

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 May 1-2, 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 May 1-2,
13 2014 at Sophie's Station, 1717 University Avenue, Fairbanks, AK.

14
15 Thursday May 1, 2014

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 • Kathleen Schedler, Mechanical Engineer, Secretary
 - 26 • Brian Hanson, Civil Engineer
 - 27 • Jeffrey Koonce, Architect
 - 28 • David Hale, Land Surveyor,
 - 29 • Colin Maynard, Civil Engineer
 - 30 • Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect
 - 31 • Keith Walters, Mining Engineer
 - 32 • John Kerr, Land Surveyor
 - 33 • Donald (John) Christensen, Public Member

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

- 36
37
 - Sara Chambers, Director CBPL (via telephone)
 - 38 • Vernon Jones, Executive Administrator.
 - 39 • Virginia (Jenny) Geary, Licensing Examiner.
 - 40 • John Savage, Investigator.

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

44
45 Jones: passed out several items that were received after the Board packets and agenda were
46 mailed.

47
48 Chair: Asks if there are any comments. He asks Vern if he wants to comment on items that will
49 be discussed in executive session.

1
2 Jones: Explains that there are some disciplinary actions that will need to be discussed in
3 executive session.
4
5 Chair: Welcomed John Christensen to the Board.
6
7 John C: Thanks everyone for their welcome.
8
9 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it**
10 **was RESOLVED to approve the agenda as amended.**
11
12 **Agenda item 3 – Ethics reporting**
13
14 Chair: Read the Board Mission Statement. There no ethics reports.
15
16 **Agenda item 4 - Review and approve the Minutes of the January 2014 meeting.**
17
18 Maynard: Requested that page 2 line 43 be worded so it is clear that he made the comment.
19
20 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Rearick and passed unanimously it was**
21 **RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the January 2014 meeting as amended.**
22
23 **Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report**
24
25 Chair: Welcomes John Savage and turns the floor over to him.
26
27 Savage: Asks if there are any questions on the Board Report. He adds that Chief Investigator
28 Warren resigned and went over to Medicaid Fraud and that John Clark who was assigned to the
29 AELS board in the past has been appointed as the interim Chief and has gotten things moving
30 again in the AG's office. As far as he knows a new Chief hasn't been hired yet. Clark's term is
31 about up and he doesn't know who the new interim Chief will be.
32
33 Rearick: Asks if it is an appointed position or hired position.
34
35 Savage: It's a hired position but there haven't been many applicants for some reason.
36
37 Jones: It may be awhile because Sara isn't the type to hire just to put a warm body in a
38 position, she will continue to advertise until she finds right person.
39
40 Savage: Agrees that that is the best policy and that he had hoped that Mr. Clark would have
41 enjoyed it so much that he would come out of retirement and take the job.
42
43 Maynard: Notes that one of the cases that had sat in the AG's officer for a couple of years is
44 now closed and asks if it is now just going away.
45
46 Savage: Yes, they would not prosecute it. He is concerned that we don't know the dollar
47 amount that we have spent on this during that time that it sat over there.
48
49 Koonce: Asks what happens after it is closed.
50
51 Savage: A letter went to the individual and to the complainant explaining what was done and

1 how it was done and that it would be kept in our files but at this time no action was going to be
2 taken. He doesn't think it does anyone any good to come back 5 or 6 years later and say oh by
3 the way this is the action we are going to take on your license. We have to be more
4 professional than that. If he was that individual his question would be if it was that serious an
5 issue why it took 5 or 6 years to get to this point. He is hoping that we get a good strong Chief
6 that will keep things moving.

7
8 Hale: Asks if they prioritize these things.

9
10 Savage: Yes, my priority is on a case where there is life, safety issues. He gives a couple of
11 examples.

12
13 Hale: So if there is a serious infraction it gets moved fairly quickly.

14
15 Savage: Yes. We've never been in this position that I know of where whoever comes in as the
16 Chief Investigator is going to have 44 different boards. With 44 different sets of Statutes and
17 Regulations concerning some pretty serious stuff when you're talking medical, Psychologists,
18 Dental and things such as that. We've never had an individual, and we've looked back pretty far
19 where we had to go out there and find someone who is interested. It's always been someone
20 who came up through the ranks in the office and understands the steps that have to be taken.
21 We need to keep our fingers crossed that it's filled with the right individual.

22
23 Maynard: Voices concern that while we are sitting here trying to enforce the regulations people
24 will get the impression that if it goes to the AG and they stall long enough it will go away and
25 they can keep doing what they are doing.

26
27 Savage: Agrees and thinks that there is a lot that we can do and thinks that he will see during
28 the executive session today that's the direction we are moving. He adds that we haven't been
29 proactive in a long time and during that time people have gotten a lot more lax about following
30 the rules.

31
32 Hale: Suggests that a quick response from the Board via letter would help expedite things and
33 keep it from getting bogged down.

34
35 Savage: The Board can't handle it at that point. He then explains that his first action is a letter
36 that a complaint has been filed that you're doing XYZ and that's a violation of this or that and
37 gives them 10 days to respond.

38
39 Hale: Asks if that usually works.

40
41 Savage: It works in the sense that they respond. Whether they respond truthfully or not or say
42 that it was a big misunderstanding or whatever, that's where the games begin. And some of
43 these once it gets to a certain point they are going to lawyer up. When we as a Division, you
44 know, we are not going to the AG, we are not going to spend AG money, we're not going to
45 spend expert witness money and things like that. Word of that also gets out and they know if
46 they lawyer up and the State don't have the money or don't want to spend the money. That's
47 part of our responsibility to ensure public safety. That's part of the licensing fees, it all plays into
48 itself but I'm not at the level where I get to make those decisions. I get told by my chain of
49 command, hey, no more AG visits without permission from the Director, no making copies of
50 drawings without permission of the Director, no more hiring expert witnesses, we don't have any
51 more money this quarter. So you see it's much bigger than us so all we can hope is we're

1 getting a brand new Director, we will be getting a brand new Chief Investigator. We have
2 investigators already putting in their resignations, leaving so we've got to hope that when we
3 come back up for air we're in a position to do proactive work like we use to be able to do. Once
4 word gets out there to the public, it does make a difference.

5
6 Rearick: You have said in the past that without an identifier of who an individual works for it
7 makes it more difficult for you to find who they work for. Say an engineered building company
8 hires a sole proprietor to stamp the drawings and then the company says we are not doing
9 engineering the sole proprietor is and he may be working in a consulting capacity or directly,
10 you don't know. If you could talk about that.

11
12 Savage: Yes, the only place in the laws requiring that this individual's title block be on there is
13 in the site adaptation law saying that you have to re-release it with your own title block and
14 information on there. So there they are required to have, you know, Joe's Engineering, Inc.
15 Then it's pretty easy to check out Joe's Engineering, Inc. He is in the data base, he has a
16 corporate authorization or he doesn't, and he has a business license and he has this and that.
17 Right now you have an architectural firm's title block on there and an engineer stamp and you
18 call the company and it's, well he doesn't work here. Then you're working up through the
19 company to find out that they hired an engineering company to do the engineering. It would be
20 helpful to have his title block on there. He gives examples of trying to get find someone and
21 finding bad addresses and phone numbers etc. He points out that once we get caught up some
22 of these not so important things can be addressed. Not having the correct contact information is
23 a violation, trying to track these people down eats up a lot of man-hours.

24
25 Hanson: Thinks we should just suspend someone's license if we get correspondence back
26 undeliverable. That's my personal opinion, you know it's in Statute and Regulation that you
27 keep it up to date, it's like your driver's license, it's like your pilots license. All these things you
28 are supposed to keep up to date and we actually have the regulations that require it. There is a
29 reason to be able to find these people. If John Doe designed a building that collapsed and hurt
30 somebody and now he's nowhere to be found, how do we handle that, or some other
31 emergency where we need to get the drawings or that individual and we can't find him.

32
33 Savage: Maybe we have been too soft in some of these arenas because when we start
34 backtracking, trying to find this individual, well he used to live in New Mexico so we check with
35 the New Mexico board to see if he has a license and find that he has a license and he has a
36 correct address and contact information on it.

37
38 Hanson: Or, he has four violations that they forgot to tell us about.

39
40 Savage: Exactly, and that's it a lot of these guys apply with us and never tell about an issue
41 they have going on down in New Mexico, so they kind of did this to themselves but these are
42 the individuals that maybe their engineer license is 8 months late and he's just now renewing it
43 and his business license hasn't been any good since 2008 and his corporate registration, 2004
44 is the last time he renewed that and the list goes on. It's hard to feel bad for them when they
45 say the missed it in the mail, he just quit caring that this was important. He's still doing
46 engineering even though he's not licensed to do engineering. Some states don't even
47 recognize that. We've had a couple of cases where we asked at what point are we not going to
48 consider that engineering? At what point is it not Land Surveying when your license has been
49 lapsed for 3 or 4 years?

50
51 Maynard: Notes that most architectural firms want their title block but they usually have a spot

1 where we can put our company logo.
2
3 Savage: When you say logo will it have the address and phone number etc?
4
5 Maynard: Typically.
6
7 Savage: That's perfect. A lot of people will say will that's just another silly requirement, well it's
8 not. You're showing who is doing the work, who's responsible.
9
10 Maynard: DOT don't like it, they won't let us put our logo on there.
11
12 Hanson: You don't have to put the logo, its plans prepared by ABC Engineering.
13
14 Rearick: Adds that even with the name of the company, because some people if they are a sole
15 proprietor they may change the name of their company so it's kind of nice to establish who they
16 are working for.
17
18 Savage: And that's the thing, some of these individuals will have a business license as a sole
19 proprietor in Alaska but now they are working for Joe's Engineering on this project and that's
20 who they sealed it for so there are a lot of steps you have to go through to find out what
21 company this was sealed for. Were you working for Joe's, were you working for yourself?
22 Because Joe's doesn't have a corporate authorization and he's a corporate entity. So that's
23 when it starts getting mind boggling when you have a bigger store where you have 15 or 20 of
24 these individuals, that's a whole lot of violations and a whole lot of digging to find out who's
25 working for who doing what.
26
27 Maynard: Adds that maybe it's a project they are doing on the side.
28
29 Savage: That's right and I think that happens a lot. You know, oh I wasn't with XYZ
30 Engineering this was something on my own, my summer cabin money.
31
32 Jones: Adds that he has had people from out of state ask if they could do that to get out of the
33 corporate registration.
34
35 Kerr: Points out that the current regulation doesn't require a current phone number and asks if it
36 wouldn't save a whole lot of time if there was a current phone number on file.
37
38 Jones: The licensing database we use right now doesn't have a block for a phone number. We
39 have started putting the phone numbers and email addresses in the comments section.
40
41 Kerr: Would like to see that added to the Administrative Code.
42
43 Jones: We have a regulation that says if you move you have to notify the Division and that's
44 what's not happening.
45
46 Maynard: Asks if it's an AELS regulation?
47
48 Jones: It's in the Centralized Regulations.
49
50 There was a short discussion regarding the centralized regulations and whether we could
51 change them and enforcement of them.

