

1 STATE OF ALASKA

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

7  
8 Minutes of Meeting  
9 May 7-8, 2015

10  
11 By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, the  
12 Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors held a meeting May 7-8,  
13 2015 in Fairbanks, AK.

14  
15 Thursday May 7, 2015

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 who was excused by the Chair.

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

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

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

- 36  
37
- 38 • Martha Hewlett, Administrative Officer II (Via Telephone)
  - 39 • Vernon Jones, Executive Administrator.
  - 40 • Sarena Hackenmiller, Licensing Examiner.
  - 41 • John Savage, Investigator (via Telephone)

42 Representing the Legislative Regulations Review Committee:

- 43  
44
- 45 • Rep. Jim Colver, Vice Chair

46 Members of the Public present:

- 47  
48
- 49 • Chris Miller, PE representing himself
  - Joseph Notkin, Architect, representing AIA Alaska

1 Chair: Ok item 2 is review and amends agenda.

2

3 Jones: Wait we should check and see if we have anyone online.

4

5 Hackenmiller: Anyone on line? No response. I haven't had anyone call in.

6

7 Jones: It should beep when someone dials in.

8

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

10

11 Chair: Asks for a motion to approve the agenda.

12

13 Koonce: Move to approve

14

15 Eriksen: Second.

16

17 Jones: passed out several items that were received after the Board packets and agenda were  
18 mailed.

19

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

22

23 **Agenda item 3 – Ethics reporting**

24

25 Chair: Item 3 is ethics reporting and I just want to take a little time here before we report on any  
26 ethics and talk about or review some of the requirements for ethics disclosure. Under  
27 procedures they say disclose on public record. Members must identify actual and potential  
28 conflicts orally at the board or commission's public meeting in advance of participating in  
29 deliberations or taking any official action on the matter. A member must always declare a  
30 conflict and may choose to refrain from voting, deliberations or other participation regarding a  
31 matter. If a member is uncertain whether participation would result in a violation of the Act, the  
32 member should disclose the circumstances and seek a determination from the chair.

33

34 Disclosures in writing at a public meeting. They say in addition to oral disclosure at a board or  
35 commission meeting, members' disclosures must be made in writing. They said if the meeting  
36 is recorded a tape or transcript of the meeting is preserved and there is a method for identifying  
37 the declaration in the record, an oral disclosure may serve as the written disclosure. And from  
38 what I have read my understanding of this is that a disclosure is not a disclosure of an ethics  
39 violation it's a disclosure of a potential conflict or a real conflict or a perceived conflict. I don't  
40 know if all of the board members have been through the States training on Procedures for  
41 Boards but that is something that they do take very seriously and want to make sure that the  
42 board is disclosing anything that could be a potential conflict. It doesn't mean that you can't  
43 participate, it may be that the Chair needs to make a determination if you can participate or not  
44 and or the board needs to make a determination depending on the situation.

45

46 So with that said, I just want to go ahead and solicit any disclosures for ethics reporting. The  
47 two listed there right now are the NCARB meeting it was actually the joint regional meeting that  
48 Vern and I attended.

49

50 Koonce: Reports that he met with John Savage on a couple of investigative activities.

51

1 Kerr: I attended the NCEES Future of Surveying Task Force on their nickel in LA.  
2  
3 Chair: Asks if he submitted an ethics report form yet.  
4  
5 Kerr: Not yet.  
6  
7 Maynard: I'll be attending the NCEES combined Southern and Western Zone meeting in  
8 Scottsdale next week I am one of the funded delegates from Alaska and NCEES will cover my  
9 expenses and I'll report on that after I have completed the trip.  
10  
11 Kerr: Is also attending the NCEES Zone meeting as a funded delegate.  
12  
13 Maynard: It has also been determined that I need to announce to everybody that I'm a  
14 structural engineer.  
15  
16 Hanson: I attended the EPE meeting; I wasn't at the February meeting so I'll fill out the ethics  
17 form and submit it. And I will be attending the Western Zone meeting on NCEES dime coming  
18 up next week as an officer. And I participated in several investigative actions.  
19  
20 Jones: Sarena and I will be attending the meeting in Scottsdale and she is funded by NCEES.  
21  
22 Hale: Will be attending the NCEES meeting (on the State's dime) and I just got back from a  
23 Society of Surveyors meeting.  
24  
25 Chair: Reminds everyone to remember to submit the ethics form for the quarterly report prior to  
26 our next meeting.  
27  
28 Jones: Reminds everyone that they cannot receive money from these organizations. If they  
29 give you a check for any expenses you sign that check over to the State and the State will  
30 reimburse you for your expenses.  
31  
32 Chair: As you may be aware there have been some accusations by some of the public, some of  
33 the engineers, about this Board's regulation project having to do with structural engineers.  
34 Those are unfounded in my view. One of their big complaints is that Colin is a structural  
35 engineer. That he has a bias on this and one of their other complaints is that because he's the  
36 only structural engineer on the board there's not another view to counter balance on that. There  
37 have also been civil engineers in some of their prior public testimony that we had last time in  
38 writing making claims that really just try to imply that we're trying to bolster structural engineer  
39 field or licensure or whatever. Some of them felt that we don't need that the civils' are perfectly  
40 capable of doing the structural engineering. And we reviewed all of those. We had those in our  
41 last board meeting packet where we acknowledge all of them at our board meeting. However  
42 there is some public perception that because Colin is not listed in our roster as a structural  
43 engineer that that's something that should be disclosed. Although we've had many discussions  
44 at our board meetings about the fact that Colin is a structural engineer in dealing with this  
45 specific regulation project it's come up as an issue. So I requested from the State's attorney his  
46 interpretation of the issue and he acknowledges that all boards and not just this board, the  
47 Legislature, the Senate, etc. There will always be some conflict of interest by virtue of the fact  
48 that we're on this board because of the fact of our licensure in our respective fields. And it's  
49 expected that we will participate in the discussion on the various regulations pertaining to our  
50 respective views. However the sticking point is really just up front disclosure that Colin is a  
51 structural engineer and it's on his advice that I'm going to recuse Colin from the discussion and

1 the voting on this topic. And normally my decision would be able to be voted on by the Board  
2 but in this instance under Determinations at a Public Meeting it states as an exception that a  
3 Chair's determination when made consistent with advice from the AG it may not be overruled.  
4 So it's regrettable that I need to make that decision because Colin does offer a great amount of  
5 expertise in the area and is our sole structural engineer on the Board. So I turned the regulation  
6 project over to Brian Hanson and Brian's collected whatever comments were received but I  
7 don't believe any were received. Brian is that true?  
8

9 Hanson: Correct.

10  
11 Chair: So as we move into the regulation update portion of the agenda we will revisit what our  
12 options are and go from there.

13  
14 Koonce: Considering Colin's being recused is he allowed to comment?

15  
16 Chair: No. And again we'll go over some of our options when we get to that particular item on  
17 the agenda. And the other thing I just want to point out is that it's not always about right and  
18 wrong it's about public perception. You know we need to do the right thing. We don't want the  
19 public to think that we're circumventing or hiding anything. We want to be very forthright and  
20 sometimes we have to make the decisions with that in mind. Not necessarily that there's any  
21 violations occurring but just the perceived conflict of interest can be enough to cause us to need  
22 to do things a little bit differently. And in light of this I just want everybody to think about it as we  
23 do work on various regulation projects and Board business if there is something that you can  
24 think of that could potentially be perceived as a conflict of interest then your better to go ahead  
25 and disclose that up front. It's not going to prohibit you necessarily from participating on it but  
26 it's just best to get it out there right up front. So with that said unless there's any other ethics  
27 issues we'll go ahead and move on.  
28

29 Hanson: I was not at the last meeting but does this mean for the future that surveyors are going  
30 to be excluded from survey work and architects from.....

31  
32 Chair: No, because we're listed in the roster of our respective disciplines for what we're serving  
33 on the Board for. So if you happen to have two licenses and you're not serving on that seat on  
34 the Board it would probably be a good idea if we're dealing with one of those other issues to go  
35 ahead and just disclose that.  
36

37 Eriksen: Points out that some of the seats are multi discipline seats.

38  
39 Maynard: The way I understand it is, like Brian, he's in a civil seat so if we had to deal with  
40 mining issues on item three he would have to disclose that he's a mining engineer too if he  
41 wants to be involved in that.  
42

43 Eriksen: Asks if it's just by the seat or is it just that it doesn't list everyone by title.

44  
45 Chair: The roster doesn't. It just says Colin is a civil engineer it doesn't say structural, under  
46 Brian it says civil engineer, mining engineer.

47  
48 Eriksen: So in the future we should make sure to list all the disciplines.

49  
50 Chair: What we may want to do is change our roster where it says what seat we're actually  
51 filing but also list whatever our credential is, our licensure is.

1  
2 Jones: We can do that.  
3  
4 Christensen: Asks if we are going to discuss this later.  
5  
6 Chair: It comes up later on in the agenda.  
7  
8 Koonce: Asks if we are going to change the roster after this meeting to make his title structural  
9 engineer so going forward we won't have that issue.  
10  
11 Chair: This has never come up before in this way. Usually it's been more a matter of what your  
12 other affiliations are, you know, are you, is there something that your firm does with what the  
13 Board is talking about or are you in some Society that might have a position on this. I know that  
14 I've disclosed prior when I was an officer in AIA I was allowed to participate in discussion and  
15 then I recused myself from the voting as did other members for various things along the way so  
16 it's not the first time that we've had recusals from voting or even discussion. This is more of a  
17 glitch than anything else but because some of the public perceiving it a certain way I think we  
18 need to respond to that.  
19  
20 Eriksen: Just wants to clarify that the Board is addressing a public concern that was a glitch  
21 and not really reflecting or acknowledging any concern for the ethics of Colin.  
22  
23 Chair: No, I don't question the ethics at all. It's really a public perception of a potential conflict.  
24  
25 Erikson: That's important.  
26  
27 Chair: It is important. Agenda item number 4 is review and approve the minutes so I think we  
28 need a motion.  
29  
30 **Agenda item 4 - Review and approve the Minutes of the November 2014 meeting.**  
31  
32 Koonce: Move to approve.  
33  
34 Walters: Second.  
35  
36 Chair: Discussion? I just had a couple of typos but I can submit those separate.  
37  
38 Jones: Ok. If any of you notice any grammar errors or typos just email them to me and I'll fix  
39 them.  
40  
41 Chair: Notes that while reviewing the draft of the minutes he noticed that sometimes we use  
42 certain situations and we should refrain from using company names in the minutes. We should  
43 just strike those out and say company A or something.  
44  
45 Jones: Then that's the way it should be presented on the record. If you're going to give an  
46 example say "company A" don't say the name.  
47  
48 Chair: And we should try to do that but if we make an error and we actually use the company  
49 name that should be corrected and not used in the public minutes.  
50  
51 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Walters and passed unanimously it was**

1 **RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the February 2015 meeting as amended.**

2  
3 Chair: Asks if it's close enough to go to item 5.

4  
5 Jones: Indicates that the investigator will call in at 9:30.

6  
7 Chair: Ok, then we'll go right into the Regulation update.

8  
9 **Agenda item 6 – Regulation update**

10  
11 A) Regulations ready for Board review and adoption.

- 12 1. 12 AAC 36.063 Engineering Education and Work Experience Requirements  
13 (SE);  
14 2. 12 AAC 36.108 Application for Registration as a Structural Engineer;  
15 3. 12 AAC 36.180 Seals; and  
16 4. 12 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals.  
17 5. 12 AAC 36.510 Continuing Education Requirements  
18

19 Chair: So, item A is the regulation for the structural engineer so I'm going to ask Brian to, one,  
20 let us know if there's any amendments proposed, if he's received any comment and also I want  
21 to afford Brian a chance to speak to any of the comments received since he wasn't here at the  
22 last meeting prior to talking about actions we might perform on that.

23  
24 Hanson: I was not at the last meeting so I wasn't able to participate in that discussion. I do  
25 have a little history though in this before a lot of folks currently on the Board were on here we  
26 kind of dealt with the general licensure issue and adding the additional disciplines etc.  
27 Structural was one of them that we added and some of the history on that was whether you're in  
28 favor of it or against it. Everyone's comments previously several years ago were that well  
29 you're just going to change it on us right away anyway. The Board in general said you're going  
30 to be able to do what you've always been able to do. And I think that's been the case since  
31 general licensure was passed. It's not a lot of change; people who have done structural  
32 engineering are continuing to do structural engineering. Structural engineers are doing  
33 structural as well and it's worked well. I don't believe we've had any, don't quote me on this but  
34 I don't think we've had any investigative issues where structural engineers were saying that  
35 civils were not qualified or vice versa. That's a little bit of the history, we went 8 years to get the  
36 general licensure through which turned out to be more of licensing every discipline and it was  
37 perceived or said maybe, I'd have to review the minutes that things wouldn't change and now  
38 we're proposing a change several years after those regulations passed. So I think there's a  
39 perception that we said one thing 4 years ago and now we're saying that the new Board is  
40 saying, which is fine. The make-up of the Board changes, public perception changes, legislative  
41 perception changes, governors change, you know the times change and if it's the time to make  
42 these sorts of changes and it's appropriate and we have the support then I think we should do  
43 that and if not then I don't think we should make the changes.  
44

45 I know in the discussion that several proposed changes due to the building code based on  
46 classification just minor comments but I did not receive any proposed amendment changes to  
47 this current language that's out now. I know possibly Jeff has some that he might forward  
48 along. But I'm not sure if any others have any. Did any of you have any proposed changes?  
49

50 Chair: I had one that I wanted to propose which is taking, actually eliminating g. which is the  
51 offshore structures exceeding 50 feet in height above the average seabed or ground level.

1  
2 Hanson: On page?

3  
4 Chair: On page 7. And my rationale behind that is that I believe that that would be largely  
5 regulated by the Coast Guard or other entities. And it didn't seem appropriate to fall in this  
6 regulation. Does anyone have a comment on that?

7  
8 The other thing I want to do is just add a few comments here. Just so everybody has some  
9 perspective on this is that right now there's seven states that currently license structural  
10 engineers. There's Hawaii and Illinois require structures engineers for all structures. Then the  
11 other states have various types of structures that they require structural engineers for. There's,  
12 I think, somewhat of a movement right now in the country to advance structural engineering as a  
13 requirement in all states. And I think with the complexity of buildings and changes in technology  
14 it's probably a good idea. I did go back and I looked at the NCEES requirements for different  
15 types of.....

