it and I think the policy is clear.

26
27 **Agenda item 10 – correspondence Sent Since February 2013.**

28
29 A) Email to Alan Rogers in response to his question re CE.

30
31 Chair: This was the one re pro-bono work.

32
33 B) Letter to Nick Bakic in response to his question re grandfathering.

34
35 Chair: He had some questions regarding grandfathering fire protection engineers.

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

38
39 A) Seismic requirements for civil and structural engineers.

40
41 Chair: Explains to the new members that this discussion is with the Governor's committee
42 on Seismic Hazards. That they feel that engineers that do civil, structural or geotechnical
43 engineering should have some seismic education and are suggesting a course similar to or
44 an addition to the arctic engineering course or a continuing education requirement. They
45 are looking for some help from us.

46
47 The Board reviews items 11 A 1 thru 5 which are the various requirements in the ARE,
48 NCEES and , Calif. Exams.

49
50 Chair: Explains that some engineers in Alaska such as civil may not have taken the
51 structural component but can still design buildings. He draws attention to their position
52 paper. He talked with them yesterday and they are concerned that people that are providing
53 structural designs or geotechnical information do not have any seismic education or
54 background. They would like to see some sort of continuing education or an addition to the

1 arctic courses in seismic hazards. So they are asking for support from us. I told them we
2 don't control the arctic course content.

3
4 Hale: Notes that it's interesting from a public safety standpoint that arctic is required and
5 seismic is not.

6
7 Rearick: Adds that arctic engineering is not a part of any curriculum but seismic is.

8
9 Hale: Doesn't think this is an issue since most of this is done by Architects and Structural
10 engineers.

11
12 Chair: Reiterates that there are some in Alaska that may be doing structural that don't have
13 the seismic education or experience. He points out that they have provided some
14 suggested regulation changes. If there is no further discussion we will call Mr. Scher at
15 11a.m.

16
17 B) Exam retakes.

18
19 No report.

20
21 C) Electronic Signatures.

22
23 No report.

24
25 D) Ethics regulation.

26
27 Hale: Explains that he was tasked with coming up with a set of ethical principles and
28 explains his thinking when he wrote the recommended regulation. He tried to keep it generic
29 and feels that it is more morality based. He looked at doctors and lawyers and even fund
30 raisers and the same things come up over and over so it's easy to pick the really important
31 things. It's morality based, it's community based, it's how we interact with one another
32 professionally. The thing that is missing is a process for registering a complaint and maybe
33 something about sanctions. He wasn't sure if the Board wanted to adopt something new or
34 just tweak what we already have in place. We have all of this in place and I'm not sure what
35 prompted the requirements for a new ethics reg.

36
37 Shiesl: It was because of the DWI incident and we have no way of disciplining someone
38 who has a DUI and there were others too.

39
40 Chair: Brings new members up to speed on the issue. Without going into detail he states
41 there was a case with multiple DUI's and the question was should we even license this
42 individual and what do we have to stand on? Our Statute says of good character and
43 reputation. What's the cut off, two DUI's, three?

44
45 Kerr: Thinks that first we need to establish that alcoholism is a disease and we can't
46 disqualify someone based on that. If someone is an alcoholic and has otherwise
47 outstanding moral character, does pro-bono work, where is the line?

48
49 Hale: Adds that a lot of them are not alcohol addiction they are just bad choices they made
50 and don't impact their ability to work. The alcohol event on the weekend has no bearing on
51 their professional ability.

52
53 Chair: It's not just one thing. Are we going to license a murderer? It could be anything in
54 between. In some instances if your convicted of a felony we can deny the license, we could

1 also grant the license, it's our option. That's where the ethics thing originated, we didn't have
2 a measuring stick.

3
4 Hale: Asks how many DUI's it takes to be a felony. (someone interjected three) So there's
5 your cutoff.

6
7 Rearick: We did get wrapped around the axle on the DUI thing but if you have a convicted
8 child molester and they want an architect license and they design a day care facilities. Adds
9 that re DUI's it depends on if they're under the influence while they design.

10
11 Jones: This comes up several times each year. I get calls asking what this has to do with
12 their ability as a PE. My response is it might not. But you are charged with protecting the
13 HSW of the public and if continue to do something that endangers the public like getting in a
14 car drunk and taking off down the road it calls into question your judgment.

15
16 The discussion continued for a few minutes more with the points being that we are here to
17 police as far as engineering goes not keep people off the road, that's the police's job. We
18 have spent hours discussing this and have no specific guidelines or even a consensus on
19 what's acceptable. We need to set a bar we can at least sort of agree on and to make it
20 legal it has to be discretionary. Once the person has served their sentence they have paid
21 their debt to society should we hold that against them? It was asked what the two questions
22 on the application are. The questions were read and it was noted that they were revised a
23 couple years ago at the recommendation of the Dept of Law and that most Boards use the
24 same questions. What right do we have to ask those questions, we are supposed to be
25 concerned with professional conduct not weekends activities. If you deny a license you
26 have to have something to back that up and that good moral character and reputation is kind
27 of thin.

28
29 Hale: It sounds like we just need to tweak what we have here. He asks what the Board
30 wants him to do.

31
32 It was suggested that he combine what he has into 12 AAC 36.200 Ethical Standards.

33
34 Jones: Will ask other Boards what they have.

35
36 At 11a.m. we called Mr. Scher to discuss the seismic issue.

37
38 Chair: Welcomes Mr. Scher to the meeting, advises him that we had discussed the issue
39 somewhat a little earlier but wanted to save most of it until he was called. He asks for a
40 synopsis of why we need the change and what he is suggesting that we change then we will
41 open it up to questions and discussion.

42
43 Scher: The Alaska Seismic Hazards Safety committee's number one duty effectively by
44 statute is to find ways and recommend ways to mitigate or reduce the seismic risk
45 considering that Alaska is the most seismic active state in North America and in terms of risk
46 as measured in the sense of the building damage relative to the replacement value of
47 buildings in the State are on par with ratio's in San Francisco and LA. The codified seismic
48 ground motion parameters are on par with those known seismic areas even though we don't
49 have the populace and we don't have the buildings. The ration of loss compared to the
50 replacement cost is just as high as it is in San Francisco and LA. So given those two things
51 we consider that a very effective way to mitigate the risk and reduce the loss of life and
52 dollars is to assure that the engineers who are completing designs, civil designs, and I'm
53 using civil in the traditional sense that it includes structural engineering and when I read the
54 regulations, civil engineers by definition are involved with structures. Things are changing

1 here and I'll get into that and I appreciate the differences, but right now we're talking as
2 defined in the broader sense of civil engineering. So we feel that an effective and efficient
3 way to mitigate the risk and ensure that civil engineers that are involved with preparing
4 designs for structures, bridges, buildings, retaining walls, whatever, utilities and so on, they
5 should have an understanding of seismic engineering and the difference in seismic
6 engineering that's seismic hazards, this awareness of our environment. The codes describe
7 ground motions that we have to design, also ground failures and other aspects of the
8 seismic environment that are in the code that are more specific to our seismic setting. The
9 kind of earthquakes that we can experience, the characteristics of those kind of
10 earthquakes. There's seismic engineering and understanding of our seismic environment
11 here. It is our opinion, when we looked through the regulations for civil engineers there is
12 nothing that assures us that all those civil engineers have an understanding of seismic
13 engineering or an awareness of seismic hazards. We looked at all the statutes, there is
14 nothing in the statutes. We saw nothing specific to seismic engineering or knowledge of
15 seismic engineering or seismic hazards regulations. Then we looked through all the general
16 categories of regulations groupings and you could infer that knowledge was there by virtue
17 of education, testing, comity and continuing education. Those were the four general ways
18 we looked at it and again we didn't see anything in the statutes. The word seismic doesn't
19 even show up in the statutes. There's nothing specific about seismic in the regulations. The
20 word seismic shows up in the regulations three times and it only refers to architects. Every
21 time this word seismic appears it only applies to architects, it does not apply to civil
22 engineers. So then again we looked at education, examination, comity and continuing
23 education and we saw that the requirements in those four general categories, while certainly
24 it's likely that people by virtue of all of those, have some knowledge of seismic engineering
25 or seismic hazards. The point is that it's not specifically required. Therefore you can't infer
26 that everybody has it. Going back to this thing to mitigate the seismic hazard in the state
27 would be to ensure that civil engineers who are preparing designs in this state recognize
28 that. And we point out that there is a requisite for all civil engineers licensed in the State to
29 take the special course for arctic engineering. The need to be aware of cold climate and
30 cold regions, frozen ground, permafrost affects on buildings, roads, pavements and so on
31 and that's all very important but if you mess up in arctic engineering it usually doesn't result
32 in a building falling down or people's lives being lost. In seismic engineering if you screw up
33 it has vary serious consequences. So while it's not necessarily a seasonal hazard
34 everybody knows it's there. Again we felt that we should really assure that all professional
35 engineers practicing civil engineering in the State have an understanding of seismic
36 engineering or have demonstrated an understanding of seismic engineering and seismic
37 hazards. Then we suggested what we thought were straight forward, simple, and those are
38 subjective terms and what in my mind may be simple in your mind goes, that's a lot of work.
39 I don't have an appreciation for how difficult it really is to amend a regulation. But we
40 thought these things you know again we gave four recommendations to amend the
41 regulations. These would not require legislation, these are thing that are within your power.
42 We didn't see that they would add cost to civil engineers trying to obtain a license or
43 maintain a license in the State. Granted there's probably going to be some potential
44 bookkeeping impacts down the road. Again we didn't see that the consequences were that
45 significant. We thought they were pretty straight forward, simple and logical and would help
46 achieve the means of the end. Sorry that wasn't very brief. Within the six page position
47 paper that we provided for you I've referenced these prospects. (unintelligible) we are
48 looking at courses, opinions and who we would talk to at NCEES about new testing.
49 (unintelligible) We're interested in hearing what (unintelligible).

