

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 November 4-5, 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 November
13 4-5, 2014 at 550 West 7th Avenue, Suite 1270 in Anchorage AK.

14
15 Tuesday November 4, 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 except Kathleen Schedler
20 (arrived at 10:05) and John Kerr (arrived at 9:08).

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

- 23
24
- Richard Rearick, Architect, Chair
 - Colin Maynard, Civil Engineer, vice-Chair
 - Kathleen Schedler, Mechanical Engineer, Secretary
 - Brian Hanson, Civil Engineer
 - Eric Eriksen, Electrical Engineer
 - David Hale, Land Surveyor,
 - Jeffrey Koonce, Architect
 - Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect
 - Keith Walters, Mining Engineer
 - John Kerr, Land Surveyor
 - Donald (John) Christensen, Public Member
- 25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

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

- 37
- Sara Chambers, Director CBPL (via telephone)
 - Martha Hewlett, Administrative Officer II (via telephone)
 - Colleen Kautz, Operations Manager (via telephone)
 - Vernon Jones, Executive Administrator.
 - Sarena Hackenmiller, Licensing Examiner.
 - John Savage, Investigator
- 38
39
40
41
42
43
44

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

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

1 Chair: Asks if there are any changes to the agenda.

2
3 Maynard: Item 10 A should be the Annual August 20-23 instead of west zone.

4
5 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it**
6 **was RESOLVED to approve the agenda as amended.**

7
8 **Agenda item 3 – Ethics reporting**

9
10 Maynard and Hanson reported that they attended the NCEES meeting and accepted airfare and
11 hotel from NCEES as funded delegates.

12
13 Chair: Reported that he just attended the Board Chair conference, airfare and hotel paid for by
14 NCARB.

15
16 Urfer: Reported that she was also at the NCEES meeting as a funded delegate.

17
18 **Agenda item 4 - Review and approve the Minutes of the August 2014 meeting.**

19
20 Maynard: Has several spelling and grammar corrections he will pass to Vernon.

21
22 Jones: Reminds the Board to speak up when talking. Even with recorders all over the table he
23 still had trouble understanding some of the conversations.

24
25 Chair: Adds that some of the content was interpretive instead of verbatim but the intent was still
26 there.

27
28 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it**
29 **was RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the August 2014 meeting as amended.**

30
31 **Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report**

32
33 Chair: Asks John Savage to join the Board at the table.

34
35 Savage: Before we get started, Vern had mentioned the Consent Agreement he just passed
36 out, when we are done with that if I could have those back so I can destroy them and we will just
37 have the signed copy.

38
39 Did anyone have any questions on the Investigative Report? No, there are a couple of issues
40 I'd like to bring up. One is exemptions in our Statutes and Regulations 08.48.331 I don't know if
41 you guys noticed that, the new Reg. book is out for October of this year and that has the
42 changes in it that the Board has been working on for about, what, 7 years Vern, if not longer.
43 So congratulations to past Board Members and to this setting Board. It's really going to help
44 with some of our enforcement. That was the exemption that was allowing Specialty Contractors
45 do work without design professionals so they could pretty much build the Captain Cook without
46 the use of any design professionals at all. So that's been changed for the time being or
47 hopefully fixed and we'll see where it goes from here. See what kind of AG action it's going to
48 arouse but I think we'll be good it reads well to me and it did to the reviewing people prior to
49 getting it passed. But that did, it took a long time and it wasn't for a lack of effort it was just the
50 nature of the beast. Any questions on that?

51

1 Just to let you know what's going on out there right now, one of the things is these additional
2 disciplines we've taken on and say an individual is work say as a civil doing structural work, we
3 are still having issues and we are going to continue to have issues until people get a good
4 understanding about it as far as advertising or holding themselves out as, and I'm going to use
5 structural as an example. We just have a ton of people, you know it's not the, oh I'm sorry and
6 will get in compliance, some of them are really pushing back and really digging their heels in
7 saying that they have always advertised, they have always held themselves out as and they feel
8 they can continue to. We need to get that word out possibly in the News Letter or something
9 reminding individuals that according to our laws they can't. They can do the structural if it's
10 appropriate but they can't hold themselves out as a structural engineer and they can't be
11 advertising as having the ability to do structural engineering.

12
13 The last thing I have is cleaning up old case files. We are, as you can tell by the list there,
14 slowly but surely we are getting rid of them. I hope to continue that and hopefully by years end
15 the oldest cases we have are 2013 and start moving forward. I feel good about that, I think it's a
16 good thing and just kind of drive on and see where it takes us.

17
18 She won't be here today because she's in Supervisor Training but all of you are aware that we
19 have a new Director, we also have a new Chief Investigator. I think she was hired since the last
20 board meeting. She's an ex-army CID Agent, she did quite a few tours overseas, she's just a
21 heads up lady and I think she'll be good for the office. She has a lot of changes that she's
22 hoping to make and hopefully she will be allowed to fill some of the slots, right now our office is
23 5 investigators down. So hang on, if we don't get those slots filled quickly before we get another
24 freeze on or a new administration or any of the above that could be problematic. I just wanted
25 to let you guys know ahead of time. Angela Birt is the new Chief Investigator and she's got a
26 good head on her shoulders and I she'll bring us in the right direction.

27
28 Chair: Is she in Juneau?

29
30 Savage: No, she's here and she is big-time trying to get these vacant slots filled. That will be
31 crippling, if in fact, we don't get that done. We'll see where that takes us. Are there any
32 questions? Ok, well thank you. I'm going to be here for a while for the financial and then come
33 back for the Public Testimony.

34
35 He asks when they will be looking at the Consent Agreement.

36
37 Chair: Looks at the agenda and decides to do it now.

38
39 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it**
40 **was RESOLVED to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310 (c)(3) to**
41 **review a Consent Agreement with ArcTerra Consulting, Inc.**

42
43 **9:10 a.m.** Went into Executive Session.

44
45 **9:39 a.m.** Out of Executive Session and on record.

46
47 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Koonce it was RESOLVED to accept**
48 **the Consent Agreement in Case number 0107-09-001 regarding Kenneth Duffus and**
49 **ArcTerra Consulting, Inc. Roll Call Vote:**
50 **Eriksen, yes, Hale, yes, Hanson, abstain, Kerr, yes, Koonce, yes, Maynard, yes, Rearick,**
51 **yes, Schedler, absent, Christensen, yes, Walters, yes.**

1
2 Chair: Motion passed. We'll move on to item 6, Regulation update.
3

4 **Agenda item 6 – Regulation update**
5

- 6 A) Regulation project for Structural Engineer and By Laws Change
7 1. 12 AAC 36.063 Engineering Education and Work Experience Requirements
8 (SE);
9 2. 12 AAC 36.108 Application for Registration as a Structural Engineer;
10 3. 12 AAC 36.180 Seals; and
11 4. 12 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals.
12 5. Change to Article II of the By Laws
13

14 Maynard: 6 A 1 to 4 are structural engineer. I handed out at the beginning the rationale
15 document that you guys asked me to prepare. This should be attached to it when they public
16 notice it. Do you have any idea how close they are to doing that?
17

18 Jones: No, I have no idea.
19

20 Maynard: I don't know anything about the Bylaws change.
21

22 Jones: That was just changing when the new elections are done.
23

24 Maynard: Basically the rationale I have on here is that basically this is the way they do it in
25 Oregon, Washington and California, well, California is slightly different, so as to make it easier
26 for comity with those states and it doesn't affect the ability to have comity with the other states
27 that don't do it this way. It explains what it's about and the types of projects that will be limited
28 to structural engineers. It talks about the grandfathering; we are going to have another
29 grandfathering process. And added the Structural Engineers of Alaska wanted this kind of a
30 system back when we adopted the SE and this kind of system is in line with their position
31 statewide, the position of the Structural Engineers Licensing Coalition. I'm just waiting for it to
32 be public noticed.
33

34 Hanson: Asks if this is a policy or just additional information.
35

36 Maynard: It's just additional information to explain what 6A 1-4 do so that when we send this
37 out to public notice there will be some explanation of what it is and why we are doing it.
38

39 Hanson: Suggests that instead of saying occupied by human beings we should say by the
40 public.
41

42 Maynard: That is what the regulation says. It says human beings.
43

44 Chair: Asks which item.
45

46 Maynard: Look on page 8 of the draft regulations that's what it says and that is copied directly
47 from the state of Washington and Oregon. When it goes out to public notice we can change
48 that to "the public" if you want.
49

50 Hanson: They don't care about dogs.
51

1 Maynard: or cows, if it's an agricultural building that has 400 cows in it, they don't care but if it's
2 people then they do.
3
4 Jones: Maybe they used human beings to differentiate between the public and government
5 employees or military or.....
6
7 Hanson: Yes, it's everybody then, there are no exemptions, it just struck me as kind of odd.
8
9 Chair: Asks if we know what the status of this is.
10
11 Jones: No I don't. It's been forwarded up the chain to the Governor's Office and we haven't
12 heard anything back yet.
13
14 Hanson: But they've had this for 9 months haven't they?
15
16 Maynard: Since February.
17
18 Kerr: Asks what occupied means, if someone just walks into a building and back out is it
19 occupied?
20
21 Several answered yes.
22
23 Chair: Usually defines it as, if the building has a door then it's occupy able. You end up with a
24 lot of manufacturing type companies, they might do a generator module and do an arctic
25 enclosure, and well the arctic enclosure ends up being a whole room around the generator with
26 a man door. So now you've created a room that's occupy able verses an enclosure that just
27 opens up from the side and you can't walk into it and they try to sell that as not a building, as a
28 generator.
29
30 Any more comments on this? We are just waiting now, I know the structural engineers are
31 aware of this and are anticipating it coming out. I don't know if the rest of the engineering
32 community is aware that this is on its way. They will be when it's public noticed and did we say
33 if we were going for 30 or 60 days?
34
35 Jones: 60.
36
37 Chair: Thinks it will generate a lot of interest so the extended time is good.
38
39 Maynard: As long as the 60 days ends at or before a board meeting.
40
41 Chair: 6 B is regulation changes sent to the Lt. Governor for filing.
42
43 Jones: That was signed on October 14th and will become effective on November 13th.
44
45 Chair: Item 6 C, the following Centralized Regulation changes have been reviewed by the Dept.
46 of Law and sent to the Lt. Governor for filing.
47
48 Jones: That repealed a couple of fees that we no longer charge. They were for exam review
49 which is not allowed anymore.
50
51 Chair: notes that the financial report is not until 10:30 so we will go on to board

1 correspondence. Unless we want to look at the Financial Report before we are on the
2 teleconference.
3
4 Koonce: Asks about accountability of the overhead component. He isn't sure he understood
5 the answer to that.
6
7 Hanson: its total number of licensees in the state of Alaska divided by your number of licensees
8 so we get, last year we got 10.24%.
9
10 Chair: And that's the indirect expenses.
11
12 Hanson: The ones that we never get back up for. And I don't know how this is possible but
13 they went down \$40K on the yearend report. But I don't expect it to stay there.
14
15 Koonce: Wasn't there some discussion two or three sessions back.....
16
17 Hanson: How to split it up?
18
19 Koonce: Well no necessarily that but there's account codes that are real specific on each if the
20 items and it just kind of gets put into one big amount.
21
22 Hanson: Right, \$4M or whatever it is.
23
24 Maynard: Asks if there was something handed out that was later than May 2014.
25
26 Jones: Yes you should have it there.
27
28 Chair: It says in this Boards and Commissions packet that you gave us, on page 26 they talk
29 about expenses of the Board, it's rather a brief section that says "indirect costs will be allocated
30 according to the number of licensees in a program. Indirect costs are an estimate during the
31 current fiscal year based on the previous fiscal years actual costs. They are adjusted during the
32 yearend close out at the end of the 4th quarter to reflect actual costs for the current year." So
33 what you see until you get to the 4th quarter it's all estimated costs. And we don't see the 4th
34 quarter until the following year.
35
36 Jones: That is the 4th quarter results there.
37
38 Maynard: And it's gone drastically down.
39
40 Chair: But last time it was just estimated.
41
42 There was a short discussion on what could have caused the decrease and it was decided to
43 ask Sara during the teleconference.
44
45 Chair: We will come back to this at 10:30 when we have the teleconference with Sara, so we
46 will go to item 9 board Correspondence.
47
48 **Agenda Item 9 - Board Correspondence Received since August 2014.**
49
50 Chair: 9A is CLARB, any comments Luanne?
51

1 Urfer: The CLARB meeting was quite interesting. There was a lot of talk about trying to get
2 people licensed and the demographics about how the population is going to change and how to
3 entice upcoming generation to get licensed. That was the major focus of the conference. There
4 were other things but the main thing was how to appeal to folks to continue on and get licensed.
5 I think it's an across the board design discipline issue.
6
7 Koonce: Asks if they see the number of graduates going up or even or down?
8
9 Urfer: The number of graduates is kind of flat. They are seeing a little bit of an increase. As we
10 started to look at the demographics it's generation Y that's more of an influence because
11 generation X is so much smaller. Then we broke it down and started to look at how the
12 demographics of the U.S. are going to change. It was really reaching out to a lot of the, because
13 the minorities that changed so dramatically and getting people involved from those
14 demographics and explaining what the discipline does because landscape architecture is so
15 misunderstood by the public.
16
17 Koonce: Do they see licensure going down based on the number of graduates?
18
19 Urfer: Yes they do. A lot of people are retiring; baby boomers are thinning out so they are
20 starting to see the number declining because the next generation isn't stepping up to get
21 licensed. But it's worse with generation Y because they say why should I spend my time I
22 should just be able to get a license. And there was a big discussion about that generation you
23 know everybody gets a prize, everybody gets a trophy just because they showed up and how
24 that would work when it comes to the workplace. It was a very interesting discussion.
25
26 Chair: Asks if there is a decline in the number of students going for a degree.
27
28 Urfer: No, actually its remaining flat but in some areas they are seeing an increase mostly
29 because of the interest in the environmental impact. And the fact that we have so many new
30 regulations coming out of the EPA.
31
32 Chair: Comments that they may see some people getting dual degrees.
33
34 Urfer: Yes I think they do see that.
35
36 Maynard: Asks about the three levels of dues on 9 A 4 and asks which we pay.
37
38 Jones: We pay the base dues. The participation credits are like a savings account. If we want
39 to pay extra to be used for future travel we can add it to our dues and it will be placed in a
40 separate account for us to use for travel, hotel and conference fees.
41
42 Chair: moving on to 9 B NCARB. NCARB sends out a lot of updates, documents that
43 regurgitate information that was in other documents so I want to flip through each one of these
44 items and will pick out the information I want to convey. Some of these were covered by my
45 recent Board Chairs meeting down in Indianapolis which I will probably go into in more detail
46 further down in the agenda.
47
48 On item 1 the fast facts what I want to point out there is the waiting period has changed when
49 you can retest. It was 6 months and they've moved that to a 60 day wait period but they also
50 limit that to 3 times in a 12 month period. And on page 4 of that initial document, as of July 1,
51 2014 interns can now report experience up to 5 years back for 50% credit beyond the previous

1 reporting rules. And the idea behind that was to allow interns that for one reason or another
2 didn't report older experience to give them an avenue to at least get half credit for it.