1
2 Kerr: Adds that it's important to have the firm name associated with the stamp because of
3 liability insurance coverage.
4
5 Rearick: Suggests a regulation project.
6
7 Savage: Adds that a lot of time is spent trying to track people down who keep renewing but
8 don't have a current address on file.
9
10 Jones: I've got brand new licensees who have just applied and it comes back undeliverable.
11
12 Hanson: That, to me, ought to be an automatic suspension of that license. And they get it right
13 back when they provided the updated information but if we can't get ahold of you and you can't
14 get your license and we can't contact you in a reasonable fashion it should be almost automatic
15 that your license is revoked until you bring it back into compliance. That's a policy decision I
16 guess.
17
18 Hale: Asks how they would know it was revoked.
19
20 Hanson: Exactly, that a whole other list of violations then.
21
22 Rearick: Suggests we would have to do a public notice, post something in the paper if you're
23 taking action.
24
25 Hanson: Not if it's a Board Policy, if we are consistent how we approach each case. If we say
26 its three attempts and you're done and we're consistent, you know, we could say one attempt
27 and you're done if we apply it consistently every time.
28
29 Rearick: Asks if you had an individual that you had proof that they violated something what do
30 you have to do legally to have due process if you can't track them down.
31
32 Savage: I think that would become a non-priority issue until we did locate them. And that's the
33 thing too; any letter I send out the only address I'm allowed by our office policy is the address in
34 the licensing data base.
35
36 Chair: Asks if we should do a regulation project.
37
38 Rearick: Just wanted to bring it up because he knows John has a lot frustration with this issue.
39
40 Savage: Suggests that posting notice on the AELS Webpage that we are going to start taking
41 a closer look at those that are not in compliance with the statute would help.
42
43 Jones: Agrees, if you could get this regulation change through that we will revoke then put
44 notice out on the webpage, listserv and get the work to APDC because a revoked license sticks
45 with you until forever, every time you apply in another jurisdiction you have to answer yes, my
46 license was revoked.
47
48 Hanson: Decides that maybe just suspend a license instead of revoking it.
49
50 Maynard: Put it out there that these licenses are suspended until they update their address.
51

1 Savage: If they are licensed in other states they have to report that every time they renew that
2 their license in Alaska has been suspended, that's huge.
3
4 Hanson: Answers the question about due process. The Board has the power at any point to
5 suspend or revoke without due process, it may get us into hot water later, and we may get sued.
6 If ABC Engineering does something egregious we can come in immediately and say their
7 license is suspended they are done. There are potential repercussions to that.
8
9 Maynard: They are suspended until the investigation is done.
10
11 Chair: Senses from the discussion that the Board needs have some consistency that gives
12 John some direction on enforcing these things and I'm not sure quite what that is maybe
13 someone can narrate an idea so we can help John out.
14
15 Rearick: We have two issues here, one is how to contact people and the other is who they are
16 actually working for at the time they stamp the drawings. So what you are saying about the
17 address we have that authority right now but when we do that we want to do it consistently
18 across the board so I think that's going to require more discussion on whether we want to do
19 some action on that. And the second one about the corporate seal, who they're working for
20 even if they are working for themselves at the time, that's another issue but I don't think we
21 need to solve it now.
22
23 Chair: Asks where to put it.
24
25 Rearick: Probably in new business or regulation stuff.
26
27 A short discussion continued about what to do and when to do it and it was decided to put this in
28 new business and talk about it tomorrow.
29
30 Savage: Suggest just putting something on the webpage about keep address updated would go
31 a long way toward solving this problem.
32
33 Discussion continued reiterating previous points and suggesting warning letters for first offense
34 and then that no warning was needed that it's the law and other agencies such as DMV don't
35 send out warnings. Putting the names on the website was suggested and then peer pressure
36 would bring people in line.
37
38 Savage: Adds that we have gone to court where there's case law where the individual said well
39 I wasn't notified and the judge ruled that as long as notification was sent to the last known
40 address that they gave the Division that we fulfilled our requirements regarding notification.
41
42 Schedler: Suggests we put something on the web and tell people we are going to be enforcing
43 this and how to check if their address is correct.
44
45 Savage: Explains that he was invited to the Fire Marshals forum and explains what it is and
46 emphasizes that it has done great things for the Board. Diana Parks and Kelly Nicoletto they
47 talk highly of this Board to the individuals at the forum. One of the issues we've had this year is
48 some of the Building Officials complaining that 08.48 says this and then some of the
49 suggestions or guidelines that the Fire Marshal puts out kind of contradict what 08.48 says and
50 Kelly Nicoletto as a Fire Marshal did kind of lay that there that, hey, 08.48 is the law, this is what
51 is required by the individuals. Now some of the times they'll bend left or right which they have

1 for years in their requirements but that doesn't affect what we do. IF they see the wrong
2 architecture involvement or the wrong engineering involvement they'll contact us immediately.
3 This helps a lot because we have been through the times when the Fire Marshall said as long
4 as it's a design professional he can seal it all. That's the way it was years ago and they've
5 come off that and really been supporting us and I hope this continues long after us, when we
6 have a new investigator, when we have new board members. This is invaluable, the eyes and
7 ears this puts out into the community and out to the places around the state. We have some
8 issues going on in Ketchikan that we would have never known about had it not been for the
9 Building Official there saying this doesn't seem right to me, this and this is happening. So we
10 need to really keep close ties with those individuals and keep inviting Diana Parks and even
11 Kelly the Fire Marshall there one day and let them know how much we appreciate them.
12 Because he's top shelf, he really is, he really supported us 150%.

13
14 Maynard: They are the ones that brought up the mechanical contractors are out there designing
15 whole buildings. Now that HB167 has passed we need to let them know that that loop hole has
16 been closed.

17
18 Jones: Suggests the Board send a letter of appreciation to John Clark for his help clearing up
19 all those cases during his tenure as interim Chief.

20
21 Savage: Couldn't agree more. The time and money and aggravation he has saved this Board.
22 When he was working with the other board he was the Chief but when he was looking at my
23 cases he was getting into the nuts and bolts of it and I'm like hey you've got your Chief hat on
24 here, you know he couldn't let go of his AELS days. The help he has given us in the last 90 or
25 100 days has been invaluable.

26
27 Chair: Appreciates the suggestions about relationships with the other agencies and maybe we
28 should be more proactive about inviting people to the meetings here and in Juneau and try to
29 invite people to these meetings and try to build that relationship and draw people into us instead
30 of being quite so.....

31
32 Savage: I think that the word getting out there like that and even individuals showing up with a
33 set of plans and they're like you can't do that and here's a guy you can contact and they don't
34 have to sit there and argue with them about enforcing 08.48 they can call us, they can call Vern
35 and run it by a Board member or whatever. To have these eyes and ears out there in these
36 outlying areas, I've never been out to Sitka and Ketchikan and those areas and I'm hoping that
37 that's going to be changing soon but until it does and even when it does having these
38 individuals out there and having an eye out there for the requirements of 08.48 is a great thing.
39 Even here in Fairbanks and the longer we stay with the Fire Marshal's Office, the longer we
40 work with them, we have these individuals that have been there for quite a while and retire are
41 just leaving, they're going to oil and gas area or going here or there. Now these guys are out
42 there knowing the requirements of 08.48. Knowing who to contact if there's a problem or
43 someone pushing back wanting to do this, that and the other and once we get that ball rolling
44 it's going to continue on long after us.

45
46 Maynard: Points out that the 12 municipalities that are exempt are basically doing the same
47 thing as the Fire Marshal. Now that John will be going out in those areas he will be supporting
48 them.

49
50 Savage: Good point. He then explains how he does his Fairbanks trip each year coming up the
51 Parks Highway checking job sites and he returns the back way through Delta Junction. He will

1 stop at a job site thinking this will be a quick one and finds that they have nothing. So not you're
2 starting to make calls getting electrical and plumbing inspectors out there. One thing I have
3 learned is when they are that far over the line it's a shotgun effect, I get everybody and their
4 brother involved and you get enough stop work orders from different agencies it works out a
5 whole lot better.
6
7 Chair: Thanks John for his report.
8
9 Savage: I'll be in this area, North Pole and Fox the rest of the day. If you need to talk to me
10 about anything Vern knows how to get ahold of me.
11
12 Chair: Notes that we will move the expenditure report to tomorrow morning.
13
14 Jones: I put the executive session to discuss the disciplinary cases now or you can do it some
15 other time.
16
17 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it**
18 **was RESOLVED to go into Executive Session to review disciplinary action.**
19
20 9:54 a.m. in executive session.
21
22 10:22 a.m. Out of executive session.
23
24 Rearick: Asks Vern to restate what our options are.
25
26 Jones: Your options are you can accept them as they are or you can change them. If you
27 change them they have to go back to the individual, once you change it all of his rights are
28 reinstated, he can request a hearing if he wants or you can just flat out reject them.
29
30 Chair: If we change it is that a rejection?
31
32 Jones: You can accept them as changed but they have to go back to the individual for his
33 acceptance.
34
35 Rearick: Without going into specifics if we question the signature on one of them, how do we
36 respond to that?
37
38 Hanson: When it wasn't the individual that signed it.
39
40 Jones: What, his lawyer signed it for him?
41
42 Hanson: No his accountant.
43
44 Chair: Asks if they can talk about details when it's time for the motion.
45
46 Jones: No.
47
48 Koonce: Asks if back fees are charged when a license is lapsed.
49
50 Jones: No, we only require the current fee. If someone lets their license lapse for two years
51 they only have to pay the current fee to get it renewed. And I would think that that signature

1 would be ok or John wouldn't have brought it to us in the first place.
2
3 Chair: Asks for a motion.
4
5 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Koonce and approved on a roll call**
6 **vote of 8 Yea, 1 Nay and 1 Abstention it was RESOLVED to approve the imposition of**
7 **civil fine in case 2014-000365.**
8
9 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Koonce and approved on a roll call**
10 **vote of 8 Yea, 1 Nay and 1 Abstention it was RESOLVED to approve the imposition of**
11 **civil fine in case 2011-000546.**
12
13 Kerr: Asks if the guidelines call for increasing amount of fines for successive violations.
14
15 Jones: Isn't sure.
16
17 Kerr: Asks if there is a copy of the guidelines available for discussion later on.
18
19 Jones: Doesn't have it with him today.
20
21 There was a short discussion on how fines were determined.
22
23 **On a Motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Koonce and approved on a roll call**
24 **vote of 8 Yea, 1 Nay and 1 Abstention it was RESOLVED to approve the Consent**
25 **Agreement in case 2013-002046.**
26
27 Kerr: Notes that there was a portion of fine from a prior violation that was suspended and asks
28 if it will be collected.
29
30 Jones: It's suspended for a period of time. It will depend on whether that time has lapsed or
31 not.
32
33 Hale: Feels that the fines imposed for the infractions are not suitable especially for multiple
34 years of infraction if they are not collecting back fees.
35
36 Jones: Notes that some states do require payment of back fees. If that's something the Board
37 wants to do it will require a regulation project and that regulation may be in centralized
38 regulations.
39
40 There was a short discussion on maximum fines.
41
42 Kerr: Asks if there are any states that base fines on a company's gross income.
43
44 Jones: Doesn't know.
45
46 Discussion continued on whether fines should be based on income or the same for all
47 infractions of the same type and adding stipulations to the adoption of the punishment.
48
49 **Agenda item 7 – Regulation update**
50
51 Chair: Notes that HB 167 passed and is awaiting transmission to the Governor and asks if there

1 is an update on when he might sign it.
2
3 Jones: No, I haven't heard yet.
4
5 Maynard: Notes that the Governor has a certain number of days to act on a bill.
6
7 Chair: Thanks everyone for their efforts on HB 167.
8
9 Maynard: That there were some late complaints and verbiage changes submitted but the
10 sponsor said he wasn't making any changes and it passed as written.
11
12 Hanson: Notes that Harley worked hard on this for the last 6 years and spearheaded the whole
13 effort and wants to thank him for that even though he's not here, maybe he'll read the minutes.
14
15 Chair: HB 187, fees, any discussion.....
16
17 Maynard: It died. It didn't pass so they will have to bring it back next January.
18
19 Chair: Asks if there is a discussion on it.
20
21 Maynard: Thinks the problem is that there is a lot of friction between the Legislature and the
22 Division. They were reluctant to give them more money and more power was the reading he
23 got.
24
25 Chair: Next item, regulation changes submitted for public notice.
26
27 Maynard: One through 4 is the structural engineering regulations but they haven't gone out yet.
28 He must be busy with other stuff so hopefully it will go out in the next three months so we can
29 adopt it in August.
30
31 A short discussion on the length of the public notice and whether to accept oral comments
32 which resulted in a motion to extend it to 60 days with written comments only.
33
34 There was some discussion on the edits. All members didn't understand who made the
35 changes.
36
37 Hanson: Asks if we could discuss 7-C-1.
38
39 Jones: Before you discuss that you need to go into executive session to look at the comments
40 from Legislative Affairs which is confidential.
41
42 **On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it was**
43 **RESOLVED to public notice for 60 days proposed changes to:**
44 **12 AAC 36.063 Engineering Education and Work Experience Requirements (SE);**
45 **12 AAC 36.108 Application for Registration as a Structural Engineer;**
46 **12 AAC 36.180 Seals; and**
47 **12 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals.**
48
49 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it**
50 **was RESOLVED to go into Executive Session to review comments from Legislative**
51 **Affairs.**