50
51 Lent: Relates how he was dealing with earth that had diatomaceous fine particulate
52 materials that wouldn't be stable under earthquake conditions when he practiced in
53 California and that the same conditions exist in Alaska over in Turnagain where the land
54 subsided dramatically in the 64 quake and he feels that landscape architects would benefit

1 from learning about seismic hazards such as this if it was to be included in the Northern
2 Design or Arctic Engineering courses that they already have to take. He would support a
3 brief course in seismic conditions.
4

5 Scher: To that effect Colin had originally suggested and I like the idea that that would be a
6 very effective approach to helping meet the ends of our desires here. But I'm not sure that,
7 and we talked about amending that program, I'm not sure that would be the most efficient
8 way, to amend the arctic engineering course. That's an established course, it's tied to
9 various universities, I think a more effective method would be, if you thought it was worthy of
10 consideration we would help move it forward, and talk to people about it you know possibly
11 a kind of a webinar type project, where it's a 4 hour online, some period of time online so it's
12 accessible to a number of people and then there's an exam at the end of it. I have no idea
13 how hard it would be to set up a web based program like this but I don't know that it would
14 necessarily be easy to take an arctic engineering class and add seismic to it. Either make
15 another class like that or something a little bit more condensed. Anyway I appreciate that
16 comment.
17

18 Hale: Was wondering if it's important enough to include in licensure is a 4 hour webinar
19 going to mitigate that? Are we just trying to expose people to seismic or are we really trying
20 to protect the public by making sure people understand all of it.
21

22 Scher: I just threw that out there, I'm not sure. To go to that level I think we would want to
23 go to ASPE and the structural groups and canvas their members more about it. Certainly
24 you would get a lot more input if we were go to the level of a webinar based program or
25 modifying arctic engineering or something. I'm all for it and it to make it specific to the
26 hazard here in this State. But again I just threw 4 hours out there.
27

28 Chair: Notes that California is the only state that has an exam and asks if they have course
29 work requirements like our arctic requirement or is it just the exam.
30

31 Scher: As far as I know it's just the exam. But there's an experience component I believe
32 before you can take the exam. It's similar to getting a PE here, the experience would have
33 to be under the responsible charge of somebody that is licensed and they would verify that
34 the work you were doing was in seismic engineering or to that effect. But it's a good
35 question Brian, I do not know for a fact that they do not have, I wasn't able find anything.
36

37 Chair: Asks if it applies to all civil engineers or just structural engineers.
38

39 Scher: I don't know about that California system other than they are, and I'm not saying this
40 is right, they have taken it to another level. In addition to examination you're licensed as a
41 geotechnical engineer, you're licensed as an engineering geologist, you're licensed as a civil
42 engineer, and you're licensed as a structural engineer. And there's no overlap between any
43 of them where in our State a civil engineer, right now, I know it's changing, right now the
44 regulations say a civil engineer can do structural engineering. I'm not suggesting that the
45 State go to that extreme although it's evolving that way at least with structural engineering
46 being separated.
47

48 Chair: Informs Mr. Scher that Colin is not here due to illness. And he has done quite a bit of
49 research on this. And draws attention to the suggested regulation changes on page 5 of the
50 position paper.
51

52 Scher: Correct, and I appreciate this. Our commission is made up of people from the
53 insurance industry, emergency responders, geologists, we have (unintelligible) out of seven
54 or nine people. And your Board made up of architects, land surveyors, civil engineers, all

1 fields and we're talking specifically to what is currently defined as a civil engineer in the
2 regulation and those that are involved in the design of structures and bridges and
3 infrastructure. There other areas of civil engineering that this may not necessarily apply to,
4 hydrology and environmental and the transportation side. It's up to the person to limit what
5 they do or to make sure if they haven't been tested in that area or don't have the
6 experience, it's their honor system not to practice there. The regulations are intended to
7 cover a broad range of (unintelligible) and a variety of people but it's specific to a small
8 percentage of them. I don't know how many civils there are, look at your Annual Report 4
9 thousand? Something like that....

10
11 Jones: Roughly 4500.

12
13 Scher: 4500, ok, and you know of that how many are doing what I would call structural
14 design? (unintelligible) I don't stamp structural design but I'm involved with
15 recommendations for holding foundations or a bridge foundation ground motion response or
16 (unintelligible) I consider myself while not physically stamping them I'm a party to that. In a
17 broader sense we're looking for (unintelligible) AELS share that this is a good idea that the
18 regulations should somehow modify or could somehow be modified to better ensure that
19 civil engineers practicing in this State have some seismic knowledge of seismic engineering
20 and seismic hazards. That's the first step and if there's agreement there, then the second
21 step is what's the best way to do it and we've suggested things that we think are straight
22 forward and could be added. There are certainly others that really (unintelligible) we could
23 go to a special course or program similar to arctic engineering. Then you guys having much
24 more experience with regulations may have other ideas on how to do it. So that's kind of a
25 secondary one. The first one is whether or not there is concurrence that has a value and a
26 need. So that's kind of the discussion, I appreciate being involved and certainly want to
27 hear what Colin had to say. Brian I know is a PE, is a civil. I'm not sure who else is
28 (unintelligible) that this could and would apply to other fields. Architects, landscape
29 architects and it would be of value to them no argument but starting out fundamentally just
30 pushing it at civil engineers.

31
32 Chair: I don't do structures. I hire people like Colin to do that. Are there any other
33 questions?

34
35 Scher: Asks if it would be appropriate for him to call Colin next week.

36
37 Chair: Responds yes, he may have some questions like I have some questions here like
38 what are other States, does California require a course? And do they even offer a course or
39 is this going to just make a lot of work for somebody? Then is it 4 hours, is it 8 hours, is it 80
40 hours, the appropriate level of training?

41
42 Scher: We haven't looked into it, I'd certainly be happy to do that. If that's a consideration,
43 to have us take that ball and run with it. The customized course, we had (unintelligible) you
44 know doing the math and reading the code and what the code is telling us to do for buildings
45 and for retaining walls, foundations depending on whether you use the IBC or (unintelligible)
46 codes for structures that's the seismic engineering part. That, engineers could do that,
47 that's pretty, but that would be a part of a specialist program for Alaska with the Alaska code
48 is, uh, the characteristics of our seismic environment and how those fit into the code
49 requirements and how to figure, or view or apply the code requirements relative to our
50 distinctive (unintelligible) shaking really addressed in the code and how you want to
51 compensate or account for that. (unintelligible) other than that is sort of an appreciation for
52 seismic activity. That's the part of the course that's probably 4 to 8 hours just our local
53 vetting and applying it. If you want the course to go into actually doing seismic engineering,
54 which the structural engineers already know and already do, add maybe another day or so.

