

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 **January 30-31, 2014**

10
11 By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, the
12 Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors held a meeting January 30-
13 31, 2014 in the State Office Building 333 Willoughby Avenue 9th floor Conference Room B.

14
15 **Thursday January 30, 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.

20
21 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board:

- 22
23
 - Eric Eriksen, Electrical Engineer, Chair
 - 24 • Richard Rearick, Architect, Vice-Chair
 - 25 • Don Shiesl, Public Member, Secretary
 - 26 • Kathleen Schedler, Mechanical Engineer
 - 27 • Brian Hanson, Civil Engineer
 - 28 • Jeffrey Koonce, Architect
 - 29 • David Hale, Land Surveyor,
 - 30 • Colin Maynard, Civil Engineer
 - 31 • Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect
 - 32 • Keith Walters, Mining Engineer
 - 33 • John Kerr, Land Surveyor

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

- 36
37
 - Sara Chambers, Operations Manager
 - 38 • Vernon Jones, Executive Administrator.
 - 39 • Alicia Kelly, Licensing Examiner.
 - 40 • John Savage, Investigator. (via telephone)

41
42
43 **Agenda item 2 – Review/Amend Agenda**

44
45 Jones: passed out several items that were received after the Board packets and agenda were
46 mailed. Agenda put off while Jones prints a revised agenda.

47
48 **Agenda item 3 – Ethics reporting**

1 Maynard: Reports that he is on the NCEES Education Committee and they pay his way to the
2 meetings.

3
4 Rearick: Reports that he is on the WestCarb Board and they pay his way to the meetings.

5
6 Hanson: Report that he is on the NCEES UPLG Committee and they pay his way to those
7 meetings.

8
9 Hale: Reports he is the NSPS Governor now and ASPLS will pay his way.

10
11 **Agenda item 4 - Review and approve the Minutes of the August 2012 meeting.**

12
13 Maynard: Has some grammatical changes he will pass to Vern.

14
15 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it**
16 **was RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the November 2013 meeting as amended.**

17
18 There was a short discussion on when Board elections should be done. Board policy is that
19 they be held the first meeting of each year.

20
21 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Shiesl and passed unanimously it was**
22 **RESOLVED to approve the agenda as amended.**

23
24 Chair: We have 15 minutes so let's move to HB167.

25
26 **Agenda item 7 – Regulation updates.**

- 27
28 A) HB 167
29 a. AS 08.48.221 Seals
30 b. AS 08.48.281 Prohibitive Practice
31 c. AS 08.58.341 Definitions
32 d. AS 08.48.331 Exemptions
33 e. AS 08.48.091 Written Examinations

34
35 Chair: Asks if anyone has any discussion on HB 167.

36
37 Rearick: Asks if this is the one we had correspondence on regarding a change. He felt that that
38 wasn't a necessary change. It's just limiting the exceptions.

39
40 Chair: Adds that Harley and Colin worked on this in response to a complaint.

41
42 Maynard: Adds that it was a complaint by Mike Tauriainen who didn't like that language and
43 asked that it be changed. Maynard had heard of re-vegetation projects on the Kenai that had
44 unintended consequences downstream so this would require a licensed civil engineer or
45 landscape architect on things that effect the HSW of the public.

46
47 Chair: the way the language was it left it a little bit to the discretion of the Board which is our
48 prevue anyway.

49
50 Rearick: Thinks the item in question is under tab 7-a-1, page 4, line 15 thru 17. It says a
51 person while involved in re-vegetation, restoration, reclamation, rehabilitation, or erosion control

1 for disturbed land and we're adding that the board determines does not affect the public health,
2 safety or welfare. I think that was just added as a statement to contain the exception and the
3 next, 18 through 20 deals with a similar item. I don't think that adds any additional restrictions on
4 folks.
5
6 Chair: Thinks the concern was outreach.
7
8 Maynard: Thinks the language is to make it clear that if you're a landscaper or gardener you can
9 do whatever you want as long as it doesn't affect health, safety and public welfare and if you're
10 doing something that major then you have to have someone that is licensed of course before if
11 you're doing re-vegetation you can do whatever you want and I'm not sure that's what we want.
12
13 Chair: So from this discussion we are in favor of leaving it as stands?
14
15 Maynard: Advises that APDC's LLC is going to be pushing when we come back in two weeks.
16 It has already passed the House and if they change the language it will have to back to the
17 House.
18
19 Chair: Any other action or follow-through?
20
21 Maynard: Advises there will be a teleconference with Dale Nelson.
22
23 Kerr: Asks what the difference is between the original and the change.
24
25 Maynard: They deleted the change from 3 plex to 4 plex.
26
27 Rearick: Adds that at this point in time we don't have the power to change the language, the
28 legislature does.
29
30 Maynard: Advises that we would have to go to the sponsor.
31
32 Chair: Asks again if there is any follow-through.
33
34 Maynard: When there is a hearing we should have some available to testify.
35
36 There was a short discussion on how, when and who would be available to testify.
37
38 Chair: Moving on to HB187. He asks if anyone is aware of any updates. We don't have any
39 action it's mostly just procedural.
40
41 Hanson: Adds that Don spoke at the Anchorage ASCE meeting.
42
43 Chair: Moving on to item 7b. Regulation project, do we have time for that?
44
45 Jones: We've got about 3 minutes.
46
47 Chair: Regulation 7b1 engineering education and work experience.
48
49 Maynard: That's the one that is currently out for comment.
50
51 Jones: No, that's yours.

1
2 Maynard: These are the changes for the structural engineer regulation.
3

4 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Rearick and passed unanimously it**
5 **was RESOLVED to put the structural engineering regulation out for public comment.**
6

7 **Chapter 36. State Board of Registration for Architects,**
8 **Engineers and Land Surveyors.**
9

10 (Words in **boldface and underlined** indicate language being added; words [CAPITALIZED
11 AND BRACKETED] indicate language being deleted. Complete new sections are not
12 underlined.)
13

14 The introductory language of 12 AAC 36.063(a) is amended to read:

15 (a) To be eligible for a professional engineering examination **other than the structural**
16 **engineering examination**, an applicant must

17 . . .

18
19 12 AAC 36.063 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

20 (k) To be eligible for structural engineering examination, an applicant must
21 (1) be currently licensed as a professional engineer in this state; and
22 (2) have at least two years of progressive structural experience, in addition to the
23 eight years of education and work experience equivalent to the requirements set out in the
24 applicable table of education and work experience requirements for a professional engineering
25 examination in this section. (Eff. 9/30/78, Register 67; am 6/29/84, Register 90; am 8/13/87,
26 Register 103; am 6/3/89, Register 110; am 3/16/96, Register 137; am 7/26/97, Register 143; am
27 8/26/98, Register 147; am 11/20/99, Register 152; am 3/8/2001, Register 157; am 6/13/2003,
28 Register 166; am 7/22/2004, Register 171; am 9/11/2004, Register 171; am 10/29/2009,
29 Registered 192; am ___/___/___, Register ___)

30 **Authority:** AS 08.48.101 AS 08.48.171 AS 08.48.181

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

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

12 AAC 36.108. Application for registration as a structural engineer. (a) A person who holds a current certificate of registration as an engineer in the state on / / (*fill in effective date of regulation*) may apply under this section for a certificate of registration as a structural engineer by meeting the requirements of this section.

(b) An application for registration as a structural engineer under this section must be submitted on or before December 31, 2015.

(c) An applicant for structural engineering registration under this section must submit

(1) a typewritten application on a form prescribed by the board, including the references required under AS 08.48.201;

(2) the application and registration fees established in 12 AAC 02.110;

(3) verification that the applicant has, within the 120 months immediately before the date of the application, at least 24 months of responsible charge experience in structural engineering;

(4) the plans or other documents required under (e) of this section; and

(5) the letters of reference required under (d) and (e) of this section.

(d) An applicant applying for structural engineering registration under this section must provide two letters of reference verifying the applicant's responsible charge experience required under (c)(3) of this section. The letters of reference must meet the requirements of (f) and (g) of this section.

(e) An applicant applying for structural engineering registration under this section must

1 provide complete structural plans or other documents of at least two completed significant
2 structures, as defined in 12 AAC 36.990, demonstrating the engineering abilities of the applicant
3 in structural engineering. The plans or other documents must be signed, sealed, and dated, and
4 must include necessary calculations and other applicable supporting documents. The plans or
5 other documents must have been dated within the 120 months immediately before the date of
6 application for structural engineering registration under this section. The plans or other
7 documents submitted under this subsection must be on a disk or thumb drive accompanied by a
8 letter of reference for each project attesting to the applicant's competence on the project. The
9 letters of reference must meet the requirements of (f) and (g) of this section.

10 (f) Except as provided in (g) of this section, the letters of reference required under (d)
11 and (e) of this section must be signed and sealed by an engineer who was registered as a
12 professional engineer in a state, territory, or possession of the United States, the District of
13 Columbia, or a foreign country at the time of the responsible charge experience or when the
14 plans or other documents were signed and sealed, and either

15 (1) was registered as a structural engineer; or

16 (2) if the licensing jurisdiction did not register structural engineers during the
17 period of the experience or when the plans or other documents were signed and sealed, designed
18 significant structures under another professional engineering license.

19 (g) If an engineer provides a reference letter under (d) or (e) of this section without a
20 seal, the applicant must provide a statement from the engineer certifying that the engineer held a
21 current registration as an engineer during the period of experience or when the plans or other
22 documents were signed and sealed, and the engineer's state of registration, registration number,
23 and branch of engineering.

1 (h) If requested by the board, the applicant must be available for an interview with the
2 board.

3 (i) The board may consult subject matter experts in the branch of engineering for which
4 the applicant seeks registration to assist the board in evaluating the application.

5 (j) Nothing in this section prevents a registrant from applying under this chapter for a
6 certificate of registration by examination or comity in structural engineering.

7 (k) To remain current, an additional certificate of registration issued under this section
8 must be renewed as provided in AS 08.48.231. (Eff. ___/___/___, Register ___)

9 **Authority:** AS 08.48.101 AS 08.48.201 AS 08.48.231

10

11 12 AAC 36.180(b) is amended to read:

12 . . .

13 [SE – STRUCTURAL ENGINEER]

14

15 12 AAC 36.180 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

16 (e) The seal authorized for use by structural engineers is of the following design or a
17 substantially similar electronic or digital representation of the design:

18



1

2

3 The seal must reflect the branch identification authorized by the board: SE. This identification is
4 to be placed below the registrant's name and preceding the registrant's number on the seal. (Eff.
5 5/23/74, Register 50; am 9/30/78, Register 67; am 10/20/90, Register 116; am 11/13/99, Register
6 152; am 1/20/2002, Register 161; am 3/11/2012, Register 201; am ___/___/___, Register ___)

7 **Authority:** AS 08.48.101 AS 08.48.221

8 12 AAC 36.185 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

9 (g) Drawings or reports regarding the structural systems of a significant structure, as
10 defined in 12 AAC 36.990, must be sealed by a registered structural engineer. (Eff. 5/30/82,
11 Register 82; am 8/29/87, Register 103; am 11/13/99, Register 152; am 6/13/2003, Register 166;
12 am 6/11/2005, Register 174; am 7/13/2011, Register 199; am ___/___/___, Register ___)

13 **Authority:** AS 08.48.101 AS 08.48.111 AS 08.48.221

14

15 12 AAC 36.990(a) is amended by adding a new paragraph to read:

16 (43) "significant structure" means:

17 (A) hazardous facilities, defined as: structure housing, supporting, or
18 containing sufficient quantities of explosive substances to be of danger to the safety of

1 the public if released;

2 (B) special occupancy structures, defined as:

3 (i) building and other structures whose primary occupancy is
4 public assembly with an occupant load greater than 300;

5 (ii) buildings and other structures containing elementary school,
6 secondary school, or day care facility with an occupant load greater than 250;

7 (iii) buildings and other structures containing adult education
8 facilities, such as colleges and universities, with an occupant load greater than
9 500;

10 (iv) medical or assisted living facilities with 50 or more resident,
11 incapacitated patients or clients;

12 (v) jails and detention facilities; and

13 (vi) all buildings or structures with an occupant load greater than
14 5,000;

15 (C) essential facilities that have a ground area of more than four thousand
16 square feet and are more than twenty feet in mean roof height above average ground
17 level; essential facilities are defined as:

18 (i) hospitals and other medical facilities having surgery and
19 emergency treatment areas;

20 (ii) fire and police stations;

21 (iii) tanks or other structures containing, housing, or supporting
22 water or fire suppression material or equipment required for the protection of
23 essential or hazardous facilities or special occupancy structures;

- 1 (iv) emergency vehicle shelters and garages;
- 2 (v) structures and equipment in emergency preparedness centers;
- 3 (vi) standby power-generating equipment for essential facilities;
- 4 (vii) structures and equipment in government communication
- 5 centers and other facilities requiring emergency response;
- 6 (viii) aviation control towers, air traffic control centers, and
- 7 emergency aircraft hangars; and
- 8 (ix) buildings and other structures having critical national defense
- 9 functions;
- 10 (D) structures exceeding one hundred feet in height above average ground
- 11 level;
- 12 (E) buildings that are customarily occupied by human beings and are four
- 13 stories or 45 feet or more above average ground level;
- 14 (F) bridges having a total span of more than two hundred feet and piers
- 15 having a surface area greater than ten thousand square feet; and
- 16 (G) off-shore structures exceeding fifty feet in height above the average
- 17 sea bed or ground level.