1
2 10:35 a.m. Went into Executive Session.
3
4 10:45 a.m. Out of Executive Session.
5
6 Christensen: Asks what problem we're trying to cure here.
7
8 Jones: Explains that now when someone wants to take the FE or FS exam they have to meet
9 the requirements in our regulations and be approved by the Board before they can register with
10 NCEES and take the exam. These exams were pencil and paper. They are now computer
11 based and the way most boards do it now, the individual can just go to NCEES, take the exam
12 and then they apply in whatever state they want to work in. Where we are running into a
13 problem now is some way to keep track of them and my suggestion was to issue a numbered
14 certificate. He explains that our rep in the AG's office doesn't think we have statutory authority
15 to regulate trainees. He adds that there is no definition of engineer in training or land surveyor
16 in training in our regulations and that could maybe help to solve this.
17
18 Maynard: Asks why we have to keep track of them. When they apply for the PE they have to
19 show they passed the FE.
20
21 Jones: We don't have to.
22
23 Maynard: Then we can just get rid of everything that refers to the FE.
24
25 Rearick: And we could get rid of the terms, not allowing anyone to use those designations.
26
27 Hanson: Right, you don't exist.
28
29 Rearick: They're associates or something.
30
31 Jones: So in every other state in the union you're an engineer in training but when you come to
32 Alaska you're nothing.
33
34 Maynard: It seems like we can't call them anything unless we get something changed.
35
36 Chair: It seems like there are some administrative things we could do.
37
38 Jones: Explains that we are still using the same method the only thing we are ignoring is the
39 deadlines. When someone applies if they are qualified we approve them and they go to NCEES
40 and schedule their exam, then NCEES asks us and we tell them they are approved. What I was
41 trying to do was take us completely out of the loop.
42
43 Hanson: That's an option.
44
45 Maynard: Asks if we can modify this project to get rid of the new language and draft new
46 language without having to go back out to public comment.
47
48 Jones: If you substantially change something you're supposed to send it back out.
49
50 Chair: Asks if the public comment period has closed.
51

1 A short discussion followed on the comments received.
2
3 Kerr: Thinks it would be demoralizing for those EIT's and LSIT's if we were to get rid of it
4 altogether. It's an achievement that helps them to go forward in their career. Doing away with
5 everything wouldn't be positive for those individuals.
6
7 Chair: Agrees that it was important to him because when he passed the FE he was an engineer
8 in training then.
9
10 Jones: So the options are to go back to the drawing board and work on it then send it back out
11 for public notice again or go ahead and adopt it in which case law will review it and say no, you
12 can't do that.
13
14 Maynard: Agrees that there is no sense in beating our heads against a wall so for the
15 foreseeable future until we can come up with some different procedure people here will have to
16 continue to apply and be approved by the Board.
17
18 Chair: Asks if we should just put this language on hold for now and work on a Statute change.
19
20 Maynard: Thinks we should do that so the Architects program they have had for the last 30
21 years is legal because this applies just as much to them as it does to us.
22
23 Jones: Thinks defining those terms would go a long way.
24
25 Rearick: Notes that the difference between the architects and engineers and surveyors is that
26 architects are recognized when they enter the Intern Development Program but there's no test
27 so there is no defining points that now you're an architect in training.
28
29 Maynard: The stance that we have heard is that there is nothing in the Statutes that say we can
30 govern intern's period. Architectural interns, engineering interns, there is nothing in there that
31 says we have that power. So the Intern Development Program as a regulation probably does
32 not exist.
33
34 Rearick: We can establish a requirement for getting a license even if we can't regulate that
35 while they are going through the process. I'm sure to become a doctor they regulate what sort
36 of.....
37
38 Maynard: They probably have a regulation that says they can do that.
39
40 Chair: Asks what everyone thinks about establishing a special committee to work on a statute
41 change.
42
43 There was a short discussion with no new points made.
44
45 Chair: asks for volunteers for a committee. Maynard, Rearick, Kerr and Urfer volunteer.
46
47 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it**
48 **was RESOLVED to for a special committed to evaluate a Statute and Regulation change**
49 **to regulate trainees.**
50
51 A short discussion on how to deal with the present regulation change that was public noticed

1 and sent back to the Board for action, whether to just ignore it and let it fade away or what.

2
3 Jones: Do a motion to adopt and then vote it down.

4
5 **Motion was made by Maynard, Seconded by Koonce to adopt changes to 12 AAC 36.062,**
6 **12 AAC 36.063, 12 AAC 36.064 and 12 AAC 36.065 regarding EIT's and LSIT's. It failed by**
7 **a vote of 10 to 0.**

8
9 **Agenda Item 9 - Board Correspondence Received since January 2014.**

10
11 A) CLARB:

12
13 Jones: Asks Urfer if she wanted to talk about 9-A-3.

14
15 Urfer: Explains that CLARB is trying to get a Member Board to partner to collaboratively explore
16 how to regulate public welfare or well-being in a specific jurisdiction. She adds that CLARB is
17 very interested in Alaska because we are a multi discipline board but she doesn't think Alaska
18 should be that pilot Board but she is interested in being involved if they decide to have a
19 steering committee and asks if the Board is interested in having some input instead of just going
20 with whatever they come up with.

21
22 Maynard: Asks if there is a difference between public welfare and public well-being.

23
24 Urfer: Doesn't think CLARB feels that it is well defined at any state level. She isn't privy to all
25 the different statutes but thinks they are trying to give it the same value as health and safety.

26
27 Chair: Asks what exactly she is asking of the Board.

28
29 Urfer: Explains that that they have an application which she isn't comfortable filling out but is
30 asking if the Board would be interested in writing a letter saying we would serve better by giving
31 input as opposed to being the pilot Board. She doesn't see Alaska as being the chosen one but
32 she would like to have some input.

33
34 Kerr: Asks if it was a perfect world and they wrote a statute what would we end up with at the
35 end of the day. Would it be a clear definition of welfare or well-being that includes the
36 environment more as a focus of landscape architecture?

37
38 Urfer: Thinks that is what they are going after. They are looking at urban development and the
39 environment and how that plays into people's quality of life.

40
41 Maynard: Wants to see more of what they are trying to do. He doesn't see the words health,
42 safety and welfare anywhere in the statute. Are they trying to put a whole laundry list of things
43 that are encompassed by that? I guess I'd like to know more about it before I sign on.

44
45 Urfer: Thinks they are trying to do it in latitude that can be defined broadly. She doesn't think
46 they can define it and that they are waiting to put it together with whichever state they choose to
47 pilot.

48
49 Chair: Doesn't see us having the motivation to take that on and thinks her suggestion of having
50 the ability to provide input is good and thinks the board would be happy to support that.

1 Maynard: Or if they have an idea of what they are looking for.
2
3 Urfer: Adds that there is more information on the CLARB website, they have seven principles
4 that define well-being but she thinks it has to be defined more.
5
6 Chair: Asks if there are any further comments on CLARB correspondence and hearing none
7 moves on to NCARB correspondence.
8
9 Rearick: Talks about 9-b-3. He explains the Memorandum of Understanding with Mexico which
10 is unlike the Memorandum of Understanding with Canada which we talked about previously.
11 This one is called a Tri-national Mutual Recognition Agreement which includes Mexico and
12 Canada and it didn't require approval by the Boards individually. NCARB was empowered to
13 negotiate with these countries by the Member Boards collectively voting to give them that power
14 so we are not signing on to this. NCARB has made this agreement. We are not obligated to
15 comply with it or any licenses that are obtained under it. He hasn't really looked at it close
16 enough to see if we want to allow people who have obtained NCARB Certificates under this to
17 be licensed in Alaska. He will spend more time looking at it to see how it relates to the
18 Canadian Agreement that we haven't signed yet.
19
20 He moves to 9-b-4 and explains that they are requesting a change for the reporting period for
21 Interns. Right now they have a 5 year period that an Intern can report that time in. They would
22 not get credit for anything they did that wasn't within that 5 year period. What they are
23 proposing is to allow Interns to go back before that another 5 years or something like that where
24 they could get up 50% of credit. Their rational is that the reporting requirements they
25 implemented 5 years ago are working well and most Interns are following those but there is a
26 sub-set of customers that for various reasons have not complied with the rule and have lost
27 experience hours as a result. So they are trying to accommodate more people in getting
28 experience. He isn't sure of the exact agenda behind this. He doesn't necessarily have a
29 problem with it as long as NCARB is keeping track of the IDP, otherwise if it was us doing it that
30 would create another administrative effort for us. NCARB kind of goes back and forth trying to
31 reach everybody and trying to put hard and fast rules in. Right now they are trying to find more
32 paths to licensure. They are exploring models that would allow you to get licensed upon
33 graduation so this may be part of that agenda. They are asking if our Board agrees to this
34 proposed change and if we disagree what are our concerns and do we need more time to
35 address the proposed change and if so when could we provide them with that. They are
36 requesting that we respond to this by June 6th. He doesn't have a problem with it and could
37 respond but wanted to see if the Board had any thoughts on it.
38
39 The Board leaves it to Richard to draft a response.
40
41 He then explains the NCARB Legislative Tracker. It shows all the regulation and bill changes
42 throughout the United States. They spend quite a bit of time going through all this Legislation
43 and picking out those that are relevant and then doing a synopsis on what they pertain to. He
44 explains that it contains different topics and is easy to use. It is a great resource and we have
45 access to these NCARB websites. Sometimes there are thing in there that may pertain to other
46 disciplines as well because there other multi-discipline boards so he encourages the Board to
47 take a look at it.
48
49 Jones: Adds if anyone has problems gaining access he will help.
50
51 Rearick: Moves on to 9-b-7 which concerns the proposed requirement to hold an NCARB

1 Certificate to serve on the NCARB Board.
2

3 There was a short discussion regarding the Pros and Cons of this requirement. The Board was
4 divided on it. The arguments were that the requirement would limit applicants on the one hand
5 and on the other hand if you want to serve in a leadership position you should promote their
6 certification by obtaining one.
7

8 Rearick: Supports the requirement and adds that it's possible to serve on committees without
9 being on the NCARB Board so there are still opportunities for those that do not hold certificates.
10 He moves on with the comment that we don't need a vote on that. (Laughter) Item 8 was his
11 unsuccessful bid for another term on the Board. He feels his downfall was that he didn't get to
12 San Antonio soon enough to go to the mixer, (laughter) so I was left scrambling the next
13 morning trying to put together votes.
14

15 He explains that item 9 is a letter from NCARB rebutting a letter from the Texas Society of
16 Architects regarding Streamlining the Path to Licensure which contains a lot of interesting facts
17 but doesn't require any action from us.
18

19 Chair: Thanks Richard and moves on to 9 C – NCEES. Asks if there is any discussion or
20 comments on the NCEES correspondence and hearing none moves on to Item 9 D. He
21 recognizes John. Item 9 E – congratulations to Sara on her promotion to Director of CBPL.
22 Item 9 F is correspondence from Colin Smith re reciprocity with Canada along with some
23 examples of what other boards have done and some suggested language for a regulation
24 change. He notes that there was an article in the recent issue of PE that discussed licensure
25 mobility.
26

27 Maynard: Explains his position on reciprocity with Canada. They want us to accept them as
28 they are without examination but want us to take their practice exam and he isn't ready to do
29 that.
30

31 Chair: Asks if there is a copy of that exam.
32

33 Jones: Put this in two places. Under 17 D there is a sample of the types of questions on their
34 practice exam.
35

36 Chair: Has looked at this and had the impression that a lot of it was on par with our exam with
37 the exception of specific law and regulations of Canada which is about 40% of the exam. He
38 can see why they have the exam.
39

40 Maynard: We have exams too. Why don't they just come here and take the exam but they don't
41 want to take our exam, well, I don't want to take theirs and if they want us to waive ours then
42 they better darn well waive theirs.
43