1 I'm not suggesting we go that far (unintelligible) 4 to 8 hours (unintelligible). And Brian
2 thanks again for letting me poke into your meeting. I would be interested, you know, look
3 forward to hearing what you ultimately decide and in the mean time I'll talk to Colin.
4

5 Chair: Thanks Mr. Scher for his time and testimony. He adds that it's an ongoing
6 discussion that we will continue and we will just go forward and see what Colin has to say
7 and how we want to proceed.
8

9 Scher: Asks if it is hard to amend the regulations.
10

11 Chair: Explains the regulation process and time line. He adds that a Statute change could
12 take up to two years or more.
13

14 Scher: Yes, that's why we were focusing on regulations side. The other question, and you
15 had mentioned this yesterday, Brian, and I went back and looked at the regulations as
16 posted and they are dated March 2012. Maybe there is a more recent version I wasn't able
17 to locate. This discussion of licensing structural and civil engineers separately now, I don't
18 see how, I couldn't find anything in the March 2012 regulations that specifies that if you're
19 doing structural design you have to have a structural engineering license. You can still be a
20 civil engineer because civil engineering says you can design structures.
21

22 Chair: That is correct.
23

24 Scher: So is that something that is coming in the next round, the next issue of the
25 regulations?
26

27 Chair: It may, it's not something the Board is pursuing right now.
28

29 Scher: Oh, OK.
30

31 Chair: Continues that it came up during the public comment period and he doesn't believe
32 that anyone on the Board or the public are pushing for any changes there at this time but
33 you're correct if you have a civil engineering license you may do structural engineering. You
34 just cannot call yourself a structural engineer or advertise yourself as such.
35

36 Scher: I don't even see that in the regulations where you can't call yourself a structural
37 engineer.
38

39 Chair: Explains that SE is one of the stamps and structural engineering is defined in the
40 regulations.
41

42 Scher: I was just curious if there were some new regulations that you guys were bantering
43 around there that we should look for. Alright thanks Brian.
44

45 Chair: Thanks for your time and we look forward to talking with you later.
46

47 Scher: Asks Hale if it's too late to give him some comments on a project he is working on
48 and upon receiving a "no" response, states that he will see him back in Anchorage on
49 Monday.
50

51 Rearick: Comments that part of the regulation changes that we did was to preserve
52 people's right to do the work they were already doing so I think if we started to talk about
53 anything it would be when you registered and what the requirements were then.
54

1 Chair: Thinks that is why he was suggesting that that be added under 063 engineering
2 registration by examination so it wouldn't apply to comity. So that's my biggest concern, so
3 you're going to have one group being required to take a seismic course or do continuing
4 education or do something different than everybody else.

5
6 Jones: That would cover exam applicant and the third one there would cover comity.
7

8 Chair: Doesn't think we want to get into dictating what CEU's you're going to have to take.
9 That was one of the things that came up in the Western Zone meeting was they are seeing
10 these PDH farms, you know, people pull together an hour course and charge \$500 for it or
11 \$250 and the course is horrible. Talking to one guy, and he said it is a lot easier if you work
12 for large companies, he's kind of on his own with a two or three person shop so it's harder
13 to get that, the brown bags, and the structured, so he has to go and pay for these. It's like
14 trying to choose a bottle of water off the shelf, some are good and some may not be.

15
16 Eriksen: (unintelligible) seems like seismic is part of continuing education and experience
17 (unintelligible)

18
19 Chair: I'm wondering myself, if it's not already covered. Look at the earthquake in Haiti, I
20 don't even remember what size earthquake that was, but it was not a very big earthquake
21 and there was massive, massive loss of life and damage to property. All over the U.S. every
22 day we have earthquakes that are bigger than that. It's very rare, there was the California
23 quake where the bridge collapsed but that is a rarity not the norm. So that's the other side
24 of it. We understand the hazards but isn't it already being dealt with through education and
25 experience and codes?

26
27 Koonce: Remarks that the codes are strict.

28
29 Chair: And there is a reason they are strict.

30
31 Rearick: Comments that not many architects are hiring civil engineers to do their structures,
32 they are hiring structural engineers.

33
34 Chair: So, we'll have ongoing discussions.

35
36 Discussion continued with no new info for several minutes.

37
38 Chair: Is there anything new on Examination Retakes or Electronic Signatures?

39
40 Rearick: On electronic signature, again I was hoping that NCARB might take a little stronger
41 action (unintelligible). So we're largely on our own. I'm going to continue to pursue it but I'm
42 not seeing a lot out there (unintelligible).

43
44 Chair: NCEES is going to have an hour and a half session on it. I hope it's helpful to us.
45 Anything on Exam retakes?

46
47 Walters: Nothing new.

48
49 Chair: Feels the question there was whether we are going to change the education
50 requirements and put forth a regulation change. I think it would be good, probably by the
51 next meeting to have a proposed regulation change or your recommendations.

52
53 Jones: Advises that there was more info from Base Camp that he will forward to Keith.

54

1 Chair: Wants to try to get rid of this one by the next meeting whether it's a regulation
2 change or we're done looking at it.

3
4 **Agenda item 17 – New business.**

5
6 A) Email from DEC re Stamping documents.

7
8 Jones: Explains that this is questioning Harley's earlier response on this subject with
9 additional questions.

10
11 Schedler: Asks what their issue is in a nutshell.

12
13 Chair: Explains that they require a stamp on record drawings that says basically, I watched
14 everything go into the ground and this is exactly how it is, it's a statement and it's very
15 specific in its wording and most would never sign it.

16
17 Schedler: And it's a DEC requirement?

18
19 Chair: Yes, to get operating permits.

20
21 Rearick: Adds that it's saying everything was done per your plan and in many instances
22 you're not going to be able to observe everything that's happening.

23
24 Koonce: Asks if people are actually doing this.

25
26 Schedler: So are engineers not signing it?

27
28 Chair: Explains that they are putting disclaimers on the plans and reads an example.
29 "Project Record Drawings. These drawings have been prepared from information furnished
30 by the general contractor. There is absolutely no guarantee as to the accuracy of the
31 information contained herein, either expressed or implied." We don't like to see putting a
32 stamp on a document and saying something like this. But DEC requires the drawings to be
33 stamped.

34
35 Koonce: Asks if this is from their regulations.

36
37 Chair: Doesn't know where the requirement comes from.

38
39 Koonce: Asks if the Board has been talking to them about this.

40
41 Chair: This is how we have gotten involved.

42
43 Rearick: Thinks in Harley's prior correspondence with them he is basically saying that they
44 really shouldn't be signing the documents that they can't attest to.

45
46 Koonce: Right, it goes against the regulations (everyone voices agreement).

47
48 Rearick: So through our correspondence with them I guess we are telling them that we
49 don't think that's right.

50
51 Kerr: Asks if DEC intends that the engineer have a representative on site during the entire
52 course of construction so that they can sign it.

53
54 A short free for all discussion ensued with the points made that the customer wouldn't want

1 to pay to have an engineer on site during the entire construction process. You would have
2 to witness it all. (unintelligible) inspection process, video document it.

3
4 Koonce: Explains the special inspection process requirements in Anchorage.

5
6 Schedler: Thinks the third statement is the most reasonable to her. She thinks we should
7 respond by saying that we think your requirement is overreaching and we don't think the
8 documents need to be stamped and in the interest in being able to move work forward we
9 would support a statement such as this and an engineer sealing those documents to meet
10 your requirements. But we really think your requirement should be changed because it's too
11 far reaching.

12
13 Chair: So do many engineers. Because what their asking for is a guarantee. Even the third
14 statement "it's in substantial conformance". Well either it's in conformance or not. There is
15 no such thing as partly pregnant it either conforms or it doesn't conform. There is something
16 wrong with all these statements. I believe personally that their requirement to have record
17 drawings stamped is in conflict with our regulation.

18
19 Short free for all discussion continued with various individuals explaining how their company
20 does it.

21
22 Schedler: It would be nice to have something like your reply that you could provide to other
23 engineers as the question comes from them you'd say this is how we replied to DEC.

24
25 Chair: Will put a response together.

26
27 Rearick: Suggests we could bring it to a head by going after the engineers that are signing
28 those documents.

29
30 Chair: Points out that someone has to file a complaint.