3
4 Item 2 is a letter from the Oregon Board to NCARB and its addressing 3 primary issues that we
5 discussed at the Board Chair meeting which is changes to the IDP credits, changes to the
6 Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) and changes to the Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect
7 (BEFA). This is just Oregon's response to those items.

8
9 Koonce: Asks if we formulated an opinion.

10
11 Chair: Yes we did, actually NCARB sent out an online questionnaire which I responded to but it
12 didn't give me a printed copy but I'll talk a little bit more about those issues. We had discussed
13 this at the last meeting and I got the Board's consensus on how to respond to that.

14
15 Koonce: Unfortunately I missed that meeting. He asks if we went with Oregon.

16
17 Chair: Generally, I can go through these real quick. On the IDP what they're doing is reducing
18 the number of total hours for IDP from like 5600 to like 3640, something like that. So basically if
19 you were to look at it in time it's going to go from 3 years to 2 years. However, most interns
20 don't get that completed within 3 years anyway. Usually it's more like 5 to 7 years. The
21 justification for that is that the core hours are justifiable through the practice analysis the rest of
22 the hours are all elective hours that can be anything. You could get all of those in the same
23 thing if you wanted to. So they contend that it's not really giving them anymore in those items
24 that the practice analysis deems important for practice and there is a lot of disagreement about
25 this, a lot of discussion about this. I generally disagreed with just lopping off the extra year
26 worth of experience. I felt like the total number of hours for the core hours was a bit arbitrary. It
27 was relevant but arbitrary and that they might be better to just increase the core hours for all or
28 a portion of those elective hours that they were getting rid of.

29
30 Maynard: Comments that someone right out of high school coming to an architectural firm if
31 going to be doing different tasks than someone out of a 4 year degree program.

32
33 Chair: With the changes in the IDP an individual can actually start earning IDP credits right out
34 of high school. Whether they're enrolled in an architectural school or not.

35
36 The other item – under the broadly experienced architect, what's required now is that somebody
37 has to be licensed in a jurisdiction all ready. So they would have had to complete that
38 jurisdictions requirement for getting licensed. They also had to take the A.R.E. and meet the
39 experience level, similar to what we have with our engineers. In addition to that the BEA
40 certification through NCARB, I believe, was an additional 6 years of experience beyond initial
41 licensure and it required a dossier and an interview.

42 So with the new program, what their proposing is getting rid of the 6 years and just have one
43 year after initial licensure, getting rid of the dossier but still require that they pass the A.R.E, still
44 requiring that they have experience that is equivalent to the IDP. And they contend with that
45 that the individual already has quite a lot of experience by that time. Most of the people that go
46 for the BEA have 20 years of experience or more. And it's a small number; it's like 5 or 6
47 people a year. I think over the total time they have had this they have had less than 50 people.
48 However there is a lot of contention over this specific issue. What the BEA would allow is if the
49 state will license somebody through high school only education and then 8 years of experience
50 or whatever they require they could get the NCARB Certification through the BEA. A lot of
51 states don't agree with that, and don't believe they should be able to do it based just high school

1 education alone. Right now what we will accept is if somebody is licensed in another state, so
2 they've gone through that whole licensing process. They've got, I think it's 2 to 5 years of
3 experience depending on education if they've been practicing in the state or licensed in the
4 state for 5 years, I can't quite remember the details. So right now we would be able to license
5 people who had an NCARB Certificate under the BEA with the proposed changes. There was a
6 lot of discussion about this. They're going to come back and look at some alternative language.
7 NAAB weighed in on it and wants to maintain that the education has to be proved out through
8 the ESSA education equivalency basis that NAAB performs. It is a somewhat expensive
9 process and a lengthy process. At this point in time, you know I'm generally in favor of changes
10 to the broadly experienced architect but I'm looking forward to seeing what gets proposed by
11 NCARB before we really talk about it as a board and make a decision on whether we support it
12 as a board.

13
14 10:05 Schedler arrived.

15
16 There were some comments on the differences between the requirements for a foreign architect
17 and a U.S. architect.

18
19 Chair: Explains that what is required is that they have a license in another country as the
20 primary thing and that the education varies for example in Germany they basically take their first
21 year of college while they are still in high school and ESSA doesn't recognize anything you did
22 in high school as part of your college education. The reality is that a lot of those programs
23 probably are better than our students are getting. And that again has a dossier interview, most
24 individuals 25 years of experience. We didn't talk a lot about the BEFA so at this point in time I
25 really don't want to get into it.

26
27 9 B 3 is a CEO Update. It just covers some NCARB business that we don't need to worry about.

28
29 9 B 4 RFI integrated path to licensure. And this is another issue we did talk about I believe at
30 the last board meeting. What they are trying to do is a pilot program with a University and a
31 State Licensure Board that is willing to look at this where someone is potentially able to get
32 licensed at graduation. They sent out an RFI soliciting interest from different Universities
33 around the country and at last count they had 34 responses. The idea behind this isn't that this
34 would replace the standard path to licensure and in all likelihood it's not going to look like the
35 degree program the way it is right now. It will probably take a lot longer to get than your typical
36 5 year Bachelor of architecture or 4 + 2 architecture degree. The idea behind it is for those
37 individuals that want a faster path, maybe a more integrated path and are up to the challenge
38 because it's not going to be easy to do. So that is still being developed, once they start working
39 with the University we will see how that starts to be molded before we will even have to talk
40 about it too much. I think it's a good idea to look at it. I was opposed to it in the beginning. It
41 seemed like it was trying to find a quicker path for people but it's really an alternate path. It's
42 one more way to get license and I always thought that if I had more experience while I was in
43 college I would have understood more what I was learning about. So I think if it can achieve
44 that it will be a good program.

45
46 I want to jump back, just for a second, on the BEA, one point of discussion on that about
47 someone basically being able to get a license on experience without having a formal education.
48 It might open the door for community colleges to capitalize on that and actually sell it to
49 individuals that you don't need a 5 year degree, you don't need to spend all that money. You
50 can just get a 2 year degree and work for 3 or 4 years and you've got your license. So that was

1 a big objection to that. That whole time frame that it takes experience to replace education was
2 a big talk.

3
4 9 B 5 was a note about data sharing and, Vern, I don't know much about this. They gave a form
5 at the meeting that requested some information but I don't know if there was a specific individual
6 that we want to submit for data sharing and what all our State laws will allow us to do.

7
8 Jones: I don't know, I'll have to check with them on that.

9
10 Chair: Asks if they have requested anything from him.

11
12 Jones: Every year they ask how many are registered and how many are in state and out of
13 state. And they ask us to go in and update our Board profile etc.

14
15 Chair: But nothing specific like violations, I know on that form that I was given it required SSN's.
16 Does the State allow us to give that to them?

17
18 Jones: SSN's are confidential. Can we have a break before we do the conference call?

19
20 Chair: Yes we will probably.....

21
22 Hanson: Move to take a break.

23 10:20 Break

24
25 10:27 On Record.

26
27 **Agenda Item 7 – Financial Report**

28
29 Chair: Ok, we are going to Agenda item 7 which is the Financial Report so Vern if you would
30 call Sara.

31
32 Schedler: Did you add to the record that I joined?

33
34 Jones: Yes we did.

35
36 Chambers: Good Morning, this is Sara,

37
38 Chair: Good Morning Sara we would like to welcome you to our Board Meeting. Do you have
39 any other folks there with you?

40
41 Chambers: I do, I have with me our new Operations Manager, Colleen Kautz and our Admin
42 Officer Martha Hewlett.

43
44 Jones: We just got a revised version of the Financial Report. Did that just come out this
45 morning?

46
47 Chambers: Oh, I'm so glad you got that, good, yes, we had an update, we hurried to get early
48 numbers to you for your Board meeting as well as a couple of other Boards who have meetings
49 within this week's period of time. And as you know sometime early numbers, early data can be
50 subject to correction. So we have a slight update. It affected your program in a very minor way
51 but it is the latest information. Martha is just getting a final copy of that for us. While she's

1 doing that I wanted to thank you all first of all for inviting us to join you and I wanted to make
2 sure that Colleen and Martha were involved as well so they can provide their expertise and so
3 you all get more comfortable in working with them as well. I am, as we are getting the final
4 FY14 information out, you have your traditional quarterly report which in this case is the last
5 quarter so it encompasses all of FY14. I'm working on a final report to all Boards that I hope will
6 be one more step in our relentless incremental improvement project that will give your Board
7 more information than perhaps you've ever had regarding indirect expenses, how they are
8 arrived at and allocated and an overall picture of how Board revenues and expenses fit within
9 the Division as a whole. I am putting the final touches on that report and certainly it depends on
10 finalized data so as this is coming out by the hour my estimate is to get this report to you within
11 the next week. I apologize that it isn't ready for this Board meeting but it will be emailed to each
12 of you from my desk. Then I would like to have some more time with you at your next regular
13 meeting to go over it. In the interim if you have any questions, if you would like more
14 information, understanding, clarification you can certainly email me or let Vern know and we'll
15 get that information to you that is something to look forward to in the short term.

16
17 Chair: Sara this is Richard Rearick. I have one question here, I see on one of the older sheets
18 that we have dated 4/24 it showed the indirect at \$323,512 and I see that that's gone down in
19 this current one so that's a positive thing but I just want to confirm that in the early reports for
20 the indirect that they are based on past years or do they plug in some real dollars?

21
22 Chambers: That's correct, we started a year or two ago estimating indirect throughout the year
23 based on the prior year's numbers. We found that when we processed indirect in the third
24 quarter which is normally when we process a significant portion of that, that it was dramatic
25 change for some of our larger programs who received a larger share of indirect and made it very
26 difficult to reliably know what your expenses were at any particular point. So we've been
27 estimating those and due to some changes in our indirect allocation methodology we do have
28 that good news of with this Board in particular of letting you know that your indirect share has
29 dramatically decreased due to some of those changes which will be explained in that report
30 further.

31
32 Chair: Ok, thank you.

33
34 Chambers: Martha is available to walk you through the numbers; she has been familiarizing
35 herself with the changes over the last quarter.

36
37 Chair: We would appreciate that.

38
39 Hewlett: Good Morning everyone. Starting at the very top of your end of year 4th quarter report
40 for FY14 you can see your licensing revenue and it is \$1,983,134. And also an additional third
41 party reimbursement amount of \$5,931 that went back to the Board specifically which is thanks
42 to Vern's wonderful job of applying for all of the third party reimbursements possible for you.
43 AEL took a sizable portion of the \$20K of authority for last year, so kudos on that. Moving to
44 your direct expenditures your Personal Services ended at \$287,835. Your direct Personal
45 Services would be a combination of your Executive Administrator, the Licensing Examiner, also
46 Investigations, Regulations Specialist work and Para Legal work. All of which are calculated by
47 actual time that they devote to Board projects. Next down, your Travel ended at \$53,408 which
48 if you were comparing to your 3rd quarter numbers it is a dramatic increase but that includes
49 combination of Board meetings and a number of conferences that were out of State that were
50 attended by Staff and Board Members that were part of your FY14 Annual Report. Your next
51 item down is your Contractual at \$88,077. Your Contractual would be things such as training

1 and conference fees, test monitoring and proctoring, Your membership accounting and auditing
2 which is credit card fees that directly attributable to the credit card transactions processed on
3 your behalf, postage, advertising, space rental for records and such in retention, print copy
4 graphics, mail and legal charges.

5
6 Chambers: And again those are all broken down in the pages that follow your Quarterly Report.
7

8 Hewlett: Yes, if you want to see the specifics, if you look at page two and three attached to your
9 report and look at the 73K series that is contractual.

10
11 Chambers: And Board Members I'm pleased to let you know that I will be providing a link to
12 explanations of all these in the Annual Report that's coming out in the next week to make sure
13 that you have the tools to dig as deep as you would like in each of these different transaction
14 codes.

15
16 Hewlett: The next line down on your expenses would be your Supplies at \$2,054. That would
17 be things such as the business supplies needed to put your Board Packets together food
18 supplies such as the coffee and tea service at your meetings. And if you look on the additional
19 two pages that would be 74K series at the very bottom of page three. Does anyone have any
20 questions on the direct expenses?

21
22 Hanson: This is Brian Hanson I had a question on the contractual expenses and I know you
23 may not be able to answer it right now but specifically the accounting and auditing number. As
24 of 3rd quarter, we have the third quarter report in front of us as well, there was \$0 under that
25 account code so in 4th quarter we accrued \$34,715 in credit card charges? I don't know what
26 that is exactly but....

27
28 Hewlett: I can certainly explain that. This is one of the items that we generally pre-pay out of the
29 overall admin and then at times in the year it's reviewed and the transaction accounts are taken
30 from the receipting system then there is a journal entry done to allocate the correct amount of
31 credit card transaction fees to each program that has receive revenue via credit card payment.

32
33 Hanson: Oh, so those are the actual fees charged by visa or master card or somebody?

34
35 Hewlett: Yes that is correct, based on the actual amount of revenue that AEL brought in by
36 credit card.

37
38 Hanson: Yes, that makes sense it just seemed like a lot of money that just popped up at the
39 end there.

40
41 Chair: This is Richard again. It's not just the credit card fees it's also the proctoring and test
42 monitoring.

43
44 Hanson: That's a separate line item. What are our credit card fees, are they 1% or something?

45
46 Hewlett: Its part of a state contract. I do not know the exact fees but I can certainly find out and
47 get that information to you.

