

1 **STATE OF ALASKA**

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

7
8 **Minutes of Meeting**
9 **August 8-9, 2013**

10
11 By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, the
12 Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors held a meeting August 8-9,
13 2013 in Suite 602, 550 West 7th Avenue, Anchorage, AK.

14
15 **Thursday August 8, 2013**

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

18
19 9:00 a.m. The Chair called the meeting to order. Roll call, all present except Brian Hanson who
20 was excused by the Chair.

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

- 23
24
- Eric Eriksen, Electrical Engineer, Chair
 - Richard Rearick, Architect, Vice-Chair
 - Don Shiesl, Public Member, Secretary
 - Kathleen Schedler, Mechanical Engineer
 - Jeffrey Koonce, Architect
 - David Hale, Land Surveyor,
 - Colin Maynard, Civil Engineer
 - Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect
 - Keith Walters, Mining Engineer
 - John Kerr, Land Surveyor
- 25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

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

- 36
- Don Habeger, Director CBPL (by telephone)
 - Vern Jones, Executive Administrator
 - Twana Curry, Licensing Examiner
 - John Savage, Investigator
- 37
38
39
40
41

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

- 43
- Dale Nelson PE, representing Alaska Professional Design Council (APDC).
 - Mike Armstrong, representing the National Council of Architect Registration Boards (NCARB).
 - Kathy Hillegas, representing NCARB.
 - Boyd Brownfield, PE, representing himself.
 - Burt Lent, LA, representing himself.
- 44
45
46
47
48
49

1
2 **Agenda item 2 – Review/Amend Agenda**

3
4 Jones: passed out several items that were received after the Board packets and agenda were
5 mailed.

6
7 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Shiesl and passed unanimously it was**
8 **RESOLVED to approve the agenda as amended.**

9
10 **Agenda item 3 – Ethics reporting**

11
12 Maynard: Reports that he has an application in for additional branches and he will not be
13 involved with the review.

14
15 Schedler: Asks if members are supposed to report watching the ethics video.

16
17 Chair: Asks if anyone has any comments on the video.

18
19 Maynard: It seems like mostly common sense.

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

22
23 Jones: The motion will be as amended. Burt Lent sent me some grammatical corrections.

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

27
28 Mike Armstrong and Kathy Hillegas of NCARB arrived.

29
30 Chair: Welcomed them and asked them to sign in.

31
32 **Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report**

33
34 Savage: Starts by introducing his supervisor Chief Investigator Quinten Warren. He then
35 reports on the way the new investigator position is going to be implemented. After 1 September
36 they will hire an investigator for the other Boards he now has and that we are looking at the first
37 of the year to have someone onboard. To give an idea of the workload he reports that this year
38 we have had over 500 contractor issues and that's just contractors. There are six other boards
39 that are going to the new investigator. He personally is excited that he will be able to get back
40 to being proactive. With the Chief's permission I've been talking with Vern about travel, getting
41 back out in the chain, out in southeast, more peninsula trips, things that have been kind of going
42 by the wayside. He feels the Division is being responsive to the need and importance of Board
43 and Investigator travel and a lot of good things are going to come from this. Once the new hire
44 is up to speed with his boards he will be trained as backup for AELS so when I'm not available
45 someone that is familiar with AELS will be. He asks if anyone has questions concerning this.

46
47 Schedler: It's encouraging and exciting that you will be our investigator instead of a new hire.

48
49 Savage: Is excited about that too because for so long a time we have been reactive as
50 opposed to proactive. The Chief has said that it won't just be a warm body in the position but
51 someone who can deal with these types of investigations.

1
2 Rearick: Asks if the travel he will be doing is going to job sites and checking documents.
3
4 Savage: Responds, absolutely, and the word gets out when you start visiting job sites. He
5 adds that he will have the new investigator be on the lookout for AELS violations when he is
6 checking contractors, another set of eyes on the street so to speak.
7
8 Hale: Asks if he is responding to calls or just showing up on his own.
9
10 Savage: When we had the time we were showing up on our own. We were spending two or
11 three days a week out in the field. Now it's more reactive responding to calls, maybe a design
12 professional sees a set of drawing that have something wrong or maybe an out of state stamp.
13 This happens a lot with the big box stores where the site plan is from another state.
14
15 Hale: Asks what the procedure is if a board member comes across a problem.
16
17 Savage: Responds that the process is to fill out a complaint packet and send it to him. If you're
18 on a job site and you see something like that, give me a call and I'm going to be on it, keeping in
19 mind that if it's in Ketchikan I have to get travel approval and that takes a couple weeks.
20 Hopefully that will get better. There was a time when if I went to the Chief and said we have a
21 problem in Ketchikan and while I'm out there I want to stop in Juneau and I was on a plane that
22 day. Those days are gone but I certainly hope they are coming back. It was looked at as some
23 sort of boondoggle. I don't know what kind of boondoggle you would have in Ketchikan or Sitka.
24 There was a day when we could use those monies as they were intended for an Investigative
25 Branch that could get out there and look at things. When these people see that we will be
26 moving around the state visiting sites they will operate a little bit straighter.
27
28 Rearick: Is hoping that he as time to spend with some of the smaller building departments like
29 Kenai and Kodiak where it might be a one man show and they don't have all the resources that
30 Anchorage has.
31
32 Savage: The people at the Fire Marshal's Office, and they have been our best friends for a lot
33 of years, they have myself and Al Nagel give a block of instruction during the forum for all the
34 different building departments that have differed jurisdictions now. That's been invaluable for
35 these times when we haven't been able to spend the money to go to these places. These
36 building officials and fire chiefs are giving us calls and alerting us to potential problems then we
37 can get on the phone and advise them of what the regulations require if it's something that
38 hasn't been submitted yet then they are educated and if it happens in the future they went in
39 knowing what they were doing.
40
41 Rearick: Asks if he is seeing any trends.
42
43 Savage: The only thing he has seen that could be a trend and this started in the oil field,
44 someone may be a civil engineer and they are using another discipline in their title block. They
45 are using the title and they are not licensed as such and we getting complaints are looking into
46 these.
47
48 Maynard: Asks about the two items that have been in the AG's office since January 2011. He
49 asks if they are actually working on them or are they just sitting on someone desk.
50
51 Savage: I hope not. On one of them we are very close to going another direction, and I'm not

1 at liberty to say what direction but we need to get those out of there. You don't want me on that
2 subject or the Chief will drag me out of here. (laughter) He continues that it has been a sore
3 spot and he wishes there was a way he could check to see if they are moving forward. One of
4 them we were close to filing another issue on it and it just kind of died. I'm of the opinion that
5 after they are there for a certain length of time we need to pull them back and go another
6 direction with them or go back to the reviewing members. I can't in good conscience let
7 something set and then after 5 years go into someone's life and say by the way we are going to
8 do this. I don't think that's professional. We need to take a look at things like that. If we can't
9 act, whether its monies or personnel or whatever, we can't be looming in someone's life for that
10 period of time, it's not right.

11
12 Chair: Asks if we want to have a discussion on this.

13
14 There was a short discussion on how to handle the issue of cases that have been with the AG
15 for a period of time without any action. Points made were that maybe the lawyers didn't
16 understand engineering and were hesitant to take on a case they didn't understand. The cost of
17 hearings was brought up. It was noted that while hearings are expensive the present perception
18 is that there is no enforcement. Even if someone is caught they may not have to pay anything.
19 One member stated that he has heard complaints about the lack of enforcement and that a
20 small increase in license fees to cover that probably would not be objected to. It was pointed
21 out that the more we have inactivity with cases in the AG's office the more people will lawyer up
22 and say see you in court knowing that day will never come. Once something sits for 4 or 5
23 years you've lost the high ground and the defense will take issue with that. Point was made that
24 once something is passed to the AG you've lost control of it. It was decided to pass this on to
25 the Director and ask for his assistance during his teleconference.

26
27 **Agenda item 7 – Regulation Update**

28
29 Statute Changes

30
31 AS 08.48.055 Executive Secretary of the Board and AS 08.58.091 Written Examinations.

32
33 Chair: SB16 was signed by the Governor.

34
35 HB 167 Sponsor: Representative Kurt Olson

36 AS 08.48.221 Seals

37 AS 08.48.281 Prohibitive Practice

38 AS 08.48.341 Definitions

39 AS 08.48.331 Exemptions

40
41 HB 167 has passed the House and is in the Senate Labor and Commerce Committee.

42
43 Rearick: Asks if this will just roll over into the next session.

44
45 Maynard: Explains that each legislative session is two years long so bills introduced in the first
46 year carry over to the second. At the end of the second session if it hasn't passed it's dead and
47 has to be reintroduced. He notes that the biggest problem was that the residential contractors
48 didn't like the change from 3-plex to 4-plex. Even though they have to go to the Fire Marshal
49 they don't want to have to have an architect or engineer design it. That got pulled because they
50 didn't want to hold up the whole thing. It was basically seen as expanding our practice for no
51 real reason.

1
2 Rearick: It was really just housekeeping, trying to be consistent with the Fire Marshal
3 regulations.
4
5 Kerr: Refers to line 6 and asks how it works when multiple design professionals have to stamp
6 and sign a plan.
7
8 Rearick: Refers him to line 14 where it says when certifying design work of minor importance
9 the registrant shall identify that work on the document near the registrant's seal and take
10 responsibility for all work prepared under the registrants seal. He thinks the intent is that when
11 there is a dual stamp that both stamps don't apply to the whole sheet. You could have a civil
12 doing structural engineering and another civil engineer doing traditional civil engineering and
13 that is just asking for clarification.
14
15 Maynard: Adds as an example, if he put his stamp on an architectural drawing he would note
16 that it was for structural only.
17
18 Chair: HB187 will be held for the teleconference with Don.
19
20 12 AAC 36.063. Engineering Education and Work Experience Requirements
21
22 Maynard: Passes out some handouts on how SE is handled on the West Coast. In California
23 they require three years of additional experience after getting the civil license. Then take the 16
24 hour exam. In Oregon it's two years after any PE license. In Washington it's two years after
25 any PE license. In Oregon they limit SE to significant structures but I don't where they define
26 significant structures. In Washington they have a long laundry list of significant structures,
27 hazardous, essential facilities, hospitals, fire and police stations civil defense structures
28 exceeding 100 feet in height. I believe in California it's basically hospitals and schools have to
29 be designed by a structural engineer. So the question is what direction do we want to do two
30 years, three years, do we want to limit structural engineer or leave it wide open or do we want to
31 go like Hawaii where any structure has to be designed by a structural engineer? So I'm looking
32 for direction and then I can write some regulations or maybe assign it to some who actually
33 writes regulations. Give me some direction, does it have to be two years or three years and
34 define significant structures.
35
36 Chair: It seems like our intent wasn't to inhibit people practicing civil engineering from their
37 normal course of activities. The idea was that there are exceptional structures that require
38 exceptional experience. So where that line is, I'm not sure.
39
40 Maynard: So the first question is two years or three years after a PE or after civil? Let's do the
41 years first. Are two sufficient or go three like California? California is going to be a different
42 ballgame for anybody coming from here because they're going to have to take their land
43 surveying and seismic test to get licensed there. And they will have to have a civil license not
44 just any PE.
45
46 Chair: Suggests two years as a starting point and if there are concerns it can be revised.
47
48 Schedler: Asks if anyone here can speak from experience.
49
50 Maynard: Thinks two years is fine because you already have eight years education and
51 experience by the time you get your license. Two years beyond that, I think, is fine.

1
2 Chair: Asks Maynard if he has any feeling for the body of people affected by this would say.
3
4 Maynard: I could ask them. The Structural Engineers Society has a meeting in the next or two.
5
6 Chair: Asks if anyone has any ideas on defining structures.
7
8 Maynard: Sat in on some of the teleconference (NCEES) during the planning for the SE
9 licensure. At first they started to list them and then decided to leave it at significant structures
10 and leave to each state to define. Basically they were looking at type three and four structures
11 which are hazardous and essential facilities and some long span bridges. And we can look and
12 see what the lists are in Washington and Oregon and follow that. Essentially its essential and
13 hazardous, so its schools, hospitals, fire stations, police stations, prisons, national defense,
14 airports, buildings that you want to be able to occupy immediately after an earthquake. I think
15 that would be the limitations.
16
17 Rearick: Thinks it would be helpful if Colin could pull out of the IBC those types of structures
18 and also as far as the seismic, I don't recall in the letter that the Governor's task force on
19 seismic hazards gave us if they discuss any specific type or if they're talking in general terms
20 about all engineers and architects need some seismic education.
21
22 Maynard: I think they said all civil engineers I don't think they said all engineers. He doesn't
23 know why mechanical and electrical shouldn't also have this education. They have to make
24 sure their equipment doesn't go flying around in an earthquake. So it would be helpful for them
25 too if we decide to require a seismic test. He doesn't think it had to do with specific types of
26 buildings just if you get a license as an engineer you should have some seismic knowledge.
27
28 Jones: Asks if they are thinking of restricting the types of buildings a civil engineer can design.
29
30 Maynard: I would lean that way, yes.
31
32 Jones: Reminds the Board that when the structural license was brought on they told all the civil
33 engineers that they could continue to practice as they have been. So a guy who has been
34 designing schools or tall buildings, you're going to make him go get a structural license now?
35
36 Maynard: Yes. And we may have to extend the grandfathering period for those individuals
37 because a lot them didn't do it because they didn't need to but now that we are changing things.
38 Washington allowed them to waive it for two years but then required the SE.
39
40 Kerr: That's a good approach. It gives them time to get the SE.
41
42 Rearick: Thinks it will be controversial but that doesn't mean we can't look at it, evaluate, take it
43 to the public and see what they say.
44
45 Chair: Wants to have both in place if we start limiting what people can practice.
46
47 Maynard: Yes we would have that in place if we limit who can do significant structures to SE's.
48
49 Jones: Recommends a break before calling Don.
50
51 Maynard: Asks if we want to limit it to civil's taking the SE or any PE.

1
2 Schedler: Thinks any discipline should be able to if they have been doing the work.
3
4 Chair: Asks if we need any discussion before calling Don.
5
6 Jones: One of the things he will talk about is the fee structure. He has some significant
7 increases.
8
9 Maynard: We have to pay for John.
10
11 Break: 9:50 – 10:00
12
13 10:00 back in session. Placed a call to Don Habeger DCBPL Director.
14
15 Chair: Greets Don.
16
17 Habeger: Good Morning Mr. Chairman. A couple of things I wish to discuss with the Board, Mr.
18 Chairman, are fees, HB187 as it may be implemented by the Legislature and anything new on
19 travel partly just questions from the Board to make sure you know where we are at. So, with
20 that, let me talk about fees if I might. Hopefully in your packet you have a proposal, and I stress
21 the word proposal, a draft, a kind of projection analysis that Vern hopefully had before you and
22 I'll be talking about that document from the get-go. So one of the things we are required to do
23 is on an annual basis we are to look at program revenue and expenses and analyze the
24 revenues against expenses to make sure that they're approximately equal. That's in
25 Centralized Licensing Statute. This report, our draft report, looks at that. We've kind of
26 compared what we think, and if you look on, looking at the document specifically. These fee
27 types are in regulations. Sometimes they're put together, in other words, an application fee
28 might be for several categories, architects, engineers, when they can be consolidated they are.
29 The next column is projected units. Basically that's a biennium count over two years. It's what
30 we anticipate to have as far as, if you will, purchasing units. Let me kind of go back to the fee
31 type. Current regulations have a number there, just so you can compare our suggestions
32 against what you are currently paying and then going back to the right side of the document,
33 unit cost. That is nothing more than the Division's recommendation for a fee price point and the
34 only thing that's driving that is taking a look at what the Board and the Division are currently
35 charging trying to distribute any differential i.e. new revenue that is needed to make the program
36 self-supporting and to equal distribution. Whether that new price point, for example, initial
37 application fee currently is \$50 our suggestion is \$100. Whether that meets the needs of the
38 Board now is for you to say it works or it doesn't work. But it is essentially a 100% increase.
39 Division just picked that number, no particular science to that. Kind of looking at that again,
40 initial registration fee, currently \$125 we are suggesting \$235 as a new price point. So that's
41 kind of how this document is read. Again there's no particular magic other than, here's the rest
42 of the analysis. We typically look at actual expenses. We use a biennium cycle because each
43 of our licensing programs run on a two year cycle. Revenue comes in at the beginning of a cycle
44 in anticipation of expenses. One of the best systems that we use is looking at the last two years
45 of expenses, assuming that a program is general static, no big changes; it gives us a pretty
46 good indication of what the new biennium expenses will be. Looking at FY 11 and 12 we have
47 1.4M. Knowing we do have one new addition, SB16 passed the Legislature, signed by the
48 Governor in September or there about, it becomes effective and we will be hiring an investigator
49 into that position. Since that is a new cost of about \$110K we added that in as an additional
50 expense. So just trying to meet those expenses with incoming revenue we estimate 1.6 given
51 those price points and that adds a little bit to the net based on known expenses and right now

1 we anticipate the Board, well we know the Board is in a slightly imbalanced position running a
2 deficit, it'll be \$186K, again that's a projection, it could go up, it could go down a little bit, but
3 based on that projection we estimate closing this biennium in the hole and this report
4 acknowledges that we add a little bit in net, bring in a little bit of additional income on a biennium
5 that deficit position in a couple of biennium's. So, that's the projection, Mr. Chairman and
6 members of the Board. Again, it is our, as for as the price point is concerned, I present it to as
7 our suggestion and if the Board is satisfied with these then I would appreciate some kind of
8 indication through a Board decision that you are satisfied. If, indeed, the Board thinks that
9 something doesn't work like the initial application fee shouldn't be \$100 and they want to make it
10 a little more attractive, you know, kind of rearranging those numbers, that's perfectly fine with
11 me as long as we meet the Legislative mandate or statutory mandate that a programs revenues
12 and expenses are approximately equal, the numbers themselves are not that significant. The
13 end goal, of course, is that's what Statute drives us to. So that is the fee analysis presentation,
14 members of the Board, any questions?