44 Jones: They claim that they will license you right away and you have up to a year to take the
45 exam which isn't the way Neal explained it. They have an education committee that scrutinizes
46 your transcripts and they look closely because U.S. Universities are not standard like Canadian
47 universities. Then their experience committee looks at your experience.
48

49 Maynard: I'm not saying their system is bad but for me to do that it has to be both ways.
50

51 Chair: Notes that their language proposal, says waive the exam if the applicant has 8 years

1 licensure without a violation and asks if they did the same for us would that be ok.
2
3 Maynard: I would have no problem with that. But right now there're not willing to do it that way.
4
5 Hanson: They have brought this up for the last 8 years. They want to come in and say, well we
6 have a better system than yours, license us. We want to be licensed in Canada, well, wait a
7 minute you have an inferior system so you have to take this exam.
8
9 Jones: They don't recognize ABET that's why they look at the transcripts so closely.
10
11 Rearick: Adds that the agreement between NCARB and Canada they are recognizing both with
12 no additional requirements.
13
14 Hanson: If NCEES said if you meet the model law then you are good.
15
16 Maynard: Yes then I wouldn't have problem.
17
18 Chair: Suggests we draft a response for Colin. He asks if there wasn't something about an
19 emergency response provision.
20
21 Jones: I sent an e-mail to those people and haven't received a response.
22
23 Chair: Asks to re-send the email just to keep it alive. He adds that there was an invitation to
24 attend their meeting in Whistler but we probably won't be going.
25
26 **Agenda Item 10 – Correspondence Sent since January 2014.**
27
28 NO comments.
29
30 **Agenda Item 11 – Old Business.**
31
32 Hanson: Jeff drafted a letter for the travel stuff and I looked at it.
33
34 Koonce: I forwarded it to Eric. We got a response from Don to hold off. I think the feedback
35 was.....
36
37 Jones: The feedback is that they are working on it and they think that they are real close to a
38 solution and they didn't want to add anything to it right now.
39
40 Maynard: Advises that when the Legislative Budget and Audit Committee met and asked
41 people to come talk about HB187 and their experiences. I went and testified on behalf of myself
42 and I mentioned the whole travel policy and what a zoo it was and Representative Hawker said,
43 I thought we fixed that. So they obviously had heard about and thought they passed a statute to
44 change it so we could get paid by these National Organizations without jumping through hoops.
45
46 Jones: What they did was allow some of the money to come back to the Board. But they didn't
47 change the procedure.
48
49 Chair: Was under the impression that the Director of the Division would have the authority to
50 grant waivers.
51

1 Jones: That's what they are working on now.
2
3 Chair: Thinks there was a letter. We went in and visited with Don and provided him some
4 correspondence requesting, that's not in here though, but there was a written letter to Don
5 following that discussion formally requesting that waiver.
6
7 Jones: That was what I asked him when I found out he was going upstairs. I asked if this was a
8 done deal and he said they were working on it.
9
10 Chair: Bottom line is a request for a waiver came from us through Don and we never got a
11 response is where it's at now.
12
13 Koonce: Asks if we can ask for a waiver when we submit a request for travel.
14
15 Jones: Not yet.
16
17 Several members stated that we should just put in the travel request that it's funded by NCEES
18 and then once approved there would be no cost to the state.
19
20 Jones: We have to go through the third party reimbursement process.
21
22 Chair: We've already brought it to Don's attention so now we should bring it to Sara's attention.
23
24 Jones: You can do that tomorrow during the teleconference.
25
26 Chair: Nest item, seismic taskforce.
27
28 Maynard: Reports that he has drafted a letter but forgot to bring it. He was waiting for the
29 structural regulations to be public noticed.
30
31 Chair: These items will remain on as Old Business items.
32
33 Jones: Reminds the Board that public comment is coming up at 1:15 so they better break for
34 lunch soon.
35
36 Maynard: Gives a short refresher on what the seismic task force was asking for to bring the
37 new members up to speed.
38
39 12:05 p.m. recessed for lunch.
40
41 1:15 p.m. called to order. Roll call – all present
42
43 **Agenda item 13 – Public Comment**
44
45 There were no members of the public present.
46
47 Chair: We will continue and if anyone comes in we will stop.
48
49 **Agenda item 17 – New Business.**
50
51 Chair: New Business, CPC/PDH requirements for those with three or more licenses.

1
2 Jones: Thinks we submitted a regulation change for that last time.
3
4 Several comments about the regulations not being out for public notice yet and that the renewal
5 cycle is over now so we have two years to get this out.
6
7 Hanson: Asks Jones how the audit was going.
8
9 Jones: Reports that there are only a few left that he brought to the Board. Things he wasn't
10 sure about and then once Alicia left he didn't have time so those that came in after that were
11 brought to the Board. He was very lenient regarding requests for extension of time to provide
12 documents because most people take their vacations in the winter and a lot of licensees were
13 out of state when the letters were sent.
14
15 Maynard: Explains the situation for new members. In the past when we only licensed 6
16 branches the most anyone had was two licenses or maybe 3 and we required a maximum of 24
17 hours with 8 in each branch or profession for those with multiple licenses. Now we have 15
18 branches so we are going to continue to require a minimum of 24 hours with at 8 in each branch
19 so someone with 8 licenses will have to do 64 hours.
20
21 Chair: Asks if anyone has 8
22
23 Jones: 9, we have one person with 9 licenses he even has a nuclear license.
24
25 Koonce: Asks if he has an architect license.
26
27 Maynard: No they are all engineer.
28
29 Chair: Where is this at now?
30
31 Maynard: You can take it out of New Business and put it in Regulation Projects.
32
33 There was no item b.
34
35 Chair: Item C Engineering Surveys.
36
37 Hale: Reports that it's being discussed on the National level and that Texas is having some
38 problems with it due to TOPO surveys being placed under engineering because the only
39 definition was engineering surveying.
40
41 Koonce: Asks if it's in our regulations.
42
43 Hale: It's in our statute that engineers can do engineering surveys but he doesn't know how
44 that's defined.
45
46 Hanson: It's not defined so it could be anything. Your and my interpretation may not be the
47 same. Generally what's happening is the surveyors are getting upset on the National level, I'm
48 not talking about here, when they hear the term engineering and surveying together. The
49 engineers don't have a problem with it but the surveyors have a real problem with it because
50 does it mean an engineer can grab a tripod and go out and to a TOPO survey? Or can they do
51 a boundary survey or can they.....

1
2 Hale: Part of the issue is it seems to be in conflict with some of the statutes because if you're
3 not a licensed surveyor you're not supposed to be doing survey work. If you look at the
4 definition of survey work in includes topography which engineers are supposedly allow to do
5 incidental to their project.
6
7 Hanson: We actually got some correspondence about someone asking whether it was
8 engineering surveying or land surveying. And it was a FEMA flood mapping I think. He thinks a
9 response went out. His response was that a land surveyor surveyed the building and they have
10 the flood mapping and they can arrive at a decision based on that information then it's ok. But if
11 the engineer has to pull out an instrument to determine the floor elevation or some of that stuff
12 then they need to have a professional land surveyor certify the elevation of that structure.
13
14 Kerr: Adds that the caveat there is that the engineer need to be fully aware that of potential
15 vertical datum so it may not be as straight forward because the survey may not state the datum
16 so they may be mixing apples and oranges. So it's a potentially precarious thing for an
17 engineer to be doing unless they understand those things.
18
19 Hanson: That's pretty much what we told them.
20
21 Hale: From the engineering perspective, practically speaking, most engineers don't want to
22 survey so it's not occurring that much. It's always the small guy that's trying to do it cheap.
23 They are working out of their practice. It says on one sentence that they are allowed to do it
24 then in the next statute calls it surveying, which one trumps? Adds that we require some better
25 definitions.
26
27 Chair: Thinks that some of the data collected by engineers using survey instruments is just data
28 collection and not creating a documented survey.
29
30 Maynard: A lot of engineering survey has nothing to do with surveying instruments. There's a
31 project where a building that had a fire and we have to go and as-built what's left of it and
32 design the fixes or we go and we measure all of the parts of a pre-engineered metal building
33 that has no drawing because it was built 50 years ago and not on that site so we can evaluate it.
34 That is a survey but it's not a land survey. Or the mechanical guy goes out there and looks at
35 what's left and where we are going and that's an engineering survey.
36
37 Kerr: It seems like it would be fairly easy to clear this up by defining engineering surveying as
38 those things not defined in our statute for land surveying.
39
40 Hale: Adds that we should shore up the definition of land surveying while we are at it.
41
42 Kerr: There is no definition of engineering surveys so it could be easy to do it as all surveys
43 other than those described in the definition of land surveying.
44
45 There was a short discussion on an as-built, a conditions survey, construction staking etc. It
46 was pointed that under the definition of land surveying if you're not setting boundaries, doing
47 cadastral surveys, monumentation etc. it's not surveying.
48
49 Hale: Not sure what to do about it.
50
51 Kerr: Is there a reason not to define it?

1 Hale: Where would we put it?
2
3 Jones: Put it in 12 AAC 990. Definitions.. That way you can do it as a regulation change instead
4 of Statute change.
5
6 Chair: Do we need a special committee?
7
8 Kerr: Volunteered to work on it.
9
10 Chair: asks if anyone else wants to work on it besides John and Dave.
11
12 Hanson: Volunteers.
13
14 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Christensen and passed unanimously it**
15 **was RESOLVED to define engineering surveys in regulation.**
16
17 Chair: item 17 D Reciprocity with Canada. We already touched on this is there any more
18 discussion?
19
20 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Rearick and passed unanimously it**
21 **was RESOLVED to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(3) to**
22 **review applicant files.**
23
24 1:33 p.m. In Executive Session.
25
26 5:10 p.m. Recessed for the night.
27
28
29
30 **Friday May 2, 2014**
31
32 9:00 a.m. reconvened in Executive Session to complete file review.
33
34 9:25 a.m. Out of Executive Session. Roll Call, all present.
35
36 Chair: We have a call to make 10 a.m. So let's plan on stopping about 9:50 or so. We are on
37 Item 17 D. We added a discussion on investigative authority and how to define levels in general
38 and how to enforce them with consistency.
39
40 Rearick: Talks a little about company names being on drawings to identify who the person is
41 working for. He would do some research to find out what is required on the stamps such as the
42 firm name and other requirements.
43
44 Chair: Thinks we should put something out on these changes so people know what to expect.
45
46 Koonce: Asks about collecting the unpaid fees for the period a license is lapsed.
47
48 Jones: Will check Centralized Regulations and see what they say about that.
49
50 Chair: Suggests these things be added to next meeting's agenda.
51

1 Hanson: Thinks the address thing can be addressed as policy easily without regulation. The
2 Board needs to do something on a quarterly basis then post it on the web that you are out of
3 compliance we're going to do XYZ at the next board meeting.

4
5 Chair: We will add to next agenda and address them.

6
7 There was a short discussion about corporate logos and contact information.

8
9 Jones: Yesterday when you voted not to adopt the regulations on FE/FS changes there was
10 another regulation attached that should be adopted regarding the Surveying Standards of
11 Practice. You can adopt is separately from the others. It's under 7C and it's the last one on the
12 list.

13
14 **On a motion duly made by Hale, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it was**
15 **RESOLVED to adopt 12 AAC 36.071 Standards of Practice for Land Surveyors.**

16
17 **Agenda Item 18 – Special Committees.**

18
19 Licensure Implementation.

20
21 Maynard: All we have is the structural regulations we are waiting for Jun to public notice.

22
23 Registration and Practice.

24
25 Rearick: Doesn't have anything to report. He asks if we want to add the research him and
26 Colin are going to do regarding the logos.

27
28 Licensure Mobility.