48
49 Hanson: Do you have a sense of why the indirect went down pretty substantially, I mean it's
50 good news for us but do you have a sense as to why they went down so much to \$290K and I

1 guess would be the Division indirect allocation? Is it a change in the formula or did we spend
2 less money?
3

4 Hewlett: There are a few things we've done in this last year which will all be explained in the
5 document that Sara is going to be sending out to you soon, but to give you an overview. A
6 couple of changes we made are one we highly scrutinize all expenditures and try to be as frugal
7 as possible. We also broke down as many charges to direct as possible. Large changes that
8 really affect it would be that we adopted a different method of indirect allocation. In the past all
9 indirect which include things such as your overhead for Leased Space, Insurance, Human
10 Resources, the Accounting Office and Commissioners Office support, the Administrative Front
11 Desk that process all the payments and answer the phone calls. Those were all allocated by
12 license count. This year there are still things that are appropriate to allocate by license count
13 but in addition for things such as the Front Desk we adopted more of the common statement of
14 allocating by transaction count. So in doing so, by counting the transactions processed by the
15 Front Desk Staff it lower the amount overall for all Professional Licensing groups and allocated
16 based on transaction count for your specific program. We additionally adopted the same type of
17 method for the Revenue Staff in the Accounting Unit that process all of our revenue
18 transactions. So those are a couple of the items that made a big difference in how your indirect
19 went down in FY14 in comparison to FY13.
20

21 Hanson: Thank you.
22

23 Chambers: We thought you might be pleased with those numbers.
24

25 Hanson: Well, lower is always better. Thank you.
26

27 Hewlett: Are there any other questions on the direct or indirect expenditures?
28

29 Chair: There's none.
30

31 Hewlett: Well I'll throw it back to the Board and Sara if there are any questions do feel free to
32 contact Sara about the financials or send them through Vern and we will get back to you.
33

34 Chambers: Thank you Board Members. I just wanted to touch on a couple of other items real
35 quickly. Continuing with our theme that we have had in updating Boards on Division activity
36 One is that the travel changes that we made this summer effective September 1st and I did send
37 an email out to all Board Members so if you did not receive an email on September 1st from me
38 with an attachment regarding out of State travel please do let Vern know and give him your
39 proper email address so I can make sure that you get that. We did accomplish several changes
40 in travel, I think we've talked about some of those at your last meeting but one of the big one's
41 that we were able to, actually two bigger ones that your board may be interested in. One is the
42 ability to make travel arrangements for Board Members through our office. If there are any
43 Board Members who would like to take advantage of the opportunity to not having to carry the
44 cost of your travel on your own personal credit cards from the time when you need to secure
45 travel till the time when it's reimbursed you can let Vern know and in the attachment that was on
46 my September 1st email you'll see some instructions on how our Division under Martha's team
47 can assist you with making those arrangements.
48

49 The other item that may be of interest to you is the ability also to make travel arrangements
50 directly with the associations who may be offering to do so. Some Boards have this offer in
51 conjunction with their conferences and some don't. I know that as Martha said that Vern's done

1 an excellent job of recouping available conference costs through the third party reimbursement.
2 However, we have one more tool in our tool box if you are able to make travel arrangements
3 directly with the association instructions are included as well on how to do that.
4

5 Chair: Director Chambers I'd like to interrupt for just a moment. I just want to let everybody
6 know that under agenda item 9 E is the new travel policy if you want to look at that and if you
7 have any questions. I believe this is what Director Chambers had emailed us. I also wanted to
8 thank you for your efforts and the Divisions efforts in working on this so long and hard. It really
9 will help us a lot.

10
11 Chambers: Well it's my pleasure. I fondly remind Vern that I think our first conversation when I
12 joined the Division in 2011 sitting down in Vern's office and learning more about AELS and your
13 needs that was my huge take away was the reimbursement not going back to benefit the Board
14 so we've been working up to this day for a few years and I'm glad (undistinguishable).
15

16 Kerr: We recently traveled to Seattle and hotel rooms were very expensive and I noticed that
17 there is a hard dollar figure here that hotel rooms in excess of \$300 a night. It seems that that is
18 kind of an arbitrary figure. How do we deal with the situation where there are no other options?
19

20 Chambers: The State Travel Policy which is set by the Division of Finance within the
21 Department of Administration gives that \$300 amount and the way to approve any rooms over
22 \$300 would be to get the Commissioner of Administration preapproval. This is a number that is
23 set through his Department and so if we are aware of those costs ahead of time then we can
24 submit a memo for his review and approval. If it's not submitted in advance the State will only
25 reimburse up to that \$300 amount.
26

27 Kerr: Ok and will it be inflation adjusted or is it a static number until a new policy comes out?
28

29 Chambers: It's a static number until a new policy released. Are there any additional travel
30 questions?
31

32 To move on to the last point that I wanted to make I have been keeping you abreast for the last
33 couple of years about our discussions with the Legislature about our fee setting policies and
34 how they respond to the requirements of State Statutes. We have been meeting with the
35 Legislative Budget and Audit Committee all summer. I have had many opportunities to discuss
36 travel concerns as well as indirect concerns. Many of the things that you all have traditionally
37 brought to my attention or Director Habegers attention have carried over in these conversations
38 with Legislative Budget and Audit because they are, not surprisingly, concerns that other Boards
39 have as well. As of this fall HB 187 which was the fee setting legislation that we have been
40 shepherding thorough the last Legislative Session it did not succeed and this summer has been
41 a fact finding mission that Legislative Budget and Audit has requested that they take to fully
42 explore and understand the concerns that Boards had as well as the concerns the Division has
43 had and we are, I believe, winding down our meetings as Legislative Session is right around the
44 corner. At the last meeting in the first part of October the Legislators that sit on that Committed
45 were starting to explore some solutions and look at ways to statutorily address the things that
46 we are unable to change as an Administration. So, that conversation turned from fact finding to
47 solution, our next meeting is November 25th these are all public hearings so you are welcome to
48 listen in or attend if you're in the Anchorage area. We are awaiting what the members of that
49 Committee may determine that they wish to file as an actual Bill. Pre-files start in the middle of
50 December. If that should happen I will certainly be communicating with all our Board and
51 Commission Members so you're aware of it. You can individually as a member of the public or

1 as a Board weighs any support or any suggestion that you may want to take as the Bill moves
2 forward this spring. As of yet there is no Bill, no vehicle but those conversations are continuing
3 and I will let you know as soon as I see a draft posted so you all can, as stake holders, take
4 appropriate action.

5
6 That's all I have for the Division Report at this time but I'm happy to answer any questions that
7 you might have.

8
9 Hanson: Sara this is Brian Hanson again. Do you have an update for us on our regulation
10 project for structural engineer? I believe it's been out of our hands for about 9 months now
11 awaiting review and advertising.

12
13 Chambers: I would have to look it up. I have various regs. Projects that are in various stages
14 Vern would probably have the latest on that as well.

15
16 Jones: The PRRF was sent up and we are just waiting for a response so it can be noticed.

17
18 Chambers: So it is in the Governor's Office and they are, what I'm anticipating is that they are
19 getting approval to move forward on Public Comment within the next week or so. They have
20 been on a bit of a hiatus lately so we are under the new law, HB 140 which we are going to
21 receive some more training on. That new law went into effect about two, three weeks ago and it
22 will effect board regulations. It probably will not have a demonstrable effect that you could
23 notice as Board Members but it does codify the involvement of the Office of the Governor in the
24 way that we have more informally been doing it by request of the Administration. So, I give you
25 that piece of information and Vern will get some more training on it in the next week or two and
26 we will get those regulations moving forward as soon as they are released from the Governor's
27 Office.

28
29 Jones: This was approved by the Board back in February and I thought that was before this
30 House Bill was effective so it shouldn't be affected by it, should it?

31
32 Chambers: I'm just getting up to speed on HB 140 in fact I have a training document right in
33 front of me and I believe I can get you the answer right now. Let's see, they apply to proposed
34 regulation first published on or after the effective date of this Act. So if the definition of
35 published is Public Notice then they will fall under the new requirements. But again I don't think
36 that will be a demonstrable difference to the Board. It's brand new to all of us so we are
37 learning about it and attempting to move forward appropriately.

38
39 Hanson: We are specifically asking on 36.063, 36.108, 36.180 and 36.185. The Board
40 approved for Public Notice in February and we haven't heard anything so that's why we asked,
41 so maybe if you could provide Vern a report on those he can pass it on to us.

42
43 Maynard: I think the last thing we heard was in April when we got a language sent to us to
44 review and we haven't heard anything since.

45
46 Chambers: Sure, I will be glad to wrap that up with Vern when he gets back to make sure that
47 you all have the latest information.

48
49 Chair: Appreciate that. Does anybody else have any questions for Director Chambers?
50 Kathleen, nothing? Well if that's all, Director Chambers, I would like to thank you and Martha
51 and Colleen for the information and walking us through some of this.

1
2 Chambers: It's our pleasure to meet with you and I hope you have a good rest of your meeting,
3 thank you all, bye.
4
5 Maynard: I did a quick little calculation and based on our expenses this year and the biennium it
6 looks fairly close, within a few thousand. If we double that we will come up with about \$1.4M in
7 expenses. We have already collected \$1.2M so we will probably collect another \$300K so we
8 are going to have about \$850K excess.
9
10 There was a short discussion on the possible result of the overage and how the fee setting
11 should have been raised in small increments of \$25 per renewal period.
12
13 Chair: I'm going to pick up where we left off.
14
15 Jones: We left off on 9 B 5.
16
17 Chair: 9 B 5 that was the data sharing and I think we pretty much covered that. I know it's
18 something they are pushing but they really haven't made any specific requests.
19
20 9 B 6 is another memo regarding the proposed IDP changes. It just gives a little bit more
21 information.
22
23 9 B 7 is the Legislative Tracker and what they've started to do is to scan the states and post
24 online different legislative issues that are happening around the country. They do a little
25 Synopsis and abstract of it and then you can look at the actual Bill or Regulation changes. It's
26 really a nice tool made available on the NCARB Website.
27
28 Hanson: I used to be able to open them now you've got to be a member.
29
30 Chair: You should be able to open it.
31
32 Hanson: I couldn't open the new one that came a week ago. It's a really neat report; you get to
33 see what's going on around the country.
34
35 Chair: Try it again and if you still have problems shoot NCARB an email.
36
37 There was a short discussion on the value of the Tracker and it was noted that it does not just
38 focus on architects it is all encompassing.
39
40 Chair: Notes that there was information on electronic seals and while most states regulations
41 are close to ours there was one state that got more in depth and he will try to find that one and
42 we can look at it at another time.
43
44 9 B 8 is again, fast facts so it is a rehash of some of the other things we've looked at.
45
46 9 B 9 is the FARB forum which I have never heard of before. It's the Federation of Associations
47 of Regulatory Boards and NCARB made mention of it and we have an attached conference
48 agenda.
49
50 Maynard: It sounds like something that NCARB would be a member of.
51

1 Chair: But we wouldn't, that's the same take away I had from it and it's going to be all sorts of
2 Regulation Boards.
3
4 9 B 10 is a CEO update, September 2014. Again a rehash.
5
6 9 B 11 is actually from West Carb. Region 6 and they did a little informal poll of all the states in
7 their jurisdiction about the IDP so I responded to this and under the IDP streamlined I disagreed
8 basically on the grounds that they were just lopping off a year worth of IDP credit that I felt that
9 maybe should be rolled into core credits. The idea of overhauling the IDP was aligning it with
10 the areas of practice so it more fits with the areas of practice as you go through the practice and
11 will also align with the A.R.E. categories. I thought that made a lot of sense to get all three of
12 those aligned. The BEA I agreed in that as an idea of reducing the amount of years required
13 after licensure to obtain the NCARB Certificate and the same with the BEFA. There are still a
14 lot of things to be worked out with that in a final proposal from NCARB before we actually need
15 to take any action. I would expect that before the Annual Meeting in June that the Board will be
16 issuing something on that so hopefully by our February meeting we will have something
17 concrete to look at.
18
19 9 B 12 is an email from Derek Haese regarding titles and at the meeting I was just at, they did
20 go over this a little bit. They formed a Task Force to look at titles, specifically to look at the
21 Intern Architects titles. At this point in time they've done data gathering and they looked at all
22 the different titles that different jurisdictions allow Interns. They looked at the different stages of
23 one's career and what they are being called in each jurisdiction but they haven't actually
24 proposed anything yet. So we'll see how that pans out and probably for the Annual Meeting
25 they'll have some for us. And that is it for the NCARB correspondence.
26
27 Oh there was a 9 B 13 in here. I don't think we have anything.....
28
29 Jones: I asked Boards and Commissions about and they said it's a policy not a regulation and
30 they try to encourage diversity as they make their selections.
31
32 9 B 1 email from Jerry Carter
33
34 Hanson: The first two are related. They have to do with the Supreme Court case. I don't know
35 if you read it, it was kind of interesting but it's basically saying if you don't have someone from
36 the government on your Board you're just doing turf protection essentially. It's the dental case
37 in South Carolina about the teeth whitening.
38
39 Chair: is it specific to that or.....
40
41 Hanson: It is specific to that but it's a broader case in the sense that all Licensing Boards are
42 affected.
43
44 Chair: It could set a precedent in other words.
45
46 Jones: Boards that are not appointed by the government.
47
48 Hanson: Right, that are self-appointed boards. An example would be if NCEES or NCARB was
49 the licensing board.
50

1 Hanson: C 3 is the Alaska Specific Exam. I don't think this will be an issue for us in the
2 immediate future but it will be an issue at some time, we are going to have to go CBT on our
3 Alaska exam at some point. NCEES will not be proctoring exams in the very near future. I
4 attended an EP, engineering meeting a couple weeks ago and right now all the schedules are
5 being developed for CBT.
6
7 Jones: They do not proctor our State Specific Exam, we proctor it.
8
9 Hanson: So we're still paying for that separately?
10
11 Jones: Yes, if they take it in Juneau Sarena or I will be there, and we hire proctors in
12 Anchorage and Fairbanks.
13
14 Schedler: Who do we hire?
15
16 Jones: In Anchorage I've been getting ex-board members, Bo Brownfield and Burt Lent. In
17 Fairbanks there is a guy up there, he doesn't have any affiliation with the Board but there is a
18 list of proctors. They have to have a Business License and have a contract with the State.
19 Head proctors get \$25 per hour and assistants get \$15 per hour and they are allowed 2 hours to
20 review materials and prepare.
21
22 Schedler: I have a comment that has to do with the proctoring. I happened to know someone
23 who took the exam a couple weeks ago and I was surprised because they are very ridged as
24 they should be, this is where you should be, this is the time you should be there and we will
25 check all your materials exactly as it should be, an individual showed up 15 minutes late, they
26 let him take the exam, the doors had already been closed.
27
28 Jones: This was the people proctoring the NCEES exams?
29
30 Schedler: This was whoever was proctoring the Fairbanks exams it shouldn't happen that way.
31
32 Hanson: This was the PLS exam?
33
34 Schedler: It was the PE exam. It shouldn't be that way. It was a detriment to the other 20
35 people sitting in that room that had showed up on time and had all their materials reviewed and
36 they started the exam late. I was shocked, I was really shocked because they, it was a woman
37 and she said I am now closing the door. The guy showed up, pounded on the door and she
38 said come on in.
39
40 Jones: They don't usually do that. They've turned people away before and they should have
41 turned whoever that was away.
42
43 Chair: Do we have a published protocol that.....
44
45 Hanson: They are not supposed to allow that.
46
47 Schedler: There should be some way we can go back to the proctors we hire and.....
48
49 Jones: We didn't hire them, NCEES did. The only ones that we proctor are the surveyor state
50 specific exam. NCEES takes care of all the others. They should not have let that person in. We