16  
17 Hanson: Somebody joined us on the conference call?

18  
19 Savage: Investigator John Savage is here.

20  
21 Chair: Ok, We'll be with you in just a minute John.

22  
23 Savage: No problem, take your time.

24  
25 Chair: So I went back and looked at NCEES different descriptions of what's on the different  
26 exams for types of engineers and found that the civil engineer has a structural component that  
27 they can take in the afternoon dealing with many of the same types of principles that are in what  
28 we are proposing for the structural engineer except not as extensive. I found that there are  
29 things in like say the naval architecture and marine engineering that are not in the structural  
30 engineering but would be important to designing structures in a marine environment. The  
31 Structural Engineer Exam is a two day exam with the afternoon for both days you have the  
32 choice to do vertical structures, like buildings, or bridges. And for both days there is that option  
33 in the exam that focuses on those items. I think there's the perception by some of the  
34 disciplines we're trying to make it so that all those things need to be designed by structural  
35 engineers not bridge engineers. But I think what we're really trying to do is make sure that  
36 bridge engineers have proper structural testing as well as other engineers as well. It's not to  
37 just replace one discipline for another it's just to make sure that the discipline that's doing it has  
38 the proper training and testing to do that work. I just wanted to throw that out there as I was  
39 reviewing these various testing requirements. So with that why don't we take a break and go to  
40 John on Item 5 and we will come back to this regulation update. So John, you're on.

41  
42 **Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report**

43  
44 Savage: Asks how everyone is doing and then brings everyone's attention to the Board Report  
45 and points out that a lot of the old items are being moved along and making room for new  
46 investigative activity. He adds that last Tuesday they hired another investigator who will take  
47 the extra boards he was handling due to a shortage of personnel. So he is officially back to just  
48 AELS and hopes the Board starts seeing a difference in the near future and that other than that  
49 it's kind of business as usual. He briefly describes the reorganization of the investigative  
50 section. He asks if there are any questions.

51

1 Maynard: Comments that the Board Report contains the shortest list of open cases that he has  
2 seen in 25 years of following this Board.

3  
4 Savage: Responds that he knew he was going to be out of the office for a spell and wanted to  
5 get those cases moved along and have a clean slate when he returned. He adds that that's  
6 certainly not the norm.

7  
8 Chair: As usual you're doing a good job. I don't have anything additional at this time.

9  
10 Savage: Ok if anything changes give me a call and I can jump back in there and call you. He  
11 comments that he wants to be included in the discussion at 10a.m. tomorrow.

12  
13 Chair: Ok, great, thank you John.

14  
15 Prior to jumping back into regulations 6 A, Rep. Colver is with us and would like to say a few  
16 things.

17  
18 Rep. Colver: Well this is my first Board meeting, I'm Representative Jim Colver. I represent  
19 House District 9, Valdez, Delta Junction and North Palmer. So I'm up here for constituent  
20 meetings we're not on vacation, we're doing the people's work. One of the things as far as  
21 Board actions and the way our boards are structured because we are self-funded by licensing  
22 fees we won't, shouldn't have any budgetary impacts. But the rest of State government, you  
23 know, we're in a multi-phase reduction and we have to be. Anyway I want to thank you for your  
24 service I know you volunteer a lot of hours and looking at your packet, it's quite in depth. I also  
25 am vice-chair of the Regulatory Review Committee, we analyze regulations to see that they  
26 conform to the statutory intent and I'm a licensed surveyor. So if there's licensing issues, if  
27 there's statute changes that you feel you might need my office will certainly be available to you  
28 to discuss that, those possibilities, you know right now if a piece of legislation has a fiscal note  
29 it's a non-starter. If you bill has any fiscal impact it's not going anywhere. You know in the  
30 design sector as well as the construction sector I anticipate that things are going to be slowing  
31 down.

32  
33 One observation I might make is continuing education. I had my license before it was a  
34 requirement and since then doing it, you know we don't have a lot of opportunity, offerings for  
35 Alaska based continuing education. I suppose it's different in every discipline but it seems to be  
36 more of a revenue generating vehicle for those who offer courses. The best continuing  
37 education that I had was through an association of surveyors in Arizona and Nevada and they  
38 had a lot of really high tech new innovation on how we do our practice but I think it would be  
39 more helpful if we're going to have continuing education that we try to encourage some of the  
40 continuing education and some of the offerings to be Alaska centric whether it be design for  
41 arctic buildings or it be permafrost or you know maybe it's done through the different  
42 professional associations but just simply taking an online course to keep your license up, I don't  
43 know what value really that adds to our profession. Not that you need anything else on your list  
44 but if we could get some value, for instance in our field, GIS is a big thing and where is that  
45 differentiation and where is that collaboration between the trades, the surveyors and those that  
46 do GIS, we've integrated a lot of those features into map making and drawings and information  
47 systems. So I won't get on that soap box but anyway if we can help, you know if there's things  
48 that need to be talked to in the administration, I've got good contacts, you know I know the  
49 Governor so, and they're still kind of getting up to speed, taking over the State with negative 3.8  
50 billion dollar budget hole. The situation we're in right now is 3/8 billion in red ink for the current  
51 fiscal year and next fiscal year 3.2 billion. So we only have a 10 billion dollar reserve. Part of



1 the 3.8 billion for this year was offset by the Statutory Budget Reserve and that's gone. So right  
2 now what we have is four party negotiations trying to settle the budget. You've got the House  
3 majority, which I'm a member of, the House minority, the Senate majority and the Governor.  
4 And until we get alignment on them, the problem is that we need a three quarters vote in the  
5 House to pass the Constitutional Budget Reserve draw, over 3.2 billion. So that's why after the  
6 session ended we had negotiations on for over a week without any fruit to bear for it. And it was  
7 going on longer and longer, we just simply can't add things to the budget at this point. So those  
8 negotiations, I don't know how long it's going to take, there's a lot of things that are trying to be  
9 extracted for the three quarter vote and that's kind of what, you won't read, get that in the press,  
10 that's what it's all about. So until we can get an agreement we won't have our budget passed  
11 and we were running out of money. Had not we passed a short funded budget, when we did  
12 about a week after the regular session we were in an extended session, finally we passed a  
13 budget but it wasn't completely funded. It was necessary because the bills coming due for our  
14 staff need to be paid. We would've run out of money in a couple weeks if we hadn't authorized  
15 spending 3.2 billion out of the Constitutional Budget Reserve for this current fiscal year we're in.  
16 So that's how tight things are and what needs to happen from an observer, this is my first term  
17 here, we're not getting to a structurally reorganizing government. They're picking off inspectors  
18 here and there or park rangers or forestry people that are out in the outlying areas. You know,  
19 we're seeing more of a centralization of services in Anchorage, Fairbanks and Juneau. What's  
20 going to happen is there's going to have to be a major restructuring and some of these cost  
21 drivers are going to have to be flattened out. Because costs of inflation and health care, you  
22 know in your businesses. You all know this because you're educated and you follow it and you  
23 know we have to be dealing with what the revenue picture looks like, what are we going to fund  
24 government with and at what level do the people want to pay it at. So that's the next leg of the  
25 stool. Anyway, anybody have any questions or comments? Maybe, I don't know if it's  
26 appropriate, usually when we testify you can't ask questions but I'd certainly, I'll leave some  
27 cards and I'm heading out to Delta Junction later so I won't be here for the afternoon, but I  
28 appreciate the opportunity and if we can help out we certainly will.

29  
30 Chair: Thanks for stopping by. It's not often we get Legislator to come to a meeting.

31  
32 Rep. Colver: A surveyor Legislator. (Laughter) I'll leave some cards, comments or have you  
33 got any insight into the budget? (Laughter).

34  
35 Chair: So let's jump back into 6 A regulation update but before we do I'd like to go over what  
36 our options are and what I'm not sure on, Vern, is at our last meeting we voted to, we had the  
37 original motion and then we voted to basically table it until this meeting so we could review any  
38 changes.

39  
40 Jones: The options are the same, you can adopt it as it was public noticed.

41  
42 Chair: Is that original motion still on the table then? Would someone have to re-introduce the  
43 motion is what I'm asking?

44  
45 Several responded that it was tabled until this meeting so it's still active.

46  
47 Jones: You can adopt it as it was public noticed, you can amend it and adopt it, you can just  
48 forget it altogether or you can send it back to committee.

49  
50 Christensen: Asks if we amend it do we have to put it back out to public notice.

51

1 Jones: That depends; if the amendment is considered to be a significant change then it has to  
2 go back out. If it's not then you can go ahead and adopt it. The way it works is you can adopt it  
3 and Law is going to review it again and if they decide it's a significant change that needs to go  
4 back out they will let you know.  
5  
6 Chair: So, if we have amendments we'd have to vote on those amendments before we vote on  
7 the motion?  
8  
9 Jones: yeah, you vote on the amendments first and once that's all dialed away you vote on the  
10 regulations.  
11  
12 Chair: So, Brian, aside from the amendment that I suggested was there actually any other  
13 amendments?  
14  
15 Hanson: No, other than your minor change there on page 7 that's the only one so far.  
16  
17 Koonce: I sent out a document or a couple of documents from the International Building Code  
18 to maybe be incorporated or help define 990 a. which under that is item 43 definitions of  
19 significant structures. I don't know if that was.....  
20  
21 Hanson: I didn't review that and incorporate it.  
22  
23 Chair: Jeff did you send that out to the Board at large right after our other meeting?  
24  
25 Koonce: Yes I did. I can resend that right now if you'd like? It may help clarify.....  
26  
27 Chair: So was that something you wanted to clarify what was in the IBC or was there something  
28 about the language in the regulations that you wanted to modify?  
29  
30 Koonce: I thought that referencing an accepted document that is used for life safety codes,  
31 building codes would be a good document to reference from verses.....  
32  
33 Chair: You mean define how much hazardous materials you could have.....  
34  
35 Koonce: Well it's an accepted document used by the industry to define significant structure  
36 verses a regulatory document that .....  
37  
38 Chair: Asks if we are allowed to reference in our regulation a document like that?  
39  
40 Jones: You adopted the NCARB Education Standard by reference. We adopted the surveying,  
41 uh, what's that called?  
42  
43 Kerr: Standards of Practice.  
44  
45 Chair: Asks if we have to adopt it by the date of the current one and if we have to change it  
46 each time it changes.  
47  
48 Jones: Every time it changes you have to re-adopt it.  
49  
50 Koonce: I would just add that we reference the most current.....  
51

1 Jones: No you can't do that.  
2  
3 Chair: No you can't do that, one problem with that is the State and the Municipalities aren't  
4 always in alignment when they adopt things so it could end up in limbo.  
5  
6 Koonce: So then I would reference the most current adopted International Building  
7 Code by the State of Alaska.  
8  
9 Kerr: So Jeff, you're saying that the IBC definition of significant structure would replace all of  
10 section 43 a. through g.  
11  
12 Koonce: Yes.  
13  
14 Kerr: So, and I did read the table of definitions that you sent out, was there anything in there  
15 about bridges in the IBC? I don't think there is.  
16  
17 Chair: I don't think so I don't think the IBC deals with bridges per se.  
18  
19 Jones: If anybody has an amendment, write it out as a motion.  
20  
21 Koonce: I just wanted to have this discussion before I propose an amendment.  
22  
23 Chair: Asks how many pages in the document?  
24  
25 Kerr: There's a table of one page and then there's definitions that are 11 pages and the 11  
26 pages are primarily exceptions.  
27  
28 Koonce: So the reference is table 1604.5 one half of a page and the other reference is section  
29 307 hazardous groups H which is several pages.  
30  
31 Chair: Asks Vern to get it printed and passed out to everyone. I think if we are going to vote on  
32 that as an amendment I'd like to see that reference in front of everybody.  
33  
34 Koonce: I'll work with Vern to get it printed out so everybody's got a chance to review it.  
35  
36 Hanson: And that will be a significant change so it's going to be re-public noticed and I think  
37 we've essentially kicked out the most educated person on all of this that helped develop this  
38 language, that knows the most about it and now we are starting from scratch essentially, we  
39 have the language but the knowledge is, we've got a lot of smart people around here that can  
40 help us but we've lost a lot of that knowledge. I would throw out that we continue to table this  
41 regulation, get all the amendments, much as you suggested to me, get all the amendments  
42 looked at, bring that back to the entire Board as a complete package not sitting around the table  
43 writing, well I want to amend this and I want to amend that and get a complete package back. It  
44 sounds like if we make any change, even if we make any changes other than very small  
45 changes it's going to have to get re-public noticed. There's no eminent need right now to get  
46 these changes made right now. So that would be my suggestion that we continue to table until  
47 the following meeting.  
48  
49 Jones: If you have an amendment write it up and email it to me, I'll put it in motion form and I  
50 will also add it to a copy of the regulation where it fits and we'll bring it to the next meeting.  
51

1 Koonce: Vern, I sent you a copy of that but I will resend it to you in current form so you have  
2 that. The other thing that goes with this and I thing john just mentioned this is that when you  
3 reference the IBC for significant structures you do not include bridges in that definition. I think  
4 the reason we are looking at this is that nationally people are going towards regulation and  
5 registration of structural engineer so that transfer of licensure throughout the states is easier,  
6 that's my understanding of it. I have not looked into it. I do not understand the significance of  
7 using bridges in that definition which seemed to raise a great deal of concern in our last  
8 meeting. I'll try to look into that a little bit more.  
9

10 Chair: Well if we are going to table it we need a motion to do that but before we get to that point  
11 I want to say that regardless of the changes, amendments that we do I think the idea of re-  
12 public noticing where we actually span one of our meetings is a good idea so that the public can  
13 come and give more testimony however that's limited to 6 minutes, in written format they can  
14 give all they want. The other thing is that since Colin's made this disclosure, I've ruled on it, I  
15 feel that if its public noticed again then Colin would be able to participate in that discussion  
16 again and I think that's pretty important. But generally the idea to get our ducks in a row as far  
17 as what amendments we want to make before we vote in it and send it back out for public notice  
18 is a good idea instead of sending it out in the same form if we intend on making changes to it.  
19