15
16 Schedler: I support increasing fees in general. I'm not opposed to that and we need a balanced
17 budget. My concern of course goes back to the indirect expenditures that increased 40% from
18 FY11to FY12. What we need to know is what would be the expectation of the increase of those
19 indirect which we are told we cannot control between 13 or 14 or 13 and the next several years?
20 Because we don't want to be increasing fees every year chasing the in-directs.

21
22 Chair: Don, do you see any trends?

23
24 Habeger: Well, yes, certainly there is an upward trend. If you look at your revenue and
25 expense report obviously you can see that. Do I think we are going to reach 768 year? I don't.
26 One of the things we have to recognize in in-directs is that the bureaucracy of the system, the
27 way it exists, there is a number of drivers in that. For example, Department of Administration,
28 there are HR functions that are provided from that department. There's an over fiscal
29 functionality. Our accounting systems are all driven by that. Every agency participates in some
30 of those standard expenses. The data lines, telephone lines, all of that goes in there. One of
31 the drivers in that is there was an increase in salaries. FY12 it was, I think it was a 3% increase
32 across the board. There was some kind of regional differential. So it wasn't all 3%. But cost of
33 labor is one of those increases. Now, going into this year there were some other things that we
34 took advantage of to hopefully reduce expenses on some other things. I don't think we're going
35 to see that end total in FY13 the same. I think we've got some of that, at least, stabilized. So
36 that's kind of my prediction for FY13. We will see how it pans out here.

37
38 Chair: Asks if it is fair to summarize that we will not see significant changes but will see some
39 growth through indirect expenses.

40
41 Habeger: Yes

42
43 Chair: Any further questions?

44
45 Habeger: It's now the Board's turn to provide input to the Division. I probably should say that
46 the goal is to put out regulations near the end of the month. That will give the industry i.e. the
47 professionals across the spectrum an opportunity to comment on that so this isn't the final
48 version necessarily. Everybody gets a chance to tell the Division what they think about
49 increases. However, Statute requires us to consult the Board and that's part of the process and
50 it's your opportunity first and foremost to tell me what you think. So that's the process.
51 Ultimately we want to have these in the regulations sometime in the November timeframe so

1 that we're prepared for the renewal season.

2
3 Chair: Thank you we'll have some discussion and bring up a motion at a later point for you. I
4 think we were anticipating some of these changes and you have our support.

5
6 Habeger: Very good Mr. Chairman, the next thing I just wanted to briefly talk about is HB187.
7 We've talked about it in the past and mostly this is a reminder of what this bill does and
8 ultimately, I'll be honest, I'll ask for your help in kind of approaching the Legislature and asking
9 your help for support. But, real briefly, once again, HB187 is the Division's request before the
10 Legislature. It was we kind of helped fashion this bill. Ultimately it's a House Labor Commerce
11 bill, Representative Olson, got the bill introduced. It was heard in his committee last year or the
12 beginning of this year, I should say, and it'll be in front of House Finance next year and hopefully
13 get all the way through the Legislature. We recognize that, if you will, fee spiking, those
14 anomalies, those large increases are not satisfactory to professionals. We hear that often in
15 comments. Finding a way to begin to manage that issue is what HB187 is all about. HB187
16 provides us a few housekeeping tools, if you will. One of those housekeeping tools is, if there is
17 a large cost area, for example, a very expensive investigation and if it's suitable to the Division
18 and the Board to recoup that expense over multiple cycles we have specific language in the bill
19 that allows making those decisions. So it's really using multiple biennial cycles to recoup those
20 expenses. Right now Statute doesn't really give us that opportunity, or I should say it's less
21 than clear. We want to make it clear in Statute, so multiple cycles to recoup large expenses if
22 they occur. The second part of that is that over time the Division tracks over 400 licensing fees.
23 This bill would allow us the ability to consolidate some of those licensing fees pending that
24 conversation with the Board. It would require us to get your buy in and if, in fact, we can find
25 ways to consolidate some of those fees that we track we would do that. The advantage we see
26 in that is just efficiency in tracking information, adding better accuracy to our information, our
27 numbers. If you have less moving pieces, obviously we think we can end up with a better, more
28 accurate product. So again those are housekeeping pieces that's been asked before the
29 Legislature. And then lastly, there is recognition that public protection is a policy that all
30 Alaskan's enjoy, not just licensees. And as part of that public protection we are asking the
31 legislature to fund investigative time as a General Fund instead of receipt supported services.
32 Receipt supported services are really the State's way of saying licensing fees that you all pay
33 for or services that you all pay for through your licensing fees. We are asking, and this is in the
34 fiscal note of the bill, we are asking for 1.7M. We looked at a number of ways to calculate the
35 best methodology to keep track of that budgetary item of public protection. In the end we
36 determined that investigative time was the easiest for us to manage. It is a number we know
37 from year to year. It is a number that could be used and put into the base budget. It doesn't
38 cover all of public protection, for example, any time we have the need of Department of Law and
39 Legal Services that would still be picked up through licensing fees or fee supported services.
40 But approximately 60%, 65% of public protection through investigative time, if this passes,
41 would be covered out of the General Fund. With that we think we can also begin to stabilize
42 licensing fees. Kathleen, I think it was, just noted that some costs are increasing. This would
43 help in that regard and perhaps even lower some fees in some instances. So with that Mr.
44 Chairman HB187 is before you. Ultimately, this fall, after you've reviewed it as an organization,
45 as a Board, as an industry, if you will, we are going to ask for board support. Some kind of
46 resolution of support that we can add to the information that goes in front of the Legislature in
47 2014. That formal request will be coming, as I said, sometime this fall in preparation for the
48 opening of the session in January. So, that's my comments on HB187 Mr. Chairman, any
49 questions?

50
51 Maynard: When we were talking with the investigators earlier, we have a couple cases in the

1 AG's office that have been sitting there for over two years and they seem to be reluctant to prod
2 them because we get big bills from the AG. I would urge you to put the AG office underneath
3 this bill and maybe have them set aside as part of, essentially, your staff a prosecuting arm, if
4 you will, so that you can set priorities and not have these cases sit here forever and ever cause
5 they don't know anything about engineering or land surveying.

6
7 Habeger: Colin, thank you for those comments, understood, just so you know why we didn't
8 head down that road. One of those less predictable pieces is our law bill and I fully understand
9 your point but the reason why we didn't ask is that the mechanism for that number, funding that
10 expense side is a supplemental problem. In other words, you have the service, you know the
11 cost, after the service is completed or after a year's worth of service is completed then you go to
12 the Legislature and say is what it is going to cost, now a supplemental appropriation and we
13 thought that would be a little more problematic from a request perspective of the Legislature.
14 But, your point is understood; I just wanted to let you know why we didn't go down that road
15 from our perspective.

16
17 Chair: Asks the Director to sit down with the Boar and try to figure out how to move these cases
18 along. He indicates that he doesn't expect an answer right away but is giving a heads up on a
19 future request of the Directors time.

20
21 Habeger: Making Notes, thank you Mr. Chairman, I will give it some thought and maybe we can
22 set aside some time maybe in an off meeting, sub-group which is certainly fine with me or at the
23 next Board meeting; however you want to handle that Mr. Chairman.

24
25 Chair: Ok, I'll maybe get together with Vern and coordinate something as an off meeting.

26
27 Habeger: Ok, and then lastly, it's not a large item, we talked about it before and that's just
28 travel, a few very quick points as a reminder. The Legislature appropriated \$730K worth of
29 authority for travel for this year. Part of that is in recognition of, and that's about \$140K worth,
30 recognition of HB84 which is the military training service temp license bill that Representative
31 Saddler got through the Legislature. It requires Boards to, if you have a temporary license,
32 promulgate regulations that acknowledge military training, service credit, education and making
33 sure that you recognize that at some level and, where credit is due, that applicant gets that
34 credit. It would require certain Boards to promulgate regulations and that's part of that process.
35 The \$140K is if a Board needs additional authority to have in-State meetings it is there, it does
36 not need to be spent on that. The rest of that is \$200K additional dollars for what I consider out-
37 of-state travel. We've has that conversation many times, the authority is there. And finally a
38 \$20K recognition of third party travel. It is a mechanism now that the Legislature has given us
39 to work with and anytime there is third party reimbursement from a National Association it can
40 be recorded now as revenue to the Board's programs and essentially it offsets the travel
41 expense we pick up on the front side. So, nothing more there Mr. Chairman, open to questions
42 on travel if there are any.

43
44 Chair: General comment, Don, the Board fully appreciates your support on travel and the effort
45 you've made. It's a big improvement for us and we recognize that, thank you.

46
47 Habeger: Thank you Mr. Chairman, that's my presentation and I look forward to hearing from
48 the Board on the fee issue.

49
50 Chair: Any more questions for Don? I guess we are done, thank you for your time.

51

1 Habeger: Thank you.
2
3 Chair: Any closing comments before we move on to the next agenda item?
4
5 Jones: Advises that the \$20K number for reimbursements is for all boards not just AELS and
6 that they are hoping that eventually the Legislature will realize that \$20K is just a drop in the
7 bucket and that more or all of it should come back to each Board.
8
9 Maynard: States, for the benefit of the new members, that the reason the fees are going up so
10 high is because they have been artificially low because we were spending off \$1M that was not
11 credited to us previously and became a surplus several years ago.
12
13 Chair: So we are getting back to a fee base that is what it should be instead of having a large
14 surplus sitting there. And another notable increase is the investigator.
15
16 Kerr: Suggests that we should have a dedicated budget with the AG and have one of the AAG's
17 become familiar with our professions so these things can move forward. It doesn't make sense
18 to have a dedicated investigator and increase his investigative time without corresponding AG
19 support. He asks if it should be increase fees and ask for the support or get the support and
20 ask for the fees.
21
22 Schedler: Feels that if we ask for the funding first and don't get it then AG wouldn't do the work
23 but if we ask them to do the work and when we get the bill then we will have numbers on paper
24 and can ask for the funds.
25
26 Maynard: Notes that there are dedicated AG's but they might put medical and dental ahead of a
27 case where someone lost 2 feet of property because a surveyor screwed up.
28
29 Chair: Adds that first we need to find out what options are available to us and this is where
30 maybe Don will be able to help us.
31
32 Jones: Gives a little history on which AAG's were assigned and that Gail and Dan have retired
33 and he thinks there have been some retirements in the Anchorage office too so right now they
34 may be short staffed.
35
36 The discussion continued for a short time. It was asked if the AG's office was aware we are
37 getting our own investigator and more may be coming their way. Point was made that it may
38 be the other way around. It may be less because the word got out and people came into
39 compliance. It was suggested that a committee titled Enforcement Enhancement be formed to
40 meet with Don. Maynard, Kerr and Eriksen volunteered.
41
42 Chair: Asks if we want to make a motion now on the fee increases.
43
44 Jones: Recommends it be put under new business and done at that time.
45
46 Chair: Decided to put the HB187 issue on hold until we get the formal request from the
47 Division and take it up at the next meeting.
48
49 Back to Item 7 b 2 Changes to 12 AAC 36.180 and 990 re software engineering.
50
51 Chair: Asks Vern to describe the concerns the came up from our request to public notice the

1 changes.
2
3 Jones: He advises that it was too vague for them. They wanted more detail, there was
4 nothing about grandfathering.
5
6 Chair: Thinks the big concern they had was who does this apply to?
7
8 Jones: They were afraid we would make their IT Section get licensed.
9
10 Maynard: Was concerned that the definition was so broad that somebody who's working for
11 Microsoft might think that they have to be licensed. He thinks we need to define what kind of
12 software it applies to.
13
14 Chair: Reads the definition – "Software engineering means the branch of professional
15 engineering that embraces the studies and activities relating to the development, operation,
16 and maintenance of software and the organizational and economic aspects of these studies
17 and activities." He has struggled with this a bit and thinks the question is the intent and the
18 intent is to protect the safety of the public and not restrict activities like IT and at the same time
19 there is concern with putting a lot of specifics in there. He asks for suggestions and points out
20 that this is something new that maybe we don't fully understand.
21
22 Hale: Wonders is we should not follow in the same path as the structural which is specific as
23 to what structures require it.
24
25 Maynard: Engineering software, define what would be. He asks if any other state has
26 adopted software engineering yet.
27
28 Chair: Yes, 24 states have software engineering. We ask other states and no one came back
29 with a definition but they did come back with what is not software engineering. He thinks
30 common sense applies, people understand, it's just convincing people to accept that. I'm not
31 sure how to move forward so I'm looking for some direction I guess.
32
33 Kerr: Asks what software we are talking about. Are we trying to regulate the action or the
34 application that is generated by the action?
35
36 Chair: Gives an example of a program that might be designed to assist a structural engineer
37 with design and calculations.
38
39 Kerr: Notes that with the software they use they always double check the results so we don't
40 care who writes the software, what I care about is that it functions as designed.
41
42 Maynard: Wouldn't see those writing structural engineering software as falling under this
43 because for one thing they all have disclaimers that this has to be used by a licensed engineer
44 and using engineering judgment and some of them require you acknowledge that every eight
45 times you go in there. And yes, you have to double check it and you have to make sure it's
46 reasonable. I was seeing software engineering as being more control systems, process
47 systems, you know the software that runs the pipeline. Those kinds of things where if they
48 screw up the program oil is spilling everywhere or there is a chemical spill at a plant or a
49 mechanical malfunctions and people freeze to death. Those kind of programs rather than the
50 excel spread sheet that you used to design the beam or whatever.
51

1 Chair: Agrees but thinks it would apply to both. Don't they have to test it and vet it as well?
2
3 Maynard: Understand it that the person that actually writes the control software actually works
4 for the contractor and the engineer that says this is what it's supposed to do doesn't
5 necessarily go back and check that software and make sure it's working. They do in the
6 commissioning phase but that's at one point in time. Like me I specify a steel joist. Now that
7 steel joist is designed by an engineer who is licensed up here, we require that. I'm relying on
8 the fact that they are a licensed engineer and doing their work correctly. So, I'm not going
9 through and checking every single line item in his calculations to make sure he's done it
10 correctly.
11
12 Koonce: Asks if we wouldn't benefit from the work of the other states that have already
13 adopted software engineering.
14
15 Chair: Responds that that was part of our solicitation and we didn't get a lot of specific
16 language back.
17
18 Koonce: Asks if we could get that information from their regulations.
19
20 Rearick: Thinks their regulations are probably as vague as what we proposed and he would
21 be more interested in if they had actually licensed people and what issues they've come
22 across and enforcement and even within their public comment period when they're adopting
23 those. How did the public perceive that? He thinks there should be some kind of control on
24 people who are writing programs that are going to be used by others the will affect the HSW.
25 He isn't convinced that this Board should be regulating software engineers at least with our
26 current definition. It just seems like it's going to be a difficult thing to enforce and regulate.
27 Maybe, as time goes on, that will become more defined within the industry or another industry.
28 I don't think we have the proper tools we need to regulate and enforce it.
29
30 Chair: Agrees that it is new and we have done quite a few queries to other states and
31 organizations and a lot of what we got back has been pretty vague. He thinks it is a
32 developing industry. Software has been here for a long time but this idea of software
33 engineering is fairly new to everybody and will probably have some evolution. He agrees with
34 Colin that it's hard to draw a line between control engineer and software engineer. He feels
35 that it's important to give those educated in software engineering an opportunity in the State.
36 For example we just licensed our first nuclear engineer. It was asked what will we use that for,
37 well now we have one and we may find out.
38
39 The discussion continued for a short period. It was asked how why we are considering this.
40 The Chair gives the history of how we got where we are now. About the time NCEES
41 developed an examination for software engineering someone sent an email asking if the Board
42 was going to license software engineers. Research showed the education is out there and
43 during the general licensing discussions it was pointed out that when NCEES developed an
44 examination for a new branch of engineering it would be considered. Most of the concern we
45 have received from organizations such as IEEE is the same as those we received during the
46 general licensing discussions. Would those presently doing software engineering be able to
47 continue? Point was made that just because NCEES offers an exam doesn't mean we have to
48 license that branch but if we decide to this is the correct Board to do it. Schedler related how
49 she handles new software used in the systems she is responsible for. Discussion continued to
50 go back and forth on whether we should regulate and what software engineering is and
51 whether it should be for software that is used specifically for engineering in Alaska. The

1 conclusion is that we need to come up with a better definition of what software engineering is.
2 For the present it will remain in committee. It was suggested we look at the definitions in the
3 24 states that now regulate it and see how they can be used in Alaska. Jones will check on
4 line and see if he can find hard copies of their regulations.
5

6 Rearick: Has a question for Vern. So the AG has looked at this, given us some comments,
7 but at this point they are not doing anything with it.
8

9 Jones: No! He then explains the process of getting regulations public noticed. That the
10 regulation changes have to be reviewed by the Division, Department and Governor's office,
11 not to stop the process because the regulatory authority is with the board, not them, but so
12 everyone up the chain is aware of what is being proposed so when the public starts calling
13 they know why. In this case the questions that came back were significant so I discussed it
14 with Eric and we decided to bring it back to the Board for further discussion before going
15 forward. He advises that the land surveyor regulation that was part of this package be
16 separated so it won't be delayed further.
17

18 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Rearick and passed unanimously it**
19 **was RESOLVED to public notice 12 AAC 36.071 Standards of Practice for Land**
20 **Surveyors as follows:**
21

22 12 AAC 36 is amended by adding a new section to read:
23

24 12 AAC 36.071. Standards of practice for land surveyors. A person who holds a
25 current certificate of registration as a land surveyor as defined in AS 08.48.341 shall at a
26 minimum perform work that meets the Alaska Society of Professional Land Surveyors,
27 Standards of Practice for Professional Land Surveyors, Chapter 2 - Standards, 2013 and
28 adopted by reference. (Eff. ___/___/___, Register ___)

29 Authority: AS 08.48.101 AS 08.48.341

30 Editor's note: The Alaska Society of Professional Land Surveyors, Standards of Practice for
31 Professional Land Surveyors, Chapter 2 - Standards, 2013, adopted by reference in 12 AAC
32 36.071, may be obtained by writing to the Alaska Society of Professional Land Surveyors, P.O.
33 Box 112835, Anchorage, AK 99511-2835; website at <http://www.alaskapls.org/sop2013.html>
34