31
32 Rearick: Thinks there is a better way for DEC to achieve their objective without being in
33 conflict with our regulations.

34
35 Chair: It sounds like we are all in agreement that Harley's response was appropriate.

36
37 All nodded or voiced concurrence.

38
39 B) Fee setting for renewals this December.

40
41 Chair: Notes that we will have a deficit this year.

42
43 Koonce: Asks what causes it.

44
45 Chair: Explains the revenue cycle and a \$1M spike we had a couple years ago.

46
47 Jones: Relates some of the complaints received when the fees go up and again when they
48 come down. And that the Board was against the severe drop from \$295 to \$125 they
49 wanted to drop to \$200 and make the \$1M overage dissipate over a longer period of time
50 but the Division disagreed and dropped to \$125.

51
52 Chair: So in August we'll get their recommendations.

53
54 11:55a.m. Lunch.

1
2 1:10 p.m. On record. We have two people signed up to testify, however, there is only one
3 here right now. Are you ready Chris?
4

5 **Agenda item 13 – Public Comment.**
6

7 Chris Miller: Thank you, Chris Miller from Design Alaska, I'm a mechanical engineer, fire
8 protection engineer, control systems engineer, whatever, all of the above. I'm here today
9 because I saw on the agenda under the new business was DEC Stamping, a thing near and
10 dear to my heart. I would just, thank Vern for sending me the correspondence when I read
11 the agenda I see things I'm interested in I just send Vern a message and he sends me the
12 agenda. It would be nice if I could just go to the web and get it but I'll take it, Vern's very
13 responsive.
14

15 I have not had any trouble with DEC lately. It's been a few years so maybe they've softened
16 a little bit. But the last couple of jobs we did the design engineer was actually the same
17 engineer that went out and inspected the work so he just signed the stamps and moved on.
18 DEC has always had some issue about they want their record drawings signed by a
19 registered engineer, which makes perfect sense. I understand why they want to do it but
20 they didn't like the little caveat that we put underneath the stamps. I'm not the designer I'm
21 the guy that inspected it. So, I know there's been some correspondence back and forth with
22 the Board. I saw the letter, it seems like it was quite awhile ago, that was written from
23 Harley Hightower to the DEC and so I don't know what the status is and why it's on the new
24 business today or if there's anything proposed. I did bring a little handout if you guys want
25 one. I can discuss it briefly. Essentially I copied off the regulation that always spouts. But
26 then I made a little, that's what the design ones look like, just a signed engineers stamp. But
27 then I would propose that the as build ones just have an as build record drawing stamp as
28 you see fit. The seal of the person who observed the construction for DEC's permit and
29 then a little caveat that says I'm the observing engineer in accordance with DEC's
30 requirements. The original designer's stamp wouldn't show up anymore because they are
31 no longer in the loop at that point. So, this would work for me, it works for the other
32 engineers in our office. We feel like we're being clear. So I just thought I'd bring a little
33 example and hopefully, maybe we can work with DEC to come to something that works for
34 all of us. That's really all I had to testify on today.
35

36 I did see the information about fire protection that went around and I was (unintelligible)
37 someone that has no further comments on how the grandfathering process has gone.
38 That's all I have today.
39

40 Chair: Thanks Chris for his testimony. He shared the results of the earlier discussion on
41 this subject and that we are going to follow up with a letter reiterating the points of the earlier
42 letter from Harley. He advises that the Board does not want to see stamps with the
43 disclaimer caveats attached. That it would be contrary to the Statutes and Regulations.
44

45 Chair: Invites Joseph Notkin to testify.
46

47 Mr. Notkin: Joseph Notkin, architect, Fairbanks, do you need my address?
48

49 Chair: We have that.
50

51 Mr. Notkin: I'm here as a member of the American Institute of Architects, I'm a director. So
52 I'm here to congratulate and welcome the new Board members to their appointments.
53 Particularly our new architect member who is a fellow University of Oregon alumnus. Thank
54 you guys for your service and we do appreciate all that the Board does. There are many of

1 us in the AIA who are following Senate Bill 16 and that's been passed, we're very happy.
2 Personally I'm pleased to see that there will be a full time investigator assigned. I can tell
3 you that the gentleman that you have is excellent. I've known him for many years.
4 Hopefully there will be a reasonable travel budget as needed for him to do investigations.
5 That's a very positive step. That's really all I have to say.

6
7 Chair: Thanks Mr. Notkin for his comments and announces that the comment period will
8 remain open for awhile in case anyone else comes in to testify. We will carry on with new
9 business.

10
11 C) Grandfather deadline.

12
13 Eriksen: Points out that the opportunity to become licensed under the 12 AAC 36.106
14 Additional Branches will expire at the end of this year and that maybe we should put out a
15 reminder to everyone.

16
17 Chair: This goes along with my thought about whether some more outreach needed to
18 happen. He offers examples like registration in additional branches without an examination
19 is set to expire at the end of the year and how do we get the notice out without sending
20 letters.

21
22 Jones: Offers to put a notice on the Board's webpage and send a note to APDC for
23 inclusion in their news letter.

24
25 Chair: We have those avenues but there are also other things. The surveyor two year
26 degree. You have a deadline of July 1, I think, for folks to get their application, it doesn't
27 have to be approved, but to get their application submitted. I know a few people who are
28 going to take that opportunity because they only have a two year degree and they will never
29 be able to get licensed. We have things like that that are ongoing and we have maybe
30 some other efforts that can be shared. He asks what the Board thinks about any sort of
31 outreach effort. We get a few people, one or two, that come to the meetings and testify that,
32 sorry Chris, but they are usually the same people. I don't know if we want more involvement
33 from the people we regulate or not.

34
35 Rearick: I've got a question for Vern. So we have e-mail to all licensees?

36
37 Jones: We have not, in the past, required e-mail addresses, however, our new system will.
38 I've actually made that a required field, in the past it was optional, it is now required.

39
40 Rearick: Do you have any idea of the percentage of license holders that subscribe to
41 listserv?

42
43 Jones: No.

44
45 Chair: Points out that anyone can subscribe to listserv.

46
47 Eriksen: What would it cost to put out a mailer?

48
49 Jones: An envelope a sheet of paper and postage times about 6 thousand.

50
51 Chair: It's about \$3500 give or take.

52
53 Hale: Do we have a face book page?

1 Chair: That's where I was headed. He informs the Board of the discussion at the Western
2 Zone meeting concerning outreach. NCEES has packets available for individuals to talk to
3 schools. They've got stuff on CBT, they have a face book page but the interesting thing is
4 they don't have a link to their face book page on their website. He notes that his company
5 just launched the first project face book page for DOT so he knows the State can do it but
6 there are a lot of rules.

7
8 Jones: Advises that social networking requires special permission from IT, however the
9 office of the Commissioner is doing some research on social networking and so it may come
10 about. He adds that some of the other States use it as a bulletin board it's a one way street
11 people can access it and it's read only.

12
13 Lent: Adds that CLARB has instituted their social networking pages and he thinks they use
14 both twitter and face book.

15
16 Chair: Social media is here to stay, whether it's twitter or face book or linked in or
17 something. Like the internet, it's here to stay. He feels we should have a committee
18 research it, see if it's viable, see how we think it should be set up. I was thinking a one way
19 street. If AELS had a face book account we would be a friend of NCARB and CLARB and
20 NCEES. He doesn't know the details but, if it's the Boards pleasure I think we should look
21 at that.

22
23 Jones: Notes that IT is concerned with security of the State system.

24
25 Hale: Adds that ASPLS has a face book page that he administers and anyone can get on
26 and comment but can't make any changes or post anything.

27
28 Kelly: Advises that she gets comments from people that they have looked for us on face
29 book and can't find us. She thinks it would be a better way to get information to the public
30 since she feels our State website is difficult to navigate.

31
32 Jones: Adds that at a recent staff meeting it was decided to put a comment form on the
33 webpage to provide an avenue of communication.

34
35 A short free for all discussion on the attributes of social media.

36
37 Chair: Asks for a motion for a special committee on outreach.

38
39 Schedler: Just looked up NCARB on face book and it says there are 143 like organizations.