18 (Eff. 5/23/74, Register 50; am 9/30/78, Register 67; am 6/29/84, Register 90; am 8/29/87,
19 Register 103; am 10/20/90, Register 116; am 3/16/96, Register 137; am 7/26/97, Register 143;
20 am 8/26/98, Register 147; am 11/13/99, Register 152; am 3/9/2001, Register 157; am 1/26/2012,
21 Register 201; am 3/11/2012, Register 201; am ___/___/___, Register ___)

22 **Authority:** AS 08.48.101 AS 08.48.181 AS 08.48.331
23 AS 08.48.171 AS 08.48.191

1
2 Hanson: Asks why we are going to grandfather again.
3
4 Maynard: Explains that this is a change from the original structural license where we told them
5 they could continue to do what they were doing and now we are changing what they can do so
6 we are giving another opportunity for them to be grandfathered as a structural.
7
8 Hanson: This is just for people taking the examination right?
9

10 Maynard: From here on out it will be the 16 hour exam.

11
12 Hanson: That's the way it is now. As of January one if you didn't get grandfathered as a
13 structural you have to take the exam.
14

15 Jones: Explains that not all the people in the structural field opted to get the structural license
16 because they didn't have to. We told them they could continue to practice as they had been.
17 Now we are changing the rules so we need to give them another chance to get their structural
18 license and I would like to add a comment to that. Do not ever have another deadline during a
19 renewal period. (laughter)
20

21 Maynard: Ok, we will just give them until December of this year.
22

23 **Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report**

24 **Call made to John Savage for the investigative report.**

25
26
27 Chair: Welcomes Savage to the meeting and gives him the floor for his report.
28

29 Savage: As you can see we've been staying busy and quite a few of these numbers are from
30 the new disciplines you adopted. We have a lot more yes block applications which we've got to
31 open an investigation on and do some background on. The AELS spot is just now getting to
32 where I'm going to be without my other boards. They've started implementing some changes
33 where I can start shuffling my other boards and hopefully the case that go along with them to
34 another investigator. Unfortunately, and I don't know how much effect it's going to have, but our
35 Chief Investigator has abruptly resigned. He was a big push for the AELS Board and what you
36 guys stand for which a lot of you have seen over the years, the support he's given us. He went
37 over to become the Chief Investigator for Medicare Fraud. I'm not quite sure what the future
38 holds for us, you know, if this is going to change the manpower scheme of things but luckily we
39 got that issue put into law prior to any of this happening. We'll see where it goes and how it
40 affects us. As far as I see it, it's going to be business as usual until they get a replacement.
41

42 Chair: John if you see him in passing would you thank him for his support for the Board?
43

44 Savage: I absolutely will and he appreciated the support you gave him as well. He was a salt
45 of the earth, top notch type individual and is sickens all of us to see him go. I'm sure it will turn
46 out great for him and hopefully we will get a good man or woman in here and move forward.
47 The other thing I would like to thank the Board for is that representatives of the Board talked to
48 the Director concerning AG issues. Hopefully that turns itself around and as we spoke about
49 before we have some other avenues we can go, if that doesn't change some other areas over at

1 the Dept. of Law that may be able to pick up some of our cases that are over there and the ones
2 that we want to send over there. So, hopefully that can straighten itself out too. A few small
3 things like that if we got the straightened out we'd be flying pretty straight.

4
5 Chair: Asks if the Director spoke with him after that meeting.

6
7 Savage: No he hasn't but with all that is going on right now he's just a little bit overwhelmed
8 and trying to put some patches on or trying to fill the void we've got there. I'm sure he will. I've
9 got mixed feelings, I don't know if there's anything concerning the support we get or don't get,
10 it's like we said before. Even when they had the manpower and they had the time. It's so
11 intimidating for them to look at a case like this when we're in this money crunch now like we
12 have been for the last several years where we are not hiring expert witnesses and this, that and
13 the other for them to be spoke to, it's all common knowledge with you guys speaking to each
14 other and using the terms and that. These lawyers that are even thinking of bringing something
15 to a hearing, it's all Greek to them and it scares the daylights out of them. So that's something
16 we're going to have to work on too, is start ramping up the expert witnesses again and start
17 kicking free with some money because even myself I couldn't walk into a court trying to use
18 terminologies you know what would happen there. Those are the things we have to be realistic
19 about too. It's not going to be free to do this stuff, it's going to take some expenditures.

20
21 Chair: Comments that the Director expressed open support for the Board and kind of
22 generalized the resource issue. He acknowledged your outstanding support and dedication and
23 valued that greatly and there were some ideas he offered that he was going to follow-up with
24 you on an idea he had. So you should be looking to hear from him at some point.

25
26 Savage: Ok, good. I'm glad to hear that. Just the fact that he's giving the Board and our issues
27 some thought, that's certainly positive.

28
29 Chair: Expands on the conversation with the Director and adds that the AG's office has a large
30 number of cases and the need to communicate to him if we thing the prioritization isn't what it
31 should be. It really comes down to resources.

32
33 Savage: I hear you. Once we get it figured out it'll help from here on out, I don't know how
34 successful, and please don't take this wrong, but with the age of some of the ones that have
35 been over there I don't know how successful we would be walking into a hearing or Superior
36 Court this far after the fact. So we're going to have to look at that too before we spend crazy
37 money on something only to be told shouldn't this have been done 4 years ago or whatever. It's
38 certainly something we can look at to see if we want to revisit that.

39
40 Chair: He did also see the value in the consent agreements that you do and the work to
41 achieve those. That's a good tool that we will probably have to continue using.

42
43 Rearick: Recalls a case a few years ago where an ex judge sat as hearing officer and asks if
44 there is a mechanism to put a case forward that isn't a full blown litigation.

45
46 Savage: Yes and no. Certain things have to happen for it to go to a hearing. They don't have
47 anything at all to do with that tool. That's what leads us to a hearing, we offer a consent
48 agreement and they say no I did nothing wrong then it goes to a hearing. Once it gets to a
49 hearing then it's a battle of wills, if they have some high speed low drag lawyer saying X, Y, Z
50 and impressing the hearing officer and we're in there not impressing him he's going to be saying
51 hey you need to sharpen you pencil a little bit and tone this consent agreement down so to

1 speak and that's usually what happens. It becomes a bartering system.
2
3 Chair: Asks if maybe Richard's question was if this board can have some review if something is
4 brought to us and have some item issued for some disciplinary action whatever it may be and
5 then its.....
6
7 Savage: Yes and we've had some of those too since you've been there Richard and there
8 should have been some more frequently but with the case load being what it was with these
9 other boards there just wasn't the time or manpower for it. But you recall those are typically the
10 consent agreements and such and there's some bartering that goes on at that level. Then it
11 goes to the Board and then it's up to the Board to decide ok we'll accept this consent agreement
12 or you can pen and ink it right there and tweak it a little bit then it goes back to the respondent
13 and the respondent says yea or nay and then you guys adopt it effective on this date. Now
14 where the monkey wrench comes in is if you don't adopt it. That's something I always, you
15 know, we should get this much or that much, you've got to think of the monies beyond there,
16 what we're going to spend if in fact we don't accept it. Not saying we should have people hold
17 us hostage but we should consider that and take a little bit less in fines because if we go
18 forward it's going to cost us another \$50k. Does that make sense?
19
20 Rearick: Yes! It sounds like our options are the consent agreement or full blown litigation but
21 within this consent agreement process there is the ability to do some negotiation, if you will.
22 And even for the Board to change what's been put in front of us do we end up having to accept
23 it as written?
24
25 Savage: No and we've had ones that either by I just had a brain freeze and didn't think to put in
26 or wasn't aware of this, that or the other but you guys as the collective entity get together and
27 say well what about this, we'll take a little off her and add a little here, you know add a little
28 education and a little less fine or whatever the case might be. And then you just pencil it in
29 there and that's what's adopted. You know it's not pretty but it's worked fine in the past.
30 They've lined through stuff and then added in a little bit, correct me if I'm wrong Vern but we've
31 never had a problem with that. One of the things with the help of investigator Winton that we've
32 adopted and there are some cases in the dugout right now that are prime for this is that civil fine
33 issue. It's a short and sweet little deal. They agree to the civil fine, it goes to you guys
34 collectively as a board you yes we'll accept it or no, we won't and now we've got a record of this
35 guy, he's been educated a little and next time we have a track record that, you know we tried a
36 little bit smaller enforcement, it didn't work evidently because since then we've had XYZ, now
37 this is where're at and if we do end up in Superior Court for a hearing, it's not like we're the big
38 bad wolf. We took baby steps first, find him a little, you know a small reprimand, move on and
39 evidently it didn't get his attention and so forth. That's another tool, that I'm excited that once
40 we get this new investigator trained on these other boards and moving along on his own then I
41 can get back into those. Because I truly think that a lot of those are initially going to be very
42 busy, Richard, but I think that once the word gets out there, you guys are out there with these
43 disciplines out there in the field you know how people talk. You know, you hear about this guy
44 he got this, you hear about this guy, in other states people don't dare pull what they pull here.
45 It's all about getting the word out there, educating people, stinging them a little bit and moving
46 on and people start hearing that and they are going to act accordingly.
47
48 Kerr: When you talked about the AG's office you said there are limited resources and priority
49 problems. Does this mean that we get none of their time or how do we.....
50
51 Savage: You know I think they split up their time however. I mean that's been an issue too that

1 myself and Vern have brought in front of the Director. It used to be that I could call over there to
2 get an opinion when we have an issue in the field or whatever and it was a long time if I got it
3 back the next day, now its months and months and months. Before we get a legal opinion
4 whatever building we are talking about will be built. I don't know what to change because they
5 don't have any more or less attorneys than they had before but I'll go back to what I originally
6 said, one, medical, dental, things like that are going to get priority over us. Two the fear of this
7 Board and the unknown, they're going to be running from it and they're going to take whatever
8 we send over there and bury it and the evidence is in the two that we've got over there right
9 now. And the other ones that aren't over there, we have several more, that's only because we
10 handled them in different ways you know as opposed and no one can tell me if we're still getting
11 dinged on, you know, I put in 20 hours last month reviewing that case and it's charged to our
12 board. No one can tell me whether we're getting charged for that or not. I'd be hard pressed to
13 believe that we are not.

14
15 Chair: Assures the Board that John is describing this pretty well and cites the example Don
16 gave us of the medical board where people were being injured and hurt and that was identified
17 through the AG's office as being a higher priority than us. That's kind of the way it goes and it
18 sounds like there's a lot of those examples and they continue to come in and continue to be
19 prioritized higher so if there is something on that scale of health and safety then we should
20 communicate that to them and make them more aware if they aren't taking action.

21
22 Kerr: Thinks it's valid to prioritize that and I'm concerned that the regulations are unenforceable.

23
24 Hanson: When John and I meet we're doing everything we can just to get a letter to folks if
25 that's what we can do to warn them and close out the case depending on what it is.

26
27 Kerr: The best thing we can do to not impact John effectiveness is to never discuss this again
28 so it isn't in the minutes. (Laughter) We don't need this in the public record that it's
29 unenforceable.