35 Chair: 7 b 4, changes for conversion to CBT.
36

37 Jones: Explains the regulations changes.
38

39 Schedler: Asks what the benefit to us is.
40

41 Jones: Explains the present process and the process after the change. He notes that making
42 these changes will significantly reduce the staff workload. It would streamline the process for
43 the applicants by removing a hurdle for them. The revenue loss will be minimal according to a
44 study by UAF that showed 75% of the graduates listed an Alaska entity as their employer upon
45 graduation.
46

47 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by rearick and passed unanimously it**
48 **was RESOLVED to public notice changes to 12 AAC 36.062, 12 AAC 36.063, 12 AAC**
49 **36.064 and 12 AAC 36.065 as follows:**
50

51 Words in **boldface and underlined** indicate language being added; words [CAPITALIZED

1 AND BRACKETED] indicate language being deleted
2

3 **12 AAC 36.062. ELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDAMENTALS OF ENGINEERING EXAMINATION.**

4 **(a) An applicant for the Fundamentals of Engineering examination must apply directly**
5 **to NCEES.** [FOR BOARD APPROVAL OF AN APPLICATION MADE ON OR BEFORE JUNE
6 30, 2010, AN APPLICANT'S EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE MUST MEET THE
7 REQUIREMENTS OF THIS SUBSECTION. TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR THE FUNDAMENTALS
8 OF ENGINEERING EXAMINATION, AN APPLICANT MUST]

9 (1) [HAVE SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED AT LEAST 75 PERCENT OF THE REQUIRED
10 CREDIT HOURS LEADING TO AN UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE IN AN ENGINEERING
11 CURRICULUM ACCREDITED BY ABET; THE COMPLETED CREDIT HOURS MUST BE
12 DOCUMENTED BY THE APPLICANT'S EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION; OR

13 (2) SUBMIT TO THE BOARD SATISFACTORY EVIDENCE THAT THE APPLICANT'S
14 EDUCATION OR WORK EXPERIENCE OR BOTH ARE EQUIVALENT TO THE
15 REQUIREMENTS SET OUT IN THE FOLLOWING TABLE OF EDUCATION AND
16 EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE FUNDAMENTALS OF ENGINEERING
17 EXAMINATION; ACCEPTABLE EXPERIENCE MUST BE DERIVED FROM OFFICE OR
18 FIELD WORK INVOLVING THE ACTIVITIES LISTED IN THE DEFINITION OF THE
19 "PRACTICE OF ENGINEERING" IN AS 08.48.341 OR OTHER WORK EXPERIENCE THAT
20 MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS IN 12 AAC 36.063:

21
22 TABLE OF EDUCATION AND WORK EXPERIENCE
23 REQUIREMENTS FOR FUNDAMENTALS OF ENGINEERING EXAMINATION

24	EQUIVALENT	MINIMUM WORK	TOTAL
25 YEARS			
26 DESCRIPTION OF	EDUCATION	EXPERIENCE	OF
27 EDUCATION AND			
28 TRAINING	IN YEARS	IN YEARS	WORK
29 EXPERIENCE			
30			
31 ABET ACCREDITED B.S. DEGREE 4		0	4
32 IN ENGINEERING			
33			
34 ABET ACCREDITED B.S. DEGREE 3		1	4
35 IN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY IN			
36 A BRANCH OF ENGINEERING			
37 LISTED IN 12 AAC 36.990(17)			
38			
39 MASTER'S DEGREE IN 4		0	4
40 ENGINEERING ACCEPTABLE			
41 TO THE BOARD IN A BRANCH			
42 OF ENGINEERING IDENTICAL			
43 OR SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR			
44 TO A BRANCH LISTED IN			
45 12 AAC 36.990(17)			
46			
47 DOCTORATE DEGREE IN 4		0	4
48 ENGINEERING ACCEPTABLE			
49 TO THE BOARD IN ABRANCH			
50 OF ENGINEERING IDENTICAL			
51 OR SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR			

1 TO A BRANCH LISTED IN
2 12 AAC 36.990(17)

3
4 NON-ABET ACCREDITED B.S. 3 1 4
5 DEGREE IN ENGINEERING

6
7 COURSE WORK IN ABET 2 3 5
8 ACCREDITED ENGINEERING
9 DEGREE CURRICULUM – NO
10 DEGREE (COURSE WORK MUST
11 INCLUDE A MINIMUM OF THREE
12 YEARS OF CREDIT HOURS IN AN
13 ENGINEERING CURRICULUM)]

14
15 (b) [EDUCATION AND WORK EXPERIENCE MAY NOT BE ACCUMULATED
16 CONCURRENTLY. A MAXIMUM OF 12 MONTHS' CREDIT MAY BE CLAIMED FOR A
17 CALENDAR YEAR.]

18 (c) REPEALED 10/29/2009.

19 (d) For board approval of an application to practice in Alaska as an engineer in training
20 [MADE ON OR AFTER JULY 1, 2010, AN APPLICANT'S EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE
21 MUST MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS SUBSECTION. TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR THE
22 FUNDAMENTALS OF ENGINEERING EXAMINATION,] an applicant must submit to the
23 board the appropriate fees, verification of having passed the fundamentals of
24 engineering examination and official transcripts verifying [HAVE SUCCESSFULLY
25 COMPLETED AT LEAST 75 PERCENT OF THE REQUIRED CREDIT HOURS,
26 DOCUMENTED BY THE APPLICANT'S EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION, LEADING TO] one of
27 the following degrees:

28 (1) ABET accredited B.S. degree in engineering;

29 (2) ABET accredited B.S. degree in engineering technology in a branch of engineering listed in
30 12 AAC 36.990(17);

31 (3) master's degree in engineering acceptable to the board in a branch of engineering identical
32 or substantially similar to a branch listed in 12 AAC 36.990(17);

33 (4) doctorate degree in engineering acceptable to the board in a branch of engineering
34 identical or substantially similar to a branch listed in 12 AAC 36.990(17);

35 (5) non-ABET accredited B.S. degree in engineering.

36
37 **12 AAC 36.063. ENGINEERING EDUCATION AND WORK EXPERIENCE**
38 **REQUIREMENTS.** (a) To be eligible for a professional engineering examination, an applicant
39 must

40 (1) hold an active Alaska Engineer in Training (E.I.T.) registration or [HAVE BEEN
41 APPROVED FOR OR HAVE PASSED THE FUNDAMENTALS OF ENGINEERING
42 EXAMINATION OR] had these requirements waived under 12 AAC 36.090(a);

43
44
45 12 AAC 36.064. **ELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDAMENTALS OF LAND SURVEYING**
46 **EXAMINATION.** (a) An applicant [TO BE ELIGIBLE] for the fundamentals of land surveying
47 examination must apply directly to NCEES for the examination. [EXAMINATION, AN] For
48 board approval to practice in Alaska as a land surveyor in training an applicant must
49 have passed the fundamentals of land surveying examination; and

50 (1) have [SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED AT LEAST 75 PERCENT OF THE REQUIRED
51 CREDIT HOURS LEADING TO] a four-year degree in a surveying curriculum approved by the

1 board; the completed credit hours must be documented by the educational institution; or
2 (2) submit to the board satisfactory evidence that the applicant's education or work
3 experience or both are equivalent to the requirements set out in the following applicable
4 table of education and work experience;
5 [FOR THE FUNDAMENTALS OF LAND SURVEYING EXAMINATION;] acceptable
6 experience must be derived from office or field work involving the activities listed in the
7 definition of the "practice of land surveying" in AS 08.48.341 or other work experience that
8 meets the requirements in 12 AAC 36.065:
9

10 **12 AAC 36.065. ELIGIBILITY FOR PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR EXAMINATION. (a)**

11 To be eligible for the professional land surveyor examination, an applicant must

12 (1) hold an active Alaska Land Surveyor in Training (L.S.I.T.) registration; [OR HAVE
13 BEEN APPROVED FOR OR HAVE PASSED THE FUNDAMENTALS OF LAND SURVEYING
14 EXAMINATION;] and

15
16 **Agenda item 9 – Correspondence Received Since February 2013.**

17
18 CLARB:

19
20 Urfer: Nothing to add.

21
22 NCARB:

23
24 Rearick: Introduces Mike Armstrong, NCARB CEO and Kathy Hillegas, NCARB Director of
25 Council Relations. He adds that they will make a presentation tomorrow morning. However,
26 he would like them to talk a little about reciprocity with the Canadians at this time because
27 NCARB is planning on entering an agreement with Canada and want support from the
28 licensing Boards.

29
30 Armstrong: Good morning I'm Mike Armstrong, I'm the CEO at NCARB and we look forward
31 to talk to you a little bit more tomorrow just generally what's going on with our organization and
32 our relationship with you, the specific issue around Alaska. We currently have a mutual
33 recognition agreement with Canada regarding reciprocity for licensure. Historically, Canada
34 for many years had used the Architectural Registration Examination for their exam. And their
35 accreditation process for their schools and colleges of architecture is considered to be
36 substantially equivalent to our accreditation process on our side of the border. And their
37 internship program, while not exactly the same as our internship program, was pretty similar.
38 So the three steps in the path to architectural licensure, education, experience, examination
39 were pretty much the same. So we've had in place for a number of years a mutual recognition
40 agreement which indicates if you have a license in Canada that was considered to be
41 equivalent to a license in the U.S. and we have some 51 jurisdictions that are current
42 signatories to that mutual recognition agreement. New York, New Jersey and Mississippi are
43 not signatories to the current agreement.

44
45 Canada has changed its path to licensure. They've done something different with their
46 examination and we're not going to say it's better or worse than our examination but it's now
47 different, it's not our exam, it's their exam. And so, arguably in assessing the strengths and
48 weaknesses of each countries path to licensure and many months of negotiation between the
49 two countries it was determined that an adjustment needed to be made to assure our member
50 boards around the U.S. that enough rigor and diligence had occurred on the Canadian side to
51 qualify for a U.S. license. So based on our assessment of their path to licensure we've come

1 up with a new draft mutual recognition agreement that would require one year of practice
2 before acquiring a reciprocal license. And this really only impacts people who are just recently
3 licensed, anyone else who has been practicing for more than a year on either side of the
4 border wouldn't really be impacted by this. We have signed the agreement with the
5 Canadians but for it to become effective the trigger is to get at least 50% of our member board
6 jurisdictions agreeing to this and our goal is to have it done by the end of the calendar year.
7 So we put out a communication that, I think just went out, requesting comment from our
8 member boards and a position from our member boards as to whether you're for or against
9 this type of an agreement.

10
11 Hillegas: It's actually requesting that they sign a letter of undertaking that they agree with the
12 parties.

13
14 Rearick: Asks if the letter is in the packet?

15
16 Hillegas: Yes, it all part of the package.

17
18 Armstrong: So, that's where we sit today. If you want I can explain a little more of the
19 specifics of how their examination has changed. Their examination, and this is not just true for
20 architects but for other professions as well. The Parliament directed that specific types of
21 testing that occurred while in school should not be repeated on a licensing exam. They felt
22 that the overlap or the redundancy between educational examinations and licensure
23 examinations was not necessary. So the new exam for architects is a much shorter exam and
24 much less in-depth examination than our exam is. The Canadian model actually is turning out
25 to be an interesting, and we can talk more about this tomorrow, an interesting resource tool for
26 us as we revisit all of our programs. In Canada there are a lot less schools of architecture
27 than there are in the U.S. And the relationship between the accrediting function and the
28 regulatory function is much, sort of hand in glove in Canada than it is here. So a lot of people
29 opine that the Canadian education experience in some ways is superior to the American
30 education experience in terms of what you come out having as your base of knowledge when
31 you get a degree in Canada and therefore it balances out what is lesser in their examination.
32 But that's the direction Canada has chosen to go and so that's why we felt we need to make
33 an adjustment to our reciprocity by adding a year of experience.

34
35 Maynard: Assumes that the architectural exam in Canada is somewhat like their engineering
36 exam where it is more laws and business practices not the engineering technical exam that we
37 offer.

38
39 Armstrong: I don't know, that may be the case but I haven't look at the details of what's in it
40 but some of my colleagues that are looking at it closely may be able to answer that question.
41 Avoid redundancy of educational examinations is the requirement the Parliament put in. I
42 think one of the concerns, if I understand it correctly, in Canada is the shortage of architects
43 and the desire to get more people through the system.

44
45 Chair: Asks when we need to sign that letter.

46
47 Armstrong: We just sent it out and, again, we would like it back by the end of the calendar
48 year. And for some reason we don't hear from half of our jurisdictions we may extend the
49 deadline. \

50
51 Rearick: Asks if they know how many Canadian architects get licensed in the U.S. and vice

1 versa.

2

3 Hillegas: 900 Canadians come down and 300 U.S. architects go up.

4

5 Armstrong: On a yearly basis?

6

7 Hillegas: No, since the program began.

8

9 Armstrong: So over the 10 year life of the program it hasn't been a huge number.

10

11 Maynard: We've been having a similar problem on the engineering side and it seems like we

12 will now have the same problem with the architects now that they have a different system. If

13 we accept the architects it will make it harder to refuse to accept the engineers.

14

15 Rearick: Maybe before our next meeting we can get NCARB to give us some more

16 information about the differences.

17

18 Armstrong: If you want to put together some sort of written inquiry that we can respond to that

19 might be helpful. But I would not that Alaska is a current signatory to the existing MRA. Most

20 of the movement seems to occur in the bigger states, bigger more populous states, California,

21 New York, Florida, the big three. Even though you border Canada you don't seem to see a lot

22 of movement compared to other states.

23

24 Rearick: As far as the rest of the NCARB there will be more specific items that they talk about

25 tomorrow during their presentation.

26

27 Chair: Anything further on that subject?

28

29 Koonce: Wants to talk to Colin about the problems he mentioned with Canadian engineers.

30

31 Maynard: Explains the difference between the two systems is that the U.S. exams are

32 technical in nature and the Canadian exam is laws and business practices. They want us to

33 waive our exam but they don't want to waive theirs.

34

35 Koonce: Asks if the Board accepting the architect agreement would compromise the

36 engineering discussions with Canada.

37

38 Maynard: Responds that it is a legal question but he can see someone presenting that

39 argument.

40

41 Rearick: Doesn't what NCEES is doing regarding talks with Canada but he knows NCARB

42 has been engaged with Canada.

43

44 Chair: Moving on to item C) NCEES.

45

46 Maynard: Notes that there are endorsements for both candidates for NCEES office.

47

48 Jones: Advises that a couple ex board members may show up during the public testimony

49 portion to urge Board support for one or more of the candidates.

50

51 Chair: Deferred discussion until after the public testimony.

1
2 Maynard: Asks if we have any direction on any of the bylaw or policy changes to be voted on
3 at the National Meeting. This might be something to discuss tomorrow.
4
5 Chair: Thinks that is a good idea. Maybe tomorrow we can talk a bit about the annual
6 meeting and some of these issues.
7
8 Rearick: Suggests putting it under item 20 Board Travel.
9
10 Jones: Comments on Item I. He notes that the Korean delegation to the NCEES Annual has
11 requested to meet with the Alaska delegation to discuss reciprocity. The time requested is
12 during the engineer and surveyor forums and he suggests that they sit at the same table
13 during lunch and have their discussion then. He cautions the members that will attend about
14 accepting gifts and urges them not to insult them by refusing to accept but keep ethics in mind
15 and use common sense.
16
17 Chair: Notes that he has had experience with the Koreans and advises to make sure to have
18 business cards available and when receiving theirs to make sure to read it. He then brings up
19 the invitation from APEGBC.
20
21 Maynard: Asks if we are going to send anyone to the APEGBC meeting.
22
23 Jones: Advises that we get invitations from them and APEGGA every year but getting out of
24 country travel authority is pretty hard but we can try now that we have more travel funds.
25
26 Chair: Notes that one year Western Zone had their meeting in Banff and that was pretty neat.
27
28 Jones: Asks if there will be any NCARB meetings in Canada.
29
30 Armstrong: No, we no longer issue our exams to them. All the provinces have withdrawn from
31 the ARE.
32
33 Chair: Item 10 Correspondence since February item A) Letter to Thomas Hixson re military
34 experience.
35
36 Jones: Explains that this concerned HB84 and that we do not have a temporary license and
37 we already accept military experience if it is properly documented and we accept the degrees
38 from the military academies.
39
40 Rearick: Adds that we evaluate their qualifications as we would any other applicant.
41
42 Chair: Item B) email from Chris Miller re outreach to licensees.
43
44 Jones: Explains that Mr. Miller is asking for the board packets for each meeting be online and
45 that the minutes from the last meeting also be placed online prior to approval by the Board
46 which is both against present board policies.
47
48 There was a short discussion regarding the board minutes. Jones explained that he puts a
49 meeting summary online a day or two after each meeting that has the attendance, action
50 items, number of files reviewed and the results of the review. It was decided that the board
51 wants to keep things like they are. Put a meeting summary online right away but hold the

1 minutes until approved by the Board. Some programs put their board packets online for their
2 members but they are not available to the public.

3
4 Chair: Item C) Max Schillinger re using EI on a business card.

5
6 Jones: Explains the email exchange, that Mr. Schillinger was not familiar with the term EI
7 (engineering intern) however, the individual using it was meeting board policy.

8
9 Chair: Item D) John Hallinan re exemptions. No discussion. Item E) re 12 AAC 37.106
10 expiration. No discussion.

11
12 **Agenda item 11 – Old Business**

13
14 Note from Jones re seismic examination.

15
16 Jones: Explains that he met the delegation from Guam at the NCARB meeting and they have
17 a contract with California to use California's seismic examination. This may be an avenue for
18 us if we decide to start requiring some sort of seismic education/examination.

19
20 Chair: We still need to draft a response to them, correct?

21
22 Jones: Yes.

23
24 Maynard: Doesn't see a need for it. He feels that present examinations are sufficient.

25
26 Chair: Will work on drafting a letter of response for the task force.