40
41 Chair: Continues with CBT while the motion is drafted. He feels it's important for the
42 University to understand that this October's test will be the last paper and pencil exam for
43 the FE and FS. He thinks that the Board members should get an NCEES outreach kit and
44 visit a University in their area and meet with the Dean of Engineering and share this
45 information with the school. He asks Eric to talk to UAS and Kathleen to UAF and he will
46 take UAA. Dave will talk to the Survey Department. He asks if UAF has a Survey
47 Department.

48
49 Hale: I don't think they do, they have a course taught by engineers.

50
51 Chair: Notes that NCEES is not contacting schools so it would be best for the Boards to do
52 that.

53
54 **On a motion duly made by Hale, seconded by Lent and unanimously passed it was**

1 **RESOLVED to form a special committee to investigate the feasibility of pursuing**
2 **Social Networking options for the dissemination of AELS related information.**

3
4 Hale: Volunteers to chair it.

5
6 Chair: Eric said he would help. He includes himself on the committee.

7
8 **On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Hale and unanimously passed it was**
9 **RESOLVED to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(3) to**
10 **review applicant files.**

11
12 1:40 p.m. Off record in Executive Session.

13
14 4:37 p.m. recessed for the day.

15
16
17
18 **Friday May 3, 2013**

19
20 8:00 a.m. On record. Roll Call, all present except Maynard who is ill.

21
22 **On a motion duly made by Rearick, Seconded by Shiesl and passed unanimously it**
23 **was RESOLVED to accept the Consent Agreement and Proposed Decision and Order**
24 **in case number 2013-000018 Sandor Manyoky civil engineer registration number**
25 **8467.**

26
27 **Agenda item 18 – Special committees.**

28
29 Chair: Special committees, Colin isn't here, Eric do you have anything on Licensure
30 Implementation?

31
32 Eriksen: Goes over his research and recommendation regarding software engineering and
33 asks the Board to review and provide any suggestions they have.

34
35 Rearick: Asks about the public notice.

36
37 Jones: Advises that it has been sent to the regulations specialist and may already be out.

38
39 Eriksen: Points out that the additional branches part of the change wasn't included but will
40 be later and would address the grandfathering of current registrants if the Board decides to
41 adopt the changes. This is kind of like a first draft.

42
43 Chair: Registration and Practice?

44
45 Rearick: I don't have anything on Registration and Practice.

46
47 Chair: Licensure Mobility?

48
49 Rearick: Reports that NCARB is trying to make it easier between the U.S. and Canada by
50 accepting their schools and exams as equal but it's still in the discussion stage and will be
51 addressed at the Annual Conference. He will report back on that.

52
53 Eriksen: Asks if they discussed what's driving this.

1 Rearick: Responds that is was discussed but he didn't have the information readily
2 available. That they are trying to find common ground and that there is an agreement
3 between the U.S. and Canada that most of the States have signed on to that allows
4 reciprocity or comity but they are trying to make it more formal and on the education side
5 they're a little bit different than us but they are close and he thinks they want to recognize
6 that and they have a little bit different structure for experience. The biggest problem is the
7 exam. He will have more information after the Annual Conference.

8
9 Chair: Asks if Canada, like the engineers, have a National accreditation?

10
11 Rearick: Explains that each province has their licensing authority and he believes that the
12 engineers are a private licensing entity. It's a little bit different but they have sound
13 processes.

14
15 Chair: Asks if we have very many Canadian architects. He adds that there are quite a few
16 engineers.

17
18 Rearick: Responds that population wise nothing like the number we have.

19
20 Chair: Adds that it seem like we get 3 or 4 Canadian engineers every quarter.

21
22 Lent: Points out that CLARB has two provinces and a third will come onboard shortly. Their
23 licensure process is the same as ours but there are still some things to work out for mobility.
24 He suggests that the engineers and architects might be able to draw on CLARB's
25 experience.

26
27 Chair: Mining engineers/Geologists: I don't have any information to report. I believe this
28 next one is done isn't it Bert?

29
30 Lent: Yes that one is complete and takes effect tomorrow.

31
32 Chair: So your work here is done. He cancels the special committee on Changes to 12
33 AAC 36.068 and thanks Bert for his work on the change. Twist?

34
35 Hale: Reports that the Twist Program will happen this year. There are two candidates from
36 Alaska going down, one a high school teacher from West and the other is Bill Hazelton who
37 runs the Geomatics program at UAA. He brings the new Board Members up to speed on
38 what Twist is all about. It's a program where middle and high school teachers are
39 introduced to surveying with spatial data. It's an outreach program to get people interested
40 in surveying. They fund teachers to take a week long course in Spatial Technology. Bill
41 Hazelton will be able to teach the course after in the future and this will save money. They
42 will go down in June and maybe I'll have a report on how it went in August.

43
44 Chair: Asks what the acronym stands for.

45
46 Hale: Teaching with Spatial Technology.

47
48 Chair: Investigative Advisory Committee: Does anyone have anything to share? It was
49 pretty quiet last quarter. He explains that everyone is on the committee and that the
50 investigator calls on members as needed depending on the case.

51
52 Eriksen: Adds that the investigator usually has everything laid out pretty well and it's a
53 simple process.

1 Chair: Guidance manual?
2
3 Lent: Advises that he has nothing new to report. He will go over the manual with Luanne
4 prior to his departure from the Board.
5
6 Shiesl: Recommends that Luanne be chair of this committee as he is the only other
7 member and it he only has three meetings left and may have to be excused from one of
8 them so it's best if someone who is going to be with the Board for awhile be assigned as
9 chair.
10
11 Schedler: Asks who Luanne is.
12
13 Shiesl: She is the new landscape architect that will replace Burt.
14
15 Chair: Legislative Liaison? He notes that it was a busy quarter for this committee.
16
17 Eriksen: Reports that Harley and Colin were very active and did a great job.
18
19 Chair: Emeritus Status? I think I finally
20
21 Jones: Advises that he sent the letter to Jerry Carter at NCEES and he will present it to the
22 BOD at their next meeting.
23
24 Chair: Budget?
25
26 Shiesl: Report that the only thing is that we need to make a recommendation on fees next
27 meeting.
28
29 Eriksen: Adds that there may be a change due to automation. He asks if we will have this
30 information at the next meeting.
31
32 Jones: Advises that he hasn't talked to the Division regarding automation and setting up a
33 numbering system for EIT/SIT certificates and asks the Board if they object to him
34 discussing this with the Division. He would recommend a \$50 application fee and a onetime
35 certificate fee of \$100 with no expiration date.
36
37 Eriksen: It would be better to get their position on this before we get too involved in it and
38 find out later that their not onboard with it.
39
40 Kerr: Asks if there is a way to get people to get their certificates early. He can see a lot of
41 people saying they aren't going to get their certificate until they are ready for the PE test
42 which would cause a large influx of applications just before a test.
43
44 Jones: That is what we have now. In January we get stacks of them because of the UAF
45 requirement to take the FE for graduation. Not as many in August for the October exam as
46 not as many graduate in December. But we have a lot of them for the February meeting
47 and that is what I'm trying to avoid by going to the automatic system. They can just go take
48 the test and then apply.
49
50 A short discussion on how to motivate graduates to obtain a certificate and how to make
51 them aware that they now need one to practice in Alaska.
52
53 Jones: We will get the word out to the colleges on the change.
54

1 Eriksen: Asks if they have to acknowledge which state they are taking the exam for.
2
3 Chair: Yes, they have to pick a jurisdiction.
4
5 Eriksen: If they go to Seattle are they likely to say they are an Alaska student?
6
7 Chair: They could pick Guam if they want or wherever the jurisdiction is.
8
9 Jones: Explains that they have to pick a State so NCEES will know if that state is manual or
10 automatic and whether they meet the requirements in that State.
11
12 Eriksen: Asks if there is some sort of feedback that would tell us who selected Alaska.
13
14 Kerr: Doesn't think this would be possible.
15
16 Chair: Explains how the automatic system will work is that our folks checking the box that
17 allows them to take the test. The Board never sees this application unless there is a
18 question. Instead of our staff, Vern and Alicia having to go through all of those, NCEES will
19 now do that. That's really the difference, we're taking the review roll away from this Board
20 and giving it to NCEES. That's really the question we need to ask here is do we want to
21 allow NCEES to take on that roll?
22
23 Jones: If they pick Alaska then NCEES will say ok, you need a degree or 75% of a degree.
24
25 Chair: Then if they picked Alaska Vern or Alicia could go into the NCEES website and pull
26 all the names that passed.
27
28 Eriksen: Thinks that would be a good way to do some outreach so people know or maybe in
29 the regulation part require the certificate before they start accruing experience for the PE.
30 That would encourage getting the certificate sooner rather than later.
31
32 Kerr: Thinks that is a good idea.
33
34 Eriksen: Adds that people should be informed so they aren't surprised by this.
35
36 Hale: Asks if the Alaska would be notified who is taking the test.
37
38 Jones: They wouldn't notify us as long as they have a degree or 75% of one. They have to
39 sign an acknowledgment that passing this test doesn't authorize them to work anywhere as
40 an EIT. They have to then apply to whichever State they want to work in but it wouldn't
41 necessarily have to be Alaska.
42
43 Hale: There is no automated process that notifies you though?
44
45 Jones: We can go up and get the scores right? And then I guess we could solicit
46 applicants for certificates.
47
48 Kerr: Asks how it works if someone takes the exam in a State that has less stringent
49 standards say if they took it in Florida and the experience was less than we would require
50 and they then applied in Alaska.
51
52 Jones: Explains that we don't require experience for the FE, we require a degree or 75% of
53 a degree so if someone applies that took the exam in another State we would accept the
54 score but would require them to provide transcripts.