20 Jones: I'd just like to say something about this perception thing. This came up when we  
21 originally added all the other disciplines. It was brought up, do we need to separate structural  
22 and make it additional, and the Board decided no let's get structural in there first and we'll look  
23 at that later. So that all came about, it was discussed before Colin ever came on the Board. So  
24 the perception that this is all something that he's doing is totally wrong.  
25

26 Chair: Yeah, I agree with that we talked about it at length way before Colin was on the Board  
27 when we were discussing the different branches.  
28

29 Christensen: My comment was that the letter writer should appreciate the fact that we have an  
30 engineer that's on the Board. That was bothersome to me because they're different disciplines  
31 here. I'm a novice, I don't have any discipline per se but I took letter umbrage with that, I thought  
32 the letter was way out of bounds.  
33

34 Chair: We'll talk more about that but in general these boards are a make-up of different  
35 disciplines, including the Public Member because it offers you different perspectives. The prior  
36 Public Member that we had wasn't an engineer but he offered some great perspective on the  
37 regulations that we worked on. So I think there's a lot of value in having a mix of folks on the  
38 Board and we all don't have to be experts in that field but we certainly want to use the experts  
39 that we do have that the people that practice in that field to be able to comment on what we're  
40 proposing. Anybody else want to voice any opinions on this?  
41

42 Brian will you propose a motion?  
43

44 Hanson: Yeah, I move to table this regulation update until the following meeting.  
45

46 Chair: And send back to committee to include amendments much like we tried to do last time  
47 but didn't quite get there. Is there a second?  
48

49 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, Seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it was**  
50 **RESOLVED to table the structural engineering regulation change until the next meeting**  
51 **and send it back to committee to incorporate any amendments/changes.**

1  
2 Eriksen: Second  
3  
4 Chair: Is there discussion?  
5  
6 Kerr: Asks if we have an active committee on this?  
7  
8 Chair: Yeah, well Colin's chair of it but he would be precluded from participating on that until  
9 such a time that we send this back out with the amendments.  
10  
11 Kerr: When can he be involved in the committee again? After the public roster is updated?  
12  
13 Chair: No, I think what we need to do is basically to clear the air on the issue. To wait until we  
14 vote on this in its amended form which will probably cause it to be re-public noticed and at that  
15 point in time he can participate in the discussion.  
16  
17 Eriksen: Asks if he is going to assign a new chair.  
18  
19 Note: The Chair appoints Hanson chair of the Licensure Implementation Committee and  
20 assigns himself, Eriksen and Koonce as members.  
21  
22 Chair: Any more discussion? All those in favor, opposed, abstentions, Maynard abstained.  
23 Motion passes.  
24  
25 Item 6 b. comments on regulation change.  
26  
27 Chair: You can comment on this one Colin.  
28  
29 Maynard: I have to I, was the one that wrote it.  
30  
31 Jones: You should go through each comment just like you did on the other one.  
32  
33 Chair: 6 B is the comments and 6b1 is in response to.....  
34  
35 Jones: 6B1 and 2 are my ideas on how to fix this thing. This is the one that the Legislative  
36 Committee objected to. And what they objected to is that right in that first comment there. The  
37 rules of the National Council of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors, they say that makes us  
38 sub-servient to their rules and that's against the law. So what I proposed in option one is putting  
39 our requirement back into that regulation. And one of the reasons that we should do that I think  
40 is because when an applicant applies at NCEES they attest to a statement that they have met  
41 the requirements of the State where they intend to be licensed. So we've got to have some  
42 requirements. If this is changed it'll have to go back out to public notice.  
43  
44 Koonce: So aren't the requirements paralleling what's going on nationally? Or am I missing  
45 something?  
46  
47 Kerr: They are.  
48  
49 Koonce: And it appears there is a problem with that right?  
50  
51 Kerr: Explains that since NCEES was administering the exams and taking care of everything,

1 the test centers etc. and our requirement was in line with theirs we essentially are de-  
2 duplicating. Is that your understanding Brian? So the language that we had proposed was  
3 problematic and Mr. Colver and Sen. McGuire noted that it was unlawful for us to delegate the  
4 qualifications to NCEES. So we need to revise this so we're not delegating our qualification  
5 process entirely to NCEES. That's how I understand it does anyone understand it differently?  
6  
7 Koonce: But it's a national testing standard, correct?  
8  
9 Kerr: Yes  
10  
11 Koonce: Compares it to NCARB's A.R.E.  
12  
13 Kerr: Explains the letter from Sen. McGuire and Rep. Colver points out the problem that the  
14 requirements to take the exam are being handed over to NCEES and we should define the  
15 requirements and NCEES can still administer the exam. He then points out that this is a  
16 fundamentals exam that brings up a whole new question.  
17  
18 Hanson: Right we are not authorized to require that exam or license them.  
19  
20 Maynard: Explains that the whole thing started when we decided to license EIT's and SIT's and  
21 the Legislature said no, you can't do that. Then we decided we really don't care who passed  
22 the FE or the FS we just want to make sure they have it when they apply for a license so this is  
23 where we ended up.  
24  
25 Chair: Asks Vern what the difference between the two options is.  
26  
27 Jones: Explains his recommended options.  
28  
29 Hanson: Believes we should allow applicants go to straight to NCEES and apply but we should  
30 have some requirements in our regulations that they have to meet. So one is the suggested  
31 language for that change.  
32  
33 Chair: Is just trying to get a basic understanding of what the regulations propose. As Colin  
34 pointed out we should go back to comments and go through those one at a time. So under 6 b  
35 are the comments received.  
36  
37 Received from Chris Miller from March 18, 2015. He said 063 appeared confusing and he  
38 thought we should add in the term fundamentals examination.  
39  
40 Hackenmiller: Is someone on the line?  
41  
42 Yeah, I'm just listening in.  
43  
44 Hackenmiller: Can you state your name please?  
45  
46 Mr. Albert Swank representing himself was listening in and was asked to mute his phone.  
47  
48 Chair: Any questions?  
49  
50 Next is from Jerry Mastin on March 19, 2015. Suggesting we do a spell check.  
51

1 The next one is from Nils Degerlund on March 20, 2015. He's concerned that the State was  
2 turning over the responsibility for this to a National Entity. He's stating that according to their  
3 website NCEES would not conduct evaluation of degrees that are offered entirely via the  
4 Internet. He says this effectively closes the door of opportunity for students wishing to utilize  
5 ABET accredited program offering Internet classes.  
6  
7 Maynard: Notes that NCEES doesn't fact check, if you check the box they assume you've done  
8 what you say you have. The only people evaluating their education would be us when they  
9 apply for their surveying license. So we're not deflecting to anybody else it would be up to us to  
10 evaluate it.  
11  
12 Chair: This is coming from Robert McClintock on 4/13/2015. He proposes modifications. He  
13 thinks it will have a negative impact and he thinks this is lowering the standard.  
14  
15 Maynard: Disagrees for two reasons. One it lowers the cost to examinees and reduces staff  
16 workload and, two, it's not lowering the standards. It's the same test whether they apply  
17 through us or NCEES. .  
18  
19 Kerr: Thinks he must be talking about testing for the education component.  
20  
21 Hanson: Notes that we are talking about EIT's and LSIT's and we don't have control over them  
22 now.  
23  
24 Maynard: We were told we can't have control over them.  
25  
26 Hale: Offers that we are regulate the end result rather than the whole process. Why have  
27 anything to do with the fundamentals. Just say if you want to be licensed in Alaska here is the  
28 criteria. Then to get there they have to go to NCEES and then show it all to us at the end. He  
29 questions why we're having a lot of discussion about the fundamentals when we aren't sure we  
30 can even regulate these guys.  
31  
32 Maynard: I think my intent when I did this is to say you need to take this test and go to NCEES  
33 to take it. But now we're getting push back from the Legislature saying do that, or you can't let  
34 them decide who gets to take it and who doesn't. You have to decide who gets to take it. So  
35 I'm kind of confused, first they tell us that we can't actually govern over these people and then  
36 they say we can't let someone else do that either so I'm confused.  
37  
38 Hale: States the criteria to be a PS. Take the FS and the PS and the AKLS and have a 4 year  
39 degree; they would have to meet that criteria.  
40  
41 Jones: Points out that 08.48.101 does mention the examination process and believes that the  
42 Board does have the authority to say what the requirements are.  
43  
44 Maynard: Adds that it says "that follows National Standards".  
45  
46 Chair: Asks if we took out the part about the National Standard but left the qualifications in our  
47 table, not that they would have to submit anything to us prior to taking the exam but would have  
48 to meet those qualifications prior to taking the exam.  
49  
50 Hale: Wants to just drop the whole thing and just have the professional qualifications.  
51

1 Eriksen: Questions whether they would be taking the exam before they met the requirements.  
2  
3 Chair: Asks if it matter to us.  
4  
5 Hanson: Thinks the language in there right now is too simple for folks to understand. We've  
6 made it too clean and sterile for people to understand, we are not reducing the standards.  
7 NCEES administers the test NCEES approves people to take the test and this new process is  
8 going to save Board money and save the State of Alaska money save the people applying  
9 money so I think it's too simple. He points out that in our language we have for board approval,  
10 for board this, submit to the board. He thinks we just need to keep the requirements in our  
11 tables strike out the fore board approval, replace the NCEES language, as set forth by NCEES.  
12 We would still have to maintain the tables but the board wouldn't actually do anything with those  
13 tables. Then we do have a standard that individuals attest to meeting when they apply and  
14 check the NCEES box. He recommends that in 062 we strike "for board approval" there is no  
15 reason for us to have to approve that. Next is complete 75% that's nothing needs to change  
16 there. "Submit to the Board" we don't need the "submit to the board" we just need to say the  
17 applicants education and work experience etc. meet the following. Then we're not giving up the  
18 approval authority to NCEES or making them come to us to get approval.  
19  
20 The question was asked what we would look for when reviewing their application. The answer  
21 was that we would just look to see that they have the required education and experience and  
22 passed the fundamentals exam.  
23  
24 Maynard: Asks if we are going to go back and check the tables for the FE and FS to see if they  
25 actually met those requirements before they took the test. (Several answered no) Then why  
26 have the table? He adds that we could get rid of the any mention of the FE or FS and just say  
27 when you apply for the PE or PS you have to have passed the fundamentals administered by  
28 NCEES. We would have to go back out to public notice because that would be a major change.  
29  
30 Kerr: We do not regulate any of the activities of an EIT or an LSIT is there any reason why we  
31 would want to control whether someone gets it or not? It doesn't give them any privileges in the  
32 State. It's of benefit when they are applying for jobs but beyond that.....  
33  
34 Maynard: We were told by the Legislature last time that we can't even license or designate  
35 these people EIT's or LSIT's because we have no control over them until they're actually  
36 licensed. We can define how they become licensed but we can't actually give them a title or  
37 charge them for that because we don't' have the power in Statute.  
38  
39 Chair: Asks if it matters whether their experience was pre FE or post FE does it, it's just what  
40 they're doing and that they are working under an engineer.  
41  
42 Maynard: Yes, the three legs, education, experience and examination.  
43  
44 There was a short discussion on exam content for the FE and PE and whether it was important  
45 to regulate the fundamentals and whether it was FE was important to be able to take the PE. It  
46 was pointed out the Statute says to meet National Standards and that the National Standard is  
47 that you pass the FE or FS and then the PE or PS.  
48  
49 Chair: Lets read the rest of these comments and then we can continue the discussion.  
50  
51 This is April 10, 2015 it's from Senator Lesil McGuire and I'm going to read through this one



1 here. Please accept this letter as our opposition to the proposed changes to the regulations to  
2 the State Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers, and Land Surveyors.

3  
4 The changes proposed would allow outside entities into Alaska Statutes by reference without  
5 due process of law, including but not limited to, public notice, public review and so on. If  
6 allowed, 12 AAC 36.063 (c)(2) would be subservient to rules promulgated by private outside  
7 entities. This is unlawful and should not be allowed.

8  
9 Based on the foregoing, we request that adoption of this regulation be delayed until the  
10 Administrative Regulation Review Committee can meet to review your proposal. Should you  
11 have any questions or wish to meet to discuss this matter further, please feel free to contact  
12 either of us at the numbers listed above. And it's cosigned by Representative Jim Colver.

13  
14 Next is Chris Hladick, it's just reaffirming when action will take place on this.

15  
16 Hackenmiller: Is this Janey?

17  
18 Hewlett: Good morning this is Martha Hewlett with Corporations, Business and Professional  
19 Licensing.

20  
21 **Agenda Item 7 – Financial Report**

22  
23 Chair: Martha you have the floor, welcome.

24  
25 Hewlett: Good Morning, for the record my name is Martha Hewlett; I'm the Administrative  
26 Officer for the Division. We had a couple of back to back board meetings and Sara Chambers  
27 and Director Hovenden are still in the last meeting. They will be joining us if they can get out of  
28 it shortly.

29  
30 So to begin does everybody have the three page copy of the FY15 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter Board Report?

31  
32 Chair: Yes we do have that.

33  
34 Hewlett: Excellent, well jumping right in at the top. At the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter which ended  
35 March 31, 2015 your licensing revenues ended at \$239,285, you are in a non-renewal year  
36 currently. Below that you'll see a dash under allowable third party reimbursement. If your  
37 program has taken advantage of any third party reimbursement option we are tracking that and  
38 at the end of the year we will do an allocation since, as most boards are aware, there is a limited  
39 amount of authority across the Division. So at the end of the year we look at who all has taken  
40 advantage and make sure that there is a fair and equitable distribution of that so you'll see that  
41 reflected in your 4<sup>th</sup> quarter report.