30
31 Chair: Advises that Don was going to discuss with Sara and John about improving
32 communication and where time is being spent so we could have an idea of what if anything is
33 being done on some of these things and if nothing is being done on something that we think is a
34 high priority then we can communicate that. That was a good suggestion I thought and was
35 some improvement. Maybe there's some way, you know we fought to have an investigator
36 maybe there's some value in trying to prioritize something with the AG's office.

37
38 Savage: One thing I thought about and maybe you guys can talk about this at another time as a
39 board. Some of our ex-board members that would like to help out, if we got those guys on the
40 books as expert witnesses where the AG's office could pick up the phone and say on Tuesday
41 afternoon I'm thinking of opening this case up and I have some questions, would you mind
42 spending an hour with me. You know what I'm saying?

43
44 Maynard: Part of the problem is lack of resources because the legislature only funds a certain
45 amount because they're trying to cut down on the oil money, but this isn't oil money. He has a
46 friend on another board and they are having the same problem. If we could get all the boards to
47 write the legislature and say we need more money to enforce these laws that you've written and
48 if we don't enforce them then there's no point in having them. Get rid of all these licensing
49 boards and just let everybody do whatever they want because that's basically what's happening.
50 Not totally but if there's no repercussions then they are going to do what they want.

51

1 Savage: Right and I think you hit it right on the head Colin. You talk a lot of these other states
2 and other jurisdictions and the number of assets working toward some of the outcomes they get,
3 it's astronomical compared to what we have here in Alaska.
4

5 Kerr: Do we have any idea, you know we talk about the astronomical costs, does anybody have
6 any idea of the kind of money we are talking about to prosecute a case? It is \$100K, \$500K?
7

8 Savage: We've had some in our past that were upwards of a \$100K.
9

10 Chair: And that information has more recently, I believe, been more readily available to
11 administration and the discussion was John and Sara may be part of that process.
12

13 Savage: You know that's another thing too and I don't know if this is something that over the
14 years has been talked about. A lot of these states, when I'm doing these yes blocks about
15 action taken in another jurisdiction other than Alaska. A lot of them have, you know they'll have
16 a fine at this and then they have investigative costs \$36K you know that's for all their copying,
17 and lawyering and investigative hours and this, that and the other and they're getting paid back
18 directly for that.
19

20 Chair: Notes that Sara might be stepping in so we might have an interruption. We have some
21 committee or some action items, a letter to the AG, and meeting with Don when we get to that
22 we can brainstorm later and maybe have some ideas to further this discussion. It will be an
23 ongoing issue. John, do you have any other trends or thoughts or concerns while we have you
24 on the phone?
25

26 Savage: No, I think we did a pretty good job of covering it here this morning. I certainly
27 appreciate you guys and gals having me speak today.
28

29 Chair: Any other changes administratively or operationally that will be effecting you. Obviously
30 we have a limbo period until they hire a new Chief.
31

32 Savage: Let's keep our fingers crossed and hopefully it won't impact what we're doing that
33 much.
34

35 Chair: Any other questions for John? Good.
36

37 Savage: I'll be in and out today and tomorrow but Vern has my contact information and can get
38 ahold of me. If you guys need anything else, by all means, feel free to call.
39

40 Call terminated.
41

42 There was a short discussion on how to handle repeat offenders, the boards options etc.
43

44 Chair: Introduces Sara Chambers and gives her the floor.
45

46 **Agenda item 6 – Expenditure Report** 47

48 Chambers: Good Morning everybody. It is a busy time of year in many ways in the State of
49 Alaska one of which is the demand on conference rooms so I would say thank your for your
50 flexibility but there's not much room to flex. I wanted to come today and make myself available
51 to go over any questions you may have on the 2nd quarter fiscal report as well as any other

1 Division issues. I think I got in on the tail end of one that I might be able to speak to a little bit if
2 you're interested but we can start at the Chair's discretion with 2nd quarter reports. It appears
3 that your increase of fees has done the trick and the Board has now gone through most of its
4 renewal. Each board, each licensing program is a little different in how expeditiously people
5 renew so we do expect to continue to see that revenue coming in as folks get caught up on
6 renewal. You can really look at the 2nd quarter FY14 on the right hand side and compare it to a
7 comparable year, another even year would be another renewal year so FY12 the total licensing
8 revenue for that year was about \$850K and now with half of the year through you're at well over
9 \$1M in licensing revenue. So, this puts you back in a healthy surplus position to get back
10 through the next biennium until 2 years from now you have another healthy renewal cycle.
11 We've also attached some specific account code details for you to your quarterly report just as a
12 continuation of the Division's efforts we've been making for the last few years to provide boards
13 with more information about how those direct funds are being spent, these are direct charges to
14 your board. Some of it may be a little account code speak but for the most part as you all know
15 Vern and Alicia's time and things that are required to be supporting them and supporting your
16 direct licensure abilities plus any travel that you all or Vern or Alicia may be taking on behalf of
17 the board. So are there any questions on the 2nd quarter report? It is a cumulative report
18 through the 2nd quarter so this does reflect the first half of your fiscal year activity.

19
20 Hanson: Asks if we will get the allocation codes for the indirect.

21
22 Chambers: You should have that.....

23
24 Hanson: That's the one that interests us the most; we know what direct expenses are. Don
25 came and spoke at the ASCE meeting and he did a very good job talking about why things have
26 gone up but I think the biggest thing I have heard from the folks that have been asking why our
27 fees are going up is they look at all these numbers and one number kind of stands out, it is
28 increasing significantly faster than the others which the indirect expenses. We have zero
29 accountability. We can't point each year to where we have these. I don't think anybody is
30 looking to hang anybody but where is, you know, what is this expense and what has it been
31 year after year and why is it going up at 15% a year when everything else is going up at 3% or
32 4%?

33
34 Chambers: Sure, we did distribute that in October. It sounds like maybe you all haven't looked
35 at that. Ok, we need to remedy that so, I'm going to hand this off to Vern to make some copies
36 and we can talk a little bit while he's doing that. In October we distributed through e-mail for
37 distribution to all the boards exactly what you're requesting, colocation code breakdown of what
38 the indirect was for FY13 and we've been going around between Don and I, going around to the
39 different board meetings since then and talking about it so when we get that back we can walk
40 through a little bit of it. We are also recognizing that indirects are going up and just as the
41 individual boards don't have the ability to influence that so the Division does also not have a lot
42 of ability to influence it because it's State wide costs and Department wide costs that are
43 delivered down through the agencies really per level of effort or as they designate it in
44 Commerce, PCN count. So, individuals working in specific agencies, there's a level of effort
45 toward that programs impact on the State according to how many people you have working to
46 get that particular thing done whether it's us with Corporations, Business and Professional
47 Licensing, whether it's Division of Insurance over here or Community and Regional Affairs, any
48 of the other agencies that are within the Department of Commerce. We all share a bit in the
49 overall Department indirect costs. So we see that, and I'll show you again with the visual, we
50 see that predominately in two ways, one is the cost of the Division of Administrative Services
51 which are all the folks who kind of sit over in this area, they're our HR staff, our IT staff, our

1 Fiscal staff, our Budget staff, people who do the travel processing. That's a centralized agency
2 for the entire Department. You've probably heard us make reference to the Division of
3 Administrative Services or ASD. They do all of those things that otherwise we would have to do
4 ourselves in the Division. It's really six of one half a dozen of another except that instead of
5 directly employing them we are sharing them with all the other agencies. We are actually
6 getting them at a little bit less of a cost than if CBPL had to have our own HR, IT, Travel and
7 Fiscal and budget folks. We also share in the cost of the Commissioner's office and while the
8 Commissioner and her very small staff continue to be budget minded they don't take revenue in
9 in and of themselves so that again is supported by all of the agencies within the Department.
10 We also have a phenomenon that I'm going to assume that you who have been on the Board
11 awhile are familiar with which is our indirect cost within our own Division. For example Director
12 Habeger does not code his time sheet according to each one of the 39 licensing programs he
13 may be working on at any moment in time. So his cost is divided among all of the licensing
14 programs as is some of our administrative support and other folks who work to support the
15 overall activities of the Division that are not dedicated specifically to a very definable group of
16 boards. Where you have Alicia and Vern working on your board specifically many of our staff
17 work on multiple boards so they may have two or three boards or licensing programs that don't
18 have a board and they do keep positive time keeping so they can really account for the time
19 they are spending on one program or another.

20
21 Chair: Asks if there is one line item that could be identified as the source of the increase or if it's
22 across the board increases.

23
24 Chambers: We are trying to hunt down where all of the increases are. Director Habeger is
25 doing a year over year comparison and digging into those weeds a little bit to see if there is a
26 trend. Certainly labor has gone up. Union negotiations have provided for an increase in labor
27 which would affect you all most dramatically with Alicia. She's very much worth it and then for
28 any of the support staff or others who would be part of the General Government Union. They
29 received a 5% increase effective July 1st so that is a bump. Labor is always the biggest cost of
30 any organization. So as you see those costs increasing they are going to be passed along. But
31 answer or a chart or graphic for you but I have seen some preliminary work Director Habeger is
32 doing and know that he is very keen on ferreting that out and delivering that information to the
33 boards when he has it.

34
35 Chair: Asks if she is aware of any line items that are new to the indirect expense report that
36 may influence that, that had not historically influenced that.

37
38 Chambers: There are things, spending, that change from year to year. There aren't any real
39 new account codes. When I'm speaking of account codes I'm speaking of these lines, these are
40 pretty standard lines within our accounting system again some of them may look somewhat
41 cryptic. They are essentially the thing I just described. There are some, last year we did buy
42 some chairs for our office staff who had not had new chairs in a couple of decades. We figured
43 that was a good investment in our staff. We also are being required, the State of Alaska and all
44 of its agencies are being required to conform to new space standards which ultimately will save
45 costs in reducing inefficiencies in space within the State as a whole. Last year we did spend
46 some money on remodeling our investigative unit to accommodate those standards. We are
47 taking it slow and steady knowing that with the size of this Division you can't afford and we can't
48 afford to remodel everybody all at once. The folks sitting right across the way here are, within
49 the next two months, going to be remodeled so we'll see that on this fiscal year. So there are
50 some, it's not usual that we would spend that money on remodeling but that is a mandate
51 coming down from the State. Our current office fixtures are several years old. I saw a tag in my

1 desk that showed when it was manufactured and I was in 7th grade. It's functional, its fine but at
2 some point they need to be replaced. We have not made that decision, that decision has been
3 made for us and we are trying to do it in a very cost effective, meaningful way. So that would be
4 an unusual cost but it would be something that would fall within the scope of reasonability within
5 the State.

6
7 Koonce: Asks how the indirect expenses are allocated.

8
9 Chambers: That's an excellent question and this is going to be a good, somewhat of a good
10 guide, I think we could get better graphics but this will have some of the numbers. You think of
11 it kind of like a funnel. I talked about the State wide and Departmental expenses and the funnel
12 down to each agency receiving a share of that cost being responsible for that cost as it rolls up.
13 So we get 100% of our bill from the Department of Commerce, DBPL here is your share that
14 you get to pay for. We allocated through a level of effort study that determined that Professional
15 Licensing as a whole is about 84% of the activity of our Division. So with all of our Boards and
16 Commissions and all of our non-boarded licensing programs that includes Investigations and
17 admin support, Professional Licensing is a good chunk of what we do every day in CBPL. The
18 remaining 16% is Corporations and Business Licensing. They do a lot of volume but it's very
19 quick work, quick turn over, not as high touch as Professional Licensing. So 84% of that bill is
20 going to be shunted over to the Professional Licensing Section. Within that you'll see this
21 percentage, the next to last line of the next to last column, the percentage of professional
22 licensees by program. That's essentially the percentage of that share; the percentage of that
23 84% that each licensing program is responsible for that at the end of the day is an even share
24 among licensees. So whether you are a nursing licensee, which is comprising about 30% of the
25 Division. Whether you're an acupuncture licensee which is less than 1% of the Division you are
26 paying the same amount of that indirect responsibility as any other professional licensing
27 licensee. So while your numbers may look bigger or smaller than others, there is no difference
28 among the boards other than your share per capita.

29
30 Chair: So this ration would be the same for everybody then?

31
32 Chambers: Right that's just a percentage broken down by board so you can kind of see what
33 your boards responsibility is but it adds up to 100% of licensees.

34
35 Schedler: So why would it not be per revenue?