1 are invited every year to have, if any Board Member want to drop in on the exam and observe,
2 they allow us to do that but you guys have always said no.
3
4 Koonce: What would happen if you went to observe a test?
5
6 Jones: You have to be there before it starts but you don't have to stay for the whole thing.
7
8 Koonce: What if you observed something that wasn't protocol?
9
10 Jones: Just make a mental note, don't interrupt the exam, just note it and we will follow up
11 afterward.
12
13 Hanson: There were 20 exam irregularities on the pencil and paper exam last year and now
14 that NCEES is using Pearson Vue there were over 1700 exam irregularities. And that could be
15 anything from bringing a pencil into the exam room to bringing a phone into the exam room
16 which is not allowed. So, it's anything from your exam gets thrown out to.....
17
18 Jones: That's on the CBT.
19
20 Hanson: That's on the CBT. It's kind of interesting because that note everything. Even the
21 person at the desk, they've got to do three steps when you come back in, if they forget one of
22 those steps, they note it and send a report. They send a report weekly to NCEES. The security
23 is much higher; the examinee is paying the cost of the exam. I don't know how much that state
24 specific LS is costing us.
25
26 Jones: \$200 is what they pay. It cost the Board \$10K a year. That's what we pay Test, Inc.
27 That's why we only do it once a year.
28
29 Hanson: So the examinees are not paying what it costs to do that exam, we are picking up the
30 costs on that.
31
32 Chair: Even with the A.R.E. it costs more to develop it than the examinees are paying and that
33 database they have is highly valuable and if it's breached and they have to throw out a whole
34 exam it costs millions of dollars to replace it.
35
36 Hanson: So pretty much by 2015 or 16 we are going to start seeing PE's in CBT, that's the time
37 line. A lot of the group two exams will stretch out to 20.
38
39 Kerr: I'm on the Surveyor task force and one of the charges is to see about having a common
40 state specific test as far as the national survey portion. It's highly unlikely this will happen
41 because every state has different laws and originally there was a single test but it broke apart
42 and the opportunity to bring it back to gather again is being explored because of these costs of
43 CBT but the likelihood of it working is very slim. There's a possibility of developing a huge test
44 databank that identifies what is specific to each individual state and having it generate a specific
45 test but it's very complicated.
46
47 Hale: Asks about developing our won database.
48
49 Kerr: The cost to do it through a third party vendor is very, very high. He adds that some states
50 just put their exam on a laptop in the administrators office it's the same questions they presently
51 have they just put it on the computer to make it work.

1
2 Jones: Just so you all know, we own that state specific question bank, it's ours. We just
3 contract Test, Inc. to take care of it for us.
4
5 Hale: That's part of the issue with the survey organization is that we make up all those
6 questions and if we go computer based we will need a lot bigger database.
7
8 Chair: Asks how often the questions are updated.
9
10 Jones: Explains that every year Test, Inc. holds a meeting in Anchorage where they get a
11 bunch of surveyors together and they make up the next years exam. Some questions are
12 dropped and some are added so no two exams are alike.
13
14 Hale: The way it's been developing is we are updating a lot of our standards right now. We've
15 got them in place now and some questions are going to be coming out of that. We've got to get
16 all of that done before we can beef up our question database.
17
18 Hanson: Notes that we will never have enough candidates to get the statistical data we need to
19 generate a good exam.
20
21 Chair: Ok let's move on, 9 C 5. Memo requesting volunteers for standard setting study.
22
23 9 C 6 was an NCARB BOD Brief that was misfiled.
24
25 9 C 7 announcing the availability of the NCEES Awards Book.
26
27 9 C 8 is soliciting articles on law enforcement.
28
29 9 C 9 is new test specification for the civil exam.
30
31 9 D is just a response from Mr. Luddington on the Board's decision on Mortgage Surveys.
32
33 9 E is travel policy, we've already covered that.
34
35 There was a short discussion on which meetings had to be reported.
36
37 9 F email re mobility from Colin Smith.
38
39 Chair: We were just cc'd on this, no action required. I asked the NCARB President if there had
40 been any progress between NCEES and Canada and he said that there hadn't been.
41
42 9 G is an email from Ramona Schimscheimer and she says that she had heard that some
43 engineering firms were going to rename architectural drawings as General Arrangement
44 Drawings or special drawings. They are looking at a way out from hiring an architect how do we
45 address this issue with the State AELS Board or the State Fire Marshal's Office?
46
47 Chair: I directed her to our Investigator and to the Fire Marshall's Office but I've seen this
48 before where an engineer will name refer to a drawing as a p drawing or an s drawing or
49 anything other than an architectural drawing or an AE drawing thinking somehow that if they
50 name it something else they are not doing an architectural drawing. So her concern is real but
51 how much is out there I don't know it really just comes back to people reporting it if they see it

1 and the Fire Marshall's Office calling them on it if they see it. I know that the Fire Marshall has
2 gone after someone and reported to John when they've done that sort of thing.
3
4 Hanson: Actually the Fire Marshall referrals are John's bread and butter.
5
6 Chair: 9 H is raise the bar email which I don't know much about.
7
8 Maynard: That was after the NCEES meeting and I told him that it was a way's out if it ever
9 occurs.
10
11 Hanson: I talked to him about a week ago and same thing.
12
13 Jones: I talked to him too. What I told him was that the last I had heard the Board was not
14 behind it.
15
16 Koonce: Asks what raise the bar is about.
17
18 Jones: 30 credits beyond bachelors.
19
20 Maynard: Or the equivalent and they are trying to figure out what the equivalent is. He explains
21 that engineering programs used to be 150 hours and over time with pressure from parents and
22 the Universities adding more humanities requirements and that there are a lot less engineering
23 going into these programs that are 120 hours. There are still a few that are 150 but they are few
24 and far between.
25
26 Hanson: Adds that while the engineering credits have gone from 150 to 120 or 130 hours the
27 humanities has gone from 10 to 30 or 45 probably. So NCEES did eliminate the B + 30
28 requirements as a Model Law Engineer 2020 because not one jurisdiction has adopted the
29 Model Law 2020 Engineer and they would have had to adopted it 2 years ago in order to allow
30 people entering college right now to accomplish it before the rules change.
31
32 Chair: Ok let's move on to 9 I re Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering. Didn't we do this
33 before?
34
35 Jones: Someone before, I don't know if it was this guy or not, asked for a waiver of the arctic
36 engineering course for Naval Architects and Marine Engineers.
37
38 There was a discussion on Naval Architects and Marine Engineering in Alaska and how many
39 ship yards and what kind of vessels they were building. It also included whether or not the
40 current regulation would allow something less than an arctic course since it does say "or its
41 equivalent". It was pointed out that in the past the board would accept a paper in lieu of the
42 course and we should discuss whether or not we again want to allow them to submit a paper
43 showing their knowledge on the subject in lieu of a formal course
44
45 Chair: My opinion is that as a board we made the decision that learning about our environment
46 is important to all engineers, architect and landscape architects. If there's additional information
47 that you need to know for your profession and learn about, great, you need to do that and I feel
48 that with this Naval Architecture there are some additional concerns that they have with doing
49 work in cold climates. But they need to learn about this to be a Naval Architect. Just like a
50 structural engineer might need to know something about cold temperature steel. So in my
51 opinion our core requirement for arctic engineering should apply to everybody across the board.

1
2 Hanson: That's where I think the equivalent comes in. If we use the structural as an example if
3 there was a specific course in cold weather structural design and somebody came to me and
4 said I don't want to take the arctic because I'm a structural engineer and I took this cold weather
5 course it would be something we could evaluate as an equivalent. I kind of look at the arctic
6 course as engineering 101, it is kind of real broad and it has 2 hours on structures but it gives all
7 engineers a broad depth of knowledge on the considerations of.....
8
9 Urfer: Thinks that the arctic course gives information from other disciplines that you wouldn't
10 otherwise be exposed to so it's beneficial to all.
11
12 Chair: We are a little bit behind let's see if we can get through 9 before we break for lunch. 9 J.
13
14 Jones: There are 2 9 J's, they are from the same individual and the second one give a little
15 more in depth as to what he is asking and why.
16
17 Hanson: He's asking for an AG's opinion.
18
19 After reading the email and the regulation a short discussion determined that the regulation
20 spelled it out. Reviewing work done by a previous employer is a conflict of interest and must be
21 declared giving both parties to option of asking for a different reviewer. Jones will write a
22 response and send to the Chair, Colin and John for review.
23
24 9 K is a letter from the Consular Office of the Republic of Korea asking for our position on the
25 MRA of engineering services. This sounds like something they are working on with the U.S.
26 government or NCEES.
27
28 Hanson: Believes this is between the U.S. Government and something our Governor would
29 have to sign on to.
30
31 Jones: Seems to remember something last meeting from NCEES stating that several states
32 had already signed on to this.
33
34 Chair: We can look at the last board meeting and see if it's something we need to consider and
35 if so we can discuss under New Business. Let's go to lunch. We have public comment at 1:15
36 so try to be back by 1:05.
37
38 12:07p.m. break for lunch.
39
40 13:13p.m. on record. Roll call, all present.
41
42 Chair: Invites Vanessa Wike to the table.
43
44 Wike: Hi, I talked to you guys a couple years, well a year and a half ago about issues but today
45 I'm here to talk about me. My name is Vanessa Wike I applied for the environmental engineer
46 license when given the opportunity to do so I guess it's been a year ago now. I guess I wasn't
47 as clear in my original submittal as I should have been and I apologize for that. We were in the
48 middle of reorganization at work and perhaps I introduced some level of confusion. At some
49 point I was asked to provide calculations which I did. We don't require our work to be sealed at
50 the Department of Environmental Conservation. So I did not seal the calculations, I did sign
51 them and date them. I did seal a new version that I gave to Vern recently. But in between then

1 I kept being asked for, you asked me to provide design plans. We don't do design plans. I do
2 asses existing systems, I am the lead drinking water engineer for the program, 15 engineers.
3 I've worked for the State about 25 years and I usually, well I get the more complicated issues. I
4 typically go out on inspections on systems that don't have design plans. Either the system has
5 evolved past the original design assumptions that we used in the system, populations have
6 changed, water quality has changed, they've added industry such as canneries (unintelligible),
7 or in some instances they just haven't gone through, they have not involved engineers. There
8 have been entire communities who upgraded their water treatment plant based on a salesman's
9 recommendation and I went out and evaluated those. In those instances there is a significant
10 amount of engineering judgment brought to bear because I have to decide whether or not the
11 systems pose an eminent public health threat, whether they need to do other things to be able
12 to use their water, whether they can use their water and any limitations on using their water.
13 Most of what I do though is I try to figure out whether the existing infrastructure can be use in a
14 way that is still protective of the public health. You know, the design of the system always
15 involves a lot of assumptions any of my approvals would be based on the actual performance of
16 the system for some period of time. Hopefully we have enough data there to do two or three
17 years of time if we don't have any good design plans. I can calculate loading rates and
18 inactivation levels for (unintelligible) if we need to. But, there are a fair amount of calculations.
19 A lot of those since it's over a period of time we don't discretely do one presumed operating
20 condition that's worse case and do a calculation on that, we do it over all of the flows, over all of
21 the raw water qualities, hopefully over at least a year, three if possible so a lot of that has been
22 spread sheeted. It's not something that we just sit down and hand crank all the time but I did
23 provide some handwritten calculations showing the worst case scenarios of what would be
24 considered for a couple of engineering systems. I provided two engineering reports that we did.
25 They're fairly technical reports I think. I'm here to answer any questions you have about my
26 application. I do exercise engineering judgment. I do complete engineering calculations. I do a
27 lot of it based on inspection of an existing system and I do not do design work. I don't have any
28 design questions for you.

29
30 Chair: Asks if she submitted a letter basically stating the kind of work you do with your stamp
31 on it.

32
33 Wike: I didn't seal it because we don't seal it, I did sign and date it. And I did provide a sealed
34 version of the calculations to Vern if that's the issue.

35
36 Chair: But I'm not talking about necessarily sealing a report but sealing the letter.

37
38 Wike: I did not seal the letter. I don't have a seal and I did not think that was a requirement
39 based on other staff that were under me. I thought that if we stated that a seal wasn't needed
40 for the work that we did we didn't have to and I apologize for that level of confusion. I can
41 provide a sealed letter if that will help it, but I signed and dated it.

42
43 Chair: I think that's part of what we're look for is when an organization doesn't typically stamp
44 the document is to have a letter from the individual stamped attesting to what they do.

45
46 Wike: I'll be glad to provide that. That was not my understanding and I don't think that was
47 done for any of the staff that were below me. Eight of which, I believe, got environmental
48 engineer licenses. I'll be happy to provide that, I can write a letter attesting to that. I develop
49 regulations, develop State wide policies. I determine how we implement oversight, engineering
50 oversight of drinking water systems. If that helps I can certainly provide a letter clarifying that
51 for you and I will get that to you today.

1 On a related issue I met with you, think, about a year ago about issues we were having at DEC
2 regarding the use of the requests for record drawings for some systems. I did make some
3 proposed changes in the regulations for the engineering chapter of Drinking Water Regulations.
4 Those have finally cleared upper management. Those are waiting for Governor Approval before
5 we can share those in a Public Notice. It will not be a complete solution but I do think some of
6 the comments that I heard here and the work group were very, very helpful. They wanted a
7 better delineation of owner responsibilities. I tried to provide a different route for systems that
8 were already in existence and evolved into being public water systems. Those are our bigger
9 issue systems that started out as private systems but had evolved into public systems that had
10 no engineering oversight during their construction because they were private. So, I did try to
11 provide a clear route and it will be done through engineering inspections and engineering
12 reports that will try to call it something other than record drawings. When those regulations go
13 out to public notice I'll absolutely reconvene the work group. I appreciate your participation on
14 that.

15
16 Chair: Asks when she anticipates those will be noticed.

17
18 Wike: Last summer. (Laughter) I appreciate the vigilance that is being used. It's good to be
19 very careful. We are also trying to, in that, I'm proposing that the Department of Environmental
20 Conservation be less involved with some lower risk activities. We don't have a lot of staff so I'd
21 like to give municipal systems the opportunity to oversee drinking water distribution installations
22 following more of a quality assurance approach where they will just show us that they have the
23 standards, the specs, they verified after. And that would save us quite a bit time in doing
24 reviews. So that's in there, I tried to fix the part about the sealing to bring it more in alignment
25 with AELS requirements to avoid any conflict. I put in a section that hopefully will delineate the
26 owner responsibility. But it's all draft, it's just that we can't even share it for public notice until
27 the Governor accepts it. We were hoping it would be by October 14th because the new rules
28 went to effect where you had to do a financial analysis for regulatory changes. So we were
29 hoping it would be reviewed by them by then but we didn't make the date so, soon. Thank you
30 for your time.