42  
43 Below that is your Direct Expenses. Your direct Personal Services ended at \$198,681 and that  
44 would correspond to the 71,000 series on page two which begins at the top and ends about  
45 midway down the page. Your direct Personal Services would be Vern and it would also be  
46 Sarena as your licensing examiner but it could also be time that the investigator or the  
47 regulations specialist or the para-legal spend working on your program. Next down your Travel  
48 ended at \$21,499 and that will correspond to the 72,000 series on page two which begins at  
49 72,111 air fare and ends at 72,930 Cash Advance Fee. Next is Contractual which ended at  
50 \$32,881. That would be your 73,000 series which begins about an inch from the bottom of page  
51 two 73026 Training and Conferences and goes through page three to account code 73,821 I/A

1 Hearing and Mediation. Now within the Legal amount of \$6,150 of that \$2,277 were for  
2 regulations and advice and the remaining 3,873 was for investigative matters that rose to the  
3 level of needing the attorney's input. And lastly your Supplies ended at \$1,052 and that would  
4 be your 74,000 series the last two line items on page 3 which would be miscellaneous supplies  
5 to put your board packets together or for Vern and Sarena to operate at their desks. And then  
6 food supplies ending at \$464 which would be the beverage service to the Board Meetings.  
7

8 Does the Board have any questions on the Direct Expenditures through the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter?  
9

10 Chair: Does anybody have anything? No questions.  
11

12 Hewlett: Excellent. Just as a reminder if you look at the Indirect Expenditures line on the first  
13 page of your Board Report it will reflect \$224,594 this would be  $\frac{3}{4}$  of FY14 indirect and we put  
14 that in as kind of a place holder so that programs are aware of approximately of what they'll be  
15 incurring for Indirect Expenditures at the end of the year. The majority of those billings aren't  
16 received until the very end of the State year. Once we receive all of those we'll process them,  
17 we'll do a true up and your 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter final report will reflect an actual there.  
18

19 So at this point I can hear in the room next to me that Director Hovenden and Sara Chambers  
20 are still active in the other board meeting, were there any items that the Board needed to  
21 address with them?  
22

23 Hanson: Asks when are we going to start getting our fee setting analysis for review?  
24

25 Hewlett: I know that Ms. Chambers is actively working on that; she's current going over the fee  
26 setting with the other board right now. Vern, could you tell me if you have slatted any time on  
27 the agenda for Sara and Janey later in your meeting?  
28

29 Jones: Not later but I'm sure we can accommodate them whenever they're available.  
30

31 Chair: Yeah, whenever they have time we can accommodate them.  
32

33 Hewlett: Well I will certainly grab them when they get out of this meeting and pass on that the  
34 Board is curious when they'll have their fee analysis and I'll have them get ahold of Vern to see  
35 when they can touch base with you guys to give you a firm date on that.  
36

37 Chair: Asks if there is anything else and thanks Martha for her report.  
38

39 Hanson: Believes the fees will go down substantially.  
40

41 This led to a short discussion on the ups and downs of the fees over the past.  
42

43 Chair: Why don't we finish up with 6 b? We've read through all of the comments and Colin had  
44 an idea for some amended language. He asks if we should address that now or send it back to  
45 committee.  
46

47 Maynard: Thinks it should go back to committee. Or we could turn it down and take a second  
48 shot at it. He suggests it be tabled forever and we come up with a new one.  
49

50 Chair: Asks for a motion.  
51

1 Kerr: Asks if we are clear on what we want the committee to look at.  
2  
3 Chair: Asks Colin to restate what he said before.  
4  
5 Maynard: Repeats his idea.  
6  
7 Chair: So all we're looking at is if they passed the FE or not.  
8  
9 Kerr: Sounds great to me.  
10  
11 Hanson: So we're going to eliminate the requirement for the FE and FS?  
12  
13 Maynard: No we're just going to eliminate the part that says you have to come to us to take it.  
14 We're just going to require that they have passed it when they apply for the PE or PS.  
15  
16 Jones: The way I understand this is you're going to just repeal 062 and 064 in their entirety?  
17  
18 Maynard: Yeah. He adds that we will just get rid of the FE and FS regulations and say that  
19 when you come to us you have to have passed that test.  
20  
21 Jones: Repeats that NCEES will make them attest that they have met our requirements.  
22  
23 Maynard: That'll be easy, we won't have any requirements. (Laughter)  
24  
25 Koonce: Asks if that will invoke protests because of the perception that we are lessening the  
26 licensure requirements.  
27  
28 Kerr: His personnel perspective is that there is a perception that EIT and LSIT carry some  
29 weight when in fact they carry no weight other than to assist you in getting work otherwise they  
30 grant no special privileges or rights except maybe to grant entrance to a professional  
31 organization.  
32  
33 Hale: Thinks we should put out an explanation out with the public notice on why we are doing  
34 this.  
35  
36 Hanson: Agrees and compares the process to a ladder and points out that other states are  
37 eliminating this language and will allow anyone at anytime from anywhere to take the FE or FS.  
38 He adds that it will come up, and some states are already allowing this. Why do we have to  
39 have experience before we take the PE? It's already happening.  
40  
41 Maynard: Points out that even if we have that language in there, there is nothing to stop  
42 someone at UAF or UAA to apply through Washington who has more liberal requirements and  
43 then go to the Anchorage or Fairbanks test site to take the test and there is nothing we can do  
44 about, we probably won't even know about it. He added that since we had been offered a  
45 meeting with the Legislative Regulatory Review Committee that we take them up on it and make  
46 sure they are ok with this path before we go further.  
47  
48 Koonce: Asks if we would present a document to them.  
49  
50 Maynard: Just explain our approach and what the system is and see if they had any concerns  
51 prior to drafting for August.

1  
2 Koonce: Recommends doing that with the structural regulation also.  
3  
4 Chair: Points out that that one was not a matter of legality, people might not have liked it but it  
5 wasn't a legal issue and this one was.  
6  
7 The discussion continued for a short period with no new information or points of view.  
8  
9 Chair: Asks for a motion.  
10  
11 Koonce: Move to approve. (Laughter)  
12  
13 Jones: You could do it that way, you could move to adopt it and vote it down.  
14  
15 Chair: Or table it. If we vote it down.....  
16  
17 Jones: It kills this version and you can start all over.  
18  
19 While the motion was being written there was a discussion on the pros and cons of doing it this  
20 way and the result being that it was decided to do the same thing with the structural regulation  
21 that was tabled earlier.  
22  
23 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Hanson if was RESOLVED to adopt**  
24 **changes to 12 AAC 36.062 Eligibility for Fundamentals of Engineering Examination, 12**  
25 **AAC 36.063 Engineering Education and Work Experience Requirements, 12 AAC 36.064**  
26 **Eligibility for Fundamentals of Land Surveying Examination, and 12 AAC 36.065**  
27 **Eligibility for Professional Land Surveyor Examination as public noticed. Motion failed**  
28 **on a unanimous vote.**  
29  
30 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it**  
31 **was RESOLVED to approve as public noticed regulation changes to 12 AAC 36.040**  
32 **Simplified Application for Reexamination, 12 AAC 36.990 Definitions (a) (44) engineering**  
33 **surveys and the changes to the AELS Board By Laws.**  
34  
35 **Chair: We'll take a 15 minute break.**  
36  
37 10:55a.m. – 11:10a.m. Break  
38  
39 Chair: Wants to go back and revisit item 6A. He explains that if the regulation project is voted  
40 down then a new regulation project can be started for introduction in August and a new public  
41 notice period to span a meeting and give the opportunity for oral testimony then since Colin has  
42 disclosed his status as a structural engineer he would be able to participate in the discussion.  
43  
44 Eriksen: Asks if we can update the roster to reflect that he is an SE.  
45  
46 Chair: Speaks to the cost of putting out a regulation and that he feels the importance out  
47 weights spending the money. He adds that another advantage is it gives more time to reflect on  
48 the comments received the first time around.  
49  
50 **On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Christenson and passed with one**  
51 **abstention (Maynard) it was RESOLVED to move 12 AAC 36.063, 12 AAC 36.108, 12 AAC**

1 **36.180, 12 AAC 36.185 and 12 AAC 36.990 off the table for reconsideration.**

2  
3 **On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Kerr it was RESOLVED to adopt**  
4 **changes to 12 AAC 36.063 re structural engineering, 12 AAC 36.108 Application for**  
5 **registration as a structural engineer, 12 AAC 36.180 Seals, 12 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals,**  
6 **12 AAC 36.990 Definitions (a)(43) significant structures as public noticed. Motion failed**  
7 **on a unanimous vote with one abstention (Maynard).**

8  
9 Chair: So with that the regulation project is dead.

10  
11 Eriksen: Asks if he is going to re-assign the committee.

12  
13 Chair: Asks for a motion to start a regulation project and then after a brief discussion decides to  
14 put it off until tomorrow morning.

15  
16 **Agenda Item 9 - Correspondence Received since February 2015.**

17  
18 CLARB:

19  
20 Urfer: Explains that a new requirement is that to take L.A.R.E. an applicant has to have  
21 attended an accredited program and that it even applies to those presently taking the exam.

22  
23 NCARB:

24  
25 Chair: He explains that there is an entity in California calling itself the American Board of  
26 Architecture. It's a self-empowering entity and they are advertising that people can get licensed  
27 by following their program. In California you can be licensed with just experience and testing.  
28 You don't have to have education that's accredited by NAAB. It's something NCARB and the  
29 California Board are watching. He just wanted to make the Board aware of it.

30  
31 He mentions that the Legislative Tracker is a good way to keep abreast of what's happening  
32 nationally.

33  
34 There was a short discussion about the NC Dental Board and the SCOTUS decision. It was  
35 pointed out that we are different in that our Board is appointed by the Governor and theirs was  
36 elected by the licensees.

37  
38 He talked about a recent meeting he attended and a discussion about NCARB's reduction of  
39 IDP hours from 5600 to 3740 core hours and removed the elective hours. He adds that the  
40 elective hours were not tied to the practice analysis and could be a wide variety of things that  
41 didn't necessarily advance the individuals learning in architecture. Alaska does not specify the  
42 number of hours just that the IDP is completed so no changes will be needed here.

43  
44 Koonce: Asks why some states were against it.

45  
46 Chair: Explains that some states have the number of hours in their Statute and would have to  
47 go to their Legislature for a change. He adds that there was a lot of discussion about it and not  
48 everyone was happy with it.

49  
50 He talks about a couple of items they will be voting on at the National Conference concerning  
51 the BEA and BFEA program going away in that it will now require some education. He doesn't

1 think it will require a change in our regulations.  
2  
3 NCEES:  
4  
5 Chair asks if anyone has any comments on any of the items.  
6  
7 Hanson: Draws everyone's attention to 9 C 3 having to do with the last pencil and paper  
8 administration of the PS exam.  
9  
10 Kerr: Brought up the AKLS and how we are unable to go to CBT with it right now.  
11  
12 Hanson: Talked about the time lines for moving an exam to CBT and that it takes a large item  
13 bank to generate a linear on the fly exam where they can generate the exam as needed. He  
14 explains that there are two types, one is just in a computer format and one is generated as the  
15 individual arrives for the exam.  
16  
17 Koonce: Asks who oversees the format of the Alaska exam.  
18  
19 Hale: Explains that ASPLS writes the questions and a company that does testing vets them and  
20 provides all of the analysis. The exam is administered by the State. He doesn't think we have  
21 enough questions to do more than two different tests a year.  
22  
23 Kerr: Adds that scoring in an additional problem as it depends on how many take the test. He  
24 asks how much it would cost.  
25  
26 Hale: \$3500 per test.  
27  
28 Koonce: Asks how many usually take the test.  
29  
30 Hackenmiller: 25 per exam average.  
31  
32 Discussion continued for a short time about the feasibility of going CBT with the AKLS with the  
33 conclusion that it's not feasible at this time.  
34  
35 Kerr: talks about C 7 where NCEES is trying to engage more young people to come into the  
36 engineering and surveying professions. He notes that the average age of a surveyor is  
37 approaching 60. He asks how the engineers are doing right now on getting younger people into  
38 the profession.  
39  
40 Hanson: We are doing ok right now. But the surveying examinees are going down 15% a year.  
41  
42 Eriksen: Asks what the reason for that is.  
43  
44 Kerr: Explains that a lot of people don't know what surveyors do and they don't get the  
45 exposure in middle school and high school. He explains the traditional avenue of becoming a  
46 surveyor when we were in a low tech world someone would come on a survey crew as a helper  
47 and work their way up, they were interns learning on the job and now the crews are smaller and  
48 don't have those entry level positions you have to have a strong skill set right from the get-go.  
49 The effect of that over the years is we won't have people stepping in to go to school.  
50  
51 Hale: Explains the rigors surveyors go through in the field.

1  
2 Kerr: Adds that NCEES has money going to schools as discretionary money to recruit people  
3 for surveying programs and as Dave said more sponsoring of young students to go to  
4 conferences. There is a strategic marketing initiative NCEES is putting together with various  
5 stake holders such as ASCE which will hopefully draw people into the profession.  
6  
7 Maynard: 9 C 8 they think the PE exam should be practice based instead of an educational.  
8  
9 Jones: Adds that there is a lot of discussion among the Boards about decoupling education  
10 from experience and will provide the info at the next meeting.  
11  
12 Kerr: Asks if the sentiment is varied or strong.  
13  
14 Jones: Responds, varied. Some boards are already decoupled, some are moving toward it and  
15 some are saying no way.  
16  
17 Chair: If nothing else we can break for lunch.  
18  
19 Jones: On number 10 (PNWER Summit) their next summit is going to be in Montana so we  
20 might be able to attend if anyone wants to since it isn't out of country. Its July 20-24<sup>th</sup> let me  
21 know if you want me to put in for travel.  
22  
23 The consensus was that attending wouldn't change our view on mobility with Canada so there  
24 was not need to attend.  
25  
26 12:00 Break for lunch.  
27  
28 13:10 On record.  
29  
30 **Agenda item 13 – Public comment.**  
31  
32 Chair: We have Chris Miller here, Chris are you ready to comment?  
33  
34 Mr. Miller: Thanks for the introduction, I'm Chris Miller from Design Alaska I'm a frequent  
35 follower of this Board, I guess it's because it's so near and dear to my heart because of what my  
36 business and career is. I'm the President of Design Alaska we have 30 some registered  
37 professionals that work for us. I personally have four licenses that I'm maintaining. So there  
38 are just three points that I wanted to make today, I'll start with the easy ones. I really  
39 appreciated the Board Packet when I came in this morning, to look at the Board Packet. I will  
40 continue to advocate forever that when the agenda items come out that that board packet is  
41 available for everybody to see what you see. I have a hard time deciphering the meeting  
42 minutes, what you were talking about because I never see the contents. I can read the  
43 discussion but I don't know what the root is. So as a public participant I'll keep encouraging  
44 that, you may have to listen to it forever, that's ok, if it could be posted to a website somewhere  
45 I'd be the happiest guy in the world.  
46  
47 The Second thing was Continuing Education and I heard it again this morning. I'll give you the  
48 opposite stance, I've never had any problem at all achieving Continuing Education and I think  
49 that's true of everybody that's practicing in this world. It seems to me to be countless  
50 opportunities for free quality local education. Or inexpensive maybe is more in line; you get what  
51 you pay for. I give up counting usually because I'm way over the limit so don't have to count

1 anymore, I don't even write it down. Like I said I have four licenses, I'm tracking them all  
2 separately although I'm not sure that's been propagated yet, it's a little painful but hey I can do  
3 that. So, it's not a problem but one of my licenses was from Oregon before I transferred into the  
4 Alaska Board, the Fire Protection license. Oregon's board spends an inordinate amount of time  
5 chasing Continuing Education and I see zero opportunity for their chasing life safety and welfare  
6 of the public. All their Board Actions are Investigations about CE. One was actually an  
7 investigation about something that would affect the HSW of the Public directly, continuing  
8 education is indirectly. I have not seen that with this Board all of the investigation reports seem  
9 to be about not practicing in your area of competence or not stamping drawings correctly or  
10 signing something you shouldn't. Please stay focused on those things. Do your audits on CE,  
11 keep yelling at us to do it right, we all need that, but just don't make this Board devolve into a  
12 kindergarten class.