27
28 B) Examination retakes.

29
30 Walters: Gives a report on his progress and asks the board for direction. He feels that after 5
31 years or 5 tries the reapplication should require some CE or a refresher.

32
33 Chair: Asks Walters to draft some regulation changes for board review.

34
35 Schedler: Thinks that if someone fails 5 times in 5 years that is reason for concern.

36
37 Maynard: Wants to see what the other states are doing.

38
39 Chair: Wants Walters to pull that information and draft a regulation change for consideration
40 at the November meeting.

41
42 Rearick: Doesn't think we need to change, we have limitations right now. There could be a
43 life circumstance that causes it to take more than 5 years so we should just leave it to the
44 individual.

45
46 Electronic Signatures.

47
48 Rearick: Talked to Idaho who has some of the same issues and they found that their state has
49 regulations related to generic banking that they adopted. Alaska has some regulations but he
50 hasn't reviewed them in depth to see how they overlay with signing drawings. He wants to
51 keep this as an ongoing item.

1
2 Chair: Asks if we have direction or follow-up on item A regarding the seismic stuff. I just kind
3 of accepted Colin's comment and moved on. Is that the consensus of the Board?
4
5 Rearick: Are they saying they've adopted California's seismic exam for Guam and California
6 has their own seismic exam, is that right? It's not the NCEES exam.
7
8 Maynard: Explains that California's exam is 2.5 hours of seismic and 1.5 hours of surveying.
9
10 Rearick: Not in favor of going down that road. He could see the NCEES exam but not
11 California's.
12
13 Maynard: Neither Oregon or Washington require an exam.
14
15 12:00 Recess for lunch until 1:15.
16
17 1:10 Back on record.
18
19 Jones: Roll call all present except for Hanson.
20
21 Chair: Asks if 3 minutes is enough time to talk about the ethics regulations.
22
23 Hale: Looked at all the boards and pulled out what he thought was the most generic portions
24 but after looking at article 2 (Code of Professional Conduct) in the regulations, all that is
25 already covered. He doesn't know if we need to continue or not and asks for direction.
26
27 Shiesl: That's where I floundered too, when I was looking at it.
28
29 Hale: Colin just gave me something that I haven't read through completely but it's criteria for
30 rehabilitation which might be something additional that you could put under the disciplinary
31 guidelines.
32
33 Maynard: Passes out a copy for everyone. It's just something that popped out at me when
34 looking at the California regulations. It was basically standards for how you evaluate people
35 who've had felony or other problems. You look at what the act was and how long it's been
36 since they committed the act. What kind of parole they've done.
37
38 Hale: We were looking at two things initially, the ethics themselves and the disciplinary
39 guidelines. What's the process for dealing with an ethics violation? What Colin has given us
40 may be worthy for inclusion into what we already have here.
41
42 Maynard: Thinks we started looking at this because of applicants who have had multiple
43 DUI's. At least if we have these criteria in the regulation it'll give us an idea of how to evaluate
44 that person. Ask what have you done for restitution etc.
45
46 Shiesl: As I read what Colin gave us it's basically just getting around the question again.
47 There isn't any specific criteria to deal with this, basically you're a professional and should act
48 like one.
49
50 Schedler: By law it needs to be non-specific because it has to be per the situation. She sees
51 this as a good guideline that shows the applicant exactly what we consider in making the

1 licensing decision and that we will never have a policy, regulation or statute that is specific.
2 She feels this would be a great start as a policy and would give us the latitude to change part
3 of it if it wasn't working.
4

5 Maynard: Adds that these will always be judgment calls. We're not going to have a set
6 standard. We have to evaluate everybody on an individual basis if it's fraud it's one thing if it's
7 DUI it's another. He sees this as having a list of things we are going to look at to use as a
8 basis.
9

10 Chair: Breaks off this discussion for the public comment.
11

12 **Agenda item 13 – Public Comment.**
13

14 Dale Nelson: Board and Chair I thank you for the opportunity to be here and for those who
15 don't know me my name is Dale Nelson. I'm wearing the hat of the Alaska Professional
16 Design Council, Chair of the Legislative Liaison Committee. So that's why I'm here in front of
17 you and I've got a few things to chat with you about. We did have a good year last year. I see
18 that was in your agenda that SB 16 got passed. It was some good work of our lobbyist John
19 Walsh and we've got one in the hopper. I see that also on your agenda you have 167, and
20 that one is working and we've got some work to do on that and there are a few things that, you
21 know, discussions this summer with different folks but I've got good feelings about that one
22 too. I would just like to make one comment is that I came over here, and it's on your thing,
23 (agenda) I came over here and I was here before 10:30, you know, did you move this around?
24 Did you discuss it, it's not for you to answer but, you know, I usually like to hear what the
25 board has to say about it, to get that kind of feeling so I can know my strengths or maybe
26 where I can strengthen some more or there's some negative parts in there that APDC can
27 share and share with John Walsh, you know, it's not for you to answer but that's why, and I did
28 the same thing for 187 and I'll talk to that in a moment. Anyway so we've got, that one is
29 working, the University of Alaska, you know it's where ladies and gentlemen will be coming out
30 of there and will sitting before you and doing good design work because their Alaskan's. We
31 got a lot of funding, we only got \$30M last year there's a few more million to go, 70 something.
32 Qualifications Based Selection (QBS) I know that's of interest to you as it puts a lot of the
33 engineers, architects, land surveyors, landscape architects, you know those that are here in a
34 real push and it's still going on. So we're trying to work that through. What we're working on
35 right now is with the Alaska Municipal League. It's a small community and it's kind of an uphill
36 climb from the standpoint that it is a smaller community. I point to Colin, he's worked this side
37 for us, ASCPC writing those letters and bringing it to their attention, what's Qualification
38 Based. We're trying to tweak the Legislation to get that covered and there's a lot of pushback.
39 A thing that we're looking to do right now is we're trying to get on the AML's Fall Conference
40 here. It's in the Captain Cook, it's in November and put on an hour and a half. It's not just
41 QBS, Kathy Waltermann's already told me if that is the highlight we're not going to get on stage.
42 There's a lot of other things, the writing, the scope, you know, and the RP and the selection
43 process. Go through this whole thing, we've got two fine people, Janet Matheson in Fairbanks
44 and Kathryn Fritz in Juneau. Good people that are getting a power point started so that's a
45 work in progress. And then I'm just going to wrap it up and if there's anything that we need to
46 be doing is HB187. This was introduced on the 26th of March and the bill was passed and
47 signed 16 and we had talked about it, we being APDC, and there is some concerns about this
48 and right now I had the feeling, uh, we got a board member that sits in on the meetings but
49 anyway it's questionable if we're going to support it or not. I'm just a spokesperson, I'm the
50 one that's got to go out here, and why I enjoyed listening to what your comments are and what
51 takes place, so you know, I can get that back and I can also feel where we are going to be on

1 this issue. Right now, Colin if I'm out of stride, let me know but I think that was the direction for
2 sure there's a lot more, during lunch break I went back to the house printed out a bunch of
3 things, scan down through it. There's some more additional things put onto the site that I
4 wasn't aware of last year. So that wraps up my little thing. What we're doing, what we're
5 looking forward to do. If there are things please bring them to APDC's attention or to my
6 attention and Vern knows how to get ahold of me.

7
8 Kerr: Asks if APDC has specific issues with HB187 that they can share.

9
10 Nelson: First the quick answer is 187, was it affecting the bill that we just got through for the
11 investigator, that was the big question. I kind of went through there really quickly. I'm not
12 convinced one way or the other. The second one is dues. Know you know the dues of the
13 members, the architects, engineers. The dues are going into this and it looks like, and it
14 sounded like this was coming out of the General Fund. Well, you know in the time of where
15 we are at with money and so forth and then there was, when we put this out, and not only
16 through APDC but I'm active in the American Society of Civil Engineers, that went out as well.
17 It was also in our newsletter a question because this investigator was being funded if you want
18 to call it that way, by our dues. And I point to myself because I'm dues paying for my
19 registration and did not receive any pushback. There might have been some grumbling but I
20 didn't even hear that. Anyway those are the two things that are going on that don't quite read
21 right. Was there a discussion by Don Habeger? What's going on? I don't know. Thank you.

22
23 Chair: Invites Burt Lent to come up and receive his Wall Certificate thanking him for his
24 service on the Board. Pictures were taken and Burt thanked the Board.

25
26 Boyd Brownfield: Good Morning, my name is Bo Brownfield and I'm happy to be amongst
27 several of my former colleagues here and more than several new members here since I've
28 been gone from this board. I congratulate all of you for being here and wish you all the luck in
29 the world.

30
31 Several days ago I was asked to say a few words in support of one of the candidates running
32 for the President Elect of NCEES, a very important senior position with our National
33 Organization that leads directly into the NCEES Presidency. And with no real time for any in-
34 depth research or analysis I decided to comment on what I know of each candidate, which is
35 not a whole lot, primarily through informal contacts and conversations during our National
36 Conferences. Unfortunately when you're, you and I, when we're down there is the only time
37 when we meet most of the people that we deal with and share the same issues. So,
38 conferences are the places that you meet those folks. And you don't get much chance, unless
39 you're on a committee of some sort, to get to know them much better. And then to study the
40 most bios of each candidate, I thought I would do that. They distributed certain campaign
41 things to folks top read for their benefit. My assumption is there would be the highlights of
42 their careers here simply because they did it themselves. My thought was if they prepared it,
43 they would be giving us their best shots. So what I decided to do was study what they said
44 about themselves thinking nothing could get any better. I would then attempt to share some of
45 my views and findings, conclusions with our sitting board here.

46
47 So I will begin. The candidates are Howard C. Harclerode II, we call him Skip and I'll be
48 calling him Skip from this point on and he is from the State of Maryland. And David H. Widmer
49 of Pennsylvania, I'll be calling him David. I'm familiar with both candidates probably more so
50 than they are with me. After viewing their accomplishments I would have to conclude that both
51 have very, very, impressive qualifications. That each are well on their way to great challenges

1 should they continue on their own set path. I know Skip from frequent times he has spoken
2 and debated issues at our general sessions. One in particular involved a very controversial
3 issue which consumed a lot of our general session time for several years, that being the B+30
4 debates. That was not a very good experience as far as this board was concerned. At the
5 time Skip happened to be on the other side but my view is to look at Skip as to how he
6 handled himself, how professional he was and not whether he agreed with me or not, and I
7 was very impressed with him. I've also attended meetings or shared the same table during
8 events and carried on general conversation with Skip, among others. I did not know him
9 personally. I know David from personal contacts, had various discussions at different events
10 and specific business meetings down at the annual sessions. We actually became good
11 friends at our meetings and we shared a lot of common experiences. I've had little to no
12 contact with either candidate since I've been off the board. So, back to the issue I need to
13 discuss with you. It falls to this board to determine which candidate has the most experience
14 emphasizing diversity of experience. Who is the most qualified to become the NCEES
15 President Elect, who will serve the best interests of NCEES as well as keeping our own Alaska
16 needs in mind and that should be very important to you. At this point putting myself in your
17 shoes, and that's an interesting concept, my intuition would be to compare the qualifications
18 that each prepared themselves, about themselves, since they both have ample potential and
19 let's take a look at what that looks like. According to each candidates fliers, and I know that
20 you all don't have them, you do have them in your packet I guess. I've got a couple of them
21 here if you need them.

22
23 Skip has served as a member of the Maryland Board since 2003. That would be for ten years.
24 David has served as a member of the Pennsylvania Board 1995, and that's over 18.5 years.
25 Said differently Dave has been an active member of NCEES significantly longer than Skip by
26 about 8 ½ years. As far as positions held I would start with Zone Vice President, although
27 there are some lower than that, because I believe this is the beginning of the progression of
28 offices held that would most logically and eventually lead to the President of NCEES. Skip has
29 served as the Northeast Zone Vice President from 2011 to 2013. David served as the
30 Northeast Zone Vice President from 2009 to 2011. In my view Skip is following in Dave's
31 footsteps at this point in their careers. Both list specific positions and experiences through
32 their NCEES Career, Skip lists 11 examples, David posts 15 examples. From my viewing of
33 both of these listings there are significant differences between the two. In my view David's
34 experiences are far more diverse and they are clearly containing a broader scope of
35 experience Skip's listings. That's just the way it came out. I tried to look at this thing from the
36 standpoint that I'm not choosing one or the other because that's not my job. It's going to be
37 your job to determine which one you want to support. So I tried to do it as a neutral
38 observation. And I think that Skip's was a little bit short of the one's that David had simply,
39 primarily because David has been there for 18 ½ years. I have a show stopper which I read
40 and looked at. It really makes me make my decision. My show stopper is that there are two
41 overarching issues which cement my conclusion that David clearly possesses the qualifying
42 experience for the position of President Elect. They are that David has most recently served
43 on the NCEES Board of Directors for the last four years. That's from 2009 to 2013. And most
44 importantly he has served as the NCEES treasurer for the last two years, 2011 to 2013. Skip
45 has served in neither of those capacities. So, my counsel is to vote for Dave Widmer.

46
47 My conclusions and my counsel is to vote for Dave Widmer as your next President Elect.
48 David is presently more qualified to step into the President Elect Chair even though I think
49 both of them have impressive bids but one clearly overshadows the other. That's about all I
50 have to say and I appreciate your attention and I will answer any questions if you make them
51 simple. But, I think that David would be the one choice that we should support. One of the

1 other issues that I know about him is he knows a little bit about Alaska and in my view he
2 would keep in mind the interests of Alaska more than, I think, Skip would.
3
4 Nelson: I would ask one question before I walk away and that's 167. Proceed? Does the
5 board support where it's at and what we are doing to continue on?
6
7 Chair: Yes, I believe that's correct.
8
9 Chair decides to keep the public comment period open in case someone else shows up and to
10 continue with the discussion on ethics.
11
12 Hale: Was hearing two different things in the ethics conversation, one is that we have ethics
13 for licensed professionals and disciplinary guidelines. The other thing is evaluating candidates
14 for licensure. It sounds like we're talking about two different things.
15
16 Maynard: Thinks it's about evaluating candidates and reinstating he notes that the California
17 law deals with both including renewal.
18
19 Chair: Notes that we have some decision making to do whether it's at application, renewal or
20 a complaint, we have to have a criteria or metric to use.
21
22 Hale: Refers to article 2 which leaves a lot of discretion to the Board. The other thing is before
23 the professional. It's not about professional conduct it's about how we deal with evaluating
24 candidates for licensure.
25
26 Maynard: Thinks it may be in the application part of the regulations and it may need to be in
27 both.
28
29 Hale: We have ethics covered we have disciplinary procedures covered for professionals. He
30 thinks we may need to add some sort of process for evaluating candidates for licensure and
31 that maybe a Board Policy would suffice or do we need it in regulation?
32
33 Chair: It would be nice if we had a definition of ethics.
34
35 Hale: If we had a Board Policy on evaluating candidates we could evaluate on the basis of
36 their ability to adhere to the ethical standards of a professional.
37
38 Chair: It could be a policy but it seems like the regulation should give authorization to make
39 decision based on ethics.
40
41 Maynard: Maybe a question for the AG's office whether regulation or policy.
42
43 Jones: Notes that when we deny a license we base it on the statement in Statute about "good
44 character and reputation". That always brings up the question, well, what does that mean? If
45 you had this you could say the decision was based on this. That would give you a basis for
46 the "good character and reputation".
47
48 Kerr: Doesn't care for the verbiage "the board will consider the following criteria". If you don't
49 consider each criteria you have given a candidate traction in a complaint about what we did.
50
51 Schedler: Thinks that's why we need it as a policy. We can change it.

1
2 Chair: Gives direction to redraft as a policy.
3
4 Koonce: Asks what led up to this. Did someone slip through the crack?
5
6 Maynard: Responds that it was a case of multiple DUI's.
7
8 Schedler: Believes that what led to this was that when she came on and saw offenses, no one
9 seemed sure how to handle them.
10
11 Koonce: Isn't sure we can hold up someone unless they have done something that affects
12 their ability to do their job.
13
14 Schedler: We are looking at all misdemeanors and felonies.
15
16 Koonce: Then if you deny someone you can be litigated.
17
18 Schedler: You can litigate anything.
19
20 Chair: Points out that that has been some of the concern with the debates we've had on how
21 defensible is that. Would this make it more defensible or not, are we handicapping ourselves
22 or giving ourselves an advantage?
23
24 Koonce: Doesn't know.
25
26 Schedler: Her experience is you have to show what you follow and be consistent and it is a
27 judgment and as long as you're consistent and as a group discussed it and made that
28 decision, it's defensible.
29
30 Jones: Adds that a recent case that was bounced back to the Board on appeal was because
31 the board didn't give a reason for the denial. So the Judge said do it over and the result was
32 that the Board granted a conditional license. So being able to show how you came to the
33 conclusion you came to would be beneficial.
34
35 Chair: Asked and everyone agreed that this should be used to draft a board policy to be
36 adopted next meeting.
37
38 Item E. Fee setting for renewal this December.
39
40 Chair: Asks if any more discussion is needed.
41
42 Jones: You need to decide if you support the Division's recommendation or not.
43
44 Chair: Asks if the Board is ready for a motion on the Division's fee changes.
45
46 Maynard: Asks why corporations get off so cheap.
47
48 Kerr: That's a good question.
49
50 **On a motion by Shiesl, seconded by Rearick and opened for discussion it was**
51 **RESOLVED to support the new fee schedule dated 7/26/13 submitted by the Division.**

1
2 Schedler: Asks why some of the items on the list are not carried across with a fee.
3
4 Jones: Explains that those items are presently in the regulation however we no longer allow
5 out of state proctoring, the LARE is administered by CLARB and they no longer allow review of
6 a failed exam which is what that fee was for. The LARE sections C and E no longer exist
7 because CLARB changed their exam structure and administer them all by computer now. So
8 there will be no revenue from those items.
9
10 Schedler: Commented that she would expect a difference between individual and corporate
11 fees. She feels that a corporation should pay a higher fee than an individual.
12
13 Kerr: Agrees that corporations should pay more than individuals and also would like to see
14 retired fees remain at a onetime fee of \$50. It's the end of their career and they will be on a
15 fixed income.
16
17 Chair: Asks if the difference between corporation and individual fees would be economic gain
18 or what.
19
20 The discussion centered on the difference between corporate and individual fees. Suggestion
21 ranged from keeping individuals at \$200 and raising corporations to anywhere from \$250 to
22 \$1000, having the corporate fee double the individual fee, having the individual fee \$200 and
23 the Corporate fee \$500, having the initial fee for corporations the same as individuals and
24 renewal higher. Points made were that some corporations are out of State and we shouldn't
25 discourage them from doing business in Alaska, that some corporations and LLC's were
26 formed by individuals and are very small operations. Discussion continued for a short time
27 with no new points or ideas on fee structure.
28
29 Chair: Asks if the consensus is that corporations should pay more than individuals. Everyone
30 agreed.
31
32 The motion was amended as follows:
33
34 **On a motion duly made by Shiesl, seconded by Rearick and passed unanimously it was**
35 **RESOLVED to support the new fee schedule dated 7/27/13 submitted by the Division**
36 **with the following changes: corporate initial and biennial fees twice the individual fee;**
37 **Retired status registration onetime \$50.00.**
38
39 Item F) Expiration of 12 AAC 36.106 Registration in Additional Branches of Engineering.
40
41 Chair: Notes that this was placed on the web and also some other places.
42
43 Maynard: Responds that it is in the APDC News Letter.
44
45 Chair: Notes that we have a new webpage.
46
47 Jones: Yes it changed and so did our URL. It went from 4 inches to 12 inches. We are trying
48 to get it shortened. The fastest way to get to our webpage is to go to Google and search for
49 Alaska AELS Board.
50
51 Chair: Calls for a 5 minute break before going into Executive Session.