29
30 Rearick: Reports that he sent out an email regarding the discussions NCARB had with Canada
31 and several meetings ago he had asked the Board if they wanted to sign on to that agreement.
32 Since then NCARB got the required number of states to sign on to adopt the Canadian
33 agreement. This doesn't mean we've adopted it just means that those states that signed on
34 agree to what's in that agreement. Since then NCARB came out with a Tri-National agreement
35 between Canada and Mexico. I had sent out an email to the AIA Board members and asked
36 them to forward it to their colleagues with an attachment of that agreement and a short
37 discussion of what it was. I got one response back and it was from Janet Matheson and she
38 recommended that we become a signatory to the agreement, however, there is nothing pressing
39 that we need to do on that. With only one response I don't feel we need to take action on it.
40 There are avenues for Canadians to be registered in Alaska so my recommendation is that we
41 not become a signatory at this point in time especially given the fact that we are looking at our
42 engineering side of things and we want to be consistent in how we develop regulations with
43 respect to Canada or other countries.

44
45 Maynard: Would lean the other way because of our stance that reciprocity should work both
46 ways and then they come up with a system that works that way we don't accept it because of
47 the engineers. He doesn't see a reason not to accept it.

48
49 Rearick: Doesn't disagree with that but thinks it would be better to put something back to the
50 engineering side and show them this agreement before we agree to take action on this one.

51

1 Hanson: Thinks that if we are going to agree to accept individuals that don't meet our statutes
2 we should public notice it.

3
4 A short discussion followed on what would need to be done to accept the agreement. It was
5 decided that a regulation project to change the comity regulation would be needed.

6
7 Chair: Asks if NCARB is waiting for a response from us.

8
9 Rearick: Volunteers to write a response and give our position. He notes that there was a push
10 in the beginning to get the 31 states but since they have the required number of signatories
11 there is no rush now.

12
13 Chair: Advises that he had seen something from the Society of Professional Engineers about
14 licensure mobility and that they were having some discussion and polling their membership.

15
16 Maynard: This issue was going to come up at the Western/Pacific meeting this month in Idaho
17 and Idaho has an agreement with the Canadians and they were looking to see how other states
18 handled it.

19
20 Chair: Thinks it would be helpful to have some feedback from their membership on this issue.

21
22 Mining Engineers/Geologists.

23
24 Walters: Notes that we had an applicant wanting to be a miner this time. (Laughter)

25
26 Hanson: No report.

27
28 Social Networking.

29
30 Hale: Reports that all he has done so far has look at other Boards to see what they are using.
31 They are using Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn that seems to be the three basic outreach
32 platforms. Vern and I were talking to a contact, in IT I think, then she moved and I haven't
33 gotten back to Vern to ask who the new contact is and see what it's going to take at the State
34 level to get things in place.

35
36 Chair: Asks if any of the other State Boards are doing anything.

37
38 Hale: ASPLS has a site that I administer, pretty casual. He thinks ours should be more
39 formalized on who controls it. Nationally this is how everybody communicates with their
40 members.

41
42 Hanson: Advises that DOT is using Facebook.

43
44 Jones: Notes that in our Division for someone to get access to the social networks they need a
45 letter from the Division to IT authorizing it and requesting access. To my knowledge no one
46 has. He asks Jenny if she knows of anyone.

47
48 Geary: No.

49
50 A short discussion followed regarding the fact that people would be more apt to go to a
51 Facebook site than our webpage to look for information and updates.

1
2 Enforcement Enhancement.

3
4 Maynard: Nothing to report. He wasn't sure what we were supposed to be doing.

5
6 Kerr: This was about getting the AG's office to be more responsive.

7
8 Maynard: And John Clark did that.

9
10 Chair: Asks if the committee needs to be continued. It was agreed to strike this committee and
11 it was decided that instead of forming new committees for the FE/FS issue and the Engineering
12 surveying issue that they would be assigned to the Registration and Practice Committee.

13 Hanson, Christensen and Hale joined the committee to assist on those projects.

14
15 Standing Committees.

16
17 Investigative Advisory Committee.

18
19 Hanson: Reports that it was pretty busy with John Clark there. We were meeting monthly and
20 sometimes every other week getting things moving. He notes that there a couple of issues that
21 Richard dealt with.

22
23 Guidance Manual.

24
25 Urfer: Reports that the committee had a number of informal conversations. Hopefully they will
26 have more progress to report next time.

27
28 Chair: Discontinues the discussion on committees and prepares for the Expenditure Report.
29 He goes over a few questions for Sara one of which was a report on the progress of hiring a
30 new investigator authorized by SB16 and filling the recently vacated Chief Investigator position.
31 Another question was on the waiver for travel. He asks if there are any other topics we should
32 discuss while she is on the phone.

33
34 Kerr: Asks if she was going to provide some expenditure details that we brought up last
35 meeting.

36
37 Hanson: Comments that it looks like we are on par to have another record year for indirect
38 expenditures.

39
40 Maynard: Adds that she said they don't get the numbers until the end of the year so these
41 numbers are just what they estimate the actual figures could be either less or more.

42
43 Chair: Feels that all the other board have the same concerns as us and it would be nice as a
44 body of boards to have some consistency of understanding of all this.

45
46 Maynard: Adds the phycologists Board has the same problem.

47
48 Schedler: Has a problem with the inconsistency. Having come from the University and having
49 to respond to OMB, they dig into the minutiae of indirects and made us substantiate absolutely
50 everything and they would be hot on certain topics, travel was always one. The accountability
51 they require of other State Agencies is phenomenal and then to come here and find that their

1 answer is, we have no idea. I just can't, you know, bring all this together.
2
3 Maynard: Doesn't know if she's not asking the DOA for accounting or they tell her they can't do
4 it or she's just not getting it.
5
6 Koonce: It has to be a matter of public record is some form.
7
8 Chair: So the right person hasn't been asked?
9
10 Maynard: I don't know. We have asked every meeting for an accounting of what goes in that.
11 And we hear, well we're not going to get a bill until after the end of the year and we are done
12 with the auditing. And to tell you what's in it we'll have to hire another person, which to me is
13 boloney, the person who came up with that number should be able to tell you what went into it.
14
15 Chair: Notes that it is public information and asks Kathleen if she know who we should ask.
16
17 Schedler: Thinks it goes back to OMB and sometimes in our conversations I felt like I could
18 actually answer the questions that we are asking Sara. Because I know how those decisions
19 are made. It's the same with any organization. It used to be that maybe you weren't charged
20 rent, you know, maybe DOT didn't ever have to pay their own rent and now they have to pay
21 their own rent. So it's the pushing out of those costs that they keep making the decisions the
22 same as the AG's office. You used to be able contact the AG's office and you didn't have to pay
23 them anything then someone said no we're not going to just base fund them we're going bill
24 them out. So not it's all parceled out. That's really answer of, I think, why the indirect keep
25 going up everybody across the whole system. And OMB knows what they've pushed out and
26 what they bill out and what's in that number. So it could well be that Sara doesn't recognize that
27 big picture or doesn't realize that that's what is in the number. But OMB knows. That's how
28 they balance the budget they just keep pushing it out and charging for more and more.
29
30 Maynard: That may be all legitimate but we would like to know what they are.
31
32 Chair: Asks Kathleen if she could help the board in finding answers to these questions.
33
34 Schedler: Would be happy to do that.
35
36 Call is placed to Sara's office.
37
38 Chair: Congratulates Sara on her promotion and thanks her for her time.
39
40 Chambers: Thank you, I'm excited about it and all I have to do and learn.
41
42 Chair: You have our ear if you want to review the expenditure report that you prepared.
43
44 Chambers: Looking at your expense report for the third quarter shows that your renewal was
45 successful and you're in a very positive financial position. That is obviously to be expected right
46 after renewals so looking at, as you know we look at the last two years to sort of predict the next
47 two. So you can take a look at the total expenses for the last two years as well as the total
48 revenue and get a sense that you are in a strong position to be able to move forward and cover
49 your expenses with the revenue that was received from this renewal. That's really what our
50 goal is, as you all know, is to capture almost all, if not all, of your expenses in the renewal period
51 and the anything above that would provide for investigations and any unforeseen activities that

1 may come along. You collected almost \$2M in revenue and your expenses and some expenses
2 for the last few years are just about \$1.5M so you are in a good spot. That's my technical term
3 for it.

4
5 Chair: We appreciate that, does anybody have any questions for the Director? Did you have
6 other items you wanted to address Director?

7
8 Chambers: Just briefly, thank you Mr. Chairman. I did want to give a quick update on the
9 Legislative Session that adjourned quite recently. We are still sort of filtering through the many
10 bills that passed that effect our agency, one of which was your signing and sealing bill. So
11 congratulations on that going through and as you know we stand ready to assist with any
12 regulations that need to move forward in support of that Statutory change if there needs to be
13 any regulations changed. We also worked together during a period of time on a concern that
14 the Administrative Regulations Review Committee had with your latest regulations project
15 regarding the, uh, as I understand it and as I testified in the Committee that you're really making
16 an administrative change to the way that the engineers and surveyors in training are tracked
17 and managed but it was a little bit more ambitious than the Regulations Review Committee,
18 which is a committee of Legislators, felt comfortable with. So their Attorney deemed it to be not
19 supported in Statute. We worked a little bit on discussing that and inviting the Committee to
20 assist in a statutory change to make that happen but that did not transpire. I worked with
21 Chairman Eriksen and Vern on that and I believe Vern was in contact with the Board on that
22 matter so none of this will be news to you however it does leave the board in the position of not
23 being able to move forward with that regulation change and possibly look at another Legislative
24 project for next session if that's the direction you want to head but that would certainly be up to
25 the board. That was our involvement on that topic.

26
27 Chair: Advises the Director that we did discuss that and wanted to thank you for your support
28 through that Legislative Session on both of those subjects. On the engineer in training we had
29 some discussion that resulted in placing that project on hold and are going to pursue the friendly
30 suggestion to make a statutory change to clarify the regulatory powers over engineers in
31 training and to make it clear that we are not necessarily in agreement we recognize the process
32 and that we need to clarify things and we will be working on a statutory project for next session.

33
34 Chambers: Great, well that was a good partnership that we had at that moment that required
35 some quick response so as you're working on your annual report that might be something to
36 consider putting in as a legislative request. And as you all know that is informational
37 advisement to us that as a board you would take on that project.

38
39 The last Legislative item that I can think of that might be of interest to you at this juncture is
40 HB187. Hb187 as you recall was the bill that was introduced to change the way that the
41 Division analyzes and assesses licensing fees to support the work of all of the professional
42 licensing programs. And that was introduced last year and it gained a little bit of steam last year
43 and then over the interim there was no activity and it came back up in hearings this session and
44 it generated some interest that we weren't necessarily expecting. It partnered with some
45 interests on other board issues, travel being a perennial issue, and it gained some steam with
46 the Legislative Budget and Audit Committee and it became a bit of everything you always
47 wanted to know about CBPL session, how professional licensing is funded and works and
48 policies and procedures. So the Legislative Budget and Audit Committee sort of called a time-
49 out on that process and has pledged to work with the Division in the interim to ensure that they
50 have the knowledge that they need to help us review and move forward with a truly meaningful
51 change if it's determined that one is actually needed, a truly meaningful change to that licensing

1 fee process. So while we were looking forward to having some new tools I think that the wider
2 discussion is really going to be substantial and productive for the Division, for the Legislature
3 and for our professional licensing boards. So that may result in an even better end product.
4 That is what happened with that effort this year and it's possible we might be taking up an effort
5 next year if the Legislature decides to move forward with a new piece of legislation.

6
7 Chair: Offers the Boards support and offers to help as needed.

8
9 Chambers: Thank you very much. I've always appreciated your boards support and your
10 candor with me and Director Habeger about the issues that are of concern. I think that that
11 really helped us to be responsive and move forward with potential solutions.

12
13 So those were the items that were on my list. I'm certainly happy to address any other topics
14 that the board may be concerned with.

15
16 Chair: We have a couple of outstanding items that we discussed. He asks the board if there
17 are any comments or questions before he continues.