36
37 Chambers: Do you mean setting up a ratio of expense per revenue? When the review was
38 done that seemed like it was the most fair of ways to distribute that cost because many of the
39 licensing basic duties are the same. The revenue may be different per licensee based on a lot
40 of other factors because revenue is just a completely different animal. Where you have Direct
41 Entry Midwives they may have, or let me take Big Game Commercial Services, our guide board
42 for example, they have a lower revenue but a higher expense so they are a little upside down
43 and were are trying to work with them to correct that. So if we were to tie their share of indirects
44 to revenue they may not be paying their full responsibility because their expenses are so much
45 higher than their revenue. So where we are trying to look at each licensee as essentially equal
46 in the basic functions that we perform, we have applications, we have licensing, we have
47 discipline, we have board meetings. For the most part these are all common functions but the
48 revenue is a completely different funding model.

49
50 Schedler: So you just decided it wasn't a good idea?
51

1 Chambers: It didn't seem very fair. It didn't seem to make sense.
2
3 Schedler: You made a statement, something about, that each licensing functions are similar or
4 something like that which I don't quite agree with that. I mean you have nursing home
5 administrators and hearing aid dealers. Hearing aid dealers are quite different than a
6 professional engineer or nurse, there are great differences.
7
8 Chambers: I'm speaking in general terms, the actual quality of what you do is different but at
9 the end of the day we're still reviewing applications, issuing licenses, investigating complaints,
10 disciplining licenses, collecting fines, collecting fees, those sort of basic functions are pretty
11 common among all of our different types of licenses. The way they go about are different, the
12 existence of a board verses the existence of the Department as the administrator or the
13 Governor is a little bit different but they kind of come in and go out the same way.
14
15 Koonce: Asks what creates the high revenue for Nursing.
16
17 Chambers: One third of our entire professional licensing is nurses and certified nurse aids they
18 are all governed under the Board of Nursing so they have about 30% of the entire Division.
19 They've been able to maintain some high fees and some pretty low expenses, they are gaining
20 in expenses, we are watching that we don't want them to feel too comfortable with that surplus
21 and have had that discussion with them recently. They hadn't lowered their fees dramatically in
22 a while, it's something they just did so we are anticipating that in two or three renewal cycles
23 they will probably be in a better ratio.
24
25 Koonce: Asks if they recalibrate the indirect expenses based on the delta between total
26 revenue and total expenses.
27
28 Chambers: Revenue doesn't factor into it, it's per licensee. So where a program is growing it
29 may also see its share of indirect growing if the program is diminishing then the share of
30 indirects will diminish depending on fewer licensees or more licensees.
31
32 Chair: Adds that if our licensees are increasing there may be some correlation between our
33 indirects increasing too.
34
35 Maynard: Notes that this method has been in use for the 25 years that he has been following
36 this and to him it's the simple method not the right method it's just easy. For example to redo
37 the investigators area we have 1/6th of one investigator but we are paying 10% of all the
38 investigators, we get to pay for everybody else because we have a lot of licensees.
39
40 Schedler: Using the rational of the Outfitters, that their expenses are higher than their revenues
41 therefore it wouldn't be fair, I think, is a little short sighted because that isn't the model that you
42 strive for and you yourself said that you're trying to correct that so the model you're striving for is
43 that the expenses are not more than the revenue so why not use the revenue and take care of
44 that one red herring but don't use that red herring as the example of why you choose to do the
45 easy way.
46
47 Koonce: Asks if revenues are correlated to actual costs.
48
49 Chambers: Revenue is what you take in and expenses are what the costs are so they're
50 completely different so when we look at revenue we look at total revenue, we could look at a
51 ratio of revenue to licensees, ratio of revenue to expenses. We could theoretically come up with

1 39 different models of creating an indirect allocation method and I don't know that there's an
2 appetite to do that. We certainly don't want to hire more staff to be able to drill down into each
3 of those areas that we don't have the ability to do right now. We don't want to charge more
4 indirect just to figure out a different way to do indirect. I know that's a very general statement.
5 I'm sure that if there are good models or recommendations or maybe you've made those before
6 that we could pass along to our Division of Administrative Services and give them some
7 recommendations of methods that boards think are more fair I'd be happy to pass that
8 information along. This seems to be the most efficient way of doing it now which is a fairly
9 straight forward way but again open to concepts. I think over the last few years we've been
10 working really hard to improve our correctness and improve the amount of information and the
11 frequency of information we give to boards. So that would be compatible with that continuum.
12

13 Kerr: Asks if we contribute anything to the AG's office operating costs.
14

15 Chambers: All of the expenses from the Department of Law and the Office of Administrative
16 Hearings are directly billed to the boards for the work that is done on behalf of your board. We
17 have an exhausting process of combing through each months law bill and identifying which
18 program that particular attorney or hearing officer may have been working on and so that's
19 reflected in your direct contractual expenses, that third line on your quarterly board report are
20 contractual but there's no overhead or indirect that's paid to them. They are all directly billing
21 their time on your behalf.
22

23 Chair: When you walked in you noted that we had some discussions on the AG's office and you
24 had some comments. Do you have some thought you'd like to share?
25

26 Chambers: I just wondered if there were any questions about the process that I might be able
27 to clear up. I heard that there were maybe some differences in the ways that boards are
28 handling discipline. It is a requirement and has been since the days of Governor Murkowski that
29 all appeals of board decisions do go through the Office of Administrative hearings. So
30 whenever someone is evoking that due process right that they don't like the decision that a
31 board has made on denying a license or conditioning a license they are given by our staff a
32 notice of defense opportunity to that they can then say that they are defending themselves or
33 that they've secured an attorney and that they want to go through the hearing process and a
34 hearing officer is assigned and ultimately that process does engage the board. There is a
35 method in that notice of defense process on how much the board wishes to be engaged and
36 that may be a cultural decision that the board wants to review. Many boards don't serve as their
37 own hearing officers. You'll get a hearing officer regardless and most will take the
38 recommendation of the hearing officer and deliberate that and either concurs with it or not.
39 Then if that is not successful then it goes on up through the court process. That's a common
40 process for each board but ultimately that hearing officer is working on your behalf and not
41 independent of the board.
42

43 Rearick: What do you call that process?
44

45 Chambers: That's the hearing process, the appeal process and it's through the Office of
46 Administrative Hearings.
47

48 Rearick: Asks if that would kick in if we had a Consent Agreement we were trying to propose
49 and work out any decision prior to going to the AG's office. Is it mandatory that it goes through
50 that hearing process?
51

1 Chambers: That's usually after, that's an appeal of the Boards decision, it's through the Office
2 of Administrating Hearings. Leading up to that, a Consent Agreement assumes that you're
3 going to get the consent of the licensee. So the licensee first agrees to those terms and then
4 the Board accepts those terms.

5
6 Rearick: But at that point in time we have the ability to reject those terms because usually the
7 Consent Agreement is negotiated by the investigators and at that point in time we might not
8 agree so then it would go to a hearing?

9
10 Chambers: It would probably go back to the investigators to renegotiate that agreement. A
11 Consent Agreement assumes that you have someone who wants to work with you, wants to
12 remain licensed and wants to get through this process and there can be some back and forth.
13 Most boards and I'm going to assume this board does have a designated board member to work
14 with our investigators to sort of take the temperature, sort gage what terms of the Consent
15 Agreement might be palatable to the Board. Then that process gets negotiated with the
16 licensee, that board member recuses themselves from the deliberation and then the Board says
17 fantastic we are really happy with this or a majority of us are happy with this or no this is awful
18 go back to the drawing board. When the Board denies a license, when someone's application is
19 not satisfactory and you all deny a license or when there is a summary suspension or another
20 prospect where the licensee doesn't have the opportunity to become engaged then their due
21 process to that is to appeal through the Office of Administrative Hearings. Our office does
22 provide them with that information. We let them know what their rights are and this is how you
23 do this and if they don't if they don't respond within 15 days then they lose their due process
24 right. They are given that short window to act on it.

25
26 Chair: Asks if there is a period of time when a license is taken then it goes to the AG's office
27 and they review that and make a case of that and make a decision and there's a time
28 associated with that before it goes back and the applicant and says my license was indeed
29 taken away and I want to appeal that so that period of time there is in the AG's office before that
30 appeal is what our concern is.

31
32 Chambers: I'm not familiar with the Department of Law being engaged after the Board makes
33 the decision unless the board specifically says, I'm not sure that would make sense because
34 once the board votes on the record, we want to deny a license, its done. The consultation
35 would be during that deliberation in executive session or leading up to it so the Department of
36 Law would be your ally, your partner in private in weighing those things and considering it. But
37 once you come out of executive session and say no then there's nothing the AG could do to
38 alter that without the boards deciding to go back and change its mind. The board is the
39 authority and when you make your decision it's done and then if someone appeals it at that
40 point then that's going to kick into that next process which each board, I would advise each
41 board that that could happen with any denial, any sort of license discipline outside of the
42 Consent Agreement process and that mounting bill we see with some programs like the Big
43 Game Commercial Services Board being an example has led them to tighten up before the
44 denial process, getting the attorney more involved, assign that consulting board member to
45 investigations, utilizing their executive administrator a little bit more in vetting their decision and
46 the defensibility of their decision well before the decision is made so then the licensee is less
47 likely to appeal. Certainly you've got ornery folks out there and you certainly have folks who
48 believe what they believe but if you have a more defensible case worked up ahead of time it's
49 less likely that someone is going to go through a full hearing. They often want to settle before it
50 gets to that point.

1 Rearick: If they appeal the process and go through the hearing process at that point in time
2 there is some sort of judgment rendered either party at that point in time could chose to advance
3 it to another level?
4

5 Chambers: I believe so, I think at that point if your decision was overturned then each party
6 would have the ability to appeal that decision depending on which way it went and it would go
7 on up to the Supreme Court ultimately. The jurisdictions give great reverence to the boards.
8 Certainly you have the Statutory Authority to make the decisions. Boards are entrusted with all
9 the expertise that you bring to the table and the reasons why the Governor appointed you to this
10 position and that's not taken lightly. We certainly get information from this jurisdiction and other
11 showing that while board members have a great responsibility they're also recognized by the
12 courts as being the best judges of that responsibility. Sometimes you have, every situation is
13 different, every board is different, conditions are different but by and large that's the tone that we
14 see from the courts.
15

16 Kerr: Asks where the colocation code for the Department of Law shows up.
17

18 Chambers: The account code for, that would be all direct billed so that would be on your 2nd
19 quarter report. Let's see if I can identify it, this is like a test. It would be under 73,000
20 contractual. I don't see any Law expenses for this quarter. (Unintelligible) and that's the
21 indirect so that wouldn't be law for you. This is the Departments indirect expense so this
22 wouldn't be discipline, this wouldn't be AELS discipline expenses, this is Department wide legal
23 expenses and the Division pays \$39,700 and you paid 10% of that. The one number I did want
24 to point out a little bit. If I were on the board I like to employ a lot of empathy when working with
25 board members because I know that when we sit here and do this all day and you don't, then
26 we have a different perspective. On the third page of the indirect account codes the CBPL
27 administration at the top there is a line that says IA Management Consulting. IA means
28 interagency so that's when we have agreements with other agencies to do certain things, either
29 they pay us or we pay them. This is the bill from our Division of Administrative Services and
30 Commissioners Office. So our Division received a \$1.2M bill for those services. So I want to
31 make sure that you saw that now because when you look at this two days from now and you call
32 me and say what? \$1.2M what is Management Consulting? As Americans I don't think we
33 want to see a million dollar consulting bill but when we know that that's all of our Division HR, IT,
34 Travel, all of those expenses it makes a little bit more sense and again this is the Division's
35 overall indirect bill not the amount that your board is paying. This is year end. These are all
36 closed FY13 expenses so each year we plan on providing each board with this information and
37 your indirect expenses that you see on your quarterly reports are an average of the previous
38 year then we true it up in that year end/first quarter report because we don't know what the
39 costs really are until we get them. So we are averaging your expenses right now for the
40 previous closed year. Then in and about October of this year you'll get the next one for closed
41 FY14 and hopefully we'll continue to make additional progress on the information both the
42 quality and quantity that we are able to give to you. I know there's a draft memo explaining this
43 stuff but legislative session started and some of those drafts have been delegated, Sara and
44 Don, just go talk to the Boards.
45