1
2 Kelly: Adds that the present system is really an unnecessary hurdle and coordinating the
3 NCEES deadline with ours causes mass confusion and every year someone misses the
4 deadline and has to wait an extra 6 months to graduate.
5
6 Chair: Points out that by going automatic we would significantly reduce the workload of
7 staff. And while requiring the certificate is a good idea but why create more work for staff.
8
9 Jones: Feels this will actually be less work because most of those taking the FE in Alaska
10 do not stay here.
11
12 Kelly: It would give us more time to spend on the PE applications because there are so
13 many FE's that it takes much of our time.
14
15 Jones: Thinks that with our present increase in applications in another year or two we will
16 need to have a second licensing examiner to handle the workload where if we go automatic
17 that will delay that 5 or 6 years or more depending on the economy.
18
19 Koonce: Thinks the problem here is making sure that all the FE's know that they need a
20 certificate to work in Alaska. Otherwise they could just take the test and we would never
21 see an application they could just go to work.
22
23 Eriksen: Wants to make it so they have to have a certificate prior to their experience
24 counting toward the PE exam.
25
26 Discussion continued with the points being the need to regulate those working in the
27 profession. It would encourage EIT's to seek licensure. Most employers want proof that an
28 EIT has passed the FE exam. The only downside mentioned was that it could hurt those
29 who work in a field and then decide to go to school and then that prior experience wouldn't
30 count.
31
32 Chair: Asks everyone to think about this until next meeting because all exams are going to
33 computer based in the future. This is just the first step and on top of that NCEES is talking
34 about changing model law to allow folks to take the PE exam as soon as they get out of
35 school.
36
37 Jones: Asks the Chair to assign this project to a board member so he can have someone to
38 work with so maybe by next meeting we can have a good set of changes to put out for
39 notice if the Board desires.
40
41 Eriksen: Volunteers.
42
43 Chair: Suggests a special committee on CBT and will help out as well. Hale and Rearick
44 also volunteer to serve on it.
45
46 **On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
47 **RESOLVED to form a special committee to research Computer Based Testing (CBT).**
48
49 Chair: Eric will be chair. Dave, myself and Richard will be members.
50
51 Lent: Encourages the committee to talk to CLARB because they just implemented CBT.
52
53 Rearick: Asks when the new landscape architect takes office.
54

1 Jones: July 1st.

2

3 Lent: Her name is Luanne Urfer.

4

5 Chair: IDP?

6

7 Rearick: Reports that there will be a blackout this summer where the A.R.E. will not be
8 available due to some realignment with NCARB, PROMETRIC and another contractor. He
9 also talked to Kathy Hillegas about including a visit to Alaska. They have been visiting
10 Universities around the country that have architectural programs. He is hoping that her and
11 the CEO can come up in August and make a presentation to the Board and hopefully while
12 they are here do something with the interns. He hasn't heard back yet and will keep the
13 Board informed.

14

15 Lent: Notes that Hillegas had written a letter regarding attendance at meetings and that
16 Vern had asked CLARB to do likewise.

17

18 Rearick: Adds that all the organizations are good about communication with each other. At
19 most National Conferences they have representatives from the other organizations. When
20 NCARB was looking at HSW they reviewed CLARB's publication before they started the
21 discussion.

22

23 **Agenda item 19 – Board Travel.**

24

25 A) NCARB Annual San Diego, CA June 19-22, 2013.

26

27 Jones: Reports that he has already submitted a request for travel for the NCARB Annual.

28

29 B) NCEES Annual San Antonio, TX August 21-24, 2013.

30

31 Eriksen: Has a conflict with the August 1-2 Board meeting and asks if it can be rescheduled
32 to the 8-9 it would be better for him.

33

34 Schedler: Asks if we moved in the agenda?

35

36 Jones: We jumped ahead a little. He then asks if there is anyone who would not be able to
37 attend the NCEES Annual in San Antonio.

38

39 Walters: Will not be able to go.

40

41 Schedler: It will depend on when we are told we can go or should I just plan on going?

42

43 Jones: Notes that the end of the FY is June 30th and he will put the request in early but it
44 probably won't be approved until after June 30th. I will request travel for all the engineers
45 and surveyors except Keith. He then asks Lent if he informed Luanne about the CLARB
46 meeting in Minneapolis in Sept.

47

48 C) CLARB Annual in Minneapolis, MN September 26-28, 2013.

49

50 Lent: Hasn't yet but will and wanted to verify the dates.

51

52 Jones: September 26th through the 28th. Tell her to let me know if she can't make it.

53

54 Lent: Suggests that either Vern or Alicia should go also.

1
2 **Agenda item 20 – National Meeting Reports.**
3

4 A) CLARB Spring meeting Scottsdale, AZ
5

6 Lent: Reports on his meeting in Scottsdale. He comments on the decline in attendance at
7 the meetings. They discussed how CLARB can be more relevant to members. It was a
8 highly charges meeting. They discussed enforcement and he told them that we had clarified
9 our policies on that. There was some talk about stabilizing fees. He then explains the
10 pictures that he included in his report.
11

12 B) NCEES Western Zone in San Francisco, CA.
13

14 Hale: Reports on the zone meeting in San Francisco. They have a task force on the
15 industrial exemption which is a big topic and industry of course is against it. Computer
16 Based Testing (CBT) is another priority. The fundamentals exams will be going CBT in
17 2014. All exams will eventually be CBT. The big issue for the Surveyor exam is working out
18 the State specific exams. Mobility of licensure is another big one and ties into the industrial
19 exemption. Oil companies are very interested in mobility. There was a discussion on
20 engineering surveys. There was some change in the verbiage and the surveyors didn't want
21 the change. CBT, starts in January 2014, two months on one month off. It will be a 6 hour
22 exam with 110 questions. There will be a 25 minute break. It's a shorter test but still a good
23 one.
24

25 Koonce: Asks what drove the shortening of the test.
26

27 Chair: Explains how Pearson Vue and NCEES arrived at consensus on the length. Some
28 of it had to do with trying to bring the cost down.
29

30 Hale: Ends his report.
31

32 Chair: Reports on the engineering forum. They are looking to allow early testing for the PE
33 exam by eliminating the experience requirement. Some of the factors pushing this is the
34 declining numbers of engineers and surveyors testing and the view that it will allow more
35 people to pass then they can get their experience. They are looking at ways to boost the
36 licensure numbers. The PE will go to CBT as soon as practical which I think means within a
37 year or two. They are already looking at the item bank. He commented on the industrial
38 exemption they would like to eliminate it. He pointed out that entire segments of industry
39 are not licensed. The Bosses are not licensed and their bosses are not licensed so how do
40 we get folks licensed. NCEES is also looking at continuing education and whether or not
41 they want to take on a roll as a repository for CE records.
42

43 Rearick: Adds that NCARB is also looking at this. That AIA has a repository for their
44 members.
45

46 Chair: Another interesting note was that they offer the PE exam in 6 different countries.
47 NCEES is becoming a global operation.
48

49 Lent: Adds that CLARB is doing the same thing.
50

51 Jones: States that over the last 6 months he has received half a dozen inquiries from
52 people in the Middle East and Korea who have taken the test and want to know if they can
53 be licensed in Alaska.
54

1 Chair: Notes that Washington also had a large number of people coming from the Middle
2 East hundreds of people wanting to get licensed. Other states report huge influxes of
3 applicants and the difficulties involved with foreign transcripts. It's an evolving situation we
4 need to keep abreast of.