18
19 Schedler: This is Kathleen Schedler and I don't want to be the broken record but my question
20 comes not just from me but from many other board members in regard to the indirect
21 expenditures. We're still waiting, I guess is the best word, for an explanation of what goes into
22 those indirect expenditures and, you know, my concern is that one year between FY11 and 12
23 we got a 39% increase. This makes it very difficult for a board to function responsibly within
24 their budget when we have no control over this whatsoever. And the other thought I have is if
25 this board were to completely go away the state would have to look somewhere else to collect
26 that \$400K. I don't believe we generate that as expenses we're just shoring up the state for
27 \$400K. Because our expenses are actually in our direct expenses, so that's why we really want
28 to know what is in the indirect expenses? And we realize that we can't control it, we may not
29 agree with it, but we want to know what it is. You know if it's the rent of the Department, if it's
30 the remodel of something, we just want to know what it is. Someone made that decision and we
31 want to be educated in it.

32
33 Chambers: Thank you, I appreciate that. We have sent out the last couple of years sent out
34 information on when the indirect expenses are determined as part of that end of year closeout.
35 We sent out some information this last year I believe it was in or around the end of September
36 or early October. Sent out a detailed, sort of line item list of what went into the indirect
37 expenses. I'd be happy to resend that, I'll send it go Vern and make sure he gets it out to all the
38 members. And that's more detail than we've been able to provide and I'm certainly very
39 interested in making sure you have those answers to your questions so if you review that and
40 find that you need more information we can look and see what it is that you need that isn't
41 represented there.

42
43 Schedler: My concern is that anything you send, Vern has shared and we have reviewed and
44 our questions have not been answered.

45
46 Maynard: Believes that the report was finished just, like a day before our meeting in November
47 and that copy did not get down to us so we got missed and then in February nobody thought
48 about so I'm not sure that we got that information.

49
50 Chambers: Well I need to make sure you get that and we have an opportunity to review it. Let
51 me get that immediately to Vern, I know that you're off site at a board meeting obviously so you

1 won't be able to look at it today. I'm happy to meet with Chairman Eriksen and walk through it
2 with him since we are both in Juneau. That might be a short term immediate move in that
3 direction and then we can certainly get that out to everyone and then the next time the board
4 meets we need to be sure that's on the agenda because you have had these questions, I recall
5 that we've had this conversation come up and is a concern and so you need to have that
6 information. That's an annual report so we will be distributing that again in the fall when that
7 information is closed and the fiscal year is closed. So I will do everything that I can to get that
8 out to you and then work on being responsive in a way that works best for the board.
9

10 Chair: Appreciates that and notes that it's been an issue for a number of years and that it
11 seems to be an increasing expense that we have not a lot of control over and it brings a concern
12 to us as a board looking out for and on behalf of the public. He asks if other board are having
13 similar concerns and questioning the Division, I'm just questioning if we are not expressing a
14 lone concern here.
15

16 Chambers: Mr. Chairman you are exactly right. Many boards do have a variety of questions
17 regarding indirects and our reporting to the boards has increased because of those concerns.
18 So, again I'm sorry we haven't had that opportunity to pick through that together, but we will.
19 The Legislative Budget and Audit Committee, the indirect allocation both from the Department to
20 the Division as well as within the Division was one of the reasons they stopped HB187 and
21 looked to this interim before this next session to dig deeper into Division finances with an eye on
22 indirects. It really is a topic that requires some dedicated time to walk through and they plan to
23 do that, this set of Legislators plan to do that. So we have been, as the conversation started,
24 Director Habeger spend quite a bit of time working on a some, like power point presentation and
25 hand-outs to help the Legislators understand indirects. And I, now that I'm in this spot, would
26 like to take that product and have an opportunity to walk through with each of our boards, that
27 very visual representation of exactly what Kathleen's question was, what goes into indirects,
28 how was it allocated, why is this number attached to our board and how did it get there and
29 really what's the benefit to the board. What are we seeing from the activities that are
30 represented in that amount? So that may be one of the opportunities of this legislation next
31 year is to look at HB187 MK 2 and look at indirects instead of investigative fees as an
32 opportunity to invite the public to share their part of this protection measure that we provide as a
33 board and a Division. So hopefully that will be something that I can deliver in the Fall when we
34 are having our indirect conversation and that will be able to cement some methodology in your
35 mind and likely raise more questions. I often find that the more you know the more questions
36 you have and I appreciate that and would invite your questions, as always.
37

38 Maynard: Has one more comment about the indirect expenses. He has a problem with the way
39 it's distributed between the boards. He knows it's based on the total number of licensees and
40 he cites the remodel of the investigative spaces and notes that we only had 1/6 of one
41 investigator but had to pay 10% of the cost. That doesn't seem like a fair distribution. I don't
42 know how many, what percentage of employees we have in the area we rent but it may not be
43 10% of that either. It may be that you need to take each line item of the indirects and assign
44 them by some other way that is more reasonable than just taking the whole lump and saying ok
45 you've got this many licensees, this is your bill, which has absolutely nothing to do with what
46 you're actually costing the state and what percentage of that cost is really related to your
47 function.
48

49 Chamber: That's a point well taken and I know that at your last meeting here in Juneau several
50 members suggested some ideas for other indirect allocation methods and that is exactly what
51 we will be walking through with the Legislature. All of those ideas are worth exploring, and

1 again I'm looking forward to that opportunity to explore that with the Legislature and then also
2 internally because many of those decisions are certainly guided by statute but the allocation
3 methodologies are often management decisions and I now have the opportunity to have a little
4 bit more say in that. We also have a new Director of Administrative Services who is the head of
5 our accounting and admin service support which supports all the activities of the Division and
6 we will be walking down this path together and may have the opportunity to really scrutinize
7 some of the suggestions we've heard from your members as well as other members and which
8 yet to be heard through this public process.

9
10 Maynard: Just to finish this it may mean that some of the bills go up because we have two
11 employees and some of the other boards have 1/6 of one and that's fine to but it needs to be a
12 little more rational.

13
14 Chair: Director that Segway's into a couple of our next questions. One is we were hoping to get
15 an update on the hiring of a new Investigator and Chief Investigator.

16
17 Chambers: Yes, excellent question. We have gone through a round of interviews and did not
18 select a candidate from that pool so we are going to put the recruitment back out and see if we
19 can cast a wider net to find another set of interviewees. We had John Clark in acting status.
20 John has been an investigator with the Division for many years and retired and came back as a
21 non-permanent acting status which was a brilliant move on the part of Director Habeger. Mr.
22 Clark was able to come in with knowledge of the Division but a fresh eye and has close 450
23 cases since February just going through and looking at the criteria of what's stagnant, what
24 needs to be closed and cleaning it up and he's made some great efficiencies but his period of
25 time ended and Angela Birt is now the acting Chief until we find a permanent Chief Investigator.
26 We are looking at an opportunity we have right now to slightly restructure the unit. That's been
27 a topic that's been floating around for over a year but was never completed and I'm very
28 motivated to complete that restructure to add a layer of senior investigators. We have the
29 personnel, we have the PCN's, just not arranged in a way that supports that more efficient
30 business change. Currently the Chief Investigator has 18 direct reports which have resulted in
31 quite a bottleneck of supervisory responsibilities as well as caseloads. So, we are looking at
32 that as an opportunity and with that will come recruitment for vacant PCN's that we have or will
33 have soon with one of our investigators moving on to another Division. That should not impact
34 your investigative work because your position is dedicated, that won't change and you will still
35 receive that high level of responsive service. Anytime you have a concern about that or you feel
36 that isn't what you're receiving, please do let me know. Vern and I did talk about this dynamic
37 change and I just wanted to reassure you that for the programs that have that dedicated
38 statutory investigator, that service level will not change even though we have some changes in
39 personnel and elsewhere in that unit.

40
41 Chair: Thank you. On behalf of the Board we have great gratitude and appreciation for the
42 efforts of John Clark and I think it's enlightening with the idea that during your interview process
43 for the Division that having the right person in the job has a great deal of impact on the success.
44 I applaud you for trying to find that right person instead of simply filling the position. Secondly
45 the importance of having all those positions filled. We will look forward to seeing where that
46 goes. He then asks about the status of the waiver request for travel.

47
48 Chambers: Yes, that is a little bit harder nut to crack than some of the other travel processes
49 that we have been and are continuing to dig into. That was an area that Director Habeger was
50 looking into before he left. He had some ideas that he shared with me that I'm sharing with the
51 Director of Admin Services so that we can be continuing to collaborate on that. That particular

1 issue we are just finding it a hard, we are finding it difficult to find the authority to allow that. But
2 now that we have an ally who understands this issue keenly in the new Deputy Commissioner of
3 the Depart of Administration I'm going to be discussing this with former Director Habeger in his
4 new capacity and seeing if there is anything new, anything more, any resolution since the
5 Department of Administration administers travel policy and sets those travel policies if there is
6 another layer that we can leverage. So, if you see him on the street, maybe don't tell him that
7 quite yet (laughter). But as the post session activities die down and we are back into a little bit
8 of a routine we may have an advantage to continue to pursue that. In the mean time I know that
9 Vern has really been a leader and a model in the Division in speaking outside the box with
10 associations and I'm not sure if it was excellent persuasive skills or he bribed them or what but
11 getting the associations to at least reimburse the board through the State instead of just letting
12 the money sit on the table has been a move in the right direction. It may not be what the board
13 would set as an ideal but he's been really useful in convincing the associations to work
14 according to the State processes and at least get that portion of reimbursement back over to the
15 State. And as you recall we have a certain pot of money that we have the authority to
16 reimburse the board directly instead of all that money going to the General Fund. That amount
17 was not increased by the Legislature this year but at least we're still working with more than we
18 had two years ago when travel was really a crisis.

19
20 Maynard: When the Budget and Audit Committee had their hearings about the Division and I
21 testified and explained about the whole problem with the travel Representative Hawker made a
22 statement to the rest of his committee members that he thought that they had solved that
23 problem. I don't know how he thought he solved it but I can ask him or you can ask him if you
24 like and maybe they didn't they just thought they did. But he was under the impression that they
25 had solved the problem somehow.

26
27 Chambers: Well they did allow an amount of money to be able to go back to the boards. It
28 didn't address direct reimbursement to the board members, bypassing the State. That wasn't at
29 all part of that travel authority.

30
31 Hanson: I've been working on the travel issue for a while and we had a letter ready to go and
32 we were told to kind of hold off on it. But it's already within the Administrative Code, the waiver
33 process, how to go about that and who approves it and, you know, maybe this is my ignorance
34 but as long as a travel authorization is completed for an individual by the State, whether it's a
35 dollar of \$5k they're on State business. I think that was the real issue, you're not on State
36 business if the State isn't paying travel. Well if you have a travel authorization you're on State
37 business, it doesn't matter the cost. So if that travel authorization says they are going to be
38 getting \$62 of per diem for 3 days and someone else is picking up the rest of the tab they are an
39 authorized State representative at that point. I think the mechanics are there to make this
40 happen, it was done, whether it was right or wrong, I think it's just a different interpretation, a
41 stricter interpretation that's not allowing it now because it was done this way for a long time. So
42 any support we can give you, we've done a lot of research on our own to figure out how to make
43 this for our board. I'm not sure if other boards are having the same situation but we have a
44 significant number of meetings every year that others are willing to pay for and it is a benefit to
45 the State of Alaska and the residents of Alaska that we should be taking advantage of. Any
46 support that we can give let us know.

47
48 Chambers: Thank you.