1
2 Rearick: Advises everyone that the reservation for dinner is at Sullivan's at 6:30.

3
4 2:10pm Break

5
6 2:20pm On record. Chair asks for a motion to go into Executive Session.

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

11
12 5:20pm recessed for the evening.

13
14
15
16 **Friday August 9, 2013**

17
18 9:00 a.m. On record. Roll Call, all present except Hanson who has been excused and Kerr and
19 Rearick who are late.

20
21 Chair: Asks if we need a motion to come out of Executive Session.

22
23 Jones: No, you can't make a motion in Executive Session. We were out when we recessed last
24 night.

25
26 **Agenda item 18 – New Business.**

27
28 E-mail from Lance Kinney re early testing for PE

29
30 Chair: It says if the motion passes does your Board intend to changes its laws and rules to
31 allow taking the PE exam prior to gaining the minimum experience?

32
33 Schedler: Asks if we have discussed this before.

34
35 Chair: Doesn't think so. He asks how this works.

36
37 9:04 Kerr arrives.

38
39 Jones: Explains that they want to allow graduates to take the PE exam as soon as they
40 graduate.

41
42 Maynard: Notes that the PE exam is supposed to be on your experience in actual practice.
43 Coming out of college you don't have that. So if it's able to be passed right out of college then
44 the test isn't testing what it is supposed to. He adds that building codes are not taught in the CE
45 program. A lot is learned in the first few years out of school. If the test is not testing on
46 experience then maybe we need to look at the test. He is not in favor of letting applicants take it
47 right out of college.

48
49 Hale: Asks what the driving force is and notes that it would eliminate one of the three legs of
50 the stool.

1 Chair: Feels they may be looking at making it easier for more people to pass the exam. His
2 opinion is the same as Colin's, he always understood the intent of the exam to be based on
3 experience.
4

5 Schedler: Remembers her PE exam as being very academic and spent probably 9 months
6 before the exam doing story problems to prepare and she worked mostly electrical problems
7 because they were easier and it had practically nothing to do with the work she was doing which
8 was HVAC and fire protection. She would favor allowing the exam, not right out of college but,
9 prior to obtaining the full 4 years of experience, perhaps 2 years in. Then when you get your 4
10 years, if you failed the exam, you've been able to take it twice and can get registered. She
11 would like to hear from NCEES what the exam is testing on because she doesn't believe it's
12 testing on experience.
13

14 9:07 Rearick arrives
15

16 Maynard: Sees the problem of applicants saying I have my degree, I've passed the test why do
17 I have to wait 3 years to get my license. Why should I have to work under a PE for 3 years
18 when I obviously know the material. We are going to lose that third leg of the stool.
19

20 Chair: His recollection was that his exam was experience based and there were a lot of code
21 based questions. There were academics as well but instead of a mathematical exercise it was
22 more of a problem solving exercise where you had some problems that your experience would
23 influence your decisions.
24

25 Kerr: Notes that often you aren't able to apply the things you learn in school until you are in a
26 more advanced position. The first 4 years you're building some core skills and not using that
27 stuff you learned in college. And it's a very healthy refresher to have to go back to that material
28 to take the test as you're entering into a position of responsibility.
29

30 Schedler: Would be interested in getting feedback from some of the engineering organizations.
31

32 Jones: I didn't get any of those. I put responses from the other states in the packet but didn't
33 see any from engineering organizations. We could query them I guess.
34

35 Koonce: Notes that the ARE can be taken early but you still need to get the experience before
36 licensure.
37

38 Rearick: Adds that NCARB is moving toward allow the IDP to start right out of high school even
39 before they are enrolled in a college. They are trying to integrate all three legs of the stool so
40 that they can start getting work experience while they are in school and when they graduate
41 they can take the test and they are ready to go. He does believe that there is value in getting
42 experience after education because you are more mature and able to apply things in the field.
43

44 Hale: Just because you have the knowledge doesn't mean you are applying it properly.
45

46 Urfer: Explains how the LARE works and offers that other professions that aren't familiar with
47 the engineering exam might not give the best feedback.
48

49 Jones: Asks Maynard to ask the local engineering societies what their take is.
50

51 Chair: Thinks we should ask NCEES what their exam is supposed to be testing.

1
2 Jones: Actually they have a comment in here to that effect.
3
4 Chair: Notes we license for minimum competency and asks if that will change.
5
6 Walters: Adds that the mentoring by licensed engineers in the important part. He doesn't care
7 when they are tested but agrees that later would probably be better than sooner.
8
9 Jones: Reads comments from the South Dakota Board questioning the defensibility of it being a
10 practice exam and Jerry Carter's response from NCEES saying the exam is legally defensible in
11 that it follows the normal accepted principles recognized by testing organizations so NCEES
12 evidently doesn't think it's going to be a problem.
13
14 Chair: Points out that he didn't say it was practiced based.
15
16 Maynard: Adds that one of the reasons to test after 4 years is to see if they remembered any of
17 the material and he also asks for direction on how to vote on this at the NCEES Annual.
18
19 Jones: That should be in the form of a motion, whether this Board supports it or not.
20
21 Kerr: Feels that most graduates will pursue work that will cultivate their knowledge and if you
22 test prior to their acquiring that knowledge you've taken that away. He also feels maturity is
23 important because someone who doesn't like the work will move on to something else and not
24 take the test where someone who graduated, passed the test may stay because there are
25 almost there even though they don't like the work and aren't good at it.
26
27 Chair: Feels comfortable with the system as it is now. He's not sure if this isn't a move to get a
28 higher success rate on the exams and asks if this is a reason for change for us.
29
30 The consensus is that getting more people through the system is not a good reason for this
31 change. If there are other reasons for the change the supporters of this change didn't articulate
32 them.
33
34 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Shiesl, and passed unanimously it was**
35 **RESOLVED to not support the NCEES motion to move testing to immediately after**
36 **passing the FE NCEES 2013 ACCA motion 1.**
37
38 Item 18 B) Email from Rick Moore re Subsurface Utility Engineering (or locating).
39
40 Kerr: Asks if the Board has two votes at the NCEES Annual.
41
42 Jones: It's just one now; there is a motion in to give two votes to combined boards. There is
43 some opposition to that, I think Illinois has had three because their SE board is separate from
44 their PE board. The idea is that each profession should get a vote.
45
46 It was decided that more information was need to determine exactly what he was asking about.
47 Is it just the people from the city that locate underground utilities for property owners or
48 something else? Would this be considered engineering, surveying, what? Vern will check with
49 Mr. More and see what they are looking for.
50
51 **Agenda item 17 – Presentation by NCARB CEO Mike Armstrong and Director of Council**

1 **Relations Katherine Hillegas.**

2
3 Chair: Welcomes our guests and gives them the floor.

4
5 Armstrong: Good morning, again I'm Mike Armstrong, I'm the CEO at NCARB and with me is
6 Kathy Hillegas who is the Director of our Council Relations Department. I want to thank you all
7 for giving us some time on your agenda. We are interested in, over time, visiting each of our 54
8 jurisdictional licensing boards and actually sitting through a meeting and getting to better
9 understand the local issues and the political issues and, quite frankly, just seeing how what
10 we're doing at NCARB is or is not translating when it gets to our member boards. I've been I
11 this job for two years and when I was hired I said that I thought on of the first things I needed to
12 do is actually physically go and meet each of our member boards and the reaction was, well
13 we've never done that before. I said, well, it seems we only have 54 members, that's probably a
14 pretty good idea. And so, it's my understanding you've probably never had a visit from NCARB
15 before, to your board meeting. And I know most of you are not architects so I appreciate the
16 rest of you sort of tolerating this presentation this morning. I will add very quickly that we have a
17 relationship with both CLARB and NCEES where we have a meeting once a year with the
18 leadership of the three organizations, both the elected leadership and the staff leadership and
19 then we have added a second meeting every year where I meet with my colleagues, Joe Albeza
20 from CLARB and Jerry Carter from NCEES because there are a lot of commonalities between
21 the disciplines and a number of our member board around the country have multiple discipline
22 missions which include frequently both the engineering and landscape architecture
23 communities. So, we learn from each other. Sometimes we watch each other make a mistake
24 and we can avoid that mistake. Whether it's evolving our examination process or looking at
25 experience requirements or the discussion you just had about where things fit on the path to
26 licensure. I think it's an interesting discussion that we are starting to move into.

27
28 A little bit about my background quickly is that I'm not an architect. I've been association
29 management for a number of years and the Board of Directors had reached a point at NCARB
30 where they had directed a lot of re-invention of the organization and felt that it was time to bring
31 in a new perspective at the leadership level so I was the beneficiary of that philosophy. I came
32 to NCARB from the International Code Council where I worked on building codes and other
33 code issues for about 4 years in a variety of positions as a senior vice president including
34 training, certification, marketing, communications, the annual meeting, membership and it sort of
35 was a reach back to, I started my career as an assistant city attorney practicing in Colorado
36 where I advised the local government in Aurora for 10 years on zoning, planning, building
37 codes, code enforcement, historic preservation. Wrote a lot of local legislation for the city and
38 prosecuted in municipal court and then I went on to a variety of political appointed positions for
39 the Governor of Colorado as his deputy for energy conservation and then I served two positions
40 in the Clinton administration at FEMA in the 1990's, pre Katrina, (laughter) back when perhaps it
41 had a little bit better reputation. My main focus was on disaster mitigation, building disaster
42 resistant communities through awareness of risk and working with the building community, the
43 architect community, the land use planning community around reducing the threat or the risk of
44 earthquakes, floods, fires, tornadoes, other natural hazards and even today I still teach a
45 graduate course in hazard mitigation and disaster management at the George Washington
46 University. So I have a great appreciation for the seismic threat here in Alaska and some of the
47 challenges you have here with a population that sometimes isn't used to living in this kind of
48 terrain or in this kind of an environment and how we can reduce risks by the decisions we make
49 and the design options we adopt which gets back to architecture. The code council was a good
50 sort of opportunity for me to get to know some elements of the architect community but NCARB
51 was something I hadn't interacted with but I have gone through my own licensing process as an

1 attorney and I appreciate the rigor and the time that's spend along that path.

2
3 NCARB is based in Washington D.C. We have roughly 100 employees working for us. The
4 largest group of our employees, work in what we call our Records Department. That's the part
5 of the organization that if someone wants to get a reciprocal license in another jurisdiction they
6 would contact us if they maintain an NCARB Record we can do all of the transmittal for them
7 and vouch for their status to another jurisdiction in the U.S. If you are enrolled in our intern
8 program, you keep a record at NCARB and you can now register your hours online with NCARB
9 so that you meet your requirements in the different categories in the intern development
10 program and then we also administer the exam.

11
12 The three E's as we call them, education, experience and examination are an area of a lot of
13 conversation right now in the architect community. As you might guess for all the professions
14 related to the building industry in the post-recession economy people are still trying to figure out
15 how we enhance the ability to get work in these professions. How do we preserve the integrity
16 of these professions? Does licensure still matter in the second decade of the 21st century?
17 We've been encouraged at NCARB by our board to revisit everything from scratch. To say why
18 do we still have an exam? Why do we still require an accredited degree? Why is experience
19 necessary? What, today, based on how the profession practices architecture, based on how
20 technology is impacting these different steps, based on the expectation of the public regarding
21 protection of their health, safety and welfare, what's the real roll of licensure? And I don't put
22 that out there as just sort of a rhetorical question but as a real one. I there are a lot of serious
23 people who are appropriately thinking critically about this issue. We still believe as an
24 organization that the three E's are necessary to get to licensure. But what those three E's look
25 like and what are the protocols and the rules that support those three E's may have to evolve,
26 they may have to change as the needs of the profession and the expectations of the public
27 change. We are very aware that in today's practice of architecture that it's a much more
28 collaborative effort than it used to be with a lot of specialists with different disciplines. Not
29 everyone on the team needs to sign and seal a document and yet many of those people work
30 for architectural firms and are valuable because of their specialty. We understand that the roll of
31 building codes and the roll of engineers and other disciplines have, perhaps, changed the
32 nature of how you assure public health, safety and welfare. And at the same time the Academy
33 tells us that frequently their students want an environment where they don't have to focus too
34 much on the elements of practice, but more about theory and design and creativity and how to
35 think in a way that's different. And so if the Academy is going in that direction and technology is
36 pushing practice in this direction, where do these 3 E's fit? So we doing several things that we
37 unveiled at our annual meeting in June that I think you all should be aware of.

38
39 Our examination, which has been a computer based exam now for a number of years, has
40 largely had the same format for a very long time. And the format has been what we call a
41 combination of multiple choice questions and something called a graphic vignette where you
42 use a tool to graphically answer questions on the examination separate from the multiple choice
43 questions. This tool is a tool that is no longer taught in school and is no longer used in the
44 profession. It's unique to the exam. And increasingly this tool has become a point of frustration
45 as an unnecessary extra learning step to get ready to be an architect. Why should someone
46 taking the exam have to learn this tool just to take the exam? So we had decided based on our
47 knowledge of what was available in the industry that we were going to update this tool and
48 make the tool more contemporary. And we had started to spend money on developing and
49 researching the upgrade process. However, as we got deeper into the process we realized that
50 by the time we upgraded the tool and tested it and put it out there it would already be
51 antiquated. And further, we were asking software developers to commit to designing something

1 that was unique to us, that they didn't have to design for anybody else. And so we were sort of,
2 I don't how you are in your offices but being at the mercy of an outside vendor to trust them to
3 develop something you is a little bit scary in terms of a business proposition. And then branding
4 wise, in terms of our credibility with the examination taker to say well here's the new tool but by
5 the way it's outdated just like the old one was. That combination of circumstances didn't seem
6 terribly compelling in terms of a future path. So we decided to pause any further research into
7 upgrading the tool and instead we started talking to the testing industry. We started looking at
8 other professions. And we started asking questions, could the exam be totally changed in terms
9 of its format? Not in terms of its content but in terms of its format. And after doing research that
10 took us about nine months or so and building upon what our research and development
11 committee had already been doing for several years we came back to our Board of Directors
12 and said yes, we think there's a new path forward that will eliminate the need to keep this
13 vignette in the exam and end the relationship with the software developers that is just sinking
14 millions of dollars into a sort of speculative effort and get us on a path that makes an
15 examination much more agile in terms of how to evolve it over time. And according to the
16 cyclematricians we spoke with and the testing industry experts we spoke with we think it actually
17 is going to do a better job tracking what occurs when you're practicing architecture. It's going to
18 be driven more by actual scenarios and case studies around the practice of architecture. You
19 will still be able to graphically represent answers to questions but the tools that weren't available
20 five years ago that are now being used, in think CLARB uses some of the tools on their exam.
21 We will embed some of those tools in the questions and so the questions will now be called
22 action items where we can, when we choose too, ask someone to represent something
23 graphically or move something on the exam. We're on the very beginning of the development of
24 this new exam. It's going to take us roughly two and a half years to get there. We are
25 committed to updating the licensing board around the country on our progress and what it will
26 look like. We want everyone to have a comfort level that this new examination will still be legally
27 defensible, cyclematrically sound. It will preserve the appropriate level of rigor that we still think
28 is required for an examination toward licensure. But we also think it will be something that will
29 be more relevant to the test taker and that we are not going to create unnecessary barriers.
30 Antiquated tools should not be impeding the ability to take an exam it should be all about what's
31 in your head and what you're able to represent not whether you can manipulate a tool. So we
32 are hopeful this new ARE, we're calling it 5.0, we hope to unveil it in the fall of 2016. We will be
33 sending you updates along the way. We're very excited about this, it also over time, and this
34 was not our original intent but it's a nice by-product. Over time we think the development of this
35 exam and its successor exams will be much less expensive than what we've been spending in
36 the past. Our examination runs in the red. We do charge a pretty good size fee for the exam.
37 We use a test center vendor. Pro Metric is the vendor that we use for the test center. But we re-
38 bid our contract and that's the only part that Pro Metric will is still going to administer. The other
39 parts of our contract are being administered by a vendor called Alpine which is much more of
40 what we think we need for the future. We think, based on everything we've seen that this is
41 going to free us from being wedded to an outdated approach to examination and it's going to
42 position us for the future. We're hearing some very interesting thing coming from the testing
43 industry. The day may come when you may not even need a test center any more. The ability
44 to track someone as they're taking an exam to see whether they are cheating is amazing.
45 There is technology out there which sounds very sci-fi to me but I guess it's real, where based
46 on the number of eye blinks or key strokes or how you're looking into the camera or whatever,
47 they can sense whether something inappropriate is occurring. So the day may come where the
48 exam might be administered outside a test center environment. Maybe we work with our
49 colleagues at the AIA and offer it at their component offices or maybe work with the universities
50 and offer it on college campuses maybe the day will come where you can sit in your PJ's at
51 home in your basement and take it. Don't know when, or if that's ever going to happen, we may

1 not even want to do that even if it's possible just because of what it might look like. That's just
2 an example to show you how rapidly technology is also changing the testing industry. So it's
3 not just changing how you're practicing engineering or architecture but it's changing everything.
4 So that's online. As part of this transition to the new vendor, instead of just being one vendor,
5 Pro Metric, for everything Alpine and Pro metric, we are currently in what we call a blackout for
6 our exam that we have notified you about. We turned the switch off on July 1st to allow a full
7 data transfer to occur from the old vendor to the new vendor. Also NCARB now is going to be
8 able to have access to all historical data from past examinations for the first time. We are going
9 to start being one of the vendors in house. Which I also think is a much more efficient way to
10 administer the exam. But this is big data and it is highly sensitive and highly secure data so we
11 can't have any mess-ups. So we indicated we would have a blackout for eight weeks to make
12 sure everything moves and there are no hiccups and no problems. The good news is that it
13 seems to be moving through faster than expected and with no problems. Kathy just mentioned
14 to me there's going to be an internal meeting next week to determine, are we going to be able to
15 come out of the blackout early? So if we do we will probably have what we call a soft reopening
16 where it will just all of a sudden be accessible without any trumpets. Then after a few days or a
17 week or so we'll let everybody know. What blackout means is that you can't take the exam right
18 now. You can't even go online to register for the exam. You can't have any interaction
19 regarding scheduling or exam taking or accessing records, it's all dark. There's been an
20 inconvenience to some we started messaging this December, January time frame. Everyone
21 has plenty of notice and we did see a spike in examinations in the May, June time frame, people
22 trying to get ahead of the blackout, but we think that's going very well.