5
6 **Agenda item 21 – Licensing Examiner Report**

7
8 Kelly: Gives a brief report on the number of applications to be reviewed and factoids on the
9 history of surveying and architecture.

10
11 **Agenda item 22 – Board Tasks (to do list)**

12
13 Chair: Eric you had software engineering.

14
15 Eriksen: Responds that Vern will let him know when it's out for public notice. I believe I'll
16 work on this social media.

17
18 Chair: Dave, Ethics regulation, ongoing and I added social networking outreach. Myself I
19 still have a letter to Sara and the Dept of Admin re travel. The letter to Rogers re pro bono,
20 Vern took care of that and the letter to NCEES re Emeritus Status. I added on mine,
21 response to DEC on item 17A. Also to gather the NCEES outreach information on CBT and
22 send that to Eric, Dave and Kathleen and Dave is going to talk to the surveying department.
23 John we haven't added any tests. Jeff, no. Burt, Guidance Manual, we'll take your name off
24 there.

25
26 Lent: Luanne should probably be a good candidate for that, although I'll let her speak for
27 herself at the next meeting. She knows I've been working on it.

28
29 Chair: Colin has a few things, regulation changes etc. I'll get with him next week. Richard, I
30 had a regulations project?

31
32 Rearick: Doesn't have anything, it's still ongoing.

33
34 Chair: Kathleen and Keith, exam retakes, it would be good to have something by next
35 meeting. Don, nothing for you. Vern, we had the regulation project for CBT which is
36 ongoing. The response about encouraging military veterans to get licensed.

37
38 Jones: Haven't done that yet.

39
40 Chair: John Savage was going to provide disciplinary sanctions, he did that, we've all got a
41 copy and complaint training. He went over that with everybody.

42
43 **Agenda item 23 – Read applications into the record.**

44
45 **On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it**
46 **was RESOLVED to find the following list of applicants for registration incomplete with**
47 **the stipulation that the information in the applicant files will take precedence over the**
48 **information in the minutes.**

49
50 *The subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*
51 *meanings:*

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

- 1 'FS': refers to the Fundamentals of Surveying Examination
- 2 'PE': exam': refers to the NCEES Principals and Practice of Engineering Examination
- 3 'PS': exam: refers to the NCEES Principals and Practice of Surveying Examination
- 4 'AKLS': refers to the Alaska Land Surveyors Examination
- 5 The title of 'Professional' is understood to precede the designation of engineer,
- 6 surveyor, or architect.
- 7 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.
- 8 'Arctic course' denotes a Board-approved arctic engineering course
- 9

Abou Eid, Mahear A.	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - pending 1 month responsible charge experience
Fogle, Brad D.	Architect	Comity	Incomplete - pending verification of: ARE; transcripts; Arctic; & JQ
Presler, Wendy	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - pending 20 months experience; PE exam; & JQ
Yeager, Ronald J.	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - pending 18 ½ months experience

10
 11 **On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it**
 12 **was RESOLVED to approve the following list of applicants for registration with the**
 13 **stipulation that the information in the applicant's files will take precedence over the**
 14 **information in the minutes:**
 15

Adams, Eric M.	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Akers, Kristen Kate	Environmental	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Bailey, Bradley R.	Electrical	Comity	Approved -pending verification of current registration
Bayles, Douglas J.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams
Beers, Michael Thomas	Mechanical	Comity	Approved -pending verification of exams & registration; Arctic & JQ
Budzyn-McAleenan, Magdalena	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Bujold, Sean J.	Architect	Comity	Approved
Burton, Matthew Robert	Control Systems	Comity	Approved -pending Arctic; & 3 ref's

Campagna, Scott R.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved -pending JQ
Cole, Frank R.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Collins, Patrick C.	Electrical	Exam	Approved -pending exam; FE; transcripts; Arctic; & JQ
Constantineau, Elizabeth J.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Darrow, Margaret F.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Diedrich, Timothy J.	Environmental	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
DiGennaro, Lawrence	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending 2 additional architect references
Ekstrom, Jon E.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Emerson, Matthew R.	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Evans, Chad	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending ARE; IDP; JQ
Fergus, David A.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Fisher, Brendan R.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Fortier, Thomas F.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending CA renewal; Arctic; & JQ
Fowler, James F.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending FE; & JQ
Fowler, John A.	Chemical	Comity	Approved -pending Arctic; & JQ
Franzen, Karin Elizabeth	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Frazer, Brett M.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending FE; 2 references; Arctic; & JQ
Fritz, Matthew F.	Mechanical	Exam	Approved -pending exam; transcripts; Arctic & JQ
Geoghegan, Joseph Aloysius	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
George, Donald Wm.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Gilbert, Kenneth D.	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Grand, Steven B.	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Gray, Tyler Tapscott	Mechanical	Exam	Approved - pending exam & JQ
Gruetzmacher, Michael R.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending JQ

Hall, Ashley Lynn	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Hamed, Mohamed Abdelkader	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending remainder of fees; Arctic & JQ
Hannafious, Dustin C.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Hansen, Matthew Hardy	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Harvey, Richard Jerome	Fire Protection	G'fthr	Approved
Heller, Jonathan	Mechanical	Comity	Approved -pending JQ
Helm, Craig Allan	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts verification of exams; Arctic; & JQ
Henricks, Michael R.	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending ARE; & JQ
Herbst, Amy Renee	Civil	Comity	Approved
Herring, Keith D.	Mechanical	Exam	Approved - pending exam & JQ
Hicks, Troy M.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved -ending PS & AKLS exams
Horazdovsky, Andrew M.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Hout, Wesley Karl	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE; & JQ
Imlach, Thomas	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending ARE & JQ
Jain, Pooja	SE	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Jemison, Jennifer Lane	Petroleum	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Johnston, Jason J.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE; JQ
Joiner, William Alfred	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Jones, John Richard	Environmental	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams & registration
Jones, Michael Allen	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Jones, Zane M.	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending ARE; IDP; & JQ
KC, Prashant	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Keene, Tyler R.	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & Arctic
Kemp, William McNeil	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Keyuravong, Nick	Electrical	Exam	Approved -pending exam & JQ
Keyuravong, Pisonth	Industrial	G'fthr	Approved

Kimball, Courtney M.	Environmental	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Lalangan, Maximo De Guzman	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams & registration; transcripts; & JQ
Leytham, Keith Malcom	Civil	Comity	Approved
Lord, Khalil Yoon	Electrical	Exam	Approved -pending exam & JQ
Marmaduke, Robert A.	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Martison, Christopher R.	Architect	Comity	Approved
Mayer, Keith B.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Mets, Anthony T.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Miller, Mitchel Joseph	Mechanical	Exam	Approved -pending exam; FE; transcripts; & JQ
Mohr, Jeffrey Richard	Electrical	Comity	Approved
Monville, John Thomas	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; Arctic & JQ
Morris, Mark	Control Systems	G'fthr	Approved
Morris, Mark	Fire Protection	G'fthr	Approved
Mueller, Karyn	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Myland, Timothy D.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending FE
Naraghi, Matt M.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending 3 references; & Arctic
Nardini, Mark O.	Architect	Comity	Approved
Narus, Matthew L.	Environmental	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE exam; & JQ
Nielsen, Thomas C.	Electrical	Comity	Approved
O'Dowd, Brian Alan	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending - PE exam; & JQ
Oertwig, Shane Lynn	SE	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Owen, Timothy W.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending verification of current registration
Parish, Donald Dixon	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic; & \$5 in fees
Parkhurst, Jennifer Dee	Mechanical	Exam	Approved - pending exam