31
32 Chair: Thank you Vanessa.

33
34 Jones: Asks Vanessa to email the letter to John Savage because it will be a couple days before
35 he can check his email.

36
37 Wike: I will do that today. Thank you very much.

38
39 Chair: Dale, would you like to tell us what's going on with APDC?

40
41 Nelson: For those that don't know me, my name is Dale Nelson I'm active with ASCE but with
42 Alaska Professional Design Council I'm chair of the APDC Legislative Liaison Committee. We
43 wrapped up some things last year and we don't have anything that we are aware of from AELS
44 on our docket but anyway that doesn't mean that we're not out there for the starting of the
45 session and we've got QBS is on there. We're looking at the continuing education or STEM or
46 what is it Colin, APEC? You know lending support those in the Legislature and others that are
47 doing that and plus there are other items, transportation, infrastructure and like that, kind of
48 what our docket has rite now and we're looking, like a lot of other people, at tonight to see who
49 we will be working with. So, that's what we have. I'm just showing up because I haven't
50 showed up for a while and to keep in touch with your and if you have something or some
51 questions we may be of assistance please don't forget who we are and where we're at.

1
2 Maynard: Don't forget the last \$32M for the Fairbanks engineering project.
3
4 Nelson: Yes, and with that it's there, let's finish what we started. Thank you Colin. Let's get
5 that facility up and running and UAA was financed and I saw in the paper the other day that it's
6 not going to be done until next fall or something like that.
7
8 Anyway I didn't write anything down, I'm just coming by to say hi and we still do exist and are I
9 think doing good things.
10
11 Chair: We appreciate your help.
12
13 Nelson: Thank you for your time and I'll let you get back to business. Have a great day.
14
15 Chair: I think we got through 9.
16
17 **Agenda item 10 – Correspondence Sent since August 2014.**
18
19 Chair: 10 A is the response to Mr. Luddington. With the help of Dave and John drafted this and
20 I signed it and sent it out and it's the letter he referenced in the email as far as not being very
21 happy with our decision. There is really no action for us here. That is our position and it stands.
22
23 **Agenda item 11 – Old Business**
24
25 Chair: 11 B, or we have no 11 A.
26
27 Maynard: We don't have anything in the packet for 11 A. John and Dave weren't doing any
28 work.
29
30 Hanson: Oh no, there was significant effort on 11 A.
31
32 A short discussion indicated that they would have something for a regulation change tomorrow.
33
34 Chair: 11 B EIT/LSIT Intern regulation project.
35
36 Maynard: I went through and found where we referenced the fundamentals of engineering
37 exam and the fundamentals of land surveying exam and modified it to get rid of it so I'll just go
38 through this fairly quickly. The first one is Simplified application for Reexamination. Obviously if
39 we aren't taking applications for examination we won't be taking application for re-examination
40 so I deleted the FE and FS from that section. In 12 AAC 36.062 which is Eligibility for
41 Fundamentals of Engineering Examination I deleted that whole section and replaced it with
42 "Eligibility for the Fundamentals of Engineering Examination shall be established by the National
43 Council of examiners for Engineers and Surveyors. Application to take that examination shall
44 be made to the National Council of Engineers and Surveyors." Then when you get to page
45 three we get into Engineering Education and Work Experience Requirements for the PE. I
46 deleted the words "have been approved for or" for the fundamentals and basically said you have
47 to have passed it to take the PE exam. Since we don't have a whole lot of control over when
48 they pass it we are just going to let them take it until they pass it and then they can apply for the
49 PE.
50
51 Jones: We can go online and see who passed.

1
2 Maynard: Yes but, rather than have us have to do it, when you pass it come and apply for the
3 PE was my approach. If you want to leave it on there that they have to apply to NCEES to take
4 the FE and then they apply to us to take the PE.
5
6 Jones: Whether they applied wouldn't matter. If they passed it we can go in and see if they
7 passed it.
8
9 Hanson: Even if they apply through Delaware or something, if they took in a state other than
10 Alaska?
11
12 Jones: Yes.
13
14 Hackenmiller: Anything past 2010 is online, anywhere.
15
16 Chair: But we only need to see if he passed it if he is applying or the PE right?
17
18 Maynard: Yes, and I'm one of the people that took the PE the day after I took the FE but that's
19 not very common.
20
21 There was a short discussion on whether or not someone could apply for the PE before they
22 passed the FE. With the result being that they can apply for the PE at any time but will not be
23 approved until they pass the FE.
24
25 Maynard: So we get to page 5 down at the bottom it says responsible charge experience or
26 successful completion of four years of responsible charge obtained within a mentoring system
27 and it referenced the table we are deleting so I just said set out in the rules of the National
28 Council of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors. Then we get to the FS exam and like the
29 FE I deleted that whole section and said eligibility is based on NCEES standards and you apply
30 to them. They don't have a similar situation, the mentoring so I didn't have to worry about that
31 for the FS exam, for the LS exam but I did do the same thing, have been approved for on the
32 PLS exam.
33
34 And that's all that references those exams. I didn't add anything about anybody being called an
35 EIT because we were told we can't do anything about interns without Statute changes. I'm not
36 going to worry about that. So the question is what do you want to do with this now, is this fine
37 the way it's written? Do you want to send it to the regulation people to sit on it for a year or do
38 you want to.....
39
40 Jones: It's up to the Board. If the Board approves it for Public Notice then I will give it to Jun
41 and he will make sure it's in the proper format and then we will go through the same thing we
42 are going through with the structural.
43
44 Maynard: Well I guess we'll have to do a financial analysis now?
45
46 Jones: That should be pretty simple. It will not cost the applicant anything with the State of
47 Alaska the only costs will be between them and NCEES. We won't get the application fee but
48 we won't have to spend the time working on them either.
49
50 Hanson: Asks do the Model Rules say about the education? Is it in the Model and Model Rules
51 for FE eligibility?

1
2 Maynard: Yes, you have to complete 75% of your engineering program.
3
4 Hanson: How does NCEES determine whether a person can sit for the FE?
5
6 Jones: They Don't. They have the person sign a statement that says that passing this exam
7 doesn't give you any rights anywhere. You have to apply to a specific Board. If we go up and
8 tell NCEES that we are now automatic they won't even question it. If somebody claims Alaska
9 they'll say ok.
10
11 Hanson: Right, so by deleting all of this language what we are saying is that anybody at any
12 time can take the FE exam. It doesn't matter whether you're an engineering student or not.
13
14 Maynard: Yes, we are saying basically whatever NCEES requires.....
15
16 Hanson: Well they saying you meet the state requirements and we're saying you meeting
17 NCEES, it's a circular, we're saying you meet each other's requirements, well there aren't any
18 requirements in that sense, so anyone if they choose Alaska could sit for the.....
19
20 Hale: They could take the test but that doesn't mean they are going to be accepted....
21
22 Hanson: They will be accepted but what does that give them?
23
24 Maynard: It doesn't give them anything they still have to have the education and the FE and the
25 experience to take the PE exam.
26
27 Hale: So they can take all the tests they want but they still have to come to us for licensure.
28
29 Kerr: It kind of deflates the value of the FE, is that what you're thinking?
30
31 Maynard: But nobody can come out of High School and take the test....
32
33 Hanson: Yes they can, without any experience requirements and they could now I suppose.
34
35 Maynard: No, NCEES requires that they be 75% done with their engineering degree.
36
37 Hanson: No, they require that they meet the State that you're applying for.
38
39 Jones: They are just going to ask them if the met the State of Alaska requirements.
40
41 Chair: I don't think that they name a state when they take it, they have to name a state that they
42 are applying for in this case though they could say Alaska but we don't have any involvement
43 with it then with this new regulation project.
44
45 Hanson: I don't think we are going to get a huge on slot of people wanting to take the FE exam
46 but it's a potential.
47
48 Jones: So if somebody out of High School takes the exam and passes it he's still has to show a
49 degree before he's going to get any farther than that.
50
51 Eriksen: It kind of defeats the whole EIT concept though.

1
2 Schedler: Yes why do we want to let them take it if they're not 75% done with their...
3
4 Maynard: Well we can't regulate EIT's so maybe its ok.
5
6 Hanson: I like the language, it cleans it up big time but it's just something I throw out there
7 when we start deleting education well then.....I hate slippery slope arguments. Oh, you're
8 going to let me take the FE whenever I want, well why not the PE because that's already
9 moving forward, some states are allowing you to take the PE whenever you want. So that's the
10 next step you may not be licensed but...
11
12 Jones: Say that someone who has completed 75% of an engineering degree may apply to the
13 National Council of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors to take the FE. That way you've
14 established that you've got to have that 75%. Once you've got that then you can apply and...
15
16 Maynard: Tell you what, why don't I go back and see what the Model Rules say because we
17 are kind of guessing what they say and I'll bring it back....
18
19 Chair: That would be a good idea because if they applied under another state and they didn't
20 have their 75% and their state allowed that and they passed the FE would we not accept that?
21
22 Jones: Once they pass the exam we'll accept it.
23
24 Chair: But if we put in ours that in order to take it they had to satisfy that condition A and they
25 didn't satisfy it....
26
27 Maynard: So nobody would apply in Alaska then.
28
29 Jones: We'll accept their PE exam if their state allowed them to take it with two years of
30 experience. We just won't accept it until they've added that other two years, but we will accept
31 their exam once they've met our requirements.
32
33 Hale: We're talking about not regulating EIT's and just having the professional requirements?
34
35 Hanson: That's essentially what we are doing.
36
37 Hale: Then we wouldn't have any EIT stipulation.
38
39 Hanson: There aren't any now. Just to take the exam.
40
41 Maynard: We tell them how to take the exam then we have to keep our hands off until they
42 apply to take the PE according to the State Legislature.
43
44 Chair: Asks if we have the term EIT in the regulations anywhere.
45
46 Jones: No, it's just in policy.
47
48 Chair: Asks what the policy says.
49
50 Hanson: You have to pass the FE and have a BS I think.
51

1 Maynard: The only place that intern appears in our regulations is in architects and that you
2 have to finish the IDP.
3
4 Jones: It's on page 1 of the General Board Policies (G). Titles for Interns.
5
6 Maynard: The Legislature told us we can't deal with interns since there's nothing in Statute.
7
8 Jones: Yes, we do not have statutory authority to regulate interns.
9
10 Maynard: I still argue that it's part of the NCEES standards and we are doing it in accordance
11 with NCEES standards.
12
13 Chair: This is strictly policy, we don't have it regulations?
14
15 Maynard: Will verify the NCEES standards and come back to the Board.
16
17 Hanson: Doesn't want to delay it.
18
19 Chair: If we could address it tomorrow that would be great.
20
21 Hanson: Thinks we will get more push back on the have been approved for, or the deletion of
22 that, than a lot of the other deletions.
23
24 Chair: the next item is 11 C and we talked about this last time. It's the use of logo's or
25 company names on plans and I drafted a letter that Vern sent out to the different jurisdictions
26 and what follows are the responses that we got back from those jurisdictions and there's a few
27 in here that, I think we got about 4 or 5 of them that actually have some stipulations regarding
28 company name, contact information, that type of thing. Out of all the one's that responded most
29 don't have any requirement but I thought it'd be good if we go ahead and look at the
30 requirements that these different states have.
31
32 So on the one from David Cox of Kentucky, what they say is in addition to their stamp, signature
33 and date, in addition, with our requirements for a business entity permit, the company name and
34 contact information that they use in the title block must be that of the licensees employer; they
35 cannot certify something under the title block of another entity. We do not specify what contact
36 information is included in the title block.
37
38 On the next page Lance Kinney of the Texas Board responded under sealing procedures (n) All
39 engineering documents released, issued, or submitted by a licensee, including preliminary
40 documents, shall clearly indicate the firm name and registration number of the engineering firm
41 by which the engineer is employed. And then it goes on to say (1) If the engineer is employed
42 by a local, State, or Federal Government agency, then only the name of the agency shall be
43 required. And (2) if the engineer is exempt from sealing a document under subsection (m) of
44 this section, but elects to seal a document, then only the name of the employer shall be
45 required.
46
47 On the next page Judy Kempker of the Missouri Board says in paragraph two. If the drawings
48 are being prepared by a licensee who is an employee of a corporation or LLC, the company
49 name and contact information that they use in the title block must be that of the licensee's
50 employer, they cannot certify something under the title block of another entity. Our title block
51 requires the following: (A) The name of the licensee either as a sole proprietor, partnership,

1 corporation, limited liability company, or other appropriate entity. (B) The licensee's address
2 and phone number. (C) The name or identification of the project. (D) The address/location of
3 the project and (H) the last pertinent one is; the printed name, discipline, and certificate of
4 authority number of the corporation as defined in section 327.011.
5

6 Kathy Hart of Oklahoma states that they must indicate which part of the work they are certifying
7 and include their personal/business contact information to ensure that it is clear which firm they
8 are work for. And (q) Consultants hired to do work on behalf of the firm must sign, seal and
9 date their work and include their title block, contact information, and Certificate of Authorization
10 information, if applicable, on the work. Consultants may not sign and seal as the responsible
11 charge engineer for the firm to which they are consulting.
12

13 I think those were the only ones, some had language drafter but that's not the focus this
14 particular topic. So, discussion on this? Does the Board like the idea, not like the idea?
15

16 Kerr: Thinks it's a great idea. It would simplify for John the situation of having plans and not
17 knowing where to go. I don't see a down side to it. Does anyone see a down side to doing
18 this?
19

20 Chair: We might end up if we do it; have some exception for Government entities. Even if
21 they're non-employees like with DOT right now they don't allow your logo to go on drawings.
22

23 Hanson: You don't need to have a logo on drawings this is not about the logo it's the name of
24 the company.
25

26 There was a short discussion on the requirements for government entities such as firm name
27 and address, the phone number, COA number etc. The Chair will work on a draft regulation.
28

29 There was a short pause while a motion was drafted.
30

31 Maynard: Went to the NCEES site and went to FE exam and it has all the states listed. I picked
32 Arizona and it says Arizona doesn't require you to do anything to apply to NCEES it doesn't say
33 anything about any minimum requirements either.
34

35 **On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Kerr and approved unanimously it was**
36 **RESOLVED to approve a regulation project to require a registrant's company information**
37 **on title blocks.**
38

39 Hanson: Wouldn't limit it to title blocks, anything that gets a stamp should have the information.
40

41 Eriksen: So stamped documents instead of title blocks?
42

43 Hanson: Well it's just a point to evaluate; I wouldn't necessarily change the motion.
44

45 Chair: Thinks the regulation project itself can clarify that. He rereads the one from Texas. He
46 will make sure there are no conflicts and asks who will help on this.
47

48 Hanson: I'll help.
49

50 Chair: Will draft it and send it to the Registration and Practice Committee for comment and at
51 our next meeting I can present it.