23
24 We are also taking a closer look at our internship program. There's been some chatter in the
25 last year or so in some of the architectural media and other places about how long it's taking
26 people to get through their internship and how much of that is the fault of the process verses the
27 fault of the intern. We know that they're many inters who are very serious and start, in
28 architecture you can start getting internship credits as soon as you graduate from high school.
29 There are many interns who are finishing their internship and taking their examination within
30 three to five of graduating from school. But what gets the publicity is what we call the lagers,
31 the 14 year intern. There was a story in Architect Magazine about this a few months ago and
32 how bad this is for the profession and how, without some change, people are going to start
33 choosing not to pursue architecture because it's so rigorous and then we're going to have a
34 shortage of architects or the profession is going to become extinct. We don't' fully buy into that
35 theory because we look at so many people that do get through the system in a timely fashion.
36 But that doesn't mean that we can't make improvements to what we have in place. Our current
37 President, Blake Dunn from Arkansas is the first NCARB President to have actually gone
38 through the intern development program and he and I are committed to seeing whether under
39 the existing framework we can have a streamlined option where we would maybe credit other
40 things in lou-of the actual internship program to get through the process. Then more holistically
41 is there something about the program over all that can be done to simplify the program. My
42 take, two years into this job, is that we have a lot of very fine well intentioned programs that
43 have suffered from being overly designed a little chiding of my architect friends around the table.
44 I think that's a temptation that's hard to resist as an architect just let's tweak it one more time.
45 But what happens is year after year if you keep tweaking these programs pretty soon all of
46 these tweaks layered on top of each other are awfully hard for the new person to figure out. We
47 want to get back to basics. How can we simplify our program without sacrificing the rigor and
48 the commitment to the public that a license really means something? This year internally we're
49 looking at IDP and we hope to have some conceptual approaches announced by spring or
50 annual meeting next year on what direction we might want to go in the future. All these changes
51 I'm talking about require transition, require new tools and so I'm sensitive to there's an element

1 that says we wish you would, fix things, and there's another element that says, you keep
2 changing things all the time we're never going to figure this out. We're trying to steer this middle
3 course between these two. I just came back from a conference that occurs every five years
4 called the accreditation review conference. This is hosted by the NAAB which is the
5 organization that does the accreditation for schools and colleges of architecture. The purpose
6 of this conference was to take a look at the existing criteria around accreditation and to make
7 recommendations as to how the accreditation criteria might be revised. This is based on an
8 assumption as practice evolves and changes so should what's taught in the schools. It also is
9 designed to acknowledge that we are getting more schools every year and also to acknowledge
10 that there're other pressures on schools besides what the practice expects. There're pressures
11 from their Provosts and their Chancellors and their University President. There are monetary
12 pressures in terms of maintaining a funding stream through tuition dollars. There are new
13 career opportunities out there for people who have a passion for design that may not require
14 getting a license. So to remain competitive these schools and institutions have to come up with
15 a curriculum that meets the accreditation criteria but also meets a lot of these other criteria's. It
16 was a fascinating meeting we had about 50 people there. NCARB sent 5 delegates there. We
17 had delegates there from colleges and schools, from the student organizations, from the AIA
18 and some observers from other countries as well as representatives from the minority
19 organization and community colleges organization. The NAAB will be issuing an interim report
20 on what they heard and we will be commenting on that report and will, through my CEO update
21 and other communication vehicles, will try to keep you aware and abreast of what's going on
22 there.

23
24 Another program that I've asked the staff to take a fresh look at is the Broadly Experienced
25 Architect and Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect programs. These are programs that are
26 designed to look at dossier's of individuals who didn't go through the traditional path of
27 accreditation, internship development and examination to determine how close is their path to
28 our path and what would they need to do to close the gap. There are a number of States around
29 the U.S. that have un-accredited schools for example that people graduate from and still want to
30 get a license. We have many jurisdictions who have over time not been as quick to adopt our
31 intern program or you have older architects who may have not gone through the intern program.
32 And I'm really concerned that NCARB evolve into an organization that meets its number one
33 goal of the strategic plan which is to facilitate licensure. Frequently I'm worried that we look like
34 we're trying to prevent licensure and I think there's a big difference between the two. I think it's
35 important for us to acknowledge that the end game is to protect the public's health, safety and
36 welfare. It's helpful to provide you all and your 53 other member board colleagues around the
37 country with model law and model regulation, consensus opinions from the National
38 Organization and a framework that's largely for reciprocity. But there are going to be other
39 paths and exceptions to those traditional paths. And I think we as an organization need to be
40 more flexible. And then we have to come back to you and make the argument for why that
41 flexibility is ok. Because when you're in a regulatory mode it's much easier to have a cookbook.
42 It's easier just to have it all black and white, no exceptions, no shades of gray, this is the way it
43 is and if it doesn't fit here it doesn't, that's easy and comfortable and convenient but it's not real
44 life. So I'm encouraging my staff and our board to think more expansively about our mission in
45 terms of what the roll of licensure is and how do we facilitate licensure. And that goes not only
46 for our rules and our laws and our programs but it also goes for our fee structure as well.

47
48 We're very strong right now financially as an organization. Our budget for the coming fiscal year
49 is \$28M. We finished last year with a surplus. We have some long term loans that we are
50 paying off and we have our financial advisor always telling us that we have to put more into our
51 rainy day funds. So we are not wasting money or squirreling it away for some party or

1 boondoggle, we're being responsible. But never the less I think that sometimes a fee structure
2 can backfire. We did a little experiment which I think proves my theory. We used to require that
3 if you had stopped maintaining an NCARB Record, for every year you were lapsed you had to
4 pay a one year penalty adnausium. So if you were lapsed for 30 years you had to pay 30 years
5 of back fees. I said you know what; this is not reaching the goal. If the goal is to help people to
6 get a license, and to get a certificate is the best way for them to get a license and maybe when
7 they were first practicing architecture they didn't think they were ever going to leave the State of
8 Alaska. But, times change and all of a sudden there's a job available down in Oregon or, they're
9 partnering with a firm because they know somebody now that's practicing in Wisconsin. Now
10 they want to be on a team or they want to bid for some work or because of this economy they've
11 just got to travel and be more competitive. Oh, gee I should have maintained that NCARB
12 Record, well gosh, let me find out, oh, I can't afford to pay 20 years of back fees. So we're
13 preventing someone from being able to practice architecture because of our fee structure.
14 That's the way I look at it as sort of a set of fresh eyes. So we've got a new policy in place we
15 cap your lapsed fee penalty at 5 years. It tries to respect the person that's diligently paid their
16 fees every year but at some point enough is enough. We want to get people back in the game.
17 I have a feeling the same thing might be true for the fees we charge for the Broadly Experienced
18 Architect program and the Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect program. So we've now
19 adjusted the BEA fees, they are now capped at \$5K. It used to be they could pay a lot more.
20 It's also a menu based on level of effort so if most of the research into your dossier is in
21 category "A" then you spend this much money. Or if it's category "A + C" then you spend this
22 much but in no case will you spend more than \$5K. I think we're going to get more people in the
23 pool. I think more people are going to be able to practice architecture and everyone wins, the
24 profession wins the public wins and we get the revenue from this increase in practice.

25
26 So we're trying to look at some things at NCARB a little differently but really our main purpose
27 here today is to demonstrate that we exist, that we are human we are not some faceless
28 bureaucratic Washington D.C. organization. Our brand has been because we have the
29 regulatory roll that we are sort of unassailable, unreachable, the castle on the hill with the draw
30 bridge up and I'm trying to reestablish our reputation on being on the ground level with open
31 doors. We want to hear from you, we are very focused on customer service. Our average
32 turnaround time now for someone who makes and email or request to us is 48 hours for nearly
33 any request which anyone who was engaged with NCARB more than 5 years ago probably had
34 a bad experience with NCARB and they would be shocked to hear that this is improved.
35 There's a community of architects out there that we would love to reach and tell them that things
36 have changed. This is one our ways of trying to do that. When we make these trips we also
37 reach out to the membership organization, the AIA and attempt to meet with their leadership,
38 which we are going to do tonight at dinner. That organization has the lobbying mission the
39 advocacy mission the voice of profession mission. That's not our mission and without a
40 partnership with that organization we can't always get success with what we are trying to do.
41 Historically that organization only hears from people who are unhappy and so they've
42 developed, perhaps, a negative impression of us and so we think it's important to try to build
43 bridges and reestablish relationships so we're on a bit of an outreach campaign as well as we
44 go around the country. Two years into the job, we're close to half way through our member
45 boards. Kathy and I hit about one a month, sometimes it's two or three, sometimes it's zero.
46 There are some commonalities, most of the member boards meet in a sort of nondescript State
47 office building, and uh, you have a window. Many of the boards do but not all of them do,
48 sometimes it's a windowless room. They usually have someone taking minutes. Sometimes
49 the board lawyer is present we noticed that with this board that's not the case. We have a lot of
50 boards that multidisciplinary. We have very few that are just architecture only. There are
51 variances from state to state but we are so impressed with your willingness to volunteer and

1 your level of engagement. We just want to let you know that we respect that. That going
2 forward we are also trying to be more efficient with our time. When we convene a meeting we
3 want things to happen. Even our annual meeting this year we tried to turn it up a little bit and
4 make it a little more dynamic and make some things happen and make it flow in a way that
5 perhaps people hadn't seen in the past. I told our staff that I expect committee meetings to have
6 real work. If it's just administrative stuff or orientation stuff you can do that via teleconference.
7 You don't need to do that face to face. That the charges from our president need to be meaty
8 and achievable but necessary, the charge should not be, look at what last year's committee did,
9 tweak it a little more and adopt it and then we'll change it and then repeat the cycle. We just
10 can't do that anymore. People want to be back home practicing, making money. We want
11 people to volunteer. We want people to come back and volunteer again and unless we make
12 that volunteer experience valuable they're not going to do that. Kathy and I were at a
13 conference this past weekend where I was on a panel talking about engaging our volunteers.
14 We have roughly 280 slots filled by 217 or so volunteers and they're precious to us. These folks
15 write the exam questions. They recommend changes to the education and intern standards for
16 the organization. They are peers recommending regulatory processes for the next generation of
17 architects and it's important for us to respect their time and their efforts.

18
19 We have several departments in addition to the records department, just so you're aware. We
20 have a very strong internal IT which we call the IS, information systems department and we've
21 made light-year speed achievements in some cases with our online capabilities and our abilities
22 to access information. That's probably the next largest department. Then we have a back
23 office department that does our accounting and our HR and our office management. We have a
24 growing communications capability. We are now fully engaged with social media. I'm even
25 learning how to twitter which I resisted for years because my generation thinks the whole thing
26 is kind of silly and kind of a fad but the younger generation doesn't and they engage. If we're
27 trying to get people to engage with us we need to turn the corner and embrace it so we're on
28 Face Book, we're on Twitter. We're actually solving customer service problems on Twitter,
29 believe it or not. So that proves its value. And then we have a very small group working on
30 internship and education and another small group working on examinations. Kathy's
31 department which she'll tell you more about in a moment is charged with supporting member
32 boards, supporting our Board of Directors and overseeing all of the planning efforts surrounding
33 all of our meetings. We have 7 or 9 architects on staff so we do have professional architects on
34 our staff advising the development of our program. If you're ever in Washington D.C. we'd love
35 to have you come by and say hello. I'm going to turn it over to Kathy and she can tell you a little
36 bit more about the stuff she's doing and her folks are doing to help you including some new
37 services.

38
39 Hillegas: Thank you Mike, thank you again for letting us be here. As Mike was talking I was
40 doing a little bit of research and just some interesting numbers. We have 13 boards in common
41 that share engineers, we have 17 boards in common that share landscape architects and
42 another 11 boards that share land surveyors. That's not a total, what would that be, 41? But
43 those are just different variances of the different types of combined boards that are out there
44 and I think the message to me that's so important is we really need to be aware of what's going
45 on with the other professions just as much as we are aware of what's going on with the
46 architects because it affects all of us. Also as I was counting I think you guys are number 28 on
47 our visit list but I might be off, I was just pulling that off the top of my head but you're
48 somewhere around 28 or 29 on our visits to state boards.

49
50 My roll has grown significantly and my department has grown significantly since Mike came
51 onboard and because we've put a huge emphasis into member board relations. We now are

1 doing things that NCARB has never done before. We're starting to view our relationship with
2 our boards as we are a service provider to you and we have services now that we are able to
3 offer to the member boards. A lot of it is very fresh, very new, we're still learning our way
4 through it but one example is we are starting to build a research library. I have a couple of
5 people on my staff who anytime a question comes up now we'll go and dig deep into laws and
6 rules within each jurisdiction regarding an issue. Continuing education is probably our first
7 example where we were considering do we need to develop a continuing education standard?
8 There are a lot of jurisdictions out there requiring it. We've learned that reciprocity is very
9 difficult for architects to achieve because each jurisdiction has a different requirement. So, let's
10 study what all of those jurisdictions are doing and try to define if there is a base line in there
11 somewhere. So we had someone go in and go into laws and rules for each jurisdiction, develop
12 this massive spreadsheet and just try to find where is the baseline? We've done that for
13 continuing education, we have done that for probably another 26 to 28 topics ranging anywhere
14 from to electronic seals and signatures. We passed a resolution on updating our Model Law
15 with some fresher language regarding the use of electronic seals and signatures. We are doing
16 research on public members on state boards right now and just understanding that it can be
17 used for issues that are internal where staff might be asking the question. We've used it for
18 charges that committees are addressing. We've done research based on requests from
19 individual state boards that are considering changes to their rules or regulations and they just
20 come to us and ask us do you have any information on what are the other jurisdictions doing?
21 It's really; it's intended to identify what are the best practices?
22

23 The other thing that we are doing that's new and I think this just got distributed this week, Vern
24 you might have received it, is we're starting to track legislation as it relates to the architectural
25 profession in all of the 54 jurisdictions. We have been internally been doing this for a while just
26 to help us understand what are the state boards doing? But we've now turned that from
27 something where it was a useful activity for us into a newsletter type document that we're going
28 to be sending out, right now we've started it to member board execs and I want to explore taking
29 it beyond that to the member board members as well. That just provides you with updates on
30 what's going on legislatively throughout the country in the 54 jurisdictions with respect to
31 architectural legislation. That just came out, we had a bit of a debut of that information at the
32 annual meeting, but we've just sent our first newsletter out about that and we're very excited
33 about that. It's a little slow right now, there are not a lot of legislatures in session but we expect
34 to see a lot of activity as the fall comes into play and as we get into the winter we expect it to get
35 very busy.
36

37 I'm trying to think what else? Mike covered the blackout. Probably the biggest thing about that
38 is the new efficiencies and tools that'll be available to you and to your board as you help your
39 candidates get through the process of examination. I would just urge you Vern, I'm pretty sure
40 you did, but because you all have a different rolling clock that is kind of outside the NCARB 5
41 year rolling clock, make sure that you send the information about that to the office so that they
42 can get your settings set up properly.
43

44 Jones: I think I did.
45

46 Hillegas: I would just urge you to make sure because your rolling clock is a little different
47 outside of ours.
48

49 The other thing that we're very interested in looking and exploring is data sharing with member
50 boards. Many people when they hear that they say we can't share data on our customers. I
51 think that Guillermo, our IT Director is looking for a win, win opportunity to share some very

1 basic data about who are your licensees, and who are our certificate holders, record holders,
2 interns etc. He has a huge vision where one day we would be able to push and pull information
3 from each other where if a candidate went in to complete an online application for licensure in
4 Alaska all they would have to do is go in and their information would draw from the one
5 database and, I hope I can get this out right, then they never have to fill all of that basic contact
6 information again, because then your website would link to our website and data would be
7 flowing back and forth and everybody would have the same contact information on these
8 candidates. One of the biggest challenges that we've had in the past is that candidates or
9 applicants would have to provide data to the state or their contact information to the state and
10 then they would turn around and have to give it to NCARB and then they would turn around and
11 have to give it to the testing vendor. We're eliminating the testing vendor out of that with this
12 new "My Examination" that is going to be rolling out very soon. And his vision is to take it to the
13 next step with a sharing of information about these people back and forth and we would have
14 one holistic database of all the licensed architects within the U.S. The bigger thing that I like
15 about that is that by having that database it will enable us to enhance and grow our disciplinary
16 database. We have a database where we encourage, at this point, state boards to input data
17 on any architects who have had any disciplinary action taken against them. It's a pretty
18 primitive database at this point and there are plans, IT does have it on their work plans for this
19 fiscal year to upgrade the database for me and give us something that's more functional,
20 searchable, we'll have categories for different levels of discipline. It would include an area where
21 you can put consent orders. That is probably the biggest thing that I'm most excited about this
22 year is being able to deliver a fresh, current disciplinary database. It's been an interesting
23 experience for us sit in some board meeting and actually watch them discussing something
24 that's going on with a registrant and have the MBE sit there and go into our database and be
25 able to say, oh wait a minute this guy was penalized for unlicensed practice 10 years ago and
26 here we are addressing the same issue with him all over again so this sob story that he's
27 throwing at us isn't working because done this before. For me that was an eye opening
28 experience to watch the power of what that database can do.