Parma, Michael P.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic; & JQ
Parpan, Ryan P.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Pohnert, Daniel Leroy	Electrical	Comity	Approved
Poole, III, John W.	Fire Protection	Comity	Approved
Posada, Mauricio	Civil	Comity	Approved
Pramodh, Isaac E.	Control Systems	Comity	Approved
Ramsay, Gavin Wm.	Petroleum	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Sambucetti, Richard E.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending 3 rd architect reference; & Arctic
Schneider, Travis Loren	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic; & JQ
Seegebrecht, George Walter	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Smith, Alaina Lynn	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Sorensen, Elizabeth Anne	Civil	Comity	Approved
Sparks, Tyler W.	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic; & JQ
Steed, Cori A.	Chemical	Exam	Approved - pending exam; Arctic & JQ
Storm, Caroline	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending ARE
Taylor, Geoffrey Alan	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Thompson, Dixie Lee	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Van Sickle, Jan Lee	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams; registration; & AKLS
Van Stone, Jon Wm.	Electrical	Comity	Approved
Vázquez, John Siro	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams & registration; transcripts; & JQ
Volk, James Edward	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE; \$20 in fees; Arctic & JQ
West, Aaron W.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic; & JQ
Wiebe, Richard T.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts
Wilson-Azelton, Mary T.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & Arctic
Zarnitz, Ryan Michael	Chemical	Comity	Approved - pending JQ

Ayers, Kenneth W.	FS	Exam	Approved
Lopez, Ricardo	FS	Exam	Approved
Afoa, Savannah	FE	Exam	Approved
Burbank, Jr., Winston	FE	Exam	Approved
Jayakumar, Jai V.	FE	Exam	Approved
Lucas, Douglas C.	FE	Exam	Approved
Mashaly, Marwan M.	FE	Exam	Approved
Raisharma, Chirag	FE	Exam	Approved
Wilks, Brandon	FE	Exam	Approved
Schwartz, Guy L.	FE	Waiver	Approved

1
2 **Agenda item 24 – Calendar of Events.**

3
4 Confirm meeting dates
5 August 1-2 in Anchorage.

6
7 Eriksen: Asks that the August meeting be moved to the 8th and 9th of August.

8
9 Chair: Won't be able to attend.

10
11 October 31-November 1, 2013 Anchorage.

12
13 Several people have a conflict with the 31st and 1st and also with the 7th and 8th. It was
14 decided to schedule the meeting for November 14-15, 2013 in Anchorage.

15
16 January 30-31, 2014 in Juneau

17
18 Chair: So, August 8th and 9th in Anchorage if you can't attend tell Eric he will be chair.
19 November tentatively scheduled for November 14th and 15th in Anchorage as well and the
20 February meeting is still holding at the end of January. And then the May meeting will be
21 the 1st and 2nd.

22
23 Chair: Calls Lent up front and thanks him for his service and promises his certificate will be
24 delivered at the next meeting.

25
26 Lent: This has been the icing on the cake for me. There is nothing that has been more
27 exciting for me. It's fascinating being a combined board where you get to work with all the
28 other professions and this was the highlight for me. When I started I knew nothing about
29 this board or how it functions. I want to thank a few people that have helped me to better
30 understand how things work on this Board. On a day to day basis Vern and Alicia and
31 previously Ginger have all been wonderful to me. The most significant event to occur while I
32 was on the Board, and this was Harley Hightower' effort. He was chairman of what they
33 called the Board Composition Committee. There was talk about whether or not to make my
34 seat a permanent voting seat. Right now it's a temporary non-voting seat. The Board
35 investigated different structures for accommodating landscape architecture as a permanent
36 voting member and recommended that the seat become a permanent voting seat. That was

1 accomplished in August of 2007. It still does not have permanent status because the
2 Legislature has to approve the Board's recommendation and that has been blocked in the
3 Legislature in committee. Hopefully that will be accomplished in the future. I think it's
4 important to have everybody on equal footing and I think this is the only seat in the United
5 States that isn't permanent. That was the most important thing to me that happened while I
6 served on the Board and hopefully that will get resolved. Colin knows a lot about the
7 background on this for future discussions. Another person that helped me when I first got
8 started was Cliff Baker. He showed me how to understand and review the applicant files
9 and Richard Heieren was very helpful too particularly with the Guidance Manual. I wanted
10 to express my thanks to everyone who has been helpful to me. The CLARB experience has
11 really been enlightening to me. I had no idea of the structure that was behind all the
12 examinations. Very valuable input from them and they're a great organization and
13 wonderful people. OK, Luanne Urfer is my replacement and she's very highly credentialed.
14 She's a down to earth landscape architect and is fairly knowledgeable about the process
15 here. So, thanks for everything, it's been a great 7 ½ years, thank you very much.
16 (Applause)

17
18 **Agenda item 25 – Board Member Comments.**

19
20 Eriksen: Thanks the Chair for his leadership and moving things along. It was a pleasure
21 working with everybody.

22
23 Hale: States that after a year he is starting to figure out what's going on and is more
24 comfortable. The more involved he gets the more interesting it is. He appreciates
25 everyone's help.

26
27 Shiesl: Welcome's the new Board Members. They will have real joy ride here. (Laughter)
28 As Burt said it's a real education and as a non-professional I've learned a lot. He suggests
29 that even though he has some time left on the Board they might want to consider looking for
30 a public member because they are really not that easy to find. If you know a non-
31 professional who has some experience, which is hard to find.

32
33 Chair: You may have longer than you think. (Laughter)

34
35 Lent: This meeting went very fast and good leadership, thank you very much.

36
37 Kelly: I'm going to miss Burt very much, especially choosing wine at dinner. (Laughter) He
38 has an extreme knowledge base and not in just landscape architecture. She welcomes the
39 two new Board members.

40
41 Schedler: Thank you Burt for all you have done. You have made me feel welcome and I
42 appreciate that. I also appreciate your efforts with adding diversity to the group, it's always
43 welcome. I appreciate Brian's attention to detail in going through the agenda and keeping
44 the meeting going. Welcome to the new members, I still feel new so it's strange having
45 someone newer than I am anyway welcome and good meeting we are making good
46 progress on some very important issues.

47
48 Kerr: I am humbled and honored to be sitting at this table with all of you. There is a lot of
49 knowledge and a lot of good stuff happening here. I look forward to learning more and
50 participating more in coming years. I'm sorry I won't get to work more with Burt because you
51 seem like a great guy.

52
53 Walters: Welcome to the new members and goodbye to Burt it has been great knowing you
54 and look forward to continuing on, we have a good system and our Chair's are good at

1 pushing things forward.

2
3 Koonce: Thank you for the warm welcome and instruction on how to move through the
4 system. He looks forward to the future.

5
6 Rearick: I would like to welcome the new members and thank Burt for his service. He's a
7 gentleman and a professional of the highest caliber. A very warm person and it's been a
8 pleasure working with you Burt. I've been on this Board roughly 4 years now I guess and I
9 still feel like I'm learning things all the time. And as Burt mentioned working with some of the
10 National organizations even on the Board it just opens up this whole world that you never
11 quite knew existed. It's been very interesting and I feel like I'm constantly trying to live up to
12 the bar established by the previous Board Members. Burt mentioned a few that are of a
13 high caliber. I think this is a well operating Board, a very professional Board and I
14 appreciate being on it.

15
16 Jones: Thanks Burt and I apologize again for not having your certificate here. He tells the
17 new members not to be bashful, to call anytime they have any questions especially if
18 someone calls them with a complaint. We want to make sure we get that process right. And
19 this is the best Board of all of them.

20
21 Chair: Well Burt we are going to miss you. It's been a lot of fun working with you the last
22 couple of years and I feel like a new member still. The feeling doesn't go away you get
23 through the applications a little quicker but there's a lot to learn on this Board, I think, from
24 the members of the Board and the people that we serve. It's an honor and a privilege to
25 serve with everyone on this Board and to serve the State of Alaska and the public. I
26 congratulate the new Chair and officers coming up at our next meeting. I look forward to
27 what they have to offer over the coming year. It's been an honor to be Chair over the last
28 year and hopefully to serve in that capacity in the future and look forward to the new exciting
29 things we have coming. You know there's a lot of changes Nationally going on right now
30 and I think we need to stay abreast of those changes and keep on our feet and keep in
31 touch with what's happening around the country. Because it does affect us and we need to
32 stay involved. Thanks everybody and congratulations to the new members. I don't expect
33 our next meeting will be this short. If there's nothing else we will adjourn the meeting.

34
35 9:47 a.m. Meeting adjourned.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

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

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

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

Date: _____