49
50 Chair: Asks if there are any other questions. Hearing none he mentions that the board is going
51 to start inviting more people to attend the meetings in order to build relationships and asks the

1 Director of she has any comments or suggestions and then thanks her for her time.
2
3 Chambers: Thank you it's always a pleasure to meet with you. I appreciate all of your
4 questions and suggestions and as usual I'm taking copious notes while we're meeting and one
5 other item I do want to mention is that we have some more licensing examiner interviews next
6 week so we are working to fill that vacancy in support of your board so thank you for your
7 patience during that process and as usual my door and my phone lines are open and I will be
8 working to send Vern, today, the indirect backup documentation and I'm willing to meet with
9 board members, the board Chairman or the board itself in the method that you want to review
10 that documentation so we will get that done as soon as possible.
11
12 Call ended.
13
14 Chair: Let's take a 5 minute break.
15
16 10:30 a.m. Break
17
18 10:40 a.m. back on record.
19
20 Chair: We are back on record. Does anyone have any comments following the conversation
21 with the Director?
22
23 Jones: Asks what the board is looking for in the indirects for information? Do you want to know
24 what the expense was how much the expense was and what our share was is that what you're
25 looking for?
26
27 Response from several board members was yes basically what goes into it.
28
29 Hanson: If you look at the one she provided, that's pretty good, it shows where every charge is
30 according to the account number. They have that same account number.....
31
32 Maynard: Thinks it was given to us but it was really late and they had stuff like lawyer's fees, or
33 expert witness fees and if we hired an expert witness it wouldn't be an indirect.
34
35 Hanson: There was something in there that was a million bucks.
36
37 Schedler: Adds that we got a summary after the meeting and then we got a link to the full report
38 so if somehow we could resurrect summary and link then that's her last year's yearly report.
39
40 Maynard: I understand that they don't do one quarterly.
41
42 Chair: Thinks Kathleen has a good idea.
43
44 Jones: When I have the time to look that up I'll send you an email.
45
46 Maynard: Then we can pick it apart.
47
48 Chair: We are on Legislative Liaison Committee.
49
50 Maynard: We got HB167 through.
51

1 Koonce: Suggests that Shiesl can be removed from the committees.
2
3 Maynard: Suggests that we assign our new member to a committee.
4
5 Chair: Assigns John to the Guidance Manual Committee. He asks if there are any other
6 suggestions on committee assignments.
7
8 Schedler: Emeritus has no chair.
9
10 It was decided to put whoever is the Board Chair as chair of that committee.
11
12 Chair: Assigns Kathleen to the Budget Committee in place of Shiesl.
13
14 Budget Committee
15
16 Koonce: We did draft a letter and maybe it should be forwarded to the new Director.
17
18 Hanson: We should just send the letter and be done with it. We've been dealing with this
19 forever, ever since they changed it. It's a formal request for waiver, they are not solving
20 anything.
21
22 Maynard: Asks if they cited the appropriate sections.
23
24 Jones: Doesn't they changed anything, we were just doing it wrong before and they said you
25 can't do that.
26
27 Hanson: Without approval because when you read the Administrative Code it says waive right
28 in there, we're not making this stuff up. It says if the employee is reimbursed directly you do
29 this, they're saying we can't even be directly reimbursed. I say we just send the letter.
30
31 Chair: Continuing Ed.
32
33 Hanson: I'll work with Vern before the next board meeting to get an idea how many audits we
34 did and how many we had to ask for additional information. I don't think we had any licensing
35 action. We got through the last ones so it doesn't look like we'll have any.
36
37 Jones: Reiterates that he was very lenient with the reporting times. One of the problems is that
38 this comes out in February and half of Alaska is down south in February. These people aren't
39 getting their mail, they are on vacation. When he gets a call from some saying they just got the
40 letter he asks them to send an email explaining the situation and asking for an extension.
41
42 Hanson: Asks how many were returned due to bad addresses.
43
44 Jones: Says he had several and when asked if he found them responded that he didn't even
45 look for them.
46
47 Hanson: So we do have licensing action.
48
49 Jones: Some of them didn't respond because they retired their license or just let it lapse. I had
50 two who just renewed last week and were audited and I'll have to check and see if they
51 responded to the audit.

1
2 Kerr: If they are not renewed and didn't respond and they renew later will we catch that?
3
4 Jones: Yes, he explains that when he calls up a license there is a flag that indicates it was
5 audited. He advises that there is a paralegal in the Division that handles licensing action
6 regarding continuing education audits. I just take it over to him and he takes care of it. Last
7 time we took a license away. It was an older retired guy that renewed just to have the license
8 without doing the CE and then decided he didn't need the license. He had two licenses he was
9 an engineer and surveyor so he lost them both.
10
11 Maynard: Asks if anyone claimed 24 and only had 18.
12
13 Chair: We had one guy who had 18 and said his employer lost his records.
14
15 There was a short discussion on record keeping. Several members noted that it's not the
16 employer's license you need to keep your own records.
17
18 Chair: IDP Liaison.
19
20 Rearick: Nothing to report.
21
22 **Agenda item 20 – Board Travel.**
23
24 Chair: Board travel, NCEES Western zone in Lincoln NE May 15-17. We have 4 people going
25 so that should be a good attendance. NCARB meeting in June?
26
27 Jones: I will get the travel request out next week. He advises the board that they can make
28 hotel reservations before the travel is authorized but they should make sure there is no penalty
29 for cancelation.
30
31 Maynard: Adds that they did a study and the cheapest fares are 54 days before departure. So
32 it might behoove them to get approval at least 60 days before.
33
34 Chair: Advance approval would be very helpful.
35
36 Koonce: Asks about the designated delegate form that's sent to NCARB.
37
38 Chair: NCEES in Seattle in August.
39
40 Jones: Notes that the information is already out for that one so he will have to get the travel
41 request in for that one also.
42
43 There was a short discussion about who could go to Seattle.
44
45 Chair: CLARB meeting in September.
46
47 Jones: Doesn't have the info on that one yet but will put in for himself, Luanne and John C.
48
49 Chair: Other Board travel, questions or comments?
50
51 **Agenda item 21 – National Meeting Reports.**

1
2 Rearick: Reports that NCARB held a Regional Summit where they had all regions at the same
3 place at the same time. It had a little bit of a National Meeting flavor but without so much of
4 NCARB pushing their agenda. He gave the results of the elections and reported on the various
5 speakers that made presentations at the meeting.
6

7 Koonce: spoke a little on the ethics presentation. Both thought it was an excellent presentation.
8

9 **Agenda Item 22 – Licensing Examiner Report.**

10
11 Jones: We don't have a Licensing Examiner so, no report.
12

13 **Agenda Item 23 – Board Tasks (To Do List)**

14
15 Chair: We'll just go around the room. He discusses the items on his list. Maynard will get him
16 the letter for the Seismic Task Force Monday. No updates on software engineering.
17

18 Mentorship regulation project?
19

20 Jones: That was to see if maybe we should change the part about face to face meetings with
21 the technology of today.
22

23 Chair: He met with Don, Vern and Sara several times since last meeting and talked about a lot
24 of the issues we've had during our meeting today. One item is forwarding the letter regarding
25 travel that Jeff and Brian worked on to Sara, our new Director. Vern and I were going to
26 summarize a response to Colin Smith regarding his correspondence to the Board.
27

28 Hale: He contacted Mr.Hazelton who referred him to the student society regarding outreach on
29 CBT but he couldn't find a meeting schedule. He will try to work the code of conduct into the
30 Guidance Manual. Social networking is an ongoing project. He will be working on engineering
31 surveying with the Licensure and Practice Committee.
32

33 Hanson: He attended a meeting with DEC regarding record drawings. He worked with Jeff on
34 the letter regarding travel. He will be working on the engineering surveying project, the EIT/LSIT
35 Statute and Regulation project and fines and penalties for not keeping address updated.
36

37 There was a short discussion regarding addresses and penalties. Rearick suggests the \$500
38 civil fine. Maynard mentions collecting overdue licenses fees instead of just the current when
39 renewing lapsed licenses.
40

41 Kerr: Will be working on the definition of engineering surveying.
42

43 Koonce: Already talked about the travel letter. He asks if a board representative should attend
44 the Building Officials forum that Savage attends every year and volunteers to attend.
45

46 Jones: Will ask Savage what he thinks of having a board member there.
47

48 Urfer: Guidance Manual is ongoing. She asks about Intern landscape architects.
49

50 Hanson: Adds her to the committee.
51

1 Maynard: The structural engineering project is done we're just waiting for Jun to post it. He will
2 get the letter regarding seismic hazards to Eric on Monday. Letter to the AG's office came off
3 my list due to your meeting with Don. HB167 passed so that can come off my list. He will be
4 working on the EIT Statute/Regulation change.

5
6 Rearick: Electronic Signatures moved to Registration and Practice and is ongoing, nothing to
7 report. Canada MRA is ongoing as part of the Licensure Mobility Committee now. He was
8 going to draft a letter to NCARB stating that we are not opposed to it but need more information.
9 He will be working on the logo address issue and also the EIT Statute change and how that
10 effects the AIT designation. He will respond to NCARB's request for a Board position on IDP
11 changes.

12
13 Maynard: Suggests, regarding the EIT issue, that we try to get guidance from the AAG on why
14 we can do this and not that. So the Committee has some idea where to go with it.

15
16 Chair: Asks how we will do that. Jones volunteers to take care of it.

17
18 Maynard: We have the intern development program the mentorship program. There are a
19 number of regulations that deal with interns. Some of them refer to them as interns and some of
20 them don't.

21
22 Rearick: Is going to send Eric a copy of the NCARB/Canada agreement so he could draft a
23 letter to the Canadian engineering side.

24
25 Koonce: Asks about the intern/EIT thing is there is a practice wide description or definition
26 established by NCEES or AIS or NCARB? This prompted a short discussion.

27
28 Schedler: Contacted the engineering schools regarding CBT outreach but didn't get a
29 response.

30
31 Christensen: Will work with Luanne on the Guidance Manual. He would like to be involved in
32 the Intern project.

33
34 Walters: Will work on the Guidance Manual but is willing to help anyone on anything.

35
36 Jones: Passed out the info on early testing last meeting. Called Mark Morris and left message
37 on how he should stamp his plans. He will find another contact for Dave regarding social
38 networking. The flow chart was passed out. Follow up on the emergency response item. He
39 responded to several emails from last meeting. He will research the Centralized Regulations
40 regarding fees and fines, ask Savage about a board member attending the Building Officials
41 Forum and talk to the AAG about the intern situation.

42
43 Chair: Asks if we missed anything.

44
45 **Agenda item 25 – Calendar of Events.**

46
47 August 11-12, 2014, Anchorage
48 November 4-5, 2014, Anchorage
49 February 5-6, 2015, Juneau
50 May 7-8, 2015, Fairbanks

51

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

Agenda Item 24 – Read Applications into the Record.

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

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

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

The following candidates are found <i>Incomplete</i> , pending completion of all required documentation & fees.			
Baginski, Sean Joseph	Structural	Gfthr.	Incom/Project letter for Artic Mini Mall or Calcs for Muldoon
Carpenter, Wesley	Control Systems	Comity	Requesting FE waiver. Approved/\$
Clemenz, Bryan W.	Control Systems	Gfthr.	Incomplete/ref ltrs from Kittle & BP Tech Authority
Croasmun, William R.	Civil	Comity	Incomplete/JQ & investigation report, Verification by PE, of additional responsible charge
Evans, Simon Andrew	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Calcs
Fawcett, Daniel Wade	Fire Protection	Gfthr.	Incomplete/no calcs included/\$

Gabbert, Paul S.	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Project Questionnaire but no plans & specs
Glaves, Eric F.	Surveyor	Exam	Incomplete/Need evidence of 2 yrs course Bd Approved Curr in Land surveying & 36 months responsible charge
Goudarzi, Ardeshir S.	Mechanical	Comity	Incomplete/2 nd reference that has known him 5 years
Heer, Kirk L.	Mechanical	Comity	Incomplete/Reference discipline on work experience form
Hopkins, Donald L.	Control Systems	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Supporting documentation for pump station project
Howlett, Garth K.	Structural	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Calcs for Rig Tenders Dock Improvements/\$
Jacobson Gregory N.	Structural	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Calcs for projects
Johnson, Edwin Ellis	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Provide 1 additional Project
Jones, Gregory V.	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Still no calcs-all data in one file/\$
Keniston-Longrie, Joy Lynn	Environmental	Comity	Resubmit after receiving transcript
Krysinski, Nicholas E.	Mechanical	Exam	Incomplete/no exper of responsinle charge in mech. Under PE, JP & FE/\$
Lindell, Larry Gene	Structural	Comity	Incomplete/Artic.,JPQ, Educa/ FE/PE Exam
Nyman, David M.	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Signed, sealed dated calcs & plans as per 12AAC 36.106(e)
Presler, Wendy A.	Civil	Exam	Incomplete/9 months additional exp/\$
Shonsey, Cara W.	Civil	Exam	Incomplete/Needs additional 8 months responsibility charge/\$
Snyder, Edward E.	Mechanical	Comity	Incomplete/Need Resp charge ref in mechanical
Sterling, David Robert	Structural	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Two projects designed by applicant including plans, calcs & references
Warton, Nicholas J.	Civil	Exam	Incomplete/Work exp verification was signed 12/18/13. However verifies through 4/11/14/JP requirement