29
30 Continuing education record keeping, we are starting to have conversations with the AIA in
31 looking at forming some sort of a partnership that might enable us to share information on
32 record keeping for architects when it comes to the continuing education which for us, from our
33 perspective is very exciting because that will enable us to kind of complete the spectrum from
34 education on through continuing education. Right now we don't track continuing education for
35 architects but the goal is that maybe one day we'll be able to include tracking continuing
36 educations in one's council record.

37
38 Lots of exciting things happening with member board relations. These visits are so helpful for
39 us. They also, I would hope Richard could attest to this, for me being out here listening to your
40 board meetings hearing what you were discussing earlier is very important in determining what's
41 important to design into programs you attend when you come to an NCARB meeting. We want
42 to make the time that you take away from your practice and your office as valuable as possible.
43 We want you to not feel like oh my gosh I just went all this way to an NCARB meeting and we
44 really didn't talk about anything but we were there for three days. We don't want you to walk
45 away feeling that way, we want you to walk away feeling really empowered and that you've
46 learned something valuable that you can bring back to this table when you sit and have your
47 board meeting. While it may seem odd that we've just kind of been sitting here believe me I've
48 been taking it all in and trying to figure out how can I learn something here and what am I going
49 to get out of this that I can it take back and how might I apply that to the next big NCARB
50 meeting. Thank you.

51

1 Armstrong: Our Board of Directors, every year we have a few changes. So, you continue to be,
2 our boards composed of 6 regional directors, the country is divided into 6 regions, you're in
3 region 6. And Greg Erny from the State of Nevada is your Regional Director on our board. And
4 then we have 6 at large officer positions as well as a public member and a member board
5 executive member. So one of Vern's colleague's sits on our board as a voting member and that
6 new representative is Kate Nobsch from the State of Virginia. She has just started on the
7 board. Our public member, Lynn Axelroth from Philadelphia is an attorney who works in the
8 building contract industry and she's finishing her last year as a public member. As I mentioned
9 a few moments ago Blake Dunn from Arkansas is our new President this year.

10
11 One of the things the board has been doing now for a while is they have been insisting, as part
12 of this era of asking why and getting back to basics, to think in what we call a blue sky mode
13 about the future and to do it at every single board meeting, to start our board meetings with this.
14 That process has generated so many exciting new ideas for the future that Blake has stood up a
15 special task force that's going to run for 3 years, maybe longer, called the licensure task force.
16 Ron Blitch our immediate past president who is high energy and very, for those of you that saw
17 him at the annual meeting, he moves at a quick pace and is usually the first one that comes up
18 with the idea. Their charge was looking in a big way about the future of licensure. One of the
19 things they're going to be looking at is would it ever be possible to create a new path separate
20 from what we currently have where you could graduate with a license and what would that
21 mean? Could you imbed within curriculum of a program somewhere the elements of internship
22 as part of the curriculum and could you break down the elements of the examination? Either
23 maybe like Medical Boards or maybe as part of the final exam process or maybe as an exit
24 exam, don't know, don't know at all, just wondering whether it could be done. People have
25 talked about it on and off, people have said, you know, this is too complicated. The way it works
26 now, and I know our process at architecture is different slightly than engineering and each
27 profession has its own approach. But we do have a number of academic institutions around the
28 country that intrigued and we may find a licensing the may want to pilot it. But it would have to
29 turn out to at the end it would still have to have the same sum elements that you're used to
30 seeing because otherwise we have a reciprocity issue. That's one of the things they're going to
31 look at. It also opens up a discussion with the academy about are you willing to design new
32 types of degrees or course work that would get you there? You can't do what you're doing now
33 and make everything else change which is sometimes what we hear from some members of the
34 academy. Everyone one has to be at the table. So we're going to have people there from the
35 other architecture organizations NAAB, AIA, AIAS and ACSA. We're going to have outsiders
36 there; critical thinkers and we're just going to have a good time, thinking big and see just how far
37 the discussion can get us. The information we are getting on how the exam is evolving and how
38 the internship program is evolving is going to influence this group as well. These 3 E's that I've
39 talked about, it used to be they were sequential. You get your degree then you get your
40 internship then you take your exam. Well most jurisdictions now allow you to start taking the
41 exam before you're done with internship. The day may come where you can start taking some
42 elements of the exam before you graduate. So the 3 E's rather than bumping up against each
43 other, as I draw a graphic, they're starting to overlap more. The concept used to be that there is
44 this stool and the cap of the stool was the exam. But more and more it seems like the exam is
45 one of the legs of the stool. Each effort, getting a degree, getting your internship, taking your
46 exam is a different way of qualifying you to become an architect but the question is does it have
47 to be so sequential, could it be concurrent? And again what would these three elements deliver
48 that would assure the public that a license is protecting the public's health, safety and welfare.
49 That's the big question that we'll always being trying to address, I guess.

50
51 But I also want to mention that we appreciate Vern's efforts and his community around the

1 country. The member board executives have become a very important and influential group
2 within NCARB. They're the constant as volunteers come on and off boards. Year in and year
3 out they see, you know, NCARB come up with an idea and they're there to say wait a minute we
4 couldn't implement that. That won't work, State government can't do that or we don't have the
5 resources or we have a better way because another profession does it differently. So they act
6 as the sounding board, as the filter, and as opinion leaders frequently. We redesigned our
7 committee structure so that more of his colleagues are on some of our most important
8 committees. We have one of his colleagues is actually chairing one of our committees for the
9 first time this year and their voice is really important to us.

10
11 So we are working a lot to be transparent. You're getting my CEO updates every month which is
12 something I started right after I came onboard. We have talking points written, you get your E-
13 News, and we are experimenting with other communications at the same time. We know that
14 you all get too much, you can't read it all. So we are trying to make it graphically interesting and
15 lots of bullet points, easily digestible. We would like to hear your feedback on what is and isn't
16 working for you, what does or doesn't make sense. A lot of good ideas we are getting as we go
17 around the country that are influencing national policy. So if you have any questions, we're glad
18 to take them.

19
20 Rearick: Asks him to talk about how the committees are structured at NCARB.

21
22 Armstrong: We had a lot of committees on the books, some of those committees, it seemed like
23 they were getting the same charges, they were duplicate charges and at some point we'd get
24 the two committees together to compare notes. That didn't seem like an efficient use of
25 people's time. So in cases where we kept seeing the overlap we said why don't we either
26 merge a committee or run them concurrently in the same location so we could be more efficient
27 with information exchange. We also still believe that the majority of our volunteers need to be
28 currently serving on member boards. But we think there are other people out there that if their
29 voices were at the table these committees might be more dynamic. In some cases someone
30 has gone off a member board because they are gubernatorial appointees, Governors change,
31 they're still vital, they have a lot background, a lot of experience but they're off their board.
32 We'd still like to keep them around. Or in other cases so much of what we do is about the new
33 generation of architect yet we don't have any recently licensed architects or interns serving on
34 the very committees that determine policy governing them. That seem like they're not getting
35 represented fairly so we're trying to populate our committees with more interns or recently
36 licensed architects. So we are trying to expand the pool and still preserve our commitment to
37 our member boards but add more diverse voices to the mix and then trying to avoid so much
38 duplication with our committees. For example this year, our fiscal year runs from July 1st to
39 June 30th. It's tempting to not meet at all until the fall and just take the summer off. Well then
40 you've missed 3 months out of the year. Then you meet in the fall and it's your first meeting so
41 you have a lot of orientation and all that kind of stuff. Then you meet again and you try to get
42 everything done that didn't get done at the first meeting and before you know it the year's over.
43 The challenge this year was to try to convene all of our committees virtually, if they couldn't
44 meet face to face, sometime during the summer months. Get that stuff over with so when you
45 meet face to face in the fall you can hit the ground running, be efficient with your time and really
46 move the ball forward so that there's no sense of oh my god another year's gone by and we
47 didn't meet often enough or we met for no good reason. That just doesn't work, I mean it makes
48 you wonder why you're volunteering, and it makes you wonder why you're paying your fees to
49 NCARB. We need to just show more value there. So that's what we're trying to do with
50 committees.

51

1 Rearick: You hit all the topics I had laid out here.
2
3 Armstrong: Well you three went to the annual meeting so yesterday it was on the agenda but
4 you said wait until today so, yes Vern.
5
6 Jones: Thinks the data sharing is a good idea and relates how the NCEES site works for
7 license and exam verifications. He mentions the problems we had with our security system
8 labeling the NCEES site a gambling site.
9
10 Hillegas: I want to look into that NCEES to see what they're doing. You don't for see any
11 blocking issues from the State with the data sharing?
12
13 Jones: No, once we convinced our IT section that it wasn't a gambling site they allowed access.
14 He adds that at the end of each URL from the posting state there was a different 4 digit number
15 and he thinks that was confusing the security system.
16
17 Hillegas: Suggests getting the two IT departments together when the time comes.
18
19 Rearick: Asks them to speak about the way the Regional Conferences will be done.
20
21 Armstrong: We have 6 regions and that's been in place for a long time. And each region has its
22 own, most of them have their own executive who supports them. Frequently they are one of
23 Vern's colleagues that do this for a little extra money or whatever. A lot of them have their own
24 rules and bylaws and rules, they elect their own officers and they in turn nominate the people
25 that will serve on our national board representing the region. And it used to be that each region
26 would have its own meeting sometime in the spring. That was 6 different meetings that the core
27 group would have to go visit. Of course if you're campaigning for national office that's just too
28 much so you have to wait until the annual meeting. A few years ago they merged, instead of
29 having 6 separate meetings they paired off and had 3 meetings. They would pair two regions
30 and they would change the pairing every year so they could interact. Then a few years later
31 they merged it again into having two meetings of either 3 regions each or the biggest regions
32 are region 6, your region and region 3 which is the southeast, sometimes it would be 2 regions
33 and 4 regions. So, in looking at the frequency of meetings and Vern's group in particular, they
34 were meeting in November every year. A lot of them felt compelled to go to their regional
35 meeting and then they would meet again at our annual meeting. And many, like Vern, have
36 more than one national organization that they want to try to attend meetings for so there was no
37 way that the member board executives could go to all these meeting or justify that with their
38 state. The architects that were involved in our committees and going to our committee summit
39 in January and then regional meeting and an annual and every other year we were meeting with
40 our member board chairs, it was just, there was a lot of meetings on the calendar. So we said
41 why don't we streamline here and we did some informal polling of Vern's colleagues and other
42 folks about what would be an acceptable adjustment to the meeting calendar? So, what we are
43 experimenting with starting this fiscal year is, Vern's group is not going to meet in November
44 anymore and they are not going to have their own meeting at our annual meeting either.
45 They're just going to meet once a year every spring as a group and all the regions are going to
46 meet at that same location following his group's meeting. So we're going to have one big
47 regional meeting. The regions will each have their own caucuses where they can meet
48 separately. We will have other sessions where we will pair up 2 or 3 regions and then we will
49 have plenary sessions where everyone can hear the same thing from the same person at the
50 same time and ask the same question all in one room. We're doing it in March and this year the
51 first one is going to be in San Antonio in March. So all 6 regions will be there, Vern's group of

1 member executives will meet the day before. That will streamline the number of meetings his
2 group has it will save on wear and tear of the officers and staff that have to go to all the regional
3 meetings. It will improve, we think, communications between the regions. We think it's a smart
4 move in terms of efficiency, of time and sharing of information. It may sound obvious to you but
5 people enjoy their regions. They have created friendships over the years, traditions, other
6 things. It's a bit of a family reunion, people look forward to it and we had to be sensitive to those
7 feelings as we modernized. I think we have avoided stepping on any mines in the mine field so
8 far. We'll see how it goes this year.

9
10 Jones: Asks them to provide enough detail in their business agendas that the travel approvers
11 can see a benefit to the State of Alaska.

12
13 Armstrong: Agrees that this is important.

14
15 Rearick: Adds that the change in the meet calendar is primarily to bring all the Regions together
16 in one place to facilitate communications among committee members that may not be in the
17 same region. It's not another annual meeting; it's all about the regions. But a side benefit is
18 that any resolutions that are going to be brought up at the annual can be discussed.

19
20 Hillegas: I'm excited about it and Mike you didn't mention that Richard is an officer.

21
22 Armstrong: Sorry, yes you've got extra clout here in Alaska. And we're thrilled to be here. I've
23 been to Alaska several time previous, Kathy, this is her first trip to Alaska. I've been here in two
24 other jobs before. I've stayed in Anchorage, I've gone halibut fishing off of Homer, and I've
25 done some flight seeing around Mount McKinley and to the Kenai Fiords. Tomorrow we're
26 going to the Portage glacier. Its nice being here, thanks for hosting us.

27
28 Chair: Thanks the guests for their outreach and sharing their ideas.

29
30 10:35am break.

31
32 10:45am on record.

33
34 Item 18 C. Licensure fee motion for increase. Don was asking for some resolution on the fees
35 that he proposed did we do that already?

36
37 Several members responded that we had completed it.

38
39 Jones: Doesn't think EIT's and LSIT's should have to pay a \$100 application fee and then \$235
40 certificate fee. He will ask for a \$100 application fee and a onetime certificate fee of \$100. He
41 asks if that sounds reasonable and the board responds, yes.

42
43 **Agenda item 19 – Special Committees.**

44
45 Licensure Implementation.

46
47 Maynard: Will bring proposed language for a regulation change to the next meeting.

48
49 Registration and Practice.

50
51 Rearick: Nothing new.

1
2 Licensure Mobility.

3
4 Rearick: Will have the info on the agreement between NCARB and Canada for next meeting.

5
6 Chair: Mentions the request from the Korean delegation to meet during the NCEES Annual in
7 San Antonio.

8
9 Jones: One more comment on that. If you do accept a gift from them make sure to declare it
10 on an ethics form.

11
12 Mining Engineers/Geologists.

13
14 No report.

15
16 Social Networking Options.

17
18 Hale: No report.

19
20 Jones: Notes that there is a person in the Commissioner's Office tasked with looking into this
21 and he will provide Dave with her contact info. He adds that NCEES recently had several
22 webinars on the social networking sites. The reason we haven't become involved to date is the
23 computer security issue. He thinks the way to go would be just use it as a bulletin board.

24
25 Kerr: Asks if NCARB has put together any guidelines.

26
27 Hillegas: We have, at the annual meeting we had our social networking people there talking
28 about ways you can use it as a tool. Maybe we can do a webinar or put together some talking
29 points on how you can utilize it. We will be partnering with some student organizations.

30
31 Twist Program.

32
33 Hale: Explains that Twist is Teaching with Spatial Technology and is an outreach program for
34 land surveyors to hopefully get high school teachers to introduce Geomatics to their students.
35 They recently had two candidates go down to Washington for the training. One of them was Bill
36 Hazelton who teach Geomatics at UAA and he will now teach the Twist program here in
37 Anchorage. The other individual is a High School teacher at West. He is excited about using
38 GPS in the classroom and getting the kids fired up about surveying.

39
40 Rearick: Asks if the board needs to do anything with this.

41
42 Hale: Doesn't think so.

43
44 Shiesl: Adds that he will soon be off the Board but he has brought up before about making High
45 School kids aware of the professions around the table. They don't have a clue what guys do.
46 They can't even define what an architect is or an engineer or a land surveyor. They don't have
47 any idea what it is and he thinks it's important that if the Board wants to grow the profession that
48 we make the kids aware of your professions. The only way to do that is to get out in the High
49 Schools and start talking about it. He thinks the Board should establish a committee to start
50 engaging the High Schools and making them aware of the professions. He has talked to school
51 counselors and they are just waiting for someone to come in.