13  
14 The third thing was the structural engineer. I came this morning to see where you would go with  
15 that. I totally respect Colin's opinion on structural engineering and I kind of like the direction you  
16 are headed at the moment. I may offer some unsolicited suggestions of amendments that may  
17 help that I think, because I guess what I would advocate is to keep thinking about is if we are  
18 really going to raise the bar on structural engineering make sure everybody takes the 16 hour  
19 test to get it. If that's what this special thing about the SE is don't grandfather in somebody who  
20 never took the test. Let them take the test and get in and get the license and practice. Try not  
21 to, as much as possible, to restrict the civil engineers ability to do structural engineering  
22 because that's where they have to start. They have to get their civil PE and they have to  
23 practice for a while before they get their structural PE. We don't have enough talent in the state  
24 the way it is to do all the things that need to be done in the state. There's probably a line  
25 somewhere that we can limit it and say only the SE's can do this. But try and make sure that's a  
26 good line that you can really defend and a 5000 sq. ft. wood fire station in Point Lay doesn't  
27 seem to meet that line. I guess it's an essential facility but it's not a very seismically active zone  
28 but try to make it something we can really be proud of and that's all the comments I have today.

29  
30 Chair: Thank you very much. Has anybody joined us on the telephone?

31  
32 Jones: We can go ahead with the agenda and if somebody does call in.....

33  
34 Chair: Ok, we'll conclude public comment for now, if someone calls in within the hour we'll let  
35 them speak. So what we're going to do is jump back up to 9 d. So 9 d is the letter we got from  
36 Jesse Escamilla, I've crossed out sections in there that had to do specifically the regulation that  
37 was proposed for structural engineers that is no longer a proposed regulation. I think we should  
38 review the other aspects of this letter and offer a few comments. So he was in attendance at  
39 our last meeting and was not happy with how we conducted that meeting. He felt like the  
40 comments hadn't been properly considered, that some members were frustrated with just the  
41 length of the comments, and this basically my take on what he is saying, and basically saying  
42 that engineers deserve more respect than that. He was not happy with the fact that Colin was  
43 involved with the SE regulation and seemed to have a lot of say-so, however we discussed this  
44 quite a bit and the fact that Colin's structural experience is paramount to us developing  
45 regulations like this just because of his experience. He also said that he thought there was only  
46 one engineer on the Board that had structural experience and he felt that a bridge engineer  
47 should be able to weigh in on it.

48  
49 Maynard: May I respond to that? I think the reason it may have looked like we were bored is  
50 because we had read all this stuff before we got here so we were going through stuff we already  
51 knew and it was taking a lot of time. Now I understand we've got to get it all on record but all of



1 us had already read it so why should we read it word for word while we are sitting here. People  
2 were seeming to not be paying attention because they had already seen the stuff that was being  
3 read. On whether I have an agenda or not, that's not the case. You have the Structural  
4 Engineers Association of Alaska asked for this when we adopted the 9 more licenses. All  
5 through this process I've said and asked a number of times, is this the direction we want to go  
6 and to this date I don't think I've heard a single no we don't want to go this way. So I was just  
7 fulfilling your desire go this direction. And on the, we should have a bridge engineer on here, if  
8 we did that we'd have a 30 member board because we've got 15 different engineering licenses  
9 and there are five different tests for civil, there's two for structural, three for mechanical, three  
10 for electrical. We would have a monstrous board if we had to have one from each one of those  
11 tests. We have enough skill here to respond to concerns in public comment and intelligence to  
12 figure out what's reasonable and what's not reasonable and having one person from every  
13 different field of engineering is not reasonable.

14  
15 Chair: I would like to say too that regarding the comments, I read through all the comments and  
16 took a few notes beforehand and when we came to the meeting I had a few of those notes  
17 jotted down and I didn't read the comments word for word. I think it's unreasonable that we  
18 would need to read all those comments word for word in the public record because they are  
19 submitted into the public record in writing.

20  
21 Eriksen: It was unprecedented that we read all those comments and it was important that we  
22 shed light on them.

23  
24 Chair: Right and we did go through each one and we did comment and discuss where we felt  
25 we needed to discuss. With that said in the future, just a reminder, you want to read those  
26 beforehand and come prepared to discuss them and if there's any questions or issues you have  
27 go ahead and raise those during the period of time that we are discussing public comment.

28  
29 Hanson: I'd like to thank Colin for his work on this assigned task to tackle the structural  
30 regulation project, it wasn't something he sought out it's something that was assigned to him  
31 and most appropriately you should probably assign a structural type of regulation project to a  
32 structural engineer. I wouldn't expect a mechanical engineer or a landscape architect to try to  
33 come up with the basic language for a structural issue just the same I wouldn't expect a  
34 structural to come up with other folks language. And having been through a lot of these  
35 comments with the general licensure when that was around, and I was not at the last meeting,  
36 however I did read the minutes and it seemed to be exactly in line, the review of each comment  
37 seemed to be exactly in line with how we handled the general licensure comments. We receive  
38 all of those comments as a package prior to the meeting and we're informed, here's your packet  
39 don't discuss it before the meeting, please review these though and we will review them at the  
40 meeting. In reading the minutes it appeared that this was an identical process we've used in the  
41 past for general licensure, the 4 year survey change that was made, several of these  
42 contentious regulation projects we've used the exact same procedure so I don't think anything  
43 was out of line here. Colin, I think, was a victim of circumstance here being assigned the  
44 assigned individual; it would have probably been any of us that was kind of leading the charge.

45  
46 Chair: The other comments that were in here were specifically speaking to that regulation which  
47 is no longer a regulation project and even if it were we wouldn't be able to talk about those  
48 under that situation. I think, again, his complaint is so registered but I really think we followed  
49 proper procedure in reviewing the public comments on this.

50  
51 Christensen: I was a little bit offended, not that it was in my bailiwick I just thought the guy was

1 a little bit disingenuous after sitting here and then making snide comments about people yawning  
2 it's a normal characteristic for someone to yawn and stretch, it's not a big thing with me. We did  
3 address everything they ask about. my take was you know bridges over 200 feet.....  
4

5 Chair: We don't need to get into that discussion.  
6

7 Christensen: You're going to get the disgruntled people that didn't get their way or didn't think  
8 you thought the same way they should. It's characteristic for people to write a letter so –  
9 unintelligible. I thought the governor should have sent a letter out to Vern and said we have this  
10 question of impropriety you know yada, yada, yada.  
11

12 Chair: Ok, we're going to jump back to public comment, we've got Joe Notkin, he's president of  
13 AIA, Joe you want to comment?  
14

15 Mr. Notkin: Well first of all I would like to give you guy's kudos for what you did last year with  
16 publishing when people get registered. I think that is always been a matter of public record so  
17 having that done either quarterly or when it happens is really appreciated. The AIA likes to  
18 recognize newly registered architects and I think that's great. I'm watching some of the  
19 discussion that's been going on with remote offices and use of seals and stuff and we're sorting  
20 of collecting information at the AIA but we're just watching the thread of the discussion on this  
21 so we appreciate the communications.  
22

23 Chair: I believe we have an agenda item dealing with that later on. Thank you Joe.  
24

25 So we will go to 9 e.  
26

27 Maynard: Explained that the email was about an engineer doing architectural work and whether  
28 or not it was considered minor.  
29

30 Chair: Responded to the same email in the same light. F is an email from Mr. Peterson re the  
31 MRA with Canada and his question is regarding the Mutual Recognition Agreement that NCARB  
32 has with Canada that Alaska has not signed on to, 30 plus states have. His question is whether  
33 we have actually considered the matter or voted on it. If the board has not voted on it he wants  
34 to know if there is a formal way to request that the board does vote on it. The Chair recalls that  
35 we did not vote on it but did discuss it and decided not to sign on because it would be  
36 inconsistent with the engineering side of things. Another thing is we do have a path for  
37 Canadian architects to get licensed here if they want to.  
38

39 Maynard: Understands that if you have an NCARB Certificate from your Canadian license then  
40 you can get licensed like you would normally. He doesn't have problem with us signing on to it  
41 because that's basically what they have to do anyway is come to us with an NCARB Certificate.  
42 Engineering is different but they don't have a similar system where you can get the NCEES  
43 record where it's reciprocity where your system and our system is similar but the engineers in  
44 Canada aren't interested in that. He would not have a problem with signing on because it's  
45 reciprocity.  
46

47 Chair: It's a little different than that in that their education system is different and the testing  
48 system is different. What NCARB is saying is that we have taken a look at your entire program  
49 and find it to be equivalent to NCARB's requirements.  
50

51 Maynard: Asks if they do that individually.

1  
2 Chair: They don't do it individually. NCARB says if they meet the Canadian requirements then  
3 they meet NCARB's requirements.  
4  
5 Chair offers to resurrect it and bring it to the next meeting and we'll go over it again.  
6  
7 Next is g. He's asking about the status of the structural regulation and the regulation process  
8 and Vern responded back with the process.  
9  
10 H is a letter from ASCE regarding use of seals.  
11  
12 Maynard: There were actually 2 letters – 9 m.  
13  
14 Chair: They cite 185 (7) and (c). So the issue they want us to look at is does that individual that  
15 is in supervisory control have to be in that office.  
16  
17 Hanson: He advises that we just recently have several complaints in regards to this issue. This  
18 is what was decided. As long as the professional has control of the work, can provide  
19 comments, changes etc. and is willing to take responsibility and stamp that work that's ok.  
20 Whether it's done in that office or remotely it's really no different than a sub-consultant working  
21 for a prime-consultant on a big job, right? The sub is responsible for their part of the work they  
22 send it on to whoever the overall project manager is. So as long as the architect or engineer or  
23 whoever it is has control over the work they don't have to be sitting right next to them to do that.  
24  
25 Chair: Thinks this will tie in with the project requiring firm names on the drawings. He thinks the  
26 current language is dated in that technologies of the day allow more remote work.  
27  
28 Maynard: thinks there are two issues. If the company has four offices and people from each of  
29 them is going to be working on the same project and one person is going to be in responsible  
30 charge and he can direct the work of the other offices and do the review and stamp that  
31 drawing. The other is item c which is you have an office that's doing engineering or architecture  
32 you have to have a licensed professional in charge of that office. They may not be working on  
33 that particular project but they're there to oversee the work of the non-professionals. So you  
34 can't have a licensed professional sitting in Anchorage with 8 rural offices with EIT's or non  
35 EIT's doing work and having it sent back to you to review and stamp. You have to have a  
36 licensed professional in each one of those remote offices. That's the question that came up at  
37 the APDC meeting, do you have to have an engineer in each one of those office and the answer  
38 is yes. If we want to change that we can change it but to me, this discussion I think occurred  
39 four or five years ago before I was on the Board. Does every office have to have a licensed  
40 professional in it and the answer then was yes. If you want to change your mind we can do that  
41 but that's a different question about whether you can work on a project with different people in  
42 different offices and then stamp their combined work after you've reviewed it.  
43  
44 Hanson: Offers a scenario where a company with offices nationwide offers mechanical but  
45 doesn't have a mechanical engineer in the state of Alaska. How can you offer a service you are  
46 not licensed for?  
47  
48 Discussion continued for a short period with the result that an office must have a licensed  
49 professional in it but not necessarily in every branch offered. The Board will respond to the  
50 question with their interpretation and then place the interpretation in the Guidance Manual. The  
51 Registration and Practice Committee will look at the language and decide if a regulation project

1 is required.  
2  
3 Chair: Item I email from the Nebraska Board re the use of SECB after a person's name.  
4  
5 Maynard: Explains that this is a designation that certifies that you have passed the 16 hour SE  
6 test and came about because some states don't have an SE license and have no intention of  
7 getting one so this is designation shows that the individual has passed the exam. The idea was  
8 that it would make reciprocity between states easier.  
9  
10 Chair: Has a problem with it in that it could imply that they are a registered structural engineer.  
11  
12 Hale: Agrees that it is confusing.  
13  
14 Hanson: Asks why we care.  
15  
16 Chair: Feels that it would cause the public to think that they were licensed structural engineers.  
17  
18 The discussion revealed that our response would be that they would have to be license in  
19 Alaska as a structural engineer to use SECB after their name.  
20  
21 Item j is requesting the board to accept experience by the numbers of hours instead of months.  
22  
23 The Board consensus is that we will continue to count it in months.  
24  
25 Item K was an invitation to APEGA's Annual Convention.  
26  
27 Board consensus was not to attend.  
28  
29 Item L was a letter from David Widmer in the American Surveyor. Re watering down the  
30 requirements for PS.  
31  
32 Item m. was a letter from APDC re having an engineer in each office. Chair will include them on  
33 the letter in response to item h.  
34  
35 Item n. is an email string between Vern and Buzz Scher re SE regulation changes.  
36  
37 Item o. is an email between Roger Weese and the Chair asking if Specs require a stamp. He  
38 responded with a direct quote out of the regulations.  
39  
40 **Agenda item 10 – Correspondence sent since February 2015.**  
41  
42 Item a was a response to William Boswell re responsible charge in surveying being signed off  
43 by an engineer.  
44  
45 Item b. is an email string between Vern and James Armstrong re CE credits.  
46  
47 Item c. is a letter from the Board to contractors re recent changes to AS 08.48.331 Exemptions.  
48  
49 Item d. is a letter to John Young re design of a building for use by the Masonic Lodge in Juneau  
50 as a meeting place. The Masonic Center Association was claiming exemption from the  
51 licensing regulations. It was determined that they are not exempt and that design professionals

1 would be required.