1
2 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Maynard and passed**
3 **unanimously it was RESOLVED to go into Executive Session IAW AS 44.62.310**
4 **(c)(3) to review applicant files.**

5
6 1:55 p.m. Went into Executive Session to review applicant files.

7
8 4:05 p.m. Recessed for the day.

9
10
11 **Wednesday November 5, 2014**
12

13
14
15 9:00 a.m. The meeting was called to order. Roll call, all present except Kerr.

16
17 Chair: There are a couple of items from yesterday that we want to revisit. 11 A.
18 Definition of Engineering Surveys.

19
20 Hanson: Hopefully John shows up before we talk about that one.

21
22 9:02 a.m. Kerr arrived.

23
24 Chair: I'll give you a moment to get settled but we are going to revisit item 11 A. which
25 is the Definition of Engineering Surveys.

26
27 Hanson: So while John's reading what I sent last night (John, I've read it) I figured
28 rather than delay it another 3 or 4 months and try to get it to at us three perfectly agree
29 on it we could maybe talk about it with the group and see if we want to put it out as a
30 regulation project and see what the licensees have to say about it. So what we were
31 tasked with doing was coming up with a definition for Engineering Surveys quite some
32 time ago and John kind lit a fire under us a couple weeks ago and we've had several
33 meetings and back and forth on it. This came up recently with the mortgage surveys,
34 someone interpreting Engineering Survey to mean they can do Land Surveying or other
35 types of surveying so I guess this is good timing to get this out. What we came up with
36 was, and I haven't talked to John yet, but you know we, the definition of Engineering
37 Surveys, we would add it to 12 AAC 36.990 which is kind of the a-la-cart definition
38 location for anything that's not in Statute or defined in other regulations. It's where all
39 the types of engineering are defined and it further clarifies the Statutes and Regulations.
40 So, what we came up with was "Engineering Surveys means work performed by a
41 professional engineer to measure and asses structures, machines, equipment, utility
42 systems, materials, processes and work public or private , but excludes the practice of
43 land surveying" and that's it. The asses' structures, machines, all of that is right out of
44 the definition of the practice of engineering. We tried not to change that. We previously
45 discussed supplemental mapping and having that in the definition. We took that out and
46 there were some other things we had. We had a really long definition and we shortened
47 it up. I think that's where we are at, John or Dave, if you want to add anything?

1
2 Chair: Asks him to read it one more time.
3
4 Hanson: Engineering Surveys means work performed by a professional engineer to
5 measure and asses' structures, machines, equipment, utility systems, materials,
6 processes and work public or private, but excludes the practice of land surveying.
7
8 Kerr: My concern is, I'm fine with this but, there are some things in land surveying that
9 engineers can do.
10
11 Koonce: What are those?
12
13 Kerr: In the practice of land surveying it discusses the alignment and grades for streets
14 related to subdivisions and I think engineers should be able to do that.
15
16 Koonce: Couldn't you just add that to the description?
17
18 Kerr: Yes, I'm sure we could so something, I was just, like Brian said we do need to get
19 something out there and if this goes out like it is I'm fine with that but I thinks it's too
20 restrictive to the engineers and I want this to be as inclusive as possible to allow the
21 engineers do everything they can competently do.
22
23 Eriksen: Asks for it to be read one more time.
24
25 Hanson: yes, it means work performed by a professional engineer to measure and
26 asses structures, machines, equipment, utility systems, materials, processes and work
27 public or private, but excludes the practice of land surveying. So, the definition of land
28 surveying is on page 9 of the regulations. The first couple of sentences are kind of like
29 the engineers, it's pretty generic but then the adequate evidence of the act of measuring
30 and locating land, geodetic and cadastral surveys, the location of monumentation of
31 property boundaries for the platting and planning of land and subdivisions of land
32 including topography alignment, and grades for streets, and for the preparation and
33 perpetuation of maps, record plats, field note records and property descriptions that
34 represent these surveys.
35
36 Kerr: it would also mean that if we adopted this that means surveyors couldn't do
37 supplemental, well it contradicts it's self where it says supplemental mapping to identify
38 and enhance previous surveying, but then it excludes everything.
39
40 Hale: That was what we were talking about before was putting in the supplemental
41 surveying that has been done before and you know the wordier you get the more
42 convoluted it gets and the less effective it is.
43
44 Hanson: Right, what's supplemental, can I do this?
45

1 Hale: I kind of like the latest because it's short and it points back to the definition of land
2 surveying which people can look at themselves and interpret it and it's not up to us to
3 dictate exactly what everyone can and cannot do.
4

5 Koonce: Why don't you include those two or three elements in the definition of
6 engineering so it clarifies that?
7

8 Kerr: Do you see that as an issue, Brian?
9

10 Hanson: I don't see it as an issue. I mean an engineer's is going to still lay out an
11 alignment for a road. It really is up to the surveyor once the engineer lays out the
12 alignment and the boundaries of the work to decide, ok this is a property take or this is
13 you know, the engineer may say well we think this is over the line based on the
14 information the surveyor gave me but they're not going to go and lay out the property
15 take or the TCE or the TCP or whatever it ends up being it's really going to be the PLS
16 that's preparing the plot plan. When it comes to that sort of stuff I don't see this as
17 hindering the ability to use survey products and do engineering over the top of them.
18

19 Eriksen: Asks if they could re-craft the word practice to survey licensure or something.
20

21 Hanson: Well that is what the practice of surveying is, that's saying like we had a
22 licensed professional well an engineer is licensed. I started with a definition that
23 engineering surveys means the gathering of data for use by engineers. But that didn't
24 fly (laughter) that was just too succinct so, you know, and I could see some flaws with
25 that (laughter) but then we kind of ballooned it up and we're kind of paring it back a little
26 bit now. The way I see it also, you know one of big things is well can an engineer go out
27 and set up an instrument and take some shots on what we would consider land
28 surveying as part of an engineer survey and I think they can under this definition
29 because of the measure, you know, no they cannot go out and do a mortgage survey or
30 a full topo survey or a full this type of survey because that's locating land. But they can
31 go out and measure something.
32

33 Kerr: The definition of engineer excludes everything that falls under the practice of land
34 surveying and I think there are things that engineers can do that fall under the practice
35 of land surveying but if you want to put it out like this, I'm ok with this but I think it's more
36 restrictive it needs to be.
37

38 Koonce: Well if it is then we are going to start getting questions regarding that and
39 we're going to have to respond to those.
40

41 Maynard: Well the first question you going to get is from the people who do sub-
42 divisions that are civil engineers and that's the platting and planning of land if you're a
43 civil engineer who does sub-divisions you're going to be yelling and screaming.
44

45 Hanson: But they can't do sub-divisions.
46

1 Hale: They can do road lay outs.

2

3 Maynard: Back in the recesses of my mind when I was at Dowl in the late 70's they
4 were doing sub-divisions. Now they may not have, they probably drafted it out where
5 they wanted everything. The surveyor probably went and actually located it. But they did
6 the basic layouts.

7

8 Hale:

9

10 Hanson: But nothing will prohibit a surveyor or an engineer or whatever from doing
11 those preliminary layouts and working together to come up with a solution but ultimately
12 it depends on the type of work it is as to who has to be in responsible charge.

13

14 Hale: There are other parts of the Statutes and Regulations that require you to work in
15 your area of expertise.

16

17 Kerr: I'm ok with this; I'm just concerned as Jeff said that we are going to get a lot of
18 blow back on this.

19

20 Hanson: Explains that in his research he couldn't find anything on Google and a lot of
21 Boards use engineering surveys. California even has a manual explaining how to do
22 engineering surveys and land surveying is all it is. It is not what he would consider an
23 engineering survey. Surveyors have a kind of narrow scope as to what a survey is. He
24 would look at going around a building and looking at all the architectural components as
25 an architectural survey, same with mechanical or electrical, going into a mechanical
26 room and looking at all the equipment, that's a survey as well. He thinks it should be
27 broader than just the land surveying portion of it.

28

29 Maynard: Points out that California requires all the civil engineers to take a surveying
30 test so to be licensed in California you have to know something about surveying.
31 Whether you know as much as a surveyor, probably not but you have to be able to pass
32 that seismic and surveying test.

33

34 The conversation continued for a short time with no new points. After a time the
35 conversation shifted to the public notice process.

36

37 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it**
38 **was RESOLVED to public notice a regulation change to 12 AAC 36.990 (43)**
39 **“engineering surveys” means work performed by a professional engineer to**
40 **measure and asses structures, machines, equipment, utility systems, materials,**
41 **processes and work public or private, but excludes the practice of land**
42 **surveying.**

43

44 Chair: Ok the second item from yesterday was 11 B, which is the EIT/LSIT regulation
45 project that Colin is working on and I believe we had to review what NCEES had in their
46 Model Law.

1
2 Maynard: So, I went to the NCEES website and that's the first sheet that I gave you.
3 The N means that you don't need to go to the Board to apply to take the FE or the FS
4 you just apply to NCEES. The Y means that you have to apply to the State and then
5 they give permission for you to take it. There are 5 States who said you can apply to
6 NCEES but you must meet the State requirements. I'm assuming that the others don't
7 have a particular State requirement although I didn't go through all their laws to figure
8 out what they actually said. They typically give you one per window and 3 per year then
9 you have to go to the particular Board to get permission to take it again. So if you look
10 on the second page the no's are 32 for the engineering and 15 that go through the State
11 and 5 of them the education must meet the State Board requirements. I grabbed the
12 Model Law which specifies what the requirements are for taking the FE and the FS;
13 however I also sent an email to NCEES to ask them what they ask for when somebody
14 signs up. They said well we make them fill out this form and it gets their college and all
15 that kind of stuff. I said, well do you verify it and they said no we just take their word for
16 it basically. There are 7 things they are agreeing to or confirming when they sign up,
17 that they are the individual and basically that, the last one is Passing this exam does not
18 ensure that I will be certified as an engineer intern/surveyor intern or that I will be
19 licensed as an engineer/surveyor in any jurisdiction, that you have to go to the particular
20 Board. Interestingly enough there was only one State that said, after you pass this you
21 can go to the State Board to get certified as an engineering intern and that was
22 California. The rest of them don't seem to care whether you passed it or not or at least
23 it was not indicated on their page.

24
25 So that's what they do and the question was if we want to just eliminate the
26 requirements and just send them to NCEES. One thing I thought of last night is we
27 could add a sentence to both of these that says once you've passed the fundamentals
28 you can call yourself and engineer intern similarly a surveyor intern, surveyor in training,
29 engineer in training, it seems like intern raises questions.

30
31 Hanson: We were told we have no jurisdiction over EIT's so how can we over interns,
32 EIT's whatever, it doesn't matter so how can we say what they can call themselves?

33
34 Kerr: We can say it we just can't enforce it.

35
36 Hanson: Well it's a policy I guess.

37
38 Maynard: We can do engineers and they are engineers in training. If we don't use the
39 word intern they probably won't bother us.

40
41 Jones: Does the Model Law say anything about using those titles?

42
43 Maynard: Yes

44
45 Jones: Then just add a sentence to say in accordance with the Model Law, etc.

46

1 Discussion continued for a short period on whether to get into what they call themselves
2 and whether to leave requirements in the regulations. It was decided to leave the policy
3 re EIT, Intern etc. in place and send the regulation change to public notice as submitted.
4

5 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hanson and passed**
6 **unanimously it was RESOLVED to send modifications to 12 AAC 36.040, 12 AAC**
7 **36.062, 12 AAC 36.063, 12 AAC 36.064 and 12 AAC 36.065 out for public comment.**
8

9 Chair: I think that takes care of yesterday's business. Do you have the motions for
10 reading in?

11
12 Jones: Do you want to do that now?

13
14 Chair: Let's get to this other stuff first. We don't have any additional action on these
15 applications?

16
17 Jones: No.

18 **Agenda Item 17 – New Business**

19
20
21 Chair: Ok we will move to item 17 which is new business. ADEC definitions.
22

23 Maynard: This is an email I got from an engineer in town and they ran across this
24 regulation and went isn't this modifying what an engineer is and what an engineer can
25 do is that legal?
26

27 Hanson: There are professional hydrologists in the State. You have to take a test
28 much like what this says, exactly like what it says, you take the test and a class and you
29 become certified as a professional hydrologist. And I believe, don't quote me, but I think
30 you have to be an engineer or a professional geologist to get that designation. You just
31 can't go and take the test, I could be wrong on that but there is a professional
32 hydrologist.
33

34 Koonce: Is there an engineering need for that, like geologist?
35

36 Hanson: Professional Geologist has the 27 different categories of types of geology they
37 can do and one of them is hydrology. If an engineer gets it it's typically a civil engineer.
38

39 Maynard: I think when he read the definition of a qualified ground water scientist he
40 saw the training and experience in ground water hydrology and he thought they may
41 have to do something beyond their engineering license but I don't think that's
42 necessarily the case.
43

44 Hanson: Typically they would.
45

1 Maynard: Well they would have done that as part of their training to become a civil
2 engineer if that's the kind of civil engineering they wanted to do. It's not as if you take
3 these additional classes and become a qualified ground water scientist.

4 Hanson: Yes, it's usually that specific training and experience that they do and they
5 become a professional hydrologist.

6
7 Chair: it looks like the definition isn't defining engineer it's just defining what you need
8 for a qualified ground water scientist, which would happen to be an engineer or scientist
9 that had this other training, I don't think it falls under our.....

10
11 Maynard: Or if they got that training as they got their civil engineering degree or that
12 was their area of expertise.

13
14 Hanson: Do we have to respond to this?

15
16 Maynard: Yes, I can do that.

17
18 Hanson: Really this is in addition to your engineering background.

19
20 Maynard: I don't think it's necessarily an addition just that is part of your area of
21 expertise as a civil engineer.

22
23 Chair: Colin, you're going to work up a response for that? Item 18 Special Committees.

24
25 Maynard: 17 B?

26
27 Chair: What was 17 B?

28
29 Jones: it had to do with – can an intern architect call themselves a project designer? It
30 was an email I got from someone. They didn't want to be called an intern because that
31 indicated that they were still in college working through the summer so they wanted to
32 be called project designers instead of intern architects.

33
34 Maynard: Feels it would be the same as engineers, as long as they don't use one of the
35 protected titles they can call themselves anything they want.

36
37 Hanson: Would refer them back to the policy. It says persons with an accredited
38 bachelor's degree in architecture may refer to themselves as Architects in Training or
39 Intern Architects. I wouldn't go to the project designer just because it's a Board policy.

40
41 Chair: Well they could call them project designers if they want we don't regulate project
42 designers unless they're doing architectural design.