46 Kerr: Asks about the FY13 expert witness line.
47

48 Chambers: Asks which line that is.
49

50 Kerr: It's on page 3 of 4 about 1/3 of the way down.
51

1 Chambers: Oh I see, you know I'm not sure why that would be in indirects. I can ask our Admin
2 Officer.
3
4 Kerr: But it would be related to a board activity, right?
5
6 Chambers: It shouldn't be. If it's related to a board activity that board should pay 100% of it.
7
8 Chair: Other questions?
9
10 Chambers: Before I left I noticed you had on your agenda some legislation coming up as your
11 next topic. If you have any legislative questions or input on HB187 or any of the bills, I think HB
12 167 is the sealing bill, I'm happy to stick around.
13
14 Chair: Relays that several board members attended a meeting in Anchorage where Don spoke
15 to HB187 and felt he did a good job.
16
17 Chambers: Well if you have any other questions Vern knows where to find me.
18
19 Chair: Ms. Chambers we appreciate and recognize your efforts in educating us.
20
21 Chambers: Feel free to call anytime and I'll see what I can do about the temperature in here.
22
23 Chair: Asks if there is any further discussion on the expenditure report.
24
25 Maynard: Sort of related to her discussion. I was going to wait until Vern gets in here but it
26 would be good for me to see basically a flow chart of how investigations occur to see where we
27 fit in this because right now as far as I know we don't. I've been on the board for 2 years and
28 we haven't done a consent agreement in two years and we are supposedly in charge of this
29 operation.
30
31 Jones: The way it works is John receives a complaint and he will call one or two board member
32 depending on what profession the complaint is about, discuss it with them and see if it's
33 something he should pursue or if it's not a violation. That's where you see on here case closed,
34 no violation. If he does pursue it and does an investigation then he works up a consent
35 agreement or sends it to the AG's office which you know the better route is to do a consent
36 agreement. If the individual will sign it then it comes to the Board can accept it, change it and
37 send it back or reject it.
38
39 Maynard: I've been here two years and haven't seen a consent agreement yet.
40
41 Hanson: It take a while to get, I mean a lot of these go to letters and a lot of them are still under
42 investigation and may be for a year or more.
43
44 Koonce: Asks if the letter is the basis of a consent agreement.
45
46 Hanson: Explains the content of the letter.
47
48 The discussion continued for a time on how investigations are done, the role of the board, the
49 role of the AG's office and inaction of the AG's office. It was suggested that we get together
50 with all the other boards and send a letter to the Legislature requesting that the Division and
51 Law be funded to complete these investigations.

1
2 11:05 – 11:10 Break.
3
4 Chair: item 7-b-1. Any discussion?
5
6 Jones: Item 7 b is what you just voted to send out for public notice. Item 7 C went out for public
7 comment Monday or Tuesday.
8
9 Item 7 C) Regulation changes submitted for public notice.

- 10
11 1) The following regulations changes have been submitted to the regulations specialist
12 for public notice.
13 a. 2 AAC 36.062 Eligibility for the Fundamentals of Engineering Examination.
14 b. 12 AAC 36.063 Engineering Education and Work Experience Requirements.
15 c. 12 AAC 36.064 Eligibility for the Fundamentals of Land Surveying Examination.
16 d. 12 AAC 36.065 Eligibility for Professional Land Surveyor Examination.
17 e. 12 AAC 36.071 Standards of Practice for Land Surveyors.
18 f. 12 AAC 02.110 Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors, Fees.
19

20 **Agenda item 9 – Board Correspondence Received Since November 2013**

21
22 A) CLARB

23
24 Chair: This is all e- newsletters. Hearing no comment moving on to item B) NCARB.
25

26 Rearick: Explains that most of these are just updates on things that happened last year. He
27 points out that item 3 is the letter reporting the number of Boards that signed on to the Canadian
28 MRA. He reports that they did get the number of states they needed to get the agreement to go
29 into effect. Alaska is not a signatory yet and we've yet to vote on that. He mentions that
30 National elections are coming up and comments on a few of them, Greg Erny and Jon Baker but
31 doesn't think we need to spend a lot of time on these items.
32

33 Chair: Asks about item 3.
34

35 Rearick: Explains that one of his tasks was to solicit input from the professional organizations
36 like AIA and APDC and he doesn't have that yet but expects to next meeting.
37

38 Chair: Asks if we need a motion on the candidates for national office.
39

40 Rearick: Doesn't think so unless we need one to allow the delegates from this board to use
41 their discretion. At the meetings each candidate will make their pitch and he doesn't want to
42 make any recommendations at this time.
43

44 Maynard: Asks about 9-b-4 re the pilot for a license upon graduation. He is interested to see
45 what that looks like.
46

47 Rearick: Reports that it's in its infancy and he isn't necessarily an advocate of that but is trying
48 to keep an open mind. What they are trying to do is figure out a way to award licensure upon
49 graduation. That means you would have all your experience, all your exams done when you
50 graduate and you could obtain your license. They have a lot of work to do on that before they
51 convince me it's a good idea.

1
2 Chair: Notes that it could take up to 8 years. You would go to school then work then back to
3 school etc. We'll move on to NCEES correspondence 9-c.
4
5 Jones: Notes that we had a discussion a few days ago with the PNWER delegation regarding
6 licensure mobility between Alaska and Canada and draws attention to item C5 regarding the
7 signing of an MOU with Japan by NCEES and several states.
8
9 Maynard: Advises that at the education committee meeting it was pointed out that early testing
10 will conflict with the B+30 plan.
11
12 Chair: 9D Email from Josh Tempel.
13
14 Maynard: Thinks this is outside what is allowed by regulation. You're supposed to have a
15 licensee in each office and this person does not have. It would be one thing if he was a sole
16 contractor working for another firm that had licensees. But having your own company and
17 having an engineer who will review your work and then stamp it doesn't seem like the way it's
18 supposed to be done.
19
20 Hanson: Doesn't think it's any different than a machine shop or welding shop. They get the
21 drawing from an engineer and build something or build something and then get an engineer to
22 make sure it was done properly.
23
24 Shiesl: Asks what prototyping is.
25
26 Kerr: Experimental type stuff.
27
28 Hall: Asks if they are doing design work is that a factor.
29
30 Kerr: Asks if it matters what he is prototyping.
31
32 Hanson: Thinks the response should be that you and your mentor need to development a
33 program that meets our regulations. We don't pre-approve mentor programs.
34
35 Maynard: Suggests that the response include that the engineer has to do his own calculations,
36 he can't just take theirs and review and stamp it.
37
38 Rearick: We don't really know what he is doing. If he is doing engineering then his engineer
39 has to do the calculations and take responsibility. He can make his widgets but he has to have
40 his engineer review and take responsibility for it.
41
42 Discussion continued for a short while with the final outcome – Vern and the Chair will get
43 together on a response. The engineer bears the responsibility whether he is within the
44 regulations.
45
46 Chair: 9 e – email from Mike Root.
47
48 Jones: That response was already done. Told him yes he needs a license.
49
50 Chair: Item 9 f – Seismic hazards.
51

1 Maynard: Will respond to it now that his structural regulation change is going out for public
2 notice.

3
4 Chair: 9 g - Catalyst Marine Engineering.

5
6 Jones: Point he is making is that the word engineer means a lot more than design work.
7 Marine engineers are licensed by the Coast Guard. They run the power plants on ships.

8
9 Maynard: Notes that he had his business before we licensed marine engineers and should
10 probably be grandfathered.

11
12 Jones: All we really need to do is tell business licensing that it's ok to give them a license. He
13 isn't doing Naval Architecture or anything like that he is just working on the power plants of
14 boats. I'll take care of it. I'll tell business licensing he can keep his name and have a license
15 and I'll give him a letter so if John ever knocks on his door he will have something to show him.

16
17 Chair: 9 h Clear training memo. They are requesting a pole to see who would be interested in
18 training. He reads the dates of the various training and notes that they are webinars. Chair
19 asks those interested to raise their hands and 9 responded.

20
21 Rearick: Comments that the in-person session they he and Brian attended had people from all
22 the Boards and you got a good perspective on what their issues were and that we are all having
23 the same frustrations.

24
25 **Agenda item 10 – Correspondence Sent Since November 2013.**

26
27 A) Letter to Mr. Saarloos re CE

28
29 Jones: Responded denying the extension.

30
31 B) MRA

32
33 Rearick: That's just Vern responding back to Kathy.

34
35 C) Email to Mr. Bolen re stamping.

36
37 Rearick: That one came down to the jurisdiction they were in.

38
39 Chair: That's it for correspondence.

40
41 **Agenda Item 11 – Old Business**

42
43 A) Retention of meeting records.

44
45 Jones: Explains the response from Law that there is nothing in our regulations that say you
46 have to retain recordings beyond when the official minutes are approved by the Board.

47
48 Chair: What's the practice now?

49
50 Jones: Once you approve the minutes the recordings are deleted.

51

1 Chair: So you see no reason for change, you're just affirming that we can do that.
2
3 B) Acquiring more control of our budget.
4
5 No report.
6
7 C) Letters to COA re Travel Policy
8
9 Koonce: Talked to Don and Mr. O'Tierney who directed him to Lisa McGuire who is working
10 with the Nursing group to try to get the same thing. He has emailed her but hasn't heard back
11 yet.
12
13 Maynard: Suggests he could also contact Rep Mia Costello.
14
15 Jones: Suggests that they try to talk Administration into either changing the rule about
16 accepting direct payment by our National Organizations or if they won't change it at least allow
17 waivers on an individual basis.
18
19 Hanson: Notes that there is a caveat in the travel policy.
20
21 Jones: Ask them to allow NCEES to direct pay for our funded delegates, airfare, hotel etc.
22 without the State getting involved.
23
24 A short free for all discussion followed regarding possible solutions and whether to ask for a
25 blanket waiver or individual or yearly waiver.
26
27 D) Response to Seismic Hazards Task Force.
28
29 Maynard: Will respond.
30
31 E) PNWER Delegation Visit.
32
33 Chair: Asks Vern if he would like to start off with his comments.
34
35 Jones: Explains that PNWER meets here yearly and as part of that their delegation lobbies the
36 Board for licensure mobility. We are pretty much where we were last year. They refuse to
37 waive their examination because they are two different exams. Ours is technical and theirs is
38 ethics and business practices. Their technical exams are taken care of by their Universities.
39 Their education system is standardized throughout Canada and ours is not.
40
41 They also talked about having pre-licensed engineers where in the event of a national disaster
42 engineers could cross borders to help with recovery.
43
44 They also invited us to attend their summit in Whistler and Don said he would support that if the
45 Board did.
46
47 Chair: Adds that the Canadians see some large mega projects coming up, mining and gas/oil
48 development, in the future and an engineering shortfall and see mobility as a great way to fill the
49 shortfall on both sides of the border. He adds that they mentioned a teleconference to discuss
50 the exam content.
51

1 Maynard: If there is no quid-pro-quo, if the Canadians can come here and get licensed without
2 doing anything and we have to take an exam to get licensed there that's not reciprocity and I'm
3 not interested.
4

5 Chair: I don't disagree with that; their discussion is they think they are not the same.
6

7 Jones: What they are asking us to do is change our regulation to read similar to Idaho's which
8 basically says something line if an applicant has been registered for 8 years or however many
9 you decide and hasn't had any disciplinary action taken against his license then the Board in its
10 discretion may waive education and examination requirements.
11

12 Maynard: But they are not willing to do the same for us.
13

14 Jones: Yes they are it's just that you still have to take their test.
15

16 Hanson: Adds that they review your education and you may have to take up to 16 tests.
17

18 Jones: Explains that the education system in Canada is standard throughout the country and in
19 the U.S. all the colleges are different. So they don't just accept ABET accreditation they look at
20 each transcript and what each student did. When you go for licensure in Canada you are
21 reviewed by their education committee and their experience committee then the exam, also on
22 this exam you would have up to a year to take after you were licensed.
23

24 Kelly: Tells of a Canadian who brought his experience package in that he submitted in Canada
25 and it was a full 4" binder. Their process is very different from ours.
26

27 Chair: Feels we should continue to educate ourselves on the processes so when we have
28 these discussions and compare like for like we can base it on education and articulate that
29 instead of what our perceptions may be. There is value in understanding what their exams are
30 understanding what their application process is. Having these things is a stronger argument.
31

32 Rearick: It would be interesting to see what they are doing on a national basis not just looking
33 at a region and developing a few states we have some agreement with. Are they talking to
34 NCEES and what's the dialog there? It's not too different than the situation with the architects.
35 He explains how NCARB came to agreement with them. Instead of tit for tat the looked at how
36 they are producing their architects and decided that they were turning our qualified individuals.
37

38 Maynard: Agrees that if it was that way he wouldn't have a problem but they are saying
39 reciprocity with you but you have to jump through our hoops.
40

41 Chair: Adds that we keep hearing a need from them but no one else has contacted us
42 expressing a need.
43

44 There was a short discussion on attending the PNWER Summit in Whistler and even though
45 they had offered to pay for it or 3rd party reimbursement it was decided that that would be an
46 ethics problem since this is a foreign country and their engineers are lobbying us for reciprocity
47 and therefore not a high priority for the Board to send a representative.
48

49 Chair: Asks about the emergency response issue.
50

51 Jones: He thought we had to do a statute change to do anything. He didn't realize that the

1 regulatory authority is with the Board and we can change it without going to the Legislature. He
2 did ask if he got a Legislature to introduce Legislation what would the Board think of that. I
3 didn't say anything.