2  
3 **Agenda item 11 – Old Business**

4  
5 None

6  
7 **On a Motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hanson and unanimously approved it**  
8 **was RESOLVED to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310 (c) (3) to**  
9 **review applicant files.**

10  
11 2:33 p.m. went into executive session.

12  
13 5:08 p.m. Out of executive session and recessed for the day.

14  
15  
16 **Friday May 8, 2015**

17  
18 9:00 a.m. Called to order, roll call, all present except Schedler who was excused by the Chair.

19  
20 Chair: We are caught up on our agenda so we'll be starting at 17.

21  
22 **Agenda Item 17 – New Business**

23  
24 Vern calls John Savage to listen in on the Use of Seals portion.

25  
26 Item a. AKLS Exam Schedule.

27  
28 Jones: What I want to do is figure out a way we can give the AKLS exam more than once a  
29 year without incurring any additional expense. It's our item bank and we should be able to use it  
30 as we see fit. I don't know all of the intricacies that are involved with vetting the questions and  
31 what is done at the exam review workshop. Help!

32  
33 Hale: Thinks the issue is that you would have to give the same test over and over.

34  
35 Jones: We have the capability to randomly select items out of a file. The same program we use  
36 for the CE audit.

37  
38 Kerr: Reports that they (him and Dave) had corresponded with Ken Ayers and Jack Warner, the  
39 cyclametrician who scores the exams and makes it defensible, which is a term he doesn't 100%  
40 understand but thinks that the way the test is prepared, handled and scored etc. would make it  
41 hard for someone to successfully sue us because problems with the test. He asks if that is  
42 everyone's understanding of a defensible exam and receives an affirmative response. He adds  
43 that we have gone to a lot of expense in making it a defensible exam over the last couple of  
44 decades.

45  
46 The item bank is one component of the test. The other component is the selective questions for  
47 the test. The third component is the scored test that was taken by subject matter experts. They  
48 pull a certain number of questions out of the item bank and that test is taken by the subject  
49 matter experts at the AKLS Workshop, which is happening today. Then based on the subject  
50 matter expert's scores the cut score for the test is determined. Does that sound right Dave?  
51

1 Hale: Per question. They have an Angoff rating for each question and all those ratings together  
2 determine the cut score.  
3

4 Kerr: So you think each question stands on its own?  
5

6 Hale: He believes that each questions has its own Angoff rating and then there is an overall test  
7 cut score. He explains that when they develop a question it goes through a vetting process and  
8 then they put them in the test he doesn't believe they are used the first few exams to see if they  
9 are good questions or if everybody is missing them.  
10

11 Kerr: We ask Jack Warner for his expertise and he says if the goal is to administer more forms  
12 of the exam it would be possible to expand the workshop objectives by having subject matter  
13 experts review one or two additional forms of the exam that contain exclusively, quote, tested  
14 items, items that have appeared on earlier forms of the exam. The tested items have been  
15 scored on earlier exams contain known statistical properties. They have also been reviewed by  
16 the subject matter experts using the modified Angoff procedure. The additional costs  
17 associated with developing more forms of the exam would be minimal compared with the cost  
18 associated with holding additional workshops. What he's talking about is assembling different I  
19 tests so we have one or two tests each year. At our AKLS workshop we have our subject  
20 matter experts take the exam and then we would have a second test available.  
21

22 Maynard: Has a concern with just having a bank of questions and having IT just pick questions  
23 out of a computer base without checking to make sure two of the questions aren't the same  
24 question with different numbers.  
25

26 Hale: I think we can come up with two tests and two tests a year seem more reasonable than  
27 one but there is an extra cost of \$3500.  
28

29 Koonce: Asks about the cost to sit for the test.  
30

31 Kerr: Explains that the \$3500 is not the cost to administer the exam it's the cost to have a  
32 second exam that is defensible.  
33

34 Hall: Adds that it's for a camera ready exam, scoring etc.  
35

36 Jones: Adds that he gets a couple of pages of questions and he copies the number needed for  
37 each administration of the exam.  
38

39 Hanson: Adds that to provide a linear on the fly exam you need 4 or more times the number of  
40 questions required for each exam. At NCEES they are talking upwards of 800 questions for a  
41 60 question exam.  
42

43 Jones: We have been doing this for a decade or two how many questions do we have.  
44

45 Kerr: Doesn't know the number but was told we have enough to do two exams. He adds that  
46 the number of people participating in today's workshop is about 8 and that's barely enough to  
47 write new questions and take one exam.  
48

49 The discussion continued for a short period noting that we don't have enough examinees to  
50 justify two exams per year unless we raise the exam fee and that it's unfortunate that we have  
51 to tell people who are qualified for licensure that they have to wait a year to take the exam. We

1 need to develop as many questions as possible and right now we don't have enough subject  
2 matter experts to do that. If we use the experts we have to take a second exam instead of  
3 writing more questions we are hurting ourselves. It was suggested that maybe some surveyors  
4 could get together on their own and develop questions. Another suggestion was to borrow  
5 questions from other western states as suggested by NCEES. The surveyors didn't know if  
6 NCEES was familiar with the AKLS and doubted if that approach would work.

7  
8 Chair: We won't take any action right now but we should continue to look at options.

9  
10 Item b. Use of Seals.

11  
12 Chair: We have John Savage on line to participate or listen in on the discussion on b. which is  
13 Use of Seals and e. which is Conformed Drawings.

14  
15 Kerr: There are a number of products and services that are generated by surveyors that  
16 traditionally have not been stamped but fall under the definition of land surveying. DOT as the  
17 biggest example, they produce maps that are based on a survey and are part of a deed and  
18 they convey land or they're the basis of a conveyance and anyway DOT doesn't, I don't think  
19 they allow consultants to stamp them, they are not traditionally stamped and I've been told by  
20 some people that they are not allowed to stamp them, I don't know if that's a fact or not.

21  
22 He goes on to explain that a person who went to work for DOT a couple years ago was  
23 questioning why she was getting document that were not stamped and noted that we should  
24 have a law that require them to be stamped to maintain the integrity of the documents. He  
25 pointed out the Statute that requires just that, and explained that it just wasn't being enforced.  
26 He thinks part of it is an institutional problem in that institutions are saying don't do this and that  
27 she is willing to write their administrative requirements so that these things are mandated to be  
28 stamped. But she thinks there's some room for misinterpretation in the wording of our  
29 document, AS 08.48.221 and so she would like, she asked for a board white paper with the  
30 Board's interpretation of the sealing requirements.

31  
32 Chair: It's seems like DNR could make a regulation that these documents be stamped just like  
33 the Fire Marshal so I'm not sure we want to tweak ours to get too specific.

34  
35 Kerr: She's not asking us to change any of our Regulations or Statutes. She's just asking for  
36 something clarifying this, I think it's pretty clear.

37  
38 Chair: You say that DOT doesn't usually allow that

39  
40 Kerr: We stamp them, yes.

41  
42 Hale: We don't', it depends on who you are working for, the Muni doesn't. He thinks there is  
43 some confusion on what the final product is because the very last product when you do a right  
44 of way is the right of way map that you do stamp and sign but it's not the final document, It's a  
45 picture of everything you've done but it's not the final document it's a picture of the final  
46 document.

47  
48 Hanson: Offers a point to DOT that if you're not going to allow just anyone to prepare it, if  
49 you're going to require a PLS to be under supervisory control of that work then it better be  
50 stamped. If I can just hire a drafter KINKO's to reproduce some property information in auto cad  
51 for me or whatever then fine, I shouldn't stamp it but that's really the crux of it but for this type of

1 document they will not let an engineer or a draftsman or anyone else just prepare these  
2 documents, it has to be under the control of a registered surveyor and that's where you hold up  
3 your sign that says wait maybe this should be stamped.  
4

5 Hale: There's an affidavit for every parcel that does get stamped. But it's not on the document  
6 though it's a separate document.  
7

8 Koonce: Asks if the two documents are married.  
9

10 Hale: No. it doesn't go in and get recorded.  
11

12 Kerr: Cautions that when you have a piece of paper that isn't associated with every other piece  
13 of paper it's subject to substitution. He reads the Statute and feels that it's clear that everything  
14 needs to be stamped.  
15

16 Hanson: Adds that several meetings back we told an engineer that they couldn't stamp an as  
17 built mortgage survey which has far less important information on it than the documents we're  
18 talking about here. These are essentially your basis for transferring property, private real  
19 property to a public entity. He feels that it's within our Statutes and Regulations that these  
20 should be stamped.  
21

22 Chair: Asks if these documents are being submitted to DNR or the recorder's office.  
23

24 Kerr: All of the above. 90% of them end up in the recorder's office.  
25

26 Chair: Well can't the recorder's office require that they have a stamp on them? It seems like  
27 they would require it.....  
28

29 Hale: They'll record anything.  
30

31 Kerr: Yeah they'll record a paper bag as long as it's 8 ½ X 11 and has a 2 inch margin.  
32

33 The discussion continues resulting in a suggestion to educate the registrants and those  
34 receiving these products as to what the law is via a letter from the Board that these documents  
35 need a stamp.  
36

37 Kerr: Gwen feels that 12 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals is not as clear because it say a registrant  
38 may instead of a registrant shall. So she's saying that this is ambiguous.  
39

40 Discussion revealed that the regulation was clear as stated and wordsmithing it wouldn't change  
41 the intent.  
42

43 Walters: offers that the rewrite of the Guidance Manual could take care of a lot of these things.  
44

45 Kerr: That's essentially what she's asking for she wants a white paper from us which essentially  
46 is guidance.  
47

48 The discussion continued for a few more minutes with the result being that Colin, Jeff and John  
49 will draft a letter to be sent to registrants and agencies and post on our webpage and put in the  
50 Guidance Manual explaining the Statutes and Regulations on what need to be stamped.  
51



1 Item e. Conformed Documents.

2  
3 Maynard: This is a question I came up with because there was discussion between various  
4 members of my office and also members of a design team that was requested to have  
5 conformed drawings which we get fairly often. We prepare the documents, there's addendums  
6 and then the contractor says well can you incorporate all those addendums into and give me a  
7 set of conformed drawings? To me those conformed drawings are the ones they are actually  
8 going to build from. So they are sort of final documents, however, if you go to trial conformed  
9 documents aren't ones (unintelligible) unless you made an error in it then it would be a problem.  
10 And that's one of the reasons some people don't want to stamp conformed drawings, because  
11 it's just a service, it's not the final drawing, the final drawings is all the bid documents and the  
12 addendum. So I asked John what he looks for. Obviously he wants to have a set of stamped  
13 drawings on the site.

14  
15 Chair: And really the permit set is really what he should have on site.

16  
17 Maynard: Right, which is not usually the conform set unless you've gone and substituted the  
18 conformed set with the other set.

19  
20 Chair: But you would have to go through the permitting entity to do that. I've had a lot of  
21 frustration with this too. There are a lot of public entities out there that want the conformed set.  
22 Sometimes it could even be after bidding they want a conformed set and this is after permitting.  
23 You've done permitting, signed your documents they have been permitted the thing is out to bid,  
24 there's some addendums that come out, and if they are significant items they should go back to  
25 permitting anyway, those items, not necessarily the whole set. You get done with bidding and  
26 the owner wants a conformed set and maybe some aspect of the design the owner wants to do  
27 a change order to modify and they want another conformed set to reflect all of that and I have a  
28 real problem with stamping multiple sets. The one you submit for permitting should be the  
29 stamped set. On the other hand what you do with a conformed set of documents. Can you just  
30 stamp it "conformed" and not put your seal on it? It's really not what's supposed to be built  
31 from, the signed set is supposed to be built from.

32  
33 Koonce: What we do is we use the set that's approved by; let's say in this case, the  
34 Municipality of Anchorage. They have a field set and an office set and the field set is the same  
35 as the office set that they go out and use and those are stamped documents not only by the AE  
36 and by the Municipality that did permitting. Now during the permitting process what we do is if  
37 there's a few comments or whatever sometimes instead of superseding each sheet, which is  
38 sometimes cumbersome we issue a completely revised set of conformed permit set and  
39 incorporate all the changes.

40  
41 Chair: So are you saying that when you reissue that set you go back to the Muni.....

42  
43 Koonce: They have the same set as the final conformed, permitted, bid reviewed set that goes  
44 in the building official office. That's pretty clean for us but there are a bunch of variables that  
45 could happen like if that's the final set then everything after that's a change order that's  
46 numbered as you go through. Typically you would not update or incorporate all those changer  
47 orders unless they are dramatic until the end of the job then you've got a record of them. Is that  
48 correct?

49  
50 Chair: That's probably how it should happen. I know that there are entities out there that, you  
51 could have a situation where you send your project in for permitting and that's your signed set.

1 At the same time it's going out to bidding. You get your permit set back before bidding is  
2 completed so you have addendum items. If they are significant addendum items then you have  
3 to submit those to the Muni for approval but they might be submitted on 8 ½ X 11 stamped  
4 sheet. Maybe I'm changing the drywall from ½ inch to 5/8's, they are not requiring me to  
5 resubmit the plan but I'm submitting a stamped 8 ½ X 11 that says we are making that change.  
6 So that's part of the permitting record but if I then go and incorporate that into my plan and  
7 stamp that then that set is going to look different than the permitted set. Because the permitted  
8 set is that drawing with the Muni stamp on it and my 8 ½ X 11 with the Muni's approval stamp  
9 on it.

10  
11 Koonce: Explains how his company does it.

12  
13 Hanson: Adds that when he has dealt with conformed documents they were just a set of  
14 documents that were produced at a set point in time to essentially say that this is what the  
15 design looked like on such and such a date.

16  
17 Chair: Thinks they should say not for construction.

18  
19 Hanson: Ours usually do. This is a conformed set it's not a for construction set. It's a point in  
20 time at a certain point in the process because it depends on when..... It is like a record drawing  
21 but is it after permitting, is it after bidding, did we extend the bidding period because we added a  
22 couple more addendums, it just a point in time and space like our design drawings but as our  
23 design changes we go and document every single change.