43
44 It was decided that the Chair would work up a response following Board Policy.

45
46 **Agenda item 18 – Special Committees**

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

Chair: Special Committees, Licensure Implementation.

Maynard: We've got the structural out in space, now we've got another one that will be out there too.

Chair: Registration and Practice. I'm the chair of that and the only thing we have is what we came up with yesterday which was just responding back to the question about the former employer, 9 J. And also I was going to draft something for the address, title block.

Licensure Mobility I'm chair of that. On that particular issue at the meeting I just had, the Chair's meeting with NCARB they had a special break out about the Canadian Mutual Recognition Agreement. We talked about that at length and they're trying to find out what obstacles we have with signing that and I told them that one issue we're looking at is we want to have parity between the engineering/surveying group and the architecture side and one of the problems we have with the engineers is that they don't want to take our test but they want us to take their test. It sounds like with the Alberta group that their test is largely like a jurisprudence test not a technical test. As far as the architectural groups go it's a National Organization rather than a Provincial Organization. They take their testing as part of their schooling and they have a test at the end that covers their laws and regulations and it covers codes as well. I don't know how far it gets into some of the other technical issues with design. Their IDP process is similar, there's a few hours difference. Their schooling is similar, so I don't think we need to take any action on it today. It's something that I'm still trying to get some information from NCARB on. I've requested a copy of the old agreement which we were a signatory too. I want to see what it says and what's changed from then to now. I do know the other one was expiring and that's why they gave us the new one. So, I'll report back on that after they give me some more information. I did ask the President of NCARB if they had made any headway or if NCEES had made any headway that they know of with Canada as far as any sort of reciprocity or mutual recognition agreement and he they really haven't made any that he's aware of. But I don't think they have the overriding organization, they have the provincial organization. That's all I have on that.

Mining Engineers and Geologists.

Hanson: We haven't had any issues.

Chair: Was that committee created when we were looking at the definition of geologist and whether or not.....

Jones: We wanted to take them on.

Maynard: They wanted to join our Board.

1 Chair: If it's not something that we want to continue to monitor or actively engage in
2 committee we probably can get rid of it.
3

4 Maynard: We can always bring it back if it comes back up.
5

6 Jones: The committee was established because of the problem of the geologists
7 encroaching on the mining engineer's profession. That's why they formed the committee
8 and then there was talk about maybe we need to bring geologists under this Board. But
9 to do that would require a Statute and it never went past that.
10

11 After a short discussion it was decided to drop that committee and bring it back if and
12 when needed.
13

14 Social Networking Options. Dave?
15

16 Hale: Recommended dropping this one also due to the fact that we have to get
17 permission from the State.
18

19 It was noted that the position in the Division that was working on a policy for Social
20 Networking was vacant and after a short discussion it was decided to wait until the next
21 meeting in Juneau to make the decision on whether to keep the committee or not.
22 Jones added that if the position is filled at that time he would invite that individual to the
23 meeting.
24

25 Enforcement, Enhancement.
26

27 Maynard: Notes that we now have a full time investigator and all our cases are out of
28 the AG's office and recommends dropping that committee also.
29

30 Chair: Ok, we will drop that. Standing Committees.
31

32 Investigative Advisory Committee. Brian you've probably been involved in more cases
33 than anybody. Does it seem to be going pretty good?
34

35 Hanson: Yes, there are quite a few cases coming up. I don't know if we will have any at
36 the next meeting, probably the meeting after that there will be a couple if John can get
37 movement on those. We met about every three weeks or so and then took a month or
38 two break but things are going well. John's doing a good job moving things off the to-
39 do-list. It is hard because they're down so many investigators but he is committed to
40 our Board so.....
41

42 Chair: Just a reminder to everybody that the Board at large is on that committee and
43 we all may be called upon by John at some point in time to get our expertise for a
44 particular discipline area. If you do then you want to keep that as confidential. Don't
45 share that information with any other Board member. Then you'll have to recuse
46 yourself if we end up taking any action on that.

1
2 Jones: John did mention that he wants to get more people involved instead of the one
3 or two that he ends up calling all the time.
4
5 Eriksen: He puts a lot of thought and preparation in before he calls so it's not like he
6 just calls out of the blue and catches you off guard and you have to figure out what to
7 do. He's got a lot of background and history and he does a good job on the process.
8
9 Chair: He does try to protect the pool; he doesn't want to spoil too many Board
10 Members in case action needs to be taken later on. He does a real good job.
11
12 Hanson: I take the civil because most of our registrants are civil. He notes that there
13 are architectural, mechanical and electrical but hasn't seen any mining yet.
14
15 Koonce: Asks if the architectural will be given to him or Richard.
16
17 Hanson: Yes, if it's a civil engineer and I think it's bordering on other things I would look
18 at it and give my opinion and then John would independently have someone else look at
19 it and they would give their opinion independently so we don't talk to each other, then if
20 we both arrive at pretty much the same solution then he has a direction to go.
21
22 Eriksen: Like Brian said John does a pretty good job about who he wants to answer
23 that question.
24
25 Hanson: Yes, he doesn't want to poll everybody.
26
27 Jones: That's another thing, when I send questions out to you from people a lot of
28 times it's something that may end up as a complaint or a case he asked that I not send
29 it to both surveyors or both civil engineers, just involve one that way you still have
30 somebody out there that can vote. So if I ask you just respond back to me, don't
31 include anybody else.
32
33 Chair: And don't' respond directly back to the individual that sent the email to Vern. I
34 always respond back to Vern and he sends an email back to the individual.
35
36 Guidance manual. Luann?
37
38 Urfer: Presents changes she made to the first two pages of the Guidance Manual for
39 board approval/comments. It was determined that she is on the right track and should
40 continue. She will try to have the next section ready for board review and comment at
41 the next meeting.
42
43 Chair: Legislative Liaison. Eric?
44
45 Eriksen: Nothing to report. He reminds everyone that the Legislative Session is coming
46 up and we should be thinking about anything we want to bring before them.

1
2 Maynard: Suggests that the Division will probably put some version of HB 187 back in
3 again.
4
5 Hanson: Asks if we are going to try to clean up 8.48.101 or see if somebody will help us
6 with that. That has to do with describing the content of examinations, establishing the
7 conduct of an examination which we don't do. I guess we still do the State specific
8 survey exam but it's not really what the Board does.
9
10 A short discussion on whether to proceed with a possible revision resulted in tasking
11 Hanson and Eriksen with reviewing and reporting back with suggestions.
12
13 Chair: Emeritus Status. We don't have anybody going off the Board.
14
15 Budget committee. Jeff?
16
17 Koonce: Is glad to see that Sara is fine tuning the budget reports.
18
19 Chair: Continuing Education. Brian?
20
21 Hanson: Vern did everything last time, we only had to do one or two. Did we have any
22 AG referrals last time?
23
24 Jones: I think we had one. I've been giving them a lot of slack so if we have to take it
25 to the paralegal that means they were really bad.
26
27 Chair: It's good to hear that people are doing what they are supposed to do.
28
29 IDP Liaison. I'm chair of that, although I wasn't able to meet with them NCARB did
30 send up a representative to the AIA Annual Meeting down in Juneau as well they
31 traveled up to Fairbanks and Anchorage and met with the Intern Groups.
32
33 **Agenda Item 19 – Board Travel**
34
35 Chair: We have the NCARB meeting in Long Beach, the Regional Meeting March 13th
36 and 14th so Jeff and I would like to attend that.
37
38 Koonce: States that he will probably be out of the country March 1st to the 15th.
39
40 Jones: I will be trying to go to all the meetings this year.
41
42 Chair: NCEES Western Zone, Scottsdale.
43
44 Schedler: I'd like to go. She will put it on her calendar and see if she can work it out.
45
46 Chair: Unfortunately we don't always get the approval far in advance.

1
2 Jones: Informs everyone that they can make hotel reservations prior to getting travel
3 approval but they should make sure the check on how far in advance reservation have
4 to be canceled without any fee.

5
6 Maynard, Hanson and Kerr voiced interest in attending the WestZone meeting. Jones
7 will send out a request asking who wants to attend once the meeting announcement is
8 out and will then put in the travel request.

9
10 Chair: NCARB Annual June 17th through the 20th in New Orleans, I'd like to attend that
11 and Jeff, you too? (yes)

12
13 NCEES Annual in Williamsburg August 19th through 22nd. Same usual suspects? (all
14 answered affirmative)

15
16 CLARB meeting in September 16th through 19th.

17
18 Jones: I want to go to that one too. Luann do you want to go to it? (yes) Do you know
19 where it's at? (no) I do but I was sworn to secrecy. (Laughter followed by speculation
20 on where it will be held. Suggestions were Guam, Hawaii, Barrow.)

21
22 **Agenda Item 20 – National Meeting Reports.**

23
24 Chair: NCEES meeting in August, did anyone go to that?

25
26 Maynard: Yes there were 4 of us, 5 of us were there. They had some interesting
27 seminars on ethics, QBS and a couple other things. The business meeting was nothing
28 really earth shattering, other than ripping the whole 20/20 thing out of the Model Law
29 and putting it into policy so we'll see where that goes.

30
31 Urfer: I have a question to ask about that. She was approached by the Board
32 Executive from Guam who wants to get Landscape Architecture as a profession. She
33 asks if she can contact him or if it has to go through the Board.

34
35 Chair: You can talk to other jurisdictions. In fact that's really one of the benefits of
36 being in these National Organizations, being able to talk about issues with other
37 jurisdictions. Find out how they're handling things.

38
39 Kerr: Adds that there was a good seminar on sub-surface utility mapping.

40
41 Hanson: Reports that the B+30 was the biggest issue. He reports on the election
42 results. CBT is moving forward at a great pace. They are looking at 2016 as possibly
43 the first administering of a PE exam and mechanical has a pretty good jump on it
44 already. It's not going to be open book if it goes CBT. It can't be because you're not
45 allowed to bring anything in the exam room. So they are looking at supplied references
46 as well as standards and codes, which is harder on the group two exams just because

1 they're smaller exams and smaller exam committees. They are looking at developing
2 the references kind of like the FE has. By 2020 they're hoping that they're all CBT.

3
4 Kerr: Adds that they had sample kiosks for trying out the computer based test and the
5 reference materials they provided worked ok.

6
7 Hanson: All the candidates love the reference material because they're searchable. It's
8 like a .pdf on steroids you can find anything you need.

9
10 Chair: 20 C is the NCARB Board Chair meeting that I just attended. I've covered all the
11 topics that were covered at that meeting. I did have some additional material that I'll
12 submit to Vern for our next Board Report. I primarily covered the changes in the IDP,
13 the changes in the BEA, the committee working on the designation or what to call
14 interns. Those were the main topics that were covered.

15
16 Maynard: Asks if he skipped B for a reason, CLARB?

17
18 Chair: CLARB.

19
20 Urfer: Wants to get a little bit more information from CLARB about international
21 registration.

22 23 **Agenda Item 22 – Examiners Report.**

24
25 Hackenmiller: The first thing is that NCEES exam scores after 2010 are online so I can
26 just type in any applicant's name and if they took the FE or PE after 2010 I can just print
27 it off instead of asking for verification from other states. It doesn't work most of the time
28 because for example at this Board Meeting we had a ton of comity applicants who took
29 the exam prior to 2010 so they still have to get that verification from another state, we
30 also need their licensure verification which is something I can't pull up on the internet.
31 It is very advantageous for those applying for or taking the PE this year because most
32 likely they took the FE 4 years ago and I can just find it, it doesn't matter if they took it in
33 Delaware or Minnesota, or where ever, print if off and they don't have to go through any
34 of the verification process which is costly and time consuming so that's helpful for me.
35 Regarding the little box on the side, there are 7 States who still don't have online
36 verification, that another problem. She explains that manual verification can takes
37 weeks where online is very quick. Those 7 states are really behind the times. Item
38 number 2 is just a count of the LARE and the ARE candidates. Right now there are 40
39 ARE candidates in our files. I didn't go through to see who is still working on it or who's
40 expired. We just approved Stephanie Brown for testing so that brought our LARE
41 number to 6. There is a list there of 4 architect candidates who finished their ARE
42 recently and who are licensed. And number 3 is just data, numbers that I was able to
43 pull showing the PE and PS examinees for the last 4 years in October for comparison.
44 And second box is the FE and FS examinees who have taken the exam this year. I
45 don't know how much this has changed from last year but it's a lot. It's very easy for
46 them to apply and they can take it whenever they want which is really great. The

1 bottom is just licenses issued so you can see in the last 4 months how many licenses
2 I've issued. Usually I license most of them right after a board meeting. Then the box
3 on the right is how many application I've received in this fiscal year and I usually receive
4 most of them in the last two weeks. That's FY15 and I'll keep updating that every 4
5 months. The numbers on the right changed a little. I updated this on Thursday of last
6 week and we got a few more application to be board ready on Friday. I think there were
7 4 or 5 so the number is about 5 off. That shows us how many and what disciplines are
8 applying and obviously civil is the winner. And the bottom is how many people took the
9 PE and PS this October in case anyone was curious. That's all.

10
11 The Board thanks her for the report.

12
13 Maynard: Asks if everything isn't supposed to be in two weeks before the meeting.

14
15 Jones: Yes but what we have been doing is if we are caught up, and she's efficient
16 enough that she is caught up a few days after the deadline, when we get an application
17 if we have everything we need to bring it to the Board we bring it. As far as the
18 verifications she mentioned being delayed because some states won't send them until
19 they receive payment, we don't do that. We tell the individual that we will get the
20 verification out now so they won't miss any deadlines and that they owe us \$20 and to
21 date I don't know of anyone who hasn't paid.

22
23 Hackenmiller: Explains how she handles it. She sends the verification right away and
24 then sends the individual a credit card form to submit payment on.

25
26 **Agenda Item 23 – Board Tasks (to-do-list)**

27
28 Chair: Asks if we have a list.

29
30 Jones: It's toward the end of last meetings minutes, page 53 at the bottom.

31
32 Chair: The first item I had was a letter that Eric had started drafting and completed. I
33 just had to send them the Mutual Recognition Agreement with Canada for reference. I
34 was tasked to respond to NCARB on the IDP changes which I did. I looked at the logo
35 issue and gave Vern a letter to send out and the responses are in our packet here.
36 There is one thing that I didn't get done, I was going to do a letter that basically just
37 talked about the Statute change that we had and eliminating the mechanical and
38 electrical administrators from our exceptions. That was for a public awareness type of
39 thing so I'll add that to my new to-do-list. I responded to NCARB regarding the BEA
40 BFEA and IDP changes. On my new to-do-list I've added that letter back on, and I've
41 got the address change I'm working on and the letter to AIDC, I have those three items
42 on my list.