4
5 Chair: Asks if anyone has comments on the emergency response issue.

6
7 Maynard: Understood that in an emergency as part of ASCE you go down to the state and
8 volunteer and you don't have to be licensed in that state.

9
10 Chair: Asks if there a verification process.

11
12 Maynard: Suggests we ask the emergency management folks at Military and Veterans Affairs.

13
14 Chair: That sounds like a good idea. It seems like there would be something in place to cross
15 boarders and help neighbors out. He asks Vern to do some research.

16
17 Short free for all discussion on emergency preparedness and what is and what should be.

18
19 12:15 recess for lunch.

20
21 13:05 in session and on record. Roll call all present.

22
23 **Agenda item 13 – Nominations of Board Officers**

24
25 Chair: item 13 discussion of nominations. Suggests a discussion on the history, how it's been
26 done in the past.

27
28 Hanson: Vern probably has the most history on this.

29
30 Jones: Explains the process.

31
32 Short discussion on how they should proceed. Point made was that the chair should be a one
33 year position to give more people a chance to serve. It was asked if there was a progression
34 like from secretary to vice chair etc. Response was sometimes but not always.

35
36 Chair opens the floor for nominations.

37
38 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it was**
39 **Resolved to nominate Richard Rearick for the office of Board Chair.**

40
41 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
42 **Resolved to nominate Colin Maynard for the office of vice-Chair.**

43
44 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Shiesl and passed unanimously it was**
45 **Resolved to nominate Kathleen Schedler for the office of Secretary.**

46
47 **On a motion duly made by Shiesl, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it was**
48 **Resolved to close nominations.**

49
50 Rearick: In August is when the new officers take their positions.

51

1 It was brought up that the Board Policies document and Bylaws were in conflict. After a short
2 discussion it was decided to change the policy to conform to the Bylaws.

3
4 **On a motion duly made by Kerr, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it was**
5 **Resolved to change the Guideline II a. of the policy document to conform with the**
6 **Bylaws and that we add the word calendar to the first sentence of Article II of the Bylaws**
7 **so that it reads “At the first meeting of each calendar year....”**
8

9 While the motion above was being drafted there was a free for all discussion on the Bylaws and
10 how they were drafted and how they could be changed and Hanson noted that one of the AAG’s
11 was involved in that.

12
13 Jones: We had one AAG that said policies don’t mean anything, if it’s not in Statute or
14 Regulation it’s worthless. Then one of the other boards had a hearing where the hearing officer
15 said if it’s an established policy that has been effect then it sets precedence.

16
17 **Agenda item 14 – Public Comment**
18

19 Chair: I don’t see anyone here for public comment so we will leave it open for about 15 minutes
20 then move on.

21
22 **Agenda item 18 – New Business**
23

24 A) CPC/PDH reqmts for those with 3 or more licenses.
25

26 Maynard: In the education committee we went over model law and it basically states that for
27 dual licensees, and they were assuming a dual licensee was a civil and a surveyor, that they
28 had to get at least 1/3 of their PDH’s in each of their two professions. I brought up if you are
29 license as a mechanical, electrical and now you have controls and fire protection do you have to
30 get 32 hours? He doesn’t know how big of a problem it is, how many have more than 2
31 licenses.
32

33 Jones: Adds that we have an individual that has about 7 licenses.
34

35 Kelly: He has 9.
36

37 Maynard: So he should have about 72 hours. We need to set something because right it says
38 you will have 24 a third in each discipline.
39

40 Rearick: Suggests that we set a maximum and notes that some disciplines cross like structural
41 and architect.
42

43 Hanson: Asks everyone to turn to page 35 in the regulations booklet. Item f. deals with this but
44 I don’t think it’s very clear. He reads the subparagraph f. which states in part that each
45 registrant must earn 24 PDH’s and that at least 8 must be in each license held. That is limiting
46 the top end saying you only need 24 and that each must be in each registration. So for
47 someone who has more than 3, the way I read this, they only have to do 24 and if they get 8 in
48 three of them they are good.
49

50 Maynard: They have to have 24 but they also have to have 8 in each one which may end up
51 being more than 24. You may be able to credit one course to several licenses.

1
2 Hanson: thinks some cleanup of the whole section is required. He thinks it should say obtain a
3 minimum of 24.
4

5 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hanson and pass unanimously it was**
6 **Resolved to start a regulation project to address the issue of multiple licenses and**
7 **continuing education.**
8

9 Chair: Asks if anyone would be willing to help Colin with the project.

10
11 Hanson: I'll help him. He feels it's best to get this out for public notice as soon as we can.

12
13 Maynard: Asks if there is any way to find out rather quickly how many have more than 2
14 licenses.

15
16 Hanson: Doesn't think that is relevant. It can just be cleaned up a little.
17

18 Chair: 18 C) definition of engineering surveying.
19

20 Hale: This is an ongoing question and he submitted something to the Guidance committee and
21 thinks the committee should vet it before the Board gets it. For the answer to Vern I just took it
22 directly from the society but I think that could be shored up a bit.
23

24 Hanson: Asks if it's in the Regulations.
25

26 Jones: It's in the Statute under the definition of engineering.
27

28 Chair: Ask if there are any other items for discussion before we go into executive session.
29

30 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Shiesl and passed unanimously it was**
31 **Resolved to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c) to review**
32 **applicant files.**
33

34 13:30 In Executive Session.
35

36 18:00 Recessed for the night.
37
38

39 **Friday 31, January 2014**

40
41 09:00 In Executive Session all present except Kerr.
42

43 12:00 Out of Executive Session roll call all present.
44

45 Chair: We are out of Executive Session, I believe we have completed item 18.
46

47 Hanson: 18 a. actually, go back to that one.
48

49 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
50 **Resolved to public notice changes to 12 AAC 36.510 regarding minimum hours for CE.**
51

1 Change 12 AAC 36.510 subparagraphs (c), (d) and (f) as follows: Underlined and bold
2 language is added, bracketed and capitalized language is deleted.

3
4 (c) To renew a professional architect, engineer, land surveyor or landscape architect
5 registration, a professional architect, engineer, land surveyor, or landscape architect must
6 obtain **a minimum of** 24 professional development hours during the 24 months immediately
7 preceding that registration period.

8
9 (d) To reinstate a lapsed professional architect, engineer, land surveyor, or landscape architect
10 registration, a professional architect, engineer, land surveyor, or landscape architect must
11 obtain **a minimum of** 24 professional development hours during the 24 months immediately
12 preceding the application for reinstatement of the professional architect, engineer, land surveyor
13 or landscape architect registration.

14
15 (f) A professional architect, engineer, land surveyor, or landscape architect holding multiple
16 registrations in the state is required to earn **at least** the [TOTAL] **minimum** number of
17 professional development hours of continuing education as those required for a single
18 registration holder. However, at least eight hours of the professional development hours must
19 be in each registration held.

20
21 Hanson: Explains how they came to the changes.

22
23 Maynard: Suggests a lead in paragraph with every change we send out for public notice so
24 there is no question why we are making the change.

25
26 Jones: Will add a lead in when submitting to Jun for publication.

27
28 Chair: On to Special Committees.

29
30 **Agenda item 19 Special Committees**

31
32 Licensure implementation:

33
34 Maynard: We public noticed the structural changes.

35
36 Registration and Practice:

37
38 Rearick: Nothing to report.

39
40 Licensure Mobility:

41
42 Rearick: Mentions the NCARB agreement with the Canadian's.

43
44 Maynard: Reports on a project the education committee is working on to make it easy for
45 anyone to find the requirements for any jurisdiction.

46
47 Chair: Adds comments about the meeting with PNWER and the MOA between NCEES,
48 several states and Japan.

49
50 Mining Engineers/Geologists:

51

1 Walters: Notes that we have added a mining engineer since last meeting.

2
3 Social Networking Options:

4
5 Hale: Reports that he hasn't been able to get in touch with the contact Vern supplied.

6
7 Hanson: Reports that he hasn't been able to find a state policy on social networking.

8
9 Jones: There actually is. He doesn't know where to find it but in order to use the social
10 networking sites IT requires approval from your Director.

11
12 Hanson: But there is nothing on how a site has to be set up. DOT is using it now and has a
13 policy they use as far as putting the information on the site, when it's updated, who is allowed to
14 post etc. So it's a work in progress. It's kind of like a bulletin board.

15
16 Hale: Asks Vern who else he could call.

17
18 The discussion continued concerning what we might want in the way of social networking.

19
20 Enforcement Enhancement:

21
22 Short discussion on the meeting with Don regarding inaction by the AG's office.

23
24 **Standing Committees**

25
26 Investigative Advisory Committee:

27
28 Hanson: Reports that he has been communication with John monthly.

29
30 Jones: Adds, as he passes out the investigation flow chart that they cannot get involved in
31 investigations beyond the Advisory Committee.

32
33 Chair: Asks where and what roll, if any, does the Board have.

34
35 Jones and Hanson explain the investigation process and where the board is involved. At the
36 beginning when John call the Advisory committee and asks if it should be pursued and then
37 after the investigation when it's time to adopt, alter or reject a Consent Agreement or after the
38 hearing when it's time to adopt, alter or reject the ALJ's recommendations.

39
40 There was a discussion on the various boxes in the flow chart and what happens in each one
41 and how and when the board gets involved. They asked that the flow chart be refined more to
42 our board to show where they are involved.

43
44 Guidance Manual:

45
46 Urfer: had received some comments (unable to hear her response over the organ and paper
47 rustling)

48
49 Legislative Liaison:

50
51 Chair: Asks if there is anything other than what was discussed yesterday the statute and

1 regulation review.
2
3 Maynard: Notes that the APDC fly in will be the 12th and 13th and thinks they will try to get a
4 hearing on HB167. Someone from the Board should be available to testify at that time.
5
6 Jones: Advise that he had a conversation with Dale, who is down in Phoenix, and that he wants
7 to have something in hand at the fly-in to defend keeping that language in the bill.
8
9 Maynard: Suggests looking at the white paper Harley wrote several years ago and see if it's in
10 there.
11
12 Short discussion on how, when and where the language came from and how to defend it.
13 Maynard will coordinate with Harley. Jones points out that these changes have been in the
14 works for seven or eight years and that he may be down here for the session. It was asked if we
15 should give the Division a letter of support for HB187. Chair thinks he is already aware of the
16 Boards support. Jones will ask him if he needs a letter from the Board.
17
18 Emeritus Status:
19
20 Koonce: Isn't quite sure what his charge is on this.
21
22 Chair: Explains that we have several ex members who are still on National committees.
23
24 It was noted that NCARB does not have an emeritus program. If someone is on a committee
25 after they are off our board they are representing themselves not our board. NCEES does have
26 emeritus status and the way it works is once a member is off our board if they want to continue
27 to work on NCEES committees we send NCEES a letter asking them to grant emeritus status to
28 the ex-board member.
29
30 Budget Committee:
31
32 Koonce: Was going to work on a letter regarding the travel.
33
34 Hanson: Notes that we are shy a lot of money so a significant number of people haven't
35 renewed.
36
37 Jones: As of yesterday 5577 individuals and 506 corporations have renewed. 670 individuals
38 and 174 corporations have not renewed.
39
40 Hanson: That's reflected in the \$1.3M. It's about \$300K shy. He asks if anyone wants to look
41 into the allocation. We are paying 10% of the Divisions costs and we are not using 10% of the
42 Divisions resources. He points out that the Nurses are using about 40% of the Divisions
43 resources and not paying anywhere near that.
44
45 Continuing Education:
46
47 Hanson: Vern and Alicia are going to be all over that.
48
49 Jones: It will be pretty easy, especially the architects because they submit their AIA log.
50
51 Chair: So we will get those next meetings?