24  
25 Koonce: Notes that the terminology is different and then expands on his explanation of his  
26 companies procedures.

27  
28 Chair: Adds that when working as a sub on a project that there are a lot of demands when  
29 you're not in control of the project you get some wearied demands on you. I've had clients that  
30 have issued a set and you signed it and then they want to make changes which is fine, it hasn't  
31 been permitted yet so then you want to recall what you signed so you can sign a new set and it  
32 becomes the only set that's out there. Then they want a conformed set or they want a wide  
33 variety of things and I'm never really comfortable having more than one signed set out there and  
34 when I'm working as a sub it's harder to control. He's been out on a job before where the  
35 contractor was building off a review set he got from the owner and didn't even have his signed  
36 set.

37  
38 Maynard: Agrees with Brian's approach because the documents are not only a set of design  
39 documents they are a part of the contract between the owner and the contractor. So that is  
40 what should be governing is the signed, sealed set with any addendums that are issued and  
41 that's what they have to build. If we produce a conformed set then we should put conformed not  
42 for construction although that's kind of odd they are probably going to use those instead of the  
43 signed set of drawings.

44  
45 The conversation continued with the result being that it doesn't really matter if it says conformed  
46 or whatever as long as it's a stamped, signed and dated document. If people want to build off  
47 the conformed set then it better be stamped and there better be a copy in the field and the  
48 contractor better be carrying it around. If they are not then they are in violation. The point was  
49 made that if the stamped conformed set didn't go back through permitting then they shouldn't be  
50 building off it. The response was that that was a contractual issue but by stamping that  
51 document you are saying that these meet all the requirements as a professional and you're

1 taking responsibility for them. So in that case if the AE has met the letter of the law but the  
2 owner and contractor don't have the permitted set then they are in violation of the law and that's  
3 what John would need to determine from the drawings that he has out there. It was noted that  
4 the permit set would probably be there but the conformed set would be what they were using.

5  
6 Chair: Invites John chime and tell them what he finds in the field.

7  
8 Savage: Explains that he sometime finds that they are working on drawing that were several  
9 changes behind and he has also seen over the years that sometimes they release a set that  
10 they are saying is 80% when in fact it's maybe 55%. That's where he thinks there has been  
11 some confusion and it's become problematic in the field. You don't have a complete set to work  
12 off of.

13  
14 Koonce: Suggests that it may be a staggered permitting process where they are going in with  
15 the foundation.....

16  
17 Savage: it could very well be. He thinks that when there is not a 100% set of drawings on site  
18 that that's an issue that needs to be looked at.

19  
20 Koonce: In all cases that drawing should be stamped and water marked what they are. If it's a  
21 footing, foundation then the civil and structural more likely would be 100% but the mechanical,  
22 electrical and architectural may not so that field set needs to delineate exactly what they're  
23 going to do, in all cases it needs to be stamped. You shouldn't be building off unstamped  
24 documents.

25  
26 Chair: Adds that there shouldn't be 50% documents that have a stamp on them. I wouldn't  
27 include 50% architectural drawings with 100% structural. I might have a concept drawing or a  
28 schematic drawing just to show the profile of the building or something like that but not as a  
29 stamped construction drawing.

30  
31 Savage: One thing he wants to clarify is that if someone has not sealed and signed that  
32 document they are not taking responsibility for it, correct?

33  
34 Chair: That's correct. He adds that any changes should be going back to the architect,  
35 engineer, surveyor etc. This issue sounds like something we could add in our other  
36 correspondence about when you stamp.

37  
38 Urfer: Asks about agencies that make changes with no discussion at all with the designer.

39  
40 Chair: They are in violation of either the Statutes or Regulations and needs to be reported. You  
41 tell them they can't do it and if they ignore you then you report them. It's a hard thing for people  
42 to do to report a client but if they're taking your document and build it differently at your  
43 objection then you're still at risk. It's still your document and you'll have to prove that they  
44 changed it and you'll also have to prove why you didn't do something about it. It's up to us to  
45 police our industry.

46  
47 Urfer: So if there is a design approval agency that won't accept your plans unless it says on  
48 there specifically that they have a right to make those changes, how do you deal with getting  
49 approval?

50  
51 Hanson: That's a John Savage issue. There have been multiple licensing actions taken against

1 people for saying the owner directed me to do this and I don't take responsibility for it. I'd go  
2 straight to John. You can let the person know that it would be immediate licensing action on  
3 you.  
4

5 Chair: You can't abdicate your responsibility. He suggests that some information be put in the  
6 letter previously mentioned that will let people know what to do if they see something they don't  
7 think is right.  
8

9 Koonce: Asks John if they got another investigator.  
10

11 Savage: Explains that due to some personnel issues within the section he got all the boards he  
12 had been relieved of back and they just hired another investigator to take them so he is now  
13 AELS only.  
14

15 17 c. Annual Report.  
16

17 Jones: Explains that Sarena does the statistical portion and he does the rest and he asks to  
18 Board for help with the Goals and Objectives portion of the report.  
19

20 Chair: Asks the Board to review and get any comments to Vern.  
21

22 Maynard: Asks that a draft be in the August package for them to review and submit corrections.  
23

24 17 d. The Western Zone meeting in Anchorage in 2016.  
25

26 Hanson: Explains that it's going to be May 19-21, 2016 in Anchorage. He encourages  
27 everyone to attend. It's a good way to see how the other side does things. The registration fee  
28 is relatively insignificant. He adds that Sarena will attend this year's meeting in Arizona for  
29 training at NCEES expense. He adds that we need to identify some speakers for lunch and  
30 some venues for dinner, guest activities etc. NCEES and WZone will do all the negotiations and  
31 contracting but it is up to us to provide them with some venues and prices. The expected  
32 attendance is approximately 125. Colin will give a welcome speech at the Zone meeting in  
33 Scottsdale Dave provided him with a video.  
34

35 Chair: Adds that on one of the AIA Regional Conferences done up here they took the Train out  
36 to Spencer Glacier. It was just them on the train and it's a long enough ride to get acquainted  
37 and socialize and there is food and drink on the train and it wasn't terribly expensive.  
38

39 Maynard: Thinks the Museum would be a good place for a reception.  
40

41 Hanson: The meeting will be at the Marriott downtown.  
42

43 Chair: Wants to see the agenda for this year's meeting for a template.  
44

#### 45 **Agenda Item 18 – Special Committees.**

46  
47 Licensure Implementation:  
48

49 Chair: Yesterday we reassigned Brian as Chair and Colin as a member and Jeff is on that  
50 committee as well and Eric and myself.  
51

1 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it was**  
2 **RESOLVED to start a regulation project to evaluate changes to structural engineering**  
3 **requirements.**

4  
5 Chair: So, we've got a new regulation project and Brian will head up that project and the  
6 committee will assist. We want to have a draft to review at the next meeting.

7  
8 Maynard: Suggests that we could approve it in August and send it to Jun to public notice for 30  
9 or 60 days and have it to adopt at the November meeting.

10  
11 Jones: Asks for a roll call vote on the last motion.

12  
13 Chair: Agrees and ask him to reread the motion.

14  
15 Jones: Reads the motion and calls the roll with the result of 9 yea's and 0 nays and 0  
16 abstentions.

17  
18 Chair: Asks if there is anything else for the committee.

19  
20 Jones: We need to set up a meeting with the Legislative Review Committee.

21  
22 Maynard: Yes which is related the FE/FS.

23  
24 Colin will take care of that and explain what we want to do and how we want to go about it.

25  
26 Registration and Practice.

27  
28 Chair: We talked about a few things yesterday that I'll be issuing letters on our position on the  
29 SECB. A letter about whether or a person is needed in each office. There might be a couple  
30 other things I'll cover under that committee but we don't need to rehash those now.

31  
32 Licensure Mobility:

33  
34 Chair: I'm chair of that and what I'm going to do is resurrect the MRA for the Canadian  
35 agreement. He will present the information to the Board at the next meeting.

36  
37 Jones: Asks if Eric would report back to the Board if he attends the PNWER meeting with for  
38 his company.

39  
40 Standing Committees: Investigative Advisory Committee.

41  
42 Jeff had two meetings with John since the last meeting.

43  
44 Brain had several meetings with John since the last meeting.

45  
46 Guidance Manual.

47  
48 Luanne: She took a look at it last night and would like to have everyone take a look at the  
49 section on their specific discipline and make sure it says what they want it to say.

50  
51 Christensen: Thinks some changes need to be made and posted on the web to better let the

1 public know what the Board does.  
2  
3 Jones: Explains that at one time this Manual was called the Building Officials Manual and its  
4 purpose was to aid plan reviewers. But we do have it on the web and anybody can look at it.  
5  
6 Maynard: Has used it to explain what he can and can't do to people.  
7  
8 The discussion concluded that the manual was for more than just the plan reviewers. There is a  
9 lot of information in it that they could care less about and a lot of information that is useful to the  
10 general public as well as Board policies etc. The Committee will review each section and  
11 recommend changes to the Board for approval.  
12  
13 Chair: Points out that the Statutes and Regulations are the law and we need to be careful we  
14 are not stating something in the Manual that is different than what the Statutes and Regulations  
15 say. He suggests using verbatim language when possible but it is designed to give a little more  
16 guidance and we do have things in there that are not in the regulations.  
17  
18 Jones: There is a disclaimer in the Manual that says the Statutes and Regulations trump the  
19 Manual.  
20  
21 Walters: Thinks that is a good way to put it, that the Statutes and Regulations sometimes are  
22 not clear so we use the Manual to let people know this is how the Board interoperates this.  
23  
24 Legislative Liaison.  
25  
26 Eriksen: Nothing to report.  
27  
28 Jones: Asks if we've made any headway getting Luanne's seat a permanent voting seat.  
29  
30 Maynard: No we haven't. He asks if anyone know someone that would be willing to sponsor  
31 that bill. He will talk to a few Legislators and see if he can get someone to do it. He will talk to  
32 Kurt Olson first.  
33  
34 Hanson: Recommends Senator Giessel.  
35  
36 Emeritus Status. Nothing to report.  
37  
38 Budget Committee.  
39  
40 Koonce: The only thing he can think of is getting the fees stabilized by doing gradual  
41 adjustments.  
42  
43 Chair: Thinks the Board will have an opportunity to respond to any fee changes before they  
44 happen.  
45  
46 The discussion determines that the fee adjustment will be a drop because we will have a  
47 surplus of over \$700K at the end of the cycle. It was pointed out that the Division has  
48 regulations on how much of a surplus or deficit each board can have before a fee adjustment  
49 has to happen. The Board asks Vern to pass on that they want to leave the fees as they are for  
50 another cycle and then start gradual adjustments to stabilize the fees.  
51

1 Continuing Education. Nothing to report.

2

3 IDP Liaison.

4

5 Chair: I'm Chair of that one. When I was reading through the Board guidelines or rules it said  
6 something in there about the Chair not being Chair of more than three committees. I'm on four  
7 right now so I'm going to assign Jeff as Chair of the IDP Liaison. As far as activity with IDP he  
8 covered that yesterday and also is sending out a letter to AIA so their members can be aware of  
9 the changes.

10

11 Jones: Recommends that Christensen be assigned as a member also since NCARB is starting  
12 to have public members on their Board.

13

14 **Agenda item 19 – Board Travel.**

15

16 NCEES WZone in Scottsdale, AZ May 14-16, 2015. Maynard, Hanson, Kerr, Hackenmiller will  
17 all attend funded by NCEES and Hale and Jones will attend funded by the Board.

18

19 Maynard: Advises that if you don't want to put this on your credit card you can have the Division  
20 travel section make your travel arrangements and not have the out of pocket expense. Just  
21 remember to get receipts for the hotel and expenses.

22

23 NCARB Annual June 17-20, 2015 in New Orleans, LA. Rearick, Koonce and Jones will attend.

24

25 Jones: We are all funded by NCARB and NCARB has offered to fund a public member from  
26 each board.

27

28 Christensen: Can't make it in June but wants to attend the CLARB Annual in September.

29

30 NCEES Annual August 19-22, 2015 in Williamsburg VA. Hanson will be funded by NCEES due  
31 to his position as a WZone officer. Maynard and Kerr will be funded delegates. Jones, Eriksen,  
32 Walters and Hale will request to be funded by the Board.

33

34 CLARB Annual September 15-19, 2015 in New Orleans, LA. Urfer, Christensen and Jones will  
35 request funding by the Board to attend.

36

37 **Agenda item 20 – National Meeting Reports.**

38

39 Chair: Reports on the NCARB Regional Summit in Long Beach March 13-14, 2015. He had  
40 already talked about the big topics yesterday. There was a speaker from Delaware who spoke  
41 about coastal disasters or events.

42

43 **Agenda item 22 – Examiners Report**

44

45 Hackenmiller: Explained some of the features of the new licensing program and how it is going  
46 to make our jobs much easier. She explains how she maintains a spread sheet on fees  
47 received etc.

48

49 There was discussion on whether or not email addresses should be available to the public via a  
50 license search. The Board is ok with requiring applicants to provide email addresses so we can  
51 communicate with applicants and licensees and ok with names and addresses on the web but

1 against having email addresses available on the web.

2  
3 **Agenda item 23 – Board Tasks**

4  
5 Chair: Most of the tasks are for me, Colin and John. So you can put down for me to research  
6 the MRA with Canada. Respond to 9h interpretation of 12 AAC 36.185 and I think the  
7 committee was going to revisit that item which was basically our interpretation of what it says  
8 about having a registered professional in the office that is doing the work. The committee was  
9 going to see if there was any alternate language to submit to the Board for consideration. That  
10 was 9h and 9m. Then I had 9i which was the state position on the SECB. 9j was response to  
11 the one about experience credit for working overtime.

12  
13 Jones: Asks if anyone was going to respond on 9d the complaint about our February meeting.

14  
15 Chair: I'll respond to that.

16  
17 Maynard: My to do list is to talk to Kurt Olson about making the landscape architect seat. I will  
18 send a letter to Senator McGuire and Rep. Colver asking to meet with them about the FE/FS  
19 regulation project and try to get direction going forward that they will agree to. I will assist Brian  
20 on the structural license project and I will work on the use of seals letter with John and Jeff.

21  
22 Christensen: Work on the Guidance Manual with Luanne.