Wike, Vanessa Blevins	Environmental	Gfthr.	Incomplete/Signed, sealed and dated plans & calculations as for 12 AAC 36.106(e)
Xu, Qi	Chemical	Exam	Incomplete/show total of 60 months' work experience/\$

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

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

The following candidates are Approved by Examination, Comity, or Additional Branch, pending completion of all required documentation and fees.			
Anderson, Michael N.	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Antwiler, Douglas Dean	Structural	Comity	Approved
Arrington, Lynn, III	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPO, Artic Eng.
Badgett, Robert Keller	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Bannow, Josh R.	FS		Approved
Belway, Sarah L.	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Billman, Daniel W.	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Bishop, John Scott	Structural	Comity	Conditional/JQ
Bobo, Brett Alan	Civil	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Bojko, Veronica L.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved/\$
Bott, James Wescott	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Campbell, Peter John	Environmenta l	Comity	Approved
Campfield, Michael Jonathan	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Conditional/Verify professional practice area is environmental
Carlson, Ryan William	Mechanical	Comity	Conditional/JP
Chadwick, Benjamin R.	Civil	Comity	Conditional/Proof educ & JP

Chin, Michael G.	Civil	Comity	Conditional/FE,JP,Artic
Clark, Daniel J.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/JQ
Colquhoun, Jason	Fire Protection	Gfthr.	Approved
Comerio, Anthony K.	Civil	Comity	Conditional/Artic
Croft, Christopher S.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Cunningham, Daniel J.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/JQ
Dahl, Michael Dean	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Deibler, Nathaniel Mark	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Denton, Jonathan Davis	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Dey, Collin Lewis	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Duval, John Ivor	Civil	Comity	Conditional/Artic Engin & JPO
Eliason, Samuel MacArthur	Civil	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Esch, Bradley M.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/Verification of exam, registration, Educ, Artic Engineering
Esmaili, Ali A.	Mechanical	Comity	Conditional/JP/NU
Farnham, Adam D.	Fire Protection	Comity	Conditional/JP
Ferebauer, Robert Lyndon	Mechanical	Comity	Conditional/JP
Fletcher, Mathew A.	Structural	Comity	Approved
Florey, James Russell	Mechanical	Comity	Conditional/JP & Artic
Francois, Kris Ellen	Structural	Comity	Approved/\$
Freese, David A.	Civil	Exam	Conditional/JPO Exam
Gastrock, Brian T.	Environmental	Gfthr.	Approved
Gilliland, Amanda L.	Civil	Exam	Conditional/Passing PE/\$
Gotschall, Howard Nelson	Structural	Comity	Conditional/Artic Engineering
Gould, Timothy Francis	Environmental	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Hall, Jordan R.	Civil	Exam	Conditional/Exam,ABET Degree in civil/\$
Hanson, Carolyn	Civil	Comity	Approved
Harris, Marcia D.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/JQ
Harriss, Brian E.	Structural	Comity	Approved
Hart, Michael N.	Mechanical	Commit y	Approved

Havenar, Thomas E.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/JQ
Hinds, Cory L.	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Hopkins, Donald L.	Fire Protection	Gfthr.	Approved
Hoskins, Stephen Paul	Electrical	Comity	Conditional/Artic/JP
Hunt, Glen L., III	Structural	Comity	Approved
Hussein, Zaid S.	Civil	Exam	Conditional pending JPQ/\$
Huynh, Khoi Duc	Electrical	Comity	Approved/\$
Ivanov, Vladimir I.	Structural	Comity	Conditional upon Artic, JPQ
Johnson, Lee Alan	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Keener, Julie Ann	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Kiddle, Fraser Wood	Mechanical	Exam	Approved/\$
Kidney, Scott Matheson	Petroleum	Exam	Conditional/JP & Verify FE/\$
Kocher, Erik Johann	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPQ & Artic
Kovel, Jeffrey Scott	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPQ
Kulbaga, John	Mechanical	Comity	Conditional/JP
Lasich, Andrew M.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/Artic & JQ
Laurent, Thomas H.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Lies, Kenneth M.	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPQ/\$
Ligozio, Christopher A.	Structural	Comity	Approved
Lips, Edwin C.	Mining	Comity	Conditional/Proof FE exam, Artic, JP
Logan, Jeffrey N.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Lundin, David	Enviromental	Gramps	Approved
Lucas, Warren K.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Malone, Chad J.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Maney, Duane C.	Civil	Exam	Conditional/Proof degree/\$
Marcum, Samuel J.	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Mason, Thad	Electrical	Comity	Approved
Mawson, Simon John	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
McDonald, William M.	Control Systems	Gfthr.	Approved

McDonnell, Terry R.	Structural	Comity	Approved
McNulty, Michael G.	Civil	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Meeks, Andrea D.	Environmental	Gfthr.	Approved
Melendez, Victor M.	Electrical	Exam	Approval upon passing exam
Menough, Jon M.	Environmental	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Merrick, Steven B.	Electrical	Comity	Conditional/JP/\$
Meyring, Justin T.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Mork, David Mitchell	Civil	Exam	Conditional/exam, JPO/\$
Nash, Adam S.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved/\$Approved to take Exam
Nelson, Andrew John	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Nelson, Derek Sven	Civil	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Newell, Aaron Dahlberg	Civil	Comity	Conditional/JPO/\$
Ohrt, Andrew W.	Environmental	Comity	Approved
Olszewski, Peter J.	Civil	Comity	Approved/\$
Oot, Ryan Harold	Civil	Exam	Conditional/exam/\$
Ostbo, Bruce I.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/Verification of exam, registration, PLQ, Educ
Pace, Roy N.	Control Systems	Gfthr.	Approved
Pannone, Steven R.	Environmental	Gfthr.	Approved
Pepe, John A.	Control Systems	Gfthr.	Approved
Perrin, Andre' J.	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPO
Pfitzinger, Joel B.	Structural	Comity	Approved
Phillips, Matthew Everette	Civil	Comity	Approved
Pirvulescu, Maria	Electrical	Comity	Approved
Rahimi, Famarz	Control Systems	Comity	Approved/\$
Read, Alexander L.	Civil	Exam	Conditional/exam/\$
Richmond, Peter Michael	Electrical	Comity	Conditional/FE, Verification PE, JP
Roberts, Michael Garrett	Environmental	Comity	Conditional/JP
Robertson, Jeffrey S.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved/\$

Roelfs, Scott Thackery	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved/\$
Sande, Trevor Scott	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Sande, Trevor Scott	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Sadow, Patrick	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Sauve, Summer M.	Civil	Exam	Conditional on exam/\$
Schanne, Joel David	Civil	Exam	Conditional pending exam, JPQ/\$
Sirois, Nathan M.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
SlatonBarker, Tony B.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Smith Nicholai J.W.	Electrical	Exam	Conditional/FE, fees, Artic, JP/\$
Solan, John P.	Mechanical	Comity	Conditional/Artic & JP
Stark, Jeremy D.	Civil	Exam	Conditional upon JQ
Steiner, Dan Edward	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Stoughtenger, Samantha	Civil	Comity	Approved
Swanson, Christine A.	Fire Protection	Comity	Approved
Tauriainen, Michael J.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Thevenot, Toby M.	Control Systems	Comity	Conditional/JP/\$
Tierney, Todd A.	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPQ
Torrents, Jeannette M.	Structural	Comity	Approved
Triandafilou, Nicholas	Structural	Comity	Conditional/JPQ
Tyrell, William A.	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Underhill, Gregory C.	Civil	Comity	Conditional/Exam, JQ, Registration
Vinberg, Hubert, Jr.	Architect	Comity	Conditional/JPQ
Vincent, John F.	Structural	Comity	Approved/\$
Wagner, Natalie M.	Environmenta l	Comity	Approved
Webb, Jason L.	Structural	Gfthr.	Approved
Westervelt, Warren Winslow	Environmenta l	Gfthr.	Approved
Wyatt, Scott T.	Structural	Comity	Conditional/Artic Engineering
Xie, Bin	Chemical	Comity	Approved

FS Exams			
Nash, Adam S.	FS		Approved
Whitehead, Jared G.	FS		
Bannow, Josh R.	FS		Approved
FE EXAMS			
Alexander, Seth	FE		
Alshammari, Fahad	FE		
Bailey, Richard	FE		
Balstad, Logan	FE		
Barnett, Robert Blair	FE		
Baumgartner, Milaud	FE		
Berg, Sean	FE		
Bergerson, Ryan	FE		
Bernardi, Adam	FE		
Boerger, Jared Thomas	FE		
Calkins, Justin	FE		
Carter, Eric Mitchell	FE		
Coisman, Charles	FE		
Critchett, Denali	FE		
Critchett, Denali	FE		
Cuanzon, Ronald	FE		
Cullen, Kodiak	FE		
Dukowitz, Austin	FE		
Ellingson, Dalton Brian	FE		
Harren, Paul Otto	FE		
Hnilicka, Charles	FE		
Hoffman, Sarah R	FE		
Kemp, Beaux Michael	FE		
Martino, Brett	FE		
Odom, Kristine	FE		

Platt, Wilson Tucker	FE		
Polasek, Thomas	FE		
Ringler, Chad E.	FE		
Roseberry, Mark Joseph	FE		
Tsogtsaikhan, Tsakhiur	FE		
Ward, Rachel	FE		
Wooten, Shawn Lee	FE		
Zimmer, Raymond	FE		

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

Agenda item 26 – Board Member Comments.

Rearick: Notes that with John’s appointment we will have the same Board Members for almost 2 years and looking forward to working with all the new members.

Maynard: We got a lot done and have a lot more to do. He thanks Jenny for filling in, welcomes John and will see everyone in August or Nebraska.

Christensen: Appreciates the opportunity to serve on the Board. He thinks it would be nice if more people knew what the Board does. He observes that the Board does quite a bit of work and thanks everyone.

Kerr: Welcomes John C. and thanks everyone for a very productive meeting.

Urfer: Thanks everyone for a productive meeting and welcomes John C.

Walters: Thanks everyone and welcomes John C. and thanks Jenny for sitting in.

Geary: Thanks you for letting her be a part of this you are all wonderful, you’re everything Vern always talks about. (Various comments and laughter)

Schedler: Thanks the Board for coming to Fairbanks and not having all the meetings in Anchorage. She feels the Board is doing really important work. She hasn’t been on the Board that long but feels they are getting at the meat of things and discussing important issues. She would like to see the public at the meetings and suggests that maybe there is something we can do to encourage, she is impressed with the relationship with the Fire Marshalls office and thinks it is very important but we need to the engineers and architects to come and tell us what their issues are.

Hale: Happy to be here learning from everyone and glad to be a part of it.

Koonce: Notes that he has completed a year on the Board. He is learning a lot about the processes and the industry we belong to. He welcomes John C. and Luanne on their appointments and Brian on his reappointment.

Hanson: Thinks it was a good meeting. He welcomes John C. and thanks Jenny for filling in for Alicia and that she will be missed. He thanks Eric for a great job as Chair and Richard on his election as the new Chair. He thanks Vern for filling two sets of shoes these last few months

1 and hopes we find a replacement soon.

2

3 Jones: Thanks Jenny for volunteering to fill in and doing an excellent job. He advises that a
4 new Licensing Examiner has been hired and will start Monday. He asks the Board to email him
5 their travel receipts next week. He tells the Board that anytime we are meeting in their area, like
6 Kathleen this time, if they want to invite someone to the meeting to feel free to do so or if they
7 want him to invite them just let him know. He notes that we are almost back to normal after the
8 influx of all the grandfathering applications at the end of last year.

9

10 Eriksen: Thanks everyone for all their hard work and support. He valued the opportunity to be
11 Chair this last year and he is looking forward to supporting Richard. He thanks the staff for their
12 work and welcomes John C.

13

14 11:50 a.m. Meeting adjourned.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

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

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

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

Date: _____