1
2 Hanson: Just the questionable ones. He tells Vern not to spend a lot of time on them if they are
3 questionable just bring them to the Board.

4
5 IDP Liaison:

6
7 Rearick: Reports on a few changes coming on the IDP process.

8
9 Chair: Asks if there are any committees that need to be closed out or added.

10
11 **Agenda item 21 – Board Travel**

12
13 Schedler: Asks what all the acronyms are:

14
15 Jones: MBA is Member Board Administrator. WCARB is the Western Region of NCARB the
16 architects. WZone is the Western zone of NCEES the engineers. NCARB - National Council of
17 Architect Registration Boards. NCEES – National Council of Examiners for Engineers and
18 Surveyors,. CLARB – Council of Landscape Architect Registration Boards.

19
20 Chair: We should discuss who will attend these events.

21
22 Jones: Explains that in the past if you went to a meeting you went to the bottom of the list. If
23 you will just keep me posted on who is available I will put in the request.

24
25 Schedler: Asks what the advantage of going to the Zone meeting as opposed to the Annual.

26
27 Hanson: Explains that it's just the western states and kind of a preliminary to the Annual.

28
29 MBA – Jones will not attend.
30 WCARB – Rearick, Koonce and Jones
31 WZone – Maynard, Hanson, Kerr, Eriksen.
32 NCARB – Rearick, Koonce, Jones
33 NCEES – Savage, Hanson, Maynard, Eriksen, Schedler, Walters, Kerr, Hale, Jones.
34 CLARB – Urfer, Jones.

35
36 **Agenda item 22 – National Meeting Reports.**

37
38 None

39
40 Hanson: Advises that the committee nominations for National is coming up. I have a list of
41 board meetings and will get Vern a flyer for my run for VP.

42
43 **Agenda Item 23 – Examiners Report**

44
45 Kelly: Gives her report which contains info on exam numbers. There was a short discussion on
46 whether or not anyone in Alaska has taken exams for any of the new branches added a couple
47 years ago.

48
49 **Agenda Item 24 – Board Tasks (to do list)**

50
51 Chair: Why don't we just start with me?

1
2 Maynard: I need to get you that letter not that we've got that out for public comment.
3
4 Chair: Respond to Seismic Hazards Task Force: Awaiting for input from Maynard.
5 Software Engineering – Ongoing
6 Mentorship regulation project – He asks if anyone has any input. Hanson responded
7 that it involved a comment received. Maynard added that it was about the requirement for face
8 to face meetings. A short discussion indicated that use of available technology may be in order.
9 Meeting with Don re AG's office. Vern and I met with Don that's agenda item 9d.
10
11 Hale: UAA outreach re CBT: He contacted UAA and will meet with them in February.
12 Professional Code of Conduct/Ethics: Ongoing – will see if it can be worked into the
13 Guidance Manual.
14 Social Networking: Ongoing
15
16 Hanson: UAA outreach: He spoke to 30 or students and some faculty and passed copies of his
17 presentation to Dave and Kathleen.
18 Response to DEC re stamping record drawings: He did meet with them and they set up
19 a working group and they have had one meeting. They are trying to get the committee to solve
20 their problem but really the problem is that DEC can't get record drawings. Maynard adds that
21 he contacted ASCE and they were interested in being a part of it. Hanson adds that they were
22 all there.
23 Letter to DOA re travel policies: Working with Jeff on that.
24
25 Kerr: Nothing:
26
27 Koonce: Budget for travel: Already discussed.
28 Letter re travel: Already discussed.
29 Emeritus Status: Not sure there is much to do with this. Jones adds that it won't be an
30 issue until someone else drops off the Board. He will check with Jerry Carter to see if it has to
31 be requested every year or just when there is a change.
32
33 Urfer: Guidance manual: Ongoing.
34
35 Maynard: SE Engineering project: You can scratch that, it's pretty much done.
36 Letter to Seismic Hazards Taskforce: Will get that written now that the SE project is
37 done.
38 Letter to AG's office: I don't think we need to write a letter to the AG based on your
39 meeting with Don.
40 HB 167: He will look at Harley's white paper and get together with Harley and Dale.
41
42 Rearick: Electronic Signatures: Moved to Registration and Practice Committee
43 Canada MRA: Ongoing – he is soliciting input from the local societies.
44
45 Schedler: Outreach to UAF re CBT: Will try to make a presentation to students re CBT and
46 retakes.
47
48 Shies: Last meeting.
49
50 Walters: Nothing to report.
51

- 1 Jones: Early testing for PE: Passed out info from other states.
- 2 Will respond to Mark Morris re stamping.
- 3 Will find another contact for Dave re Social Networking.
- 4 Follow-up on 17 a.
- 5 Respond to 17 e.
- 6 Check with NCEES re Mobility.
- 7 Flow chart on investigative process
- 8 Respond to 9 d. and 9 g.
- 9 Find out about emergency response.

10
11 **Agenda item – 25 Read Applications into Record.**

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

17
18 *The subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following meanings:*

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

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

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

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

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

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

26 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

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

The following candidates are found <i>Incomplete</i> , pending completion of all required documentation & fees.			
Abutrab, Anthony	Surveyor	Comity	Incomplete - pending another 5 months experience; ver of reg
Bradshaw, Tyler	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - pending another 9 months experience

Croasmun, William R.	Civil	Comity	Incomplete - pending addition 6 months responsible charge experience; clearance by Investigations
Daggett, Andrew	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - pending another 12 months experience
Freese, David	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - pending additional 24 months experience
Gilliland, Amanda	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - pending 1 month responsible charge
Hayden, Natasha	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - pending additional 3 months experience
Knight, Thomas Craig	Surveyor	Exam	Incomplete - pending 2 months experience under a PS, & 8 semester hours in Surveying specific courses
Krysinski, Nicholas	Mechanical	Exam	Incomplete - pends 9 months experience
Poulsen, Melvin	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - pending verification of 48 months experience post May 2010 or, 36 months post May 2011
Rahimi, Faramarz	Control Systems	Comity	Incomplete - pending 24 months responsible charge exp not concurrent with date range relied upon for Mechanical
Read, Alexander	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - pending 24 months resp charge/ 48 mos total, after May 2010
Schultz, Christopher	Enviro	Exam	?? - pending fees; FE; Arctic & JQ
Shearer, Nathan J.	Electrical	Exam	Incomplete - pending 16 ½ mos additional experience; FE; Arctic; JQ
Stephens, Ryan	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - pending 5 mos additional experience
Thevenot, Toby	Control Sys	Comity	Incomplete - pending experience ver by CS

Varney, Joshua Wm.	Surveyor	Exam	Incomplete - pending 13 months resp charge/ 21 mos total
Xu, Qi	Chemical	Exam	Incomplete - pending 17 months resp charge/ 48 mos total
Anderson, Michael	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs & signed reference
Badgett, Robert	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending calcs
Baginski, Sean	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending calcs
Belway, Sarah	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends sealed projects & letters
Billman, Daniel	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends letter of resp charge
Bott, James	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs
Clemenz, Bryan W.	Control systems	G'fthr	Incomplete, Plans w/references
Curtis, Charles P.	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending calcs &/or letter
Dahl, Michael	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending 2 nd project
Dey, Collin	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending calcs &/or letter
Gabbert, Paul S.	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending projects
Gastrock, Brian T.	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending calcs
Hargesheimer, John	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending letter re: resp charge
Hinds, Cory	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending resp charge
Hopkins, Donald L.	Control Systems	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs
Hopkins, Donald L.	Fire Protection	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs
Hudson, Bryan	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends references
Hughes, Kraig	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs & drawings
Jeannet Charles	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends stamped drawings

Johnson, Edwin Ellis	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends additional project
Johnson, Lee Allen	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs
Jones, Gregory	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs
Laurent, Thomas	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends letter re: resp charge
Lucas, Warren	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends reference
Lundin, David W.	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends 2 nd reference
Malone, Chad	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends letter re: resp charge
Marcum, Samuel	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs
Martens, Brian	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs & resp charge
Mawson, Simon	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending submission of 2 non SPCC projects
McDonald, William	Control Systems	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends letter re: resp charge
Meeks, Andrea	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs
Menough, Jon	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends letter re: resp charge
Meyring, Justin	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs; drawings; letters
Miller, Chris H.	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs
Nuss, Stephen	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs; project
O'Malley, Willie	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs
Pannone, Steven	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs
Pomeranz, Jacob	Control Systems	G'fthr	Denied - ineligible to apply
Rieth, William	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends plans
Robertson, Jeffrey	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends resp charge
Sande, Trevor	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs & resp charge
Sande, Trevor	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs & resp charge
SlatonBarker, Tony	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending stamped drawings
Sterling, David	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending professional ref

Tauriainen, Michael	Structural	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends 2 projects
Tyrell, William	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs & resp charge
Westervelt, Warren	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending more detailed plans & calcs
Wike, Vanessa	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends calcs
Woolard, Craig	Environmental	G'fthr	Incomplete - pends references & resp charge
???	?????		
Nyman, David	Environmental	G'fthr	Missed deadline - filed at ANC
Freas, George C.	Structural	G'fthr	Pending
Imbsen, George H.	Structural	G'fthr	Pending
Moyers, Jonathan	Environmental	G'fthr	Pending

2
3 **On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it**
4 **was RESOLVED to approve the following list of applicants for registration with the**
5 **stipulation that the information in the applicant's files will take precedence over the**
6 **information in the minutes:**
7

The following candidates are Approved by Examination, Comity, or Additional Branch, pending completion of all required documentation & fees.			
Acayan, Antonio	Electrical	Comity	Approved

Alley, Timothy	Civil	Exam	Approved -pending
Alonso, Chad	Electrical	Exam	Approved -pending
Alstrom, Audrey	Civil	Exam	Approved -pending
Amsden, Roslynn	Surveyor	Exam	Approved -pending
Andrews, Jeffrey	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending
Austin, Jacob	Surveyor	Exam	Approved -pending AKLS
Bartlett, Leigh	Civil	Comity	Approved -pending
Beglin, Michael	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending
Beri, Pradeep	Chemical	Comity	Approved - pending
Boyle, Richard	Control Systems	Comity	Approved
Bradshaw, Travis	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending
Brainard, James	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending AKLS
Brennecke, Daniel	Civil	Comity	Approved -pending
Carpenter, Patrick	Chemical	Exam	Approved - pending
Carpenter, Wesley	Control Systems	Comity	Approved - pending
Chell, Steven E.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Chiu, Linda	Civil	Comity	Approved
Clark, Gordon	Civil	Comity	Approved
Coronel, Michael	SE	Comity	Approved - pending
Danao, Antonio	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Diedrich, Timothy	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending
Duan, Xiaodong	SE	Comity	Approved - pending
Dunford, Kyler	Chemical	Exam	Approved -pending
Elkins, Forrest	Chemical	Exam	Approved - pending

Eppers, Laurice	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Escamilla, III, Jesse	Civil	Comity	Approved -pending
Faas, Patrick	NA/ME	Comity	Approved - pending
Farrar, Matthew	Electrical	Comity	Approved -pending
Figuerres, Rey	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending
Fite, Sonny James	SE	Comity	Approved - pending
Flatt, Michael	SE	Comity	Approved
Friedel, Richard	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Furlow, Robert	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending
Gaby, Joseph Peter	SE	Comity	Approved - pending
Ghaffari, Hassan	Minerals & Metallurgical	Comity	Approved - pending
Gibson, Shane	Civil	Exam	Approved -pending
Gleaves, Stephen	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending
Goetz, Robert	Civil	Exam	Approved -pending
Guffey, Jon	Surveyor	Exam	Approved -pending AKLS
Gwynn, James	Electrical	Exam	Approved -pending
Haines, Jeffrey	Mechanical	Exam	Approved -pending
Hannan, Stephen	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Harris, Stephen	NA/ME	Comity	Approved
Harshbarger, Ned	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending
Hendee, Jr, Richard	Electrical	Comity	Approved -pending
Hoffman, Theodore	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending
Hoopes, Oliver	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending

Hrachovec, Michael	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Huber, James	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending AKLS
Hughes, Joseph	Mechanical	Exam	Approved - pending
Hughes, Ronald	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Huntting, Timothy	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Ivancic, Michael	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending
Johansen, John E.	SE	Comity	Approved
Jones, Galen	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending
Jones, II, Harry	SE	Comity	Approved
Kastar, Joanna	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending
Kemp, William	Enviro	Exam	Approved -pending
Kenche, Divyashree	Civil	Comity	Approved -pending
Khalili, Keyan	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Konicki, Wm.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Kovacevich, Jeremy	Chemical	Exam	Approved pending
Kubic, Andrew	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Kupilik, Karin	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending
Kyzer, Karl	Surveyor	Exam	Approved -pending AKLS
Larsen, Craig	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Laufenburg, Ted	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Lawler, Kurt	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending
Lentz, Gordon	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending
Lind, Rachel	Mechanical	Exam	Approved
Lloyd, Kimberly	Civil	Exam	Approved -pending

Logue, Clint	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Louie, Robert	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending
Love, Aaron	Mechanical	Exam	Approved -pending
Marshall, James	Electrical	Exam	Approved -pending
Mattson, Luke	Civil	Exam	Approved -pending
McKenzie, Debbie	Electrical	Comity	Approved
McMullin, Paul	SE	Comity	Approved - pending
Meehan, Zachary	Civil	Exam	Approved -pending
Meurn, Scott S.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Meyers, Gretchen	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending
Miller, Drew	Civil	Comity	Approved -pending
Mines, Jayson	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending
Mullen, Brian M.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending
Mullikin, Christopher	Surveyor	Exam	Approved
Mullikin, Christopher	Surveyor	Exam	Approved- pending
Mundahl, Erik	Enviro	Exam	Approved - pending
Narag, Jovian	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Nelson, Jessica	Architect	Comity	Approved -pending
Nichols, Kenneth	Enviro	Comity	Approved
Olson, Carl	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending
Parada, Jose	SE	Comity	Approved - pending
Pedersen, Hans	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending
Pei, Xiaofei	Civil	Comity	Approved
Perry, Ethan	Civil	Exam	Approved -pending

Pesce, Jerry	Architect	Comity	Approved -pending
Petrov, Nikolai	Civil	Exam	Approved -pending
Rasmussen, Per'Christian	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending
Rininger, Zachary	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending
Russell, Paul	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pends PS exam & AKLS
Rutter, IV, James	Mechanical	Exam	Approved - pending
Sabatini, Michael	Chemical	Comity	Approved - pending
Satterfield, Jennifer	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending
Satterfield, Joshua	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending
Sauls, Darin Dylan	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending
Scarborough, Jr., Jimmy	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending
Scott, William	SE	Comity	Approved - pending
Selberg, Mack	Architect	Comity	Approved -pending
Severin, Anne	Architect	Exam	Approved -pending
Shoemake, Rachel	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending PS exam & AKLS
Simon, Heather	Enviro	Comity	Approved
Stegner, Andrew J.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending
Stoneking, Julie	Civil	Exam	Approved -pending
Stoughtenger, Samantha	Civil	Comity	Approved -pending
Terry, Seth	Architect	Comity	Approved
Thornton, David	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending
Townsend, Strethen	Petroleum	Exam	Approved - pending
von Wolfe, Sherri	Architect	Exam	Approved -pending

Walton, Michael	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending
Ward, Scott	Civil	Comity	Approved -pending
Welch, Morgan	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending
Wells, Sarah	Civil	Exam	Approved - pends
Wetherall, Darrell	Electrical	Exam	Approved -pending
Wichgers, Matthew	NA/ME	Comity	Approved - pending
Wilhelm, John	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending AKLS
Williams, Clifford	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
Wycoff, Leif	Civil	Exam	Approved -pending
Zabala, Edward	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending
The following are approved by Additional branch, pending completion of all required documentation & fees.			
Smith, Gregory	Control Systems	G'fthr	Approved
Santoro, Lee J.	Control Systems	G'fthr	Approved
Rogers, Jr. Daniel	Control Systems	G'fthr	Approved
Oien, Tory C.	Control Systems	G'fthr	Approved
Neeley, James F.	Control Systems	G'fthr	Approved
Conrad, Timothe C.	Control Systems	G'fthr	Approved
Buss, David M.	Control Systems	G'fthr	Approved
Brimstein, William	Control Systems	G'fthr	Approved
Woolard, Lisa Ann	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Tsigonis, Robert C.	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Trudeau, Julee	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved

Trivette, Marcus	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Trasky, Trevor	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Syta, Dean	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Swenson, Mark	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Spencer, David	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Soderlund, David	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Sobczak, Kelly	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Sherman, Mark	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Serlin, Brett	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Schubert, Daniel	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Rieth, William	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Rieser, Michael	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Rescober, John	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Mendez, Johnny	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Mears, Donna C.	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Lybrand, George	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Law, Timothy	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Lambe, John	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Laderach, Shawna	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Khan, David	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Jefferies, Jay	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Hulse, Karl	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Horn, Richard	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Hermon, Jon H.	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Helgeson, Larry	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved

Heikkila, Terrence	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Hawley, William T.	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Gryder-Boutet, Donna	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Gould, Stephanie A.D.	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Godden, Ronald	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Garness, Jeffrey A.	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Forgue, Scott	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Florio, Shawn	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Estabrook, Heather	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Ellis, Wade	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Edge, Matthew	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Crisenberg, Patricia T.	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Crewdson, James A.	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Brown, Gerry	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Brady, Michael J.	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Blei, Jeremy	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Black, Code	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Beardsley, Peter	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Anderson, Jennifer	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Fawcett, Daniel W.	Fire Protection	G'fthr	Approved
Johnston, Elizabeth	Fire Protection	G'fthr	Approved
Pearce, Daniel	Fire Protection	G'fthr	Approved
Posma, Robert	Fire Protection	G'fthr	Approved
Rauchenstein, Daniel	Fire Protection	G'fthr	Approved
Syta, Dean	Mechanical	G'fthr	Approved

Zak, Jonathan	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Young, Shane	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Wilson, Ryan	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Wiita, James	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Whitaker, Keith	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Tovey, Terri	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Thompson, Franklin	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Thompson, David	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Thomas, Roy	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Thieman, Dempsey	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Struck, Josef	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Strait, Sterling	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Story, Michael	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Stchyrba, David	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Soden, Derek	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Smith, Grant E.	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Slater, Adrian	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Sherk, John	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Randolph, Lynn	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Pusich, Joseph	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Pederson, Brian	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Palmer, David	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Ottenbreit, Daniel	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Oien, Benjamin	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Murph, Alan	Structural	G'fthr	Approved

Lundberg, Wade	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Lindamood, Brian	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Larson, Kirk	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Larson, Blake W.	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Lamb, Sean	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Korri, Keith	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Kinney, Jr. Rodney	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Kenley, Fredrick	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Imbsen, Roy	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Hopper, David	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Honrud, Derrick	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Holmgren, Daniel B.	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Hewko, Peter	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Hermon, Jon H.	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Gianotti, Christopher	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Gephardt, Grant C.	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Folmar, Daniel	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Fischetti, Thomas	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Ferrari, Cynthia S.	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Dura, Matthew J.	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Dullanty, Robert E.	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
DeMuth, John	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Daley, John	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Choromanski, Nicholas	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Carlson, Lynette	Structural	G'fthr	Approved

Browning, Dale	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Braun, Kenton	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Blanning, Mark	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Belsick, Todd W.	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Anderson, Michael	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Anderson, Duane H.	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Andersen, Kenneth	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Alder, Mark A.	Structural	G'fthr	Approved
Adams, Scott	Structural	G'fthr	Approved

FE & FS EXAMS			
Badarch, Tumen			
Alkire, Zachary			
Alshammari, Fahad			
Ancheta, Debbie			
Bailey, Richard			
Baumgartner, Milaud			
Brown, Pryce			
Burgess, Christopher Wm.			
Campbell, Seth			
Carlson, Eli			
Cheshire, John			

Chiesa, Richard			
Choromanski, Clayton			
Collier, III, James			
Cullen, Kodiak			
Devore, Ashley			
Dionne, Dominic			
Dobson, Forrest			
Edic, Heather			
Eguires-Lee, David			
Faulise, Meghanne			
Feller, Christopher			
Garvey, Summer			
Gatter, Lance			
Gorman, Jamie			
Greene, Edward			
Guerrero Herrera, Juan			
Hanzon, Luke			
Hoffman, Sarah			
Holman, Charles			
Holmes, Travis			
Holta, Ryan			
Hoyos, Shanann			
Janssen, Jared			
Johnson, Bryan			
Kemp, Melinda			
Koenen, Christopher			
Krzykowski, Mindona			
Lewallen, Rebecca			

Liu, Ying			
Magnan, Michael			
Marshall, James			
Mazzolini, Andrew			
McClure, Scott			
McCormack, Patrick			
McKee, Ian			
Miguel, Breille			
Miller, Joseph J.			
Miller, Mary McRae			
Monta, Katrina			
Morse, David			
Muniz, Matthew			
Nashookpuk, Derek			
Nguyen, Long Ngoc			
Oliver, Nathan			
Pangulayan, Newell			
Pappe, Jeremiah			
Posma, Allen			
Saner, Timothy			
Sivils, Richard			
Skya, Mark			
Song, Yan			
Southworth, Eric			
Staley, Matthew			
Stanfill, Kyle			
Swanson, Karl			

Titus, Michael			
Valdez, Marjorie			
Verbeek, Gerrit			
Verma, Sidhant			
Wells, Keoni			
Wilson, Shaun			
Wiseman, Matthew			
Myers, Bryce			
Miller, Ian C.			
Mullikin, Christopher			

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

Agenda item 26 – Calendar of Events.

May 1-2, 2014, Fairbanks
August 7-8, 2014, Anchorage
November 4-5, 2014, Anchorage
February 5-6, 2015, Juneau

Agenda item 27 – Board Elections

Nominations accepted new officers are: Rearick – Chair, Maynard – vice-Chair and Schedler – Secretary.

Jones: Kathleen gets to take office two months early.

Chair: Presented Don Shiesl with a wall certificate.

Shiesl: It was a good time. I want to thank Vern and Alicia for all the help they gave me and I hope you are going to treat the new public member as well as you treated me.

Jones: If anyone hears of a board who needs a public member, Don is looking for a job.

Agenda item 28 – Board Member Comments.

Urfer: Good Meeting, she appreciates all the help from the other members.

Schedler: It was an excellent meeting, everyone really pitched in, worked hard and there was good communication between board members. She looks forward to many more good meetings.

1
2 Kerr: Good job on all those applications, it was a good meeting.
3
4 Hale: No comments.
5
6 Maynard: Glad the SE thing is behind us. Thanks for the certificate and it was a good meeting.
7
8 Walters: We got a lot done, very good.
9
10 Koonce: I've completed my first year trying to replace Harley Hightower, big shoes to fill but I'm
11 learning. He enjoyed going through all the applications and learning about the other
12 professions.
13
14 Hanson: Good meeting and happy we got through all the grandfather applications. Structural
15 engineering, that's exciting, we will see what happens. He thanks Don for his service on the
16 board and thinks it's important that we have public members on the board to ask the questions
17 that are maybe obvious to us but we are here to service and protect the public.
18
19 Shiesl: Thanks again, it's been fun.
20
21 Rearick: Is amazed at how much work the board can get done when there's still a chance that
22 the flights will not be delayed. (laughter) He thanks Don for his service and adds that it's been a
23 pleasure serving with him. He appreciates his perspective when we get wrapped up in our
24 engineering, architecture, surveying world and he brings us a fresh perspective.
25
26 Jones: Was really surprised that all the applications were completed. We were making
27 contingency plans for what we would tell people on why their application wasn't reviewed.
28 Maynard interjects "weather delay". Sorry to see Don go. Sorrier to see his wife's cookies go.
29 (Laughter)
30
31 Alicia: Echo what Vern said and hey we have an open seat. Mrs. Shiesl can apply then she
32 can bring those cookies. (Laughter) Good Meeting.
33
34 Chair: Thanks everyone for their hard work. Don, it's been a pleasure working with you. He
35 congratulates the new officers.
36
37 13:35 Meeting adjourned.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

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

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

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

Date: _____