43
44 Hanson: I was working with engineer surveys, we got that out. Colin took care of all
45 the EIT stuff.

1 Jones: Asks if anyone heard from the Seismic Task Force since we sent the letter. (no
2 response)

3
4 Chair: Brian I had something under you for time and penalty.

5
6 Hanson: Yes, that's the address and I'm wrapping that up, keeping your address up to
7 date and I'm almost done with it. I added this time to look at AS 08.48.101 with Eric and
8 then work with you on that 9j letter if you need any review of it.

9
10 Kerr: Engineering surveys we got wrapped up. Dave and I are working on updating the
11 work experience form for the PLS application.

12
13 Koonce: We were working on that letter to Sara and the results of that are the travel
14 updates. He would still like to see direct reimbursement from NCARB or NCEES.

15
16 Chair: The new travel policies are a huge improvement.

17
18 Jones: You can make your travel arrangements through them and let them pay for your
19 airfare and hotel. You just can't accept any money from them. If they give you a check
20 for incidentals you have to turn it over to the State and the State will reimburse your
21 M&IE, meals that aren't provided by them.

22
23 Urfer: I need to get you the information on International (unintelligible).

24
25 Schedler: I sent the CBT information to UAF.

26
27 Christensen: Asks if the revised summary sheet can be reviewed by the Board when
28 completed.

29
30 Jones: Yes we can send it to the Board for review.

31
32 Walters: Work on Guidance Manual with Luanne.

33
34 Maynard: I have the FE/FS and the summary for the structural regulation project. I will
35 send to Vern electronically.

36
37 Dave: Guidance Manual and work with John on the form.

38
39 Chair: Time to read the application in.

40
41 **Agenda Item 24 – Read Applications into Record**

42
43 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it**
44 **was RESOLVED to approve the following list of applicants for registration by comity,**
45 **examination and in additional branches of engineering with the stipulation that the**
46 **information in the applicant's files will take precedence over the information in the**
47 **minutes:**

1
 2 *The following subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*
 3 *meanings:*

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

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

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

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

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

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

11 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

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

13
 14

Allred, Amanda	PLS	Comity	AKLS, Transcripts	Approved
Bai, Feifei	Structural	Exam	Approved	Approved
Barton, John	Chemical	Comity	Incomplete - FE ever? Tx	Approved
Baxter, David M.	Civil	Comity	Approved	Approved
Bixler, Marty G.	Civil	Comity	Approved	Approved
Block, Francis J.	Civil	Comity	CA - fe/pe	Approved
Bodsky, Miro Marcel	Architecture	Comity	Approved	Approved
Bolling, Lee	Mechanical	Exam	Approved	Approved
Byard, Helena	Civil	exam	Conditionally Approved	CA
Chase, Jesse	Civil	Comity		Approved
Clayton, Libby	Chemical	Exam	Approved	Approved
Clemenz, Bryan W.	Control Systems	Grand	Approved	APproved
Corella Morales, Adrian	Civil	Com		approved
Curran, Justin D.	Chemical	Exam	Approved	Approved

Custer, Karen Rose	Chemical	Exam		Approved
D'Amico, Marcelo	Fire Pro	Comity	Approved	Approved
Deak, Tamas	Architecture	Exam	Approved (reapproval)	Approved
Erb, Gary	Control Systems	Comity	CA - JPQ, Arctic, Tx	Approved
Gallant, Steven D.	Electrical	Comity	Approved	Approved
Gerard, Kenneth F.	Civil	Comity	CA - Arctic Course	Approved
Godejord, Arnstein	Civil	Com		Approved
Grabowski, David	Chemical	Exam	Approved	Approved
Harpe, Kolya G.	NAME	Exam		Approved
Jennings, William	Electrical	Com	CA- Money, arctic	APproved
Jobe, John C.	Electrical	Comity	Approved	Approved
Khan, Amjad	Structural	Comity		Approved
Knutson, David R.	Civil	Exam		Approved
Ko, Harrison	Electrical	Comity	Approved	APproved
Krysinski	Mechanical	Exam	Approved	Approved
Kuenning, Jess	Civil	Com	Approved	Approved
Lau, I Kei	Civil	Comity	Approved	Approved
Linkhart, Daniel	Structural	Com	Approved	Approved
Linn, Jason	Architecture	Com	Approved	APproved
Livermore, Gary	Architecture	Com	Approved	approved
Lohr, Edward M.	Civil	Comity		Approved
Long, Merlin D.	Electrical	Com	Approved	Approved
Lowery, Kenneth M.	Architecture	Comity	CA - Arctic Course	Approved
Mapes, Kiel P.	Electrical	Com	Approved	Approved

Mayo, Alicia A.	Control Systems	Grand	CA - money	Approved
Meigs, Blythe Erin	Structural	Com		Approved
Mester, Matthew J.	Structural	Com	Approved	Approved
Meyerhoff, William	PLS	Comity	Approved for AKLS	Approved
Miller, Chris H.	Enviro	Grand	Approved	Approved
Myket, Allan T.	Structural	Com	Arctic	Approved
Nataluk, Ryan	Civil	Com	Approved	Approved
Nyman, David	Enviro	Grand	Approved	Approved
Paquette, Kenneth	Civil	Com	Approved	Approved
Polamarasetty, Ravi	Structural	Exam		Approved
Puls, John	Civil	Com	JPQ	Approved
Sayler-Brown, Thomas	Architecture	Com	Arctic	Approved
Smith, Lucas Avery	Civil	Com	Approved	Approved
Solomon, Michael J.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved	Approved
Spencer, Thomas E.	Structural	Com	Approved	Approved
Steele, Emily	Architecture	Exam	Approved	Approved
Stine, Jessica A. Cawvey	Architecture	Exam	Approved for 1&2 , jpq	Approved
Tompos, Eric	Structural	Com	Approved	Approved
Tweedley, Scott	Mechanical	Exam	Approved	Approved
Tyson, Charles	Architecture	Comity	Approved	Approved
Verplancke, Glen	Civil	Com	CA - JPQ	Approved
Vibrans, Paul	NA ME	Comity		Approved
Wandover, george	Mechanical	Com	Approved	Approved
Wang, Honglin	Civil	Com		Approved

Wheeler, William P.	Fire Pro	Comity	CA - FE	Approved
Wike, Vanessa Blevins	Enviro	Grand	Approved	Approved
Zarlengo, Michael A.	PLS	Comity	Approved for AKLS	APproved
Baum, Edward	Structural	Comity	A or CA-arctic, jpg	CA
Boudreaux, Neal	Electrical	Comity	Approved	CA
Carson, Joseph	Mechanical	Comity	Approved	CA
Cartwright, Megayla	Mechanical	Exam	Approved	CA
Duytschaever, Kathryn E.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved	CA- Arctic
Jones, William	Civil	Comity	CA - Tx, Ver	CA
Juergens, Robert P.	Electrical	Comity		CA
Lagen, Jacqueline Simone	Mechanical	Exam		CA
Lantz, William	Civil	Comity	CA - tx	CA
Larson, Kevin C.	Architecture	Comity	CA - JPQ	CA
Liu, Cythia	Civil	Comity	Approved	CA
Lyon, Chris	Mechanical	Com	Approved, JPQ	CA
Morris, Michael	Mechanical	Exam	Approved	CA
Mott, Michael D.	Civil	Exam	Approved	CA
Nespor, Greg	Architecture	Com	Approved	CA
Nottingham, Derek	Petro	Comity	CA - NCEES C. Record	CA
Patel, Sheetal	Electrical	Com	Approved	CA
Pope, Heath	Civil	Comity	A	CA
Rafalko, Susan	Civil	Comity	Arctic	CA
Ransom III, Gaylord	Structural	Comity	CA - Money	CA
Ronning, Shawn	Architecture	Com	Approved	CA

Salnick, Nathanal	Structural	Com	Approved	CA
Schuettpelz, Tim	Electrical	Com	CA - JPQ, Arctic, FE	CA
Shremshock, Timothy J.	Architecture	Com	Approved	CA
St. George, Christopher T.	Structural	Com	CA - JPQ, Arctic	CA
Stephens, Jeremy L.	Civil	exam	Approved	CA
Sybron, Rohan H.	Civil	Com	CA - Arctic Course	CA
Witt, Jenna E.	Chemical	Exam	Approved	CA
Wolf, Eric M.	Mechanical	Comity	CA - Arctic, Tx & FE, JPQ	CA
Yuan, Bing C.	Structural	Com	Incomplete-verifier is Can.	CA
Baker, Jennifer Kristine		FE		
Bauman, Forrest R.		FE		
Bertram, Alexander		FE		
Boswell, William		FE		
Bush, Zachary Lee		FE		
Cervin, Jesse		FE		
Fenzl, James		FE		
Gelineau, Douglas A.		FE		
Goering, Nathan D.		FE		
Gossel, Cody A.		FE		
Goudreau, James L.		FE		
Goughnour, Robert		FE		
Hjortstorp, Daniel		FE		
Hulbert, Garth James		FE		
Jones, Corbin Dean		FE		

1

Knapp, Jonathan D.		FE		
Kozyrenko, Artem		FE		
Mathers, Evan		FE		
Miller, Michael Ori		FE		
Minturn, Jacob		FE		
Mott, Michael D.		FE		

Ms. Bai, Feifei		FE		
Nelson, Jarrod M.		FE		
Pahkala, John S.		FE		
Perry, Lowell		FE		
Rahlf, Jacob		FE		
Reid, Peyton Michelle		FE		
Richmond, Dustin		FE		
Schroth, Austin		FE		
Sharma, Varun		FE		
Shrider, James Dennis		FE		
Simon, Michelle Regan		FE		
Simonson, Kelvin R.		FE		
Sky, Mark		FE		
Smith, Tana Marie		FE		
Southerland, Luaren		FE		
Strickland, Sebastian		FE		
Sveinbjornsson, Bjorn		FE		
Tobin, Erika Dawn		FE		

Williams, Micah		FE		
-----------------	--	----	--	--

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hanson 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.

Bermejo, Gil	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - 60 mo.	
Boswell, William	PLS	Exam	Incomplete- 2 months	
Saliz, Buku	PLS	Exam	Incomplete	
Williams, Molly	Civil	Exam	Incomplete- 8 months	

9

10

Agenda item 25 – Review Calendar of Events

11
12

Chair: Review calendar of events item 25. Ok we have board meetings scheduled February 5th and 6th in Juneau.

13
14

Hanson: I may need to miss that, I'll let you know.

15
16
17

Chair: May 7th and 8th in Fairbanks. August 6th and 7th in Anchorage and November 5th and 6th in Anchorage. Is everybody still good with those dates? National meeting dates, NCARB region March 13th and 14th. NCEES May 14th – 16th. NCARB Annual June 17th through 20th. NCEES Annual August 19th through 22nd and CLARB Annual September 16th through 19th.

18
19
20
21
22

Agenda item 26 – Board Comments.

23
24

Chair: Eric you want to start us off?

25
26

Eriksen: Enjoyed everyone's professionalism and great meeting.

27
28

Maynard: Good to get the grandfathering finally done I think. Hopefully we will get the regulations that are in limbo out and keep on chugging along.

29
30
31

Koonce: Good Board meeting, appreciate the efficiency of the staff and it's a pleasure to be here.

32
33
34

Schedler: Good group working together really well and appreciate everyone's efforts and appreciate what Sarena is bringing to the table, good meeting.

35
36
37

Christensen: A little more streamlining (unintelligible) nice to serve, thank you.

38
39

Hackenmiller: Glad to hit the low last time so you could see the difference this time, that's how I work. Just wanted to say thanks and if you guys have anything that you would like me to

40
41

1 update or change that would help make things more efficient I would love to hear it. On the
2 examiner's report if there are numbers you want to see or comparisons or any of the issues I
3 deal with, with people please let me know.
4

5 Hale: Thanks, good meeting,
6

7 Kerr: Good meeting and thanks Sarena and Vern for having everything prepared. Everything is
8 moving in a positive direction and I had the opportunity to speak to the UAA Geomatics
9 association about what our Board does and why they should seek licensure. It was really good,
10 I don't know how the civil engineering and architectural students are, and do we have any
11 architectural education in Alaska?
12

13 Chair: The only thing we have is an architectural engineering technology program at UAA.
14

15 Kerr: Anyway I got feedback that there were students that weren't sure why they should pursue
16 licensure, we met and they were convinced why they should do it.
17

18 Urfer: Thank you for making that report it was very helpful, good board meeting.
19

20 Walters: Good meeting it's good to see the things we are working on finally coming around.
21

22 Hanson: Good meeting, thanks to the staff, Sarena and Vern for doing most of the work for us.
23 The applications actually, they felt like they were easier to review this time, the labeling and the
24 notes that were added, appreciate that. John Savage also works pretty hard, he's had an uphill
25 road for as long as I've been on the Board and it's nice that he's able to figure out ways to get
26 cases settled that work's for both parties involved because it is very stressful for the individual.
27 No matter how minor the issue is just having it linger out there it's just a lot of stress for
28 everybody involved so I'm glad he's able to clear cases and now we have a new Chief. I think
29 Sara's been doing a pretty good job. That travel is probably the biggest thing that's happened
30 since I've been on the Board. We use to draw straws to see which two people could go to the
31 meetings, this way is way better. He encourages all to get involved with their National
32 Organization. At NCEES, anyone can get involved with the exam development committees, just
33 get ahold of NCEES and let them know you are interested. Especially on group two exams like
34 mining. They are always looking for committee members to help out. With CBT the item banks
35 are going to have to get considerably larger. The Budget, it seem like they're getting a handle
36 on that at the Division level. We'll see what the number really end up being here in a week or
37 two but it seems like they are getting it, at least the reporting end is getting better. Good
38 meeting and thank you.
39

40 Jones: It was an excellent meeting. Meetings that move along quickly are always excellent.
41 On the committee involvement, national committees, in the Annual Report I list who is on what
42 committee for each organization. I do that to show the Legislature and everyone else that reads
43 the report that we are involved nationally and we do have a say on examinations and licensing
44 requirements so let me know so I can get it in the report.
45

46 Chair: Sarena, you did a great job, it shows in what we reviewed yesterday. You're doing a
47 good job at getting the candidates to compete their information in so there aren't many holes in
48 the applications. As far as National involvement, I can say that being on committees at the
49 National level you learn so much more about the regulations and how the whole system works.
50 You kind of drill into the detail of the particular committee that you're on as well as well as
51 creating professional associations to help you with the regulation we do on this Board. And I'm

1 glad to see that on this Board we are able to start tweaking a few things to get them a little bit
2 better. For a number of years we had some pretty big issues that we were dealing with so now
3 we are able to pick and choose a little bit on what we focus on. He thanks everyone for their
4 participation.

5
6 10:42 a.m. Meeting Adjourned.

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

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

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

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

Date: _____