23  
24 Kerr: Will draft a letter re use of seals and forward to Jeff and Colin for review. He is also  
25 working on the land surveyors work experience verification form with Dave trying to restructure  
26 so there is less opportunity to double count their time and make it more understandable.

27  
28 Hanson: Working on the Structural project and need to get a draft Board policy for the current  
29 address.

30  
31 Hale: Review Board goals with everybody else and provide some input for the Guidance  
32 Manual and help John with the form.

33  
34 Walters: Will continue to help Luanne on the Guidance Manual and review Board Goals.

35  
36 Koonce: Will work with Colin on seals and with Brian on the SE Regulations.

37  
38 Urfer: Will help with the response to the COA issue with John and an outline for restructuring  
39 the Guidance Manual.

40  
41 Eriksen: Just my committee assignments.

42  
43 Jones: Work on changing the roster.

44  
45 Hanson: Asks for copies of the comments from the public notice of the SE regulation.

46  
47 Jones: Brought a couple copies and provided him with one.

48  
49 **Agenda item 24 – Read Applications into the Record.**

50  
51 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it**



1 **was RESOLVED to APPROVE the following list or applicants for registration by comity,**  
 2 **examination and in additional branches of engineering with the stipulation that the**  
 3 **information in the applicant’s file will take precedence over the information in the**  
 4 **minutes:**

5  
 6 *The following subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*  
 7 *meanings:*

8 ‘FE’: refers to the NCEES Fundamentals of Engineering Examination

9 ‘FS’: refers to the Fundamentals of Surveying Examination

10 ‘PE’: exam’: refers to the NCEES Principals and Practice of Engineering Examination

11 ‘PS’: exam: refers to the NCEES Principals and Practice of Surveying Examination

12 ‘AKLS’: refers to the Alaska Land Surveyors Examination

13 The title of ‘Professional’ is understood to precede the designation of engineer,  
 14 surveyor, or architect.

15 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

16 ‘Arctic course’ denotes a Board-approved arctic engineering course

17

	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Branch</b>	<b>Ex/Com</b>	<b>Board Action</b>	<b>NEEDS:</b>
	Aquino, Todd S.	Electrical	Comity	Approved	
	Blizzard, Joshua	Structural	Comity	Approved	
	Bruno, Matthew	Civil	Comity	Approved	
	Cherney, Shane M.	Fire Protection	Comity	Approved	4 more months RC by FP
	Collier, Linda	Electrical	Comity	Approved	FE Exam - AZ
	Coss, Pablo M.	Environmental	Comity	Approved	
	Dick, Jeff A.	Environmental	Comity	Approved	
	Dreher, Dave	Architect	Exam*	APproved	
	Ely, Darlene A.	Electrical	Comity	Approved	
	Fellows, Arthur	Structural	Comity	Approved	JPQ errors
	Gall, Donald W.	Civil	Comity	Approved	

	Green, Laura Bradbury	Fire Protection	Comity	Approved	
	Horeczy, Grant	Civil	Comity	Approved	
	Kingsley, Steve	Civil	Comity	Approved	
	Kumar, Dinesh	Civil	Comity	Approved	
	Lee, Ronald	Electrical	Comity	Approved	need 1 more reference
	Paszczuk, Pawel	Architect	Comity	Approved	
	Patterson, Aaron L.	Civil	Comity	Approved	invest. Clearance
	Pavelec, Charles T.	Electrical	Comity	Approved	
	Ramo, Leonard	Fire Protection	Comity	Approved	
	Reid, Bret N	Civil	Comity	Approved	
	Ruybal, Stephanie S.	Civil	Comity	Approved	
	Spalding, Ryan C.	Structural	Comity	Approved	
	Taylor, Chad	Structural	Comity	Approved	
	Vaughan, George M.	Electrical	Comity	Approved	
	Wu, Neil P.	Fire Protection	Comity	Approved	
	Zapata, Brian	Structural	Comity	Approved	
	Gilliland, Larry	Mechanical	Comity	Approved	JPQ
	Weir, Gregory M.	Civil	Comity	Approved	
	Bogard, Lee W.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved	
	Barresi, John F.	Mechanical	Comity	CA	FE Exam
	Boualamallah, Fatah	Architect	Comity	CA	JPQ
	Brinjac, David A.	Civil	Comity	CA	Arctic

	Chabot, James A.	Civil	Comity	CA	JPQ
	Cote, Jessica M.	Civil	Comity	CA	FE, JPQ
	Duet, Vincent Paul	Architect	Comity	CA	JPQ, Arctic
	Fandozzi, Andrew	Civil	Comity	CA	Arctic, JPQ
	Fey, Cornel David	Architect	Comity	CA	JPQ
	Garg, Kamal	Electrical	Comity	CA	Arctic, JPQ
	Gilson, Bradley	Civil	Comity	CA	arctic
	Goins, Christopher	Civil	Comity	CA	FE/PE, JPQ
	Jackson, Rhett	Electrical	Comity	CA	Arctic- May
	Kearns, Patrick	Electrical	Comity	CA	JPQ, Arctic
	Keeland, Richard	Civil	Comity	CA	
	Kelley, Bruce M.	Mechanical	Comity	CA	
	Kruse, Ronald	Architect	Comity	CA	JPQ, Arctic
	Langley, William A.	Architect	Comity	CA	Arctic
	Logelin, Molly	Architect	Comity	CA	MONEY
	Maki, Otto W.	Mechanical	Comity	CA	PE, Arctic
	McClellan, Kevin	Mechanical	Comity	CA	FE/PE, Tx, JPQ, Arctic
	Mills, Randall E.	Structural	Comity	CA	FE Exam - FL
	Ojala, David R.	Civil	Comity	CA	
	Ojala, David R.	Structural	Comity	CA	
	Pollard, Bran P	Civil	Comity	CA	JPQ
	Reardon, Kristin Eastman	Civil	Comity	CA	Arctic
	Roberts, Jeffrey G.	Electrical	Comity	CA	JPQ, Arctic

	Roberts, Mark G.	Civil	Comity	CA	FE, PE, Tx
	Smith, David	Land Surveying	Comity	CA	AKLS
	Sverdrup, Eric	Electrical	Comity	CA	JPQ Arctic
	Tindall, Keith	Structural	Comity	CA	references
	Wolfe, James	Electrical	Comity	CA	
	Zahl, Derek B.	Mechanical	Comity	CA	
	Turechek, Wesley T.	Civil	Comity	CA	FE, JPQ, Arctic
	Wilson, Daniel A.	Civil	Comity	CA	JPQ, clearance
	Flynn, Anthony	Mechanical	Comity	CA	money
	Bolen, Wayne A.	Structural	Exam	CA	arctic
	Brown, Stephanie	Landscape Arch.	Exam	CA	
	Crabtree, Steffanie	Control Systems	Exam	CA	Experience from PE
	Ferree, Nick	Civil	Exam	CA	
	Froelich, Eric M.	Architect	Exam	CA	JPQ, Arctic
	Geserick, Matthew C.	Architect	Exam	CA	Arctic, finish IDP, JQ
	Hale, Nathan W.	Architect	Exam	CA	(reapproval)
	Hunting, Aaron Lothaire	Civil	Exam	CA	jPQ
	Keifer, Brianne Rennee	Landscape Arch.	Exam	CA	
	Minnema, Nathan	Electrical	Exam	CA	
	Munisteri, Islin	Petroleum	Exam	CA	More experience
	Popiel, David	Architect	Exam	CA	Arctic proof, JPQ
	Rhodes, Michael	Civil	Exam	CA	More experience
	Roelfs, Eric V.	Civil	Exam	CA	

	Shank, Michael L.	Petroleum	Exam	CA	JPQ
	Stoll, Allyson M.	Mining & Min Proc	Exam	CA	
	Verbeek, Gerrit	Petroleum	Exam	CA	JPQ
	Yanoshek, Andrew	Electrical	Exam	CA	
	Chambers, Lucas	Civil	Exam	CA	FE, JPQ, clearance

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

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

	Martin, Brett	Civil	Comity	CA	Take PE Exam
	Zartman, Greg J.	Civil	Comity	CA	Take PE Exam
	Barrett, Brian John	Land Surveying	Exam	Incomplete	Survey coursework
	Hanson, Brian P.	Civil	Exam	Incomplete	More experience
	Hooker, Joshua M.	Landscape Arch.	Exam	Incomplete	
	Lombardo, James N.	Civil	Exam	Incomplete	Degree
	Meyer, Jennifer Rae	Civil	Exam	Incomplete	Arctic
	Tidd, Brent W	Control Systems	Exam	Incomplete	Need 3 months
	Hickey, Dylan	Land Surveying	Exam	Incomplete	
	Nuss, Stephen	Environmental	Grandfather	Incomplete	
	Faschan, John H	Control Systems	Grandfather	Incomplete	

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

**Agenda item 25 – Calendar of Events**

Chair: We need to confirm our upcoming board meetings. Next one is August 6-7<sup>th</sup>.

Koonce: Asks if the locations can be switched around considering how hard it is to get into Juneau in the winter.

1 Chair: Explains that the Board meets in Juneau at that time because the Legislature is in  
2 session should we have a need to meet with them. He asks if anyone has any problems with  
3 the August meeting.  
4

5 Eriksen: Has a to attend an AEL&P Board meeting in August and doesn't know if the dates will  
6 conflict yet.  
7

8 Chair: November 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> in Anchorage. February 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> in Juneau or 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>.  
9 Colin do you know when the fly-in is?  
10

11 Maynard: They haven't scheduled it. They usually do it the second week of February so the  
12 Legislators are settled in before they hit them. The other reason for us to do the meeting the  
13 second week is NCEES Board Chairs meets the first week. So if it's not a problem the 11<sup>th</sup> and  
14 12<sup>th</sup> would probably be better.  
15

16 Hanson: Suggests to facilitate travel we move the meeting to the middle of the week vs Friday  
17 night when everybody is trying to get out of town. Have it Tuesday/Wednesday or  
18 Wednesday/Thursday.  
19

20 Maynard: Thinks it's a good idea because every Friday during the session there will be  
21 lobbyists and others heads to Anchorage and they're always packed.  
22

23 Jones: So, the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>?  
24

25 Chair: I'm good with that. Then May 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> in Fairbanks.  
26

27 Hackenmiller: Suggests the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> because the western zone is in the middle of the month.  
28

29 Maynard: Suggests switching the Fairbanks and Anchorage meetings this year so we would  
30 have that meeting to finalize plans for the zone meeting.  
31

32 Chair: so for 2016 switch the May and August locations?  
33

34 After discussion it was decided to wait until August or November to make the decision on the  
35 2016 May/August meetings.  
36

37 Chair: We've already talked about the Nation Meeting dates.  
38

39 **Agenda item 26 – Board Member Comments.**  
40

41 Maynard: Good Meeting, a few steps forward, a few steps back. He thinks we are heading in  
42 the right direction. I'll see you in August.  
43

44 Christensen: Last night when we were sitting at the table somebody made the comment that  
45 this has really been a fun group to work with. I agree with that, I think the degree of  
46 professionalism shows in respect to the other people's disciplines. We may have our  
47 differences but we all achieve what we are supposed to and it's a real pleasure serving with you  
48 guys.  
49

50 Hackenmiller: I agree with John thank you all for being so professional and thank you all for  
51 debating with me yesterday, it was nice to be involved in what you guys are thinking.

1  
2 Kerr: Good meeting. Thanks to everybody for contributing and providing good feedback.  
3  
4 Hanson: I think it was a good meeting. We've got a lot of changes coming up a lot of changes  
5 have been made recently. Congratulations to our Chair for making it through a couple more  
6 months. This will be your last Fairbanks meeting.....  
7  
8 Chair: Yes it will, you guys can meet whenever and wherever you want to. (Laughter)  
9  
10 Hanson: I appreciate all your efforts as Chair and Vern and Sarena as well, it takes a lot to put  
11 these meetings together both at the meeting and preparing for them so thanks to the staff.  
12  
13 Hale: Glad to be here as usual and thanks to everybody for their work.  
14  
15 Walters: A lot going on this meeting and thank you Richard for directing us.  
16  
17 Koonce: I really appreciate being on this Board. It's always been a goal of mine to give back so  
18 this is a great venue to reach out and dig into licensure, and the reason why things go the way  
19 they go it's pretty informative. I appreciate Sarena's and Vern's efforts making things go  
20 smoothly and appreciate you being the Chair, Richard and all your wisdom.  
21  
22 Urfer: I don't get out too often. (Unintelligible)  
23  
24 Eriksen: Good meeting. I enjoyed all the discussions we had. He complements Sarena on the  
25 way the files are put together he sees that a lot work goes into it.  
26  
27 Jones: To be honest with you I was dreading this meeting. But it went a whole lot smoother  
28 than I thought it would. And I think we did the right things, you did the right things. Good  
29 meeting, good job.  
30  
31 Chair: It's been an honor serving as the Chair of this Board. When I came on this Board there  
32 were excellent members on it, I think Bo was Chair. So in the roll as Chair you have all those  
33 that came before you and you want to try to do as good a job as they did or better if you  
34 can.....you succeeded.....And Brian and Eric it's nice to have past Chairs on the Board for their  
35 experience. This Board has always conducted it's self in a very professional manner from the  
36 first Board meeting that I attended and knew that it was a well-run Board. I've served on AIA  
37 committees and others and I find that this is one of the most effective, most well run boards or  
38 committees that I've ever served on. So I enjoy everybody on the board and our different  
39 opinions and I also really like the fact that we can have assertive discussion about the issues  
40 and at the end of the day we're all friends and nothing personal just trying to do what's best for  
41 the registrants and the State. So with that, thanks Sarena for all your hard work. The  
42 application process is getting better all the time and easier for us to review. And I think in the  
43 process it'll make it better for the applicants themselves. And Vern thank you, I also was  
44 dreading this meeting. (laughter) I knew that there had to be some unplesantries that had to  
45 occur. In the end I think the system's working even though we had to, like Colin said, take a few  
46 steps backward. Everything is above board and we're following the process, we'll see where it  
47 takes us and I just appreciate everybody's effort. So thank you.  
48  
49 Jones: As far as your comment on professionalism, this Board has that reputation within the  
50 Division. It's considered one of the best Boards.  
51

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



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

Respectfully submitted:

---

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

---

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

Date: \_\_\_\_\_