1
2 Maynard: Adds that the engineering societies do outreach but most are not aware of it. There
3 are a lot of programs out there; the schools just need to become aware of them.
4
5 There was a short discussion about outreach to schools. Jones noted NCEES has outreach kits
6 for engineers and surveyors that can be downloaded anytime someone wants to talk to a school
7 or group and that most High Schools, at least when he was in school, had a career day for
8 things like this.
9
10 Chair suggests using social media to communicate with the schools.
11
12 Rearick noted that schools are not always receptive to outsiders coming in. He suggests
13 inviting educators to a board meeting to establish a dialog and thinks the societies or individual
14 registrant should be the ones to run the programs instead of the board.
15
16 Maynard: Doesn't think this is the mission of the Board but should be done by the societies.
17
18 Chair: Suggests maybe we could provide the tools for them such as the NCEES outreach kits.
19
20 Hale: Agrees that Twist is more of an ASPLS thing. Thinks we can remove it as a committee.
21
22 Computer based testing.
23
24 Chair: Communicated with the UAS pre engineering program about CBT.
25
26 Hale: Has talked to UAA Bill Hazelton at UAA about it.
27
28 Jones: Thinks Brian was going to talk to UAA and asks Kathleen if she was able to talk to UAF.
29
30 Schedler: Has not. She is waiting to get some information on it.
31
32 Jones: Will provide her with the info.
33
34 Enforcement Enhancement.
35
36 New committee, no report.
37
38 Standing Committees.
39
40 Investigative Advisory Committee.
41
42 Chair: Explains to the new member how this committee works. The investigator will call one or
43 two members to review a complaint to see if he should go forward with an investigation. Who
44 he calls is dependent on which profession is involved.
45
46 There was a short discussion prompted by Kerr on whether the board should be involved in
47 setting priorities for investigations and/or things for the AG. It was noted that the board cannot
48 be involved in investigations as the board has to rule on the case if it comes to that. Jones feels
49 that the Investigator is in the best position to set these priorities. Chair feels that John does a
50 good job in this area. Jones again explains how the committee works and how John sets his
51 priorities. Rearick thinks that John should have the latitude to do the prioritization. Jones adds

1 that he will not respond to an anonymous complaint. Chair adds that a lot of the calls he gets
2 involve the additional branches and someone using a title that he doesn't hold a license for.
3
4 Guidance Manual.
5
6 Urfer: Asks if she automatically acquired this committee.
7
8 Several members explained that she wasn't present when it was assigned. (Lots of laughter
9 and kidding)
10
11 Jones: Notes that he corrected the page numbers on the Guidance Manual because they were
12 out of sequence.
13
14 Kerr: Talks about the definition of land surveying and that he had dissected it and in
15 collaboration with several surveyors created a flow chart that represents the information in the
16 Statute and wants the Board to consider it for inclusion into the Guidance Manual.
17
18 Jones: Asks if someone laying out stream buffers for a logging operation needed to be licensed
19 as a professional surveyor.
20
21 Kerr: Explained that it depended on where was and if it impacted someone's ability to use their
22 land.
23
24 Hale: Especially if you're talking about boundaries, easements, setbacks that's all surveying.
25
26 There was a short discussion on construction surveying.
27
28 Jones: This gentleman disagrees with what he was told and wants the specific statutes that
29 support it. John and Dave will work on an answer.
30
31 Rearick: Suggests that since Luanne is new at this that we all take a look at the Guidance
32 Manual before the next meeting and see if there is anything that need adjustment.
33
34 Legislative Liaison.
35
36 Chair: We have already covered this.
37
38 Emeritus Status.
39
40 Jones: Reports that Richard Heieren, Bo Brownfield and Cliff Baker all have emeritus status
41 with NCEES.
42
43 Budget Committee.
44
45 No report.
46
47 Continuing Education.
48
49 Chair: Brian's not here. Anyone have anything?
50
51 Maynard: Asks if anyone has any information on once CE is adopted how it affects the number

1 of complaints. Is this doing anything besides enriching the CE providers?
2

3 Rearick: Responds that there is no research that links continuing education to greater health,
4 safety and welfare. But that's not to say that it's not important.
5

6 Kerr: Suggests that if we knew the types of complaints the Investigator is getting we might be
7 able to get the societies to provide the types of CE that is needed.
8

9 Information was provided to the new members that CE was not the Boards idea but it came
10 from a Legislative Audit recommendation that included pressure for the Board to adopt it or they
11 would ask the Legislature to.
12

13 IDP Liaison.
14

15 Rearick: Gives a reminder about the ARE blackout.
16

17 **Agenda item 20 – Board Travel.**
18

19 NCEES Annual in San Antonio, TX August 21-24.
20

21 Chair: Mentions the resolution re early testing and public testimony on candidates.
22

23 Jones: Instructs travelers to send receipts to leola.masters@alaska.gov as she is now doing all
24 TA's for the Division. He advises that those that live in the vicinity of the meeting i.e. those
25 living in the anchorage are don't have to submit a TA. They should automatically pay you for
26 lunch for two days.
27

28 It was decided that re the voting on at the meetings that those at the meeting should have a little
29 flexibility in the voting due to the additional discussions and presentations that occur at the
30 meetings.
31

32 CLARB Annual in Minneapolis, MN September 26-28.
33

34 Jones: Luanne and I will be going to that one. The next meetings will be MBA in Scottsdale AZ
35 that must be NCEES then WESTCARB in San Antonio in March and Western Zone in Lincoln
36 NE in May and NCARB in Philadelphia in June.
37

38 **Agenda Item 21 – National Meeting Reports.**
39

40 Chair: Recommends that for planning purposes we get as much notice as possible on meeting
41 dates.
42

43 Jones: Has provided Schedler with dates through 2015 and will pass to the entire Board. He
44 adds that a travel budget is included in the annual report for the upcoming FY. We need definite
45 commitments so we don't get approval and then not use it.
46

47 Chair: Notes that we don't get approval until close to meeting day and a couple months would
48 be much better for scheduling.
49

50 Rearick: Goes over his report in the packet re the NCARB Annual. He notes that all the
51 resolutions were passed and that NCARB always has several workshops that are pertinent to

1 the boards. The big one this year was the future ARE which Mike talked about. A lot of the
2 discussion at the conference was about that. One presentation was on data collected re how
3 long it takes to get a license after graduation. How long someone takes to get through IDP and
4 found that some of the myths weren't true. Most were getting through IDP in a reasonable
5 amount of time but there were some that took longer. It was also noted that when there was a
6 major change in the exam there was an influx of exam takers just before the change took effect.

7
8 **Agenda item 22 – Licensing Examiner Report.**

9
10 Jones: The report is the statistics in the Annual Report. Also in that Annual Report is the travel
11 request that I put in.

12
13 **Agenda item 23 – Board Tasks (to do list)**

14
15 Hale: UAA outreach – Continuing.
16 Social Networking – New assignment.
17 Ethics Policy – Continuing.

18
19 Hanson: UAA outreach – Continuing (Brian was excused from this meeting by the Chair.)
20 Letter to the Department re travel. – Moved to the Chair's list.
21 Letter to DEC.

22
23 Rearick: Mentions a conversation in his office about a DEC regulation.

24
25 Jones: That was concerning requiring an engineer stamp on as built drawings.

26
27 Kerr: List of questions to ask the investigator about.
28 Surveyor definition flow chart.

29
30 Koonce: Doesn't have anything.

31
32 Luanne: Guidance Manual.

33
34 Schedler: UAF outreach.
35 Exam retakes with Keith.

36
37 Walters: Exam retakes – ongoing

38
39 Maynard: SE regulation project – ongoing
40 Letter to DOA re travel policy but that has been straightened out so don't think we need
41 that.

42 Response to the Seismic Hazards Task Force.

43
44 Rearick: Electronic signature – ongoing

45
46 Shiesl: Will assist Luanne with the Guidance Manual as needed.

47
48 Chair: Respond to Chris Miller re minutes and board packet on webpage
49 Software engineer – ongoing

50
51 Jones: How many states are authorizing early testing for PE?

1 18B what are they asking re underground utilities
 2 Social Networking contact to Dave
 3 CBT info to Kathleen
 4 Send the Board Leola's contact info.
 5
 6

7 **Agenda item 24 – Read Applications into the Record.**
 8

9 **On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Shiesl and passed unanimously it was**
 10 **RESOLVED to find the following list of applicants for registration incomplete with the**
 11 **stipulation that the information in the applicant files will take precedence over the**
 12 **information in the minutes.**
 13

14 *The subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following meanings:*

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

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

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

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

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

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

22 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

23 'Arctic course' denotes a Board-approved arctic engineering course
 24

Andersen, Stephen R.	Civil	Comity	Incomplete - pending 5 months responsible charge experience; Arctic & JQ
Blain, Roy Thomas	SE	G'fthr	Incomplete - no drawings for Nelson Lagoon Small Commerce Building
Bojko, Veronica L.	Surveyor	Exam	Incomplete - pending 9 months responsible charge experience; & clarification from Stan Ponsness detailing responsible charge work performed
Brockamp, Matthew Robert	Surveyor	Comity	Incomplete - pending 20 credit hours of survey course work and 1 letter of reference

Dammeyer, Michael D.	Petroleum	Exam	Incomplete - pending 10 months experience - PE exam; & JQ
Davenport, Emily J.	Surveyor	Exam	Incomplete - pending minimum of 2 years of board approved land surveying coursework. Must be survey classes.
Diedrich, Timothy J.	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - pending 12 months experience; PE exam; & JQ
Freas, George Craig	SE	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending 2 project plans and calculations

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

Abe, Ryota	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending FE & PE Exam; & JQ
Abou Eid, Mahear	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Alabanzas, Athea Myles	Mechanical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Anderson, Christopher R.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE & JQ
Anderson, Nikolas Benjamin	NA/ME	Comity	Approved - pending FE; & JQ
Apodaca, III, Victor J.	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Badarch, Tumen	Mining	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Barrett, Amy	Civil	Comity	Approved
Beaman, Derek M.	SE	Comity	Approved
Beck, Paul C.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Bell, Graham E.C.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Bills, Robert Paul	SE	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE & PE; current license &

			Transcripts
Bivens, Christopher M.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts; Arctic & JQ
Blanchard, Fred A.	Fire Pro	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Boldrick, Zachary B.	Mechanical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; Arctic & JQ
Bowen, Patricia	Mechanical	Exam	Approved
Brady, Karen Ann	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Branlund, Clinton Scott	SE	Comity	Approved
Bridgman, Eric Wayne	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; Arctic & JQ
Brown- Farrell, William J.	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Brown, William Robert	Control Systems	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Burrell, Walter Todd	Civil	Comity	Approved
Cavallo, Christopher	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Cheasebro, Philip	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Claassen, Brandon	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Clark, Keith R.	Mining	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Colandrea, Aldo Fernando	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Conlon, Royce Lynn	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Dawag, Marion E.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Dexter, Justin T.	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; Arctic & JQ
Dihle, Denise M.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Dittman, Gavin C.	Petroleum	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Elzafraney, Mohamed	SE	Comity	Approved

Erdbrink, Lynda M.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending FE; Arctic & JQ
Ervice, Anne Marie	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Evans, David Allen	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Fay, Colin P.	Mechanical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Fay, Danielle Ida	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Fedorova, Olga	Mechanical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Fleming, Ryan P.	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Fogle, Brad D.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Foran, Gary A.	Mechanical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Gibson, Thomas	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE
Green, Jeffrey Douglas	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Gress, George Sterling	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Grueneis, Sherry E.	Architect	Comity	Approved
Haapala, Matthew G.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Hall, James E.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Hanneman, Keith Leroy	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Hardy, David	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending JQ
Harper, Jennifer K.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Hayward, Chad Tyler	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending verification of PE & FE exams; transcripts; & Arctic
Horazdovsky, Jacob E.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Huck, Andrew J.	Petroleum	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; Arctic & JQ
Hunjan, Mani	Electrical	Comity	Approved

Jackson, Brittany Ann	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending A.R.E.; Arctic & JQ
Jensen, Mike T.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE; & JQ
Johansen, Gilbert Eric	SE	Comity	Approved
Johnson, Lawrence R.	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts; Arctic & JQ
Jones, Marc W.	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Kobylinski, Mark J.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; Arctic & JQ
Koruna, Robert John	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Kranich, Robert Wm.	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Kreitel, Cody James	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending verification of FE; PE exam
Lausman, Rick L.	Chemical	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts; Arctic & JQ
Lazzari, James R.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Lewis, Robert R.	Mechanical	Exam	Approved - pending JQ
Looney, Daniel J.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE; transcripts; & JQ
Lowell, David H.	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Majoros, Matthew I.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Marseille, Thomas J.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Martin, Brian M.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts; Arctic & JQ
Martin, Mark	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Matson, David E.	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Maulin, John	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic

Maynard, Colin	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Mettler, Matthew James	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Michels, Alan D.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Money, Alan E.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Moore, Taylor Maxwell	PS	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS exams
Moothart, Nicholas Andrew	PS	Exam	Approved - pending PS exam
Mooheart, Nicholas	PS	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS
Morrison, Paul Brian	Chemical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Moughamian, Matthew S.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Nord, Kimberly	Civil	Exam	Approved - Pending PE exam; & JQ
Oakley, Brian T.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending FE & PE exams
Paley, Norman	FE Waiver		Approved
Paul, Garrett Robert	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending transcripts; & JQ
Piehl, Jeffrey Allen	Electrical	Comity	Approved
Pinske, Michael L.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Rathbun, Aimee Annette	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Reilly, Evan	Petroleum	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Rein, David Charles	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending verification of mechanical work experience
Risse, Kenneth Allen	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Roberts, Lance	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & Arctic
Robertson, Neil Andrew	Environmental	Comity	Approved - pending NCEES FE & PE exams; transcripts; Arctic & JQ

Rogness, Juleen J.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Rogness, Paul D.	SE	Comity	Approved
Russell, Steven E.	Chemical	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Sams, Mark Douglas	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Schollenberg, Jason L.	PS	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS exams
Sherrill, Aharon Avery	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Sherrod, Beau L.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Simon, Douglas P.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic; & JQ
Smith, Corey M.	SE	Comity	Approved
Stanaszek, Julie R.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending FE; & JQ
Styskel, Edward Larsen	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Syed, Kamran H.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending FE exam; & Arctic
Titus, Dennis M.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Troxwell, David D.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Tubbs, Jeffrey S.	Fire Pro	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Vasquez, Paul III	PS	Exam	Approved - pending PS exam
Venechuk, Alec Mikhail	Mining	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; Arctic & JQ
Walker, Kasi B.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Wasserman, Robert J.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Wilmot, Brett A.	PS	Exam	Approved - pending PS Exam
Wilson, Elliot Cook	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; transcripts; Arctic & JQ
Xia, Chuan Tom	SE	Comity	Approved

Xu, Qi	Chemical	Exam	Approved - pending verification of 24 months continued employment;
Yankee, Nicholas Wm.	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending Arctic
Zellmer, Joshua A.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
FE Exams			Approved
Alatalo, Travis	FE		
Bool, Justin	FE		
Boyle, Patrick	FE		
Broek, Dustin	FE		
Brooks, Raymond	FE		
Cannon, Edmund Dunne	FE		
Cannon, Justin	FE		
Chelimo, Micah	FE		
Clifton, Phillip	FE		
Collier, III, James	FE		
Cox, Nathaniel	FE		
Cumlat, Judy Anne	FE		
Curran, Justin	FE		
Curran, Urvashi	FE		
Dance, Danielle	FE		
Dorman, Ian	FE		
Elkins, Forrest	FE		
Evans, Mark	FE		

Fefelov, Michael	FE		
Fishburn, Tol	FE		
Garcia, Zachary	FE		
George, Luke	FE		
Gray, Martin	FE		
Guenther, Jim M.	FE		
Hansen, Shawn	FE		
Henry, Curtis James	FE		
Hess, Joseph	FE		
Hinzman, Austin	FE		
Hopkins, Katie	FE		
Horazdovsky, Joseph	FE		
Li, Zhiyu	FE		
Liu, Qi	FE		
Jones, Jr, Sammie Lee	FE		
Kruse, Aaron	FE		
Lewallen, Rebecca	FE		
Miao, Yan	FE		
McClure, Scott	FE		
Mayo, Coty	FE		
Norris, Halvor	FE		
Nuqul, Sami	FE		
Oliver, Nathan	FE		
Peters, James	FE		

Polya, Buchanan	FE		
Raese, John	FE		
Raiha, Andrew	FE		
Rife, Sarah	FE		
Salazar, Zaqueo	FE		
Sam, Zachary	FE		
Sauls, Darin	FE		
Sawyer, Quinn	FE		
Siemoniet, Steven	FE		
Silberer, Frank	FE		
Smith, Elliot	FE		
Stadnicky, Nicholas	FE		
Stevens, Michael	FE		
Swanson, Andrew	FE		
Swanson, Connor	FE		
Vermeulen, Brendan	FE		
Wardrope, Cory	FE		
White, Benjamin	FE		
Williams-Cudo, Ryan	FE		
FS Exams			Approved (<i>likely</i>)
Bergin, Bryant	FS		
Guffey, Jon	FS		Approved
Lopez, Ricardo	FS		
McCormack, Patrick	FS		

Roder, Jonathon	FS		
Varney, Joshua Wm.	FS		Approved

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

Agenda item 24 – Calendar of Events.

- November 14-15, 2013, Anchorage
- January 30-31, 2014, Juneau
- May 1-2, 2014, Fairbanks
- August 7-8, 2014, Anchorage
- November 13-14, 2014, Anchorage

Agenda item 25 – Board Member Comments.

- Rearick: Thanks the guests for their presentation and welcomes the new Board member.
- Shies: Welcome to Luanne and please start looking for my replacement.
- Maynard: Welcomes the new Board Members and thanks everyone for the direction on the structural issue.
- Walters: Welcomes Luanne and it's always a pleasure working with a very special special group.
- Curry: This is a great experience. You guys are great.
- Chair: Thanks her for her assistance with the meeting.
- Schedler: Appreciates the well run agenda, we got a lot done, good conversations and welcome to the new Board Member.
- Urfer: Appreciates all the help from the Board.
- Koonce: Welcome Luanne, this is my second meeting. Thanks Kathy and Mike for sharing what the know.
- Kerr: Ditto on all the comments, welcome Luanne and it's interesting to learn about NCARB.
- Hale: I learned stuff as usual and it nice working with such professionals.
- Jones: I might as well join everybody, welcome Luanne, it was a good meeting, we got some things accomplished. Thank you to our guests, come and join us anytime.
- Chair: Thank you for all your comments and support. I've survived my first meeting and glad to meet all the new members and our guests, I just really thank you for the outreach. I think it's really wonderful and hopefully we'll get to see more of that. It's been a good meeting and always a good discussion I think we are doing well in serving our mission and serving the public.
- Maynard: You should suggest this to Jerry Carter.

1 Chair: Yes, you know that's the thought that goes through my mind to see some more outreach
2 from more organizations like that. You know it's hard for the boards sometimes to travel and the
3 intimacy that's kind of associated with this kind of meeting is very valuable I think. I think you
4 guys were right on the mark.

5
6 12:28pm meeting adjourned.

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

Eric Eriksen, PE, Chair
Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers and Land Surveyors

Date: _____