

1 **These draft minutes were prepared by the staff of the Division of Corporations,**
2 **Business and Professional Licensing. They have not been reviewed or approved**
3 **by the Board.**

4
5
6 **STATE OF ALASKA**

7
8 **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**
9 **DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING**
10 **BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS & LAND**
11 **SURVEYORS**

12
13 **Minutes of Meeting**
14 **November 5-6, 2015**

15
16 By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, the
17 Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors held a meeting May 7-8,
18 2015 in Fairbanks, AK.

19
20 **Thursday November 5, 2015**

21
22 **Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Roll Call**

23
24 9:00 a.m. The Chair called the meeting to order. Roll call, all present except Luanne Urfer who
25 was excused by the Chair. She will be late.

26
27 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board:

- 28
29 • Colin Maynard, Civil Engineer, Structural Engineer, Chair
30 • Keith Walters, Mining Engineer, vice-Chair
31 • Kathleen Schedler, Mechanical Engineer, Secretary
32 • Brian Hanson, Civil Engineer, Mining Engineer
33 • Eric Eriksen, Electrical Engineer
34 • Richard Rearick, Architect
35 • Jeffrey Koonce, Architect
36 • John Kerr, Land Surveyor
37 • Dave Hale, Land Surveyor
38 • Donald (John) Christensen, Public Member
39

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

- 41
42 • Martha Hewlett, Administrative Officer II (Via Telephone)
43 • Sara Chambers, Operations Manager (via Telephone)
44 • Janey Hovenden, Director CBPL (Via Telephone)
45 • Angela Birt, Chief Investigator
46 • Alvin Kennedy, Investigator
47 • John Savage Investigator
48 • Vernon Jones, Executive Administrator.
49 • Sarena Hackenmiller, Licensing Examiner.

1
2 Members of the Public present for portions of the meeting:

3
4 August 6th

- 5 • Daniel R. Moran, representing himself
- 6 • Albert Swank, representing himself
- 7 • Peter Giessel, representing himself
- 8 • Anson Moxness, representing himself
- 9 • Richard Conneen, representing himself (via phone)
- 10 • Alfred Mangus, representing himself (via phone)
- 11 • Chris Miller, representing Design Alaska (via phone)

12
13 **Agenda item 2 - review and approve agenda.**

14 Chair: Asks if there are any additions to the agenda?

15 Note: Jones passed our several additions prior to the meeting including an updated copy of the
16 agenda.

17 Rearick: Wants to talk about the corporate licensing issue.

18 Chair: Put it under new business, call it corporate authorization.

19
20
21
22
23 **On a motion duly made by Eriksen, and passed unanimously it was RESOLVED to accept
24 the agenda as amended.**

25
26
27 **Agenda item 3 - ethics reporting.**

28 Chair – Attended the NCEES Annual Meeting as a funded delegate. He will fill out a report form
29 and submit it. He is also involved with the Structural Engineers of Alaska so during the
30 discussion of the regulations changes he will answer questions of fact but will not be voting or
31 participating in the discussion.

32 Hanson: Was at the NCEES Annual Meeting funded by NCEES as an officer of Western Zone.

33 Kerr: Was a funded delegate at the NCEES Annual meeting.

34 Note: Funded delegates and officers are provided travel and lodging by NCEES.

35
36
37
38
39 **Agenda item 4 – review and approve the May 2015 minutes.**

40 Chair: Asks if everyone read the minutes and if there are any changes.

41
42
43
44 **On a motion duly made by Christensen, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it
45 was RESOLVED to approve the August 2015 minutes as submitted.**

46
47 **Agenda item 6 – Regulation update.**

48 The Board discussed the pending regulations. It was asked why some were combined. Jones
49 explained that it was to save money in the public notice process.
50

1
2 Chair: Explains that we will take oral comment on the changes out for public notice at 1:15. If
3 you want to comment you have to be signed up by then. He adds that we will again take oral
4 comment at the February meeting but the written comment deadline is January 12th at 4:30p.m.

5
6 It was determined that any time limit on comments would be established once the number of
7 commenters was known.

8
9 **Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report.**

10
11 John Savage: Presented the Investigative Report. He noted that he had invited Diana Parks
12 and Lloyd Nakano from the Fire Marshall's Office and emphasized how much of an asset our
13 relationship with them is. He was expecting them around 9:30 however due to unforeseen
14 circumstances they were unable to attend. He then introduced his supervisor Investigator Alvin
15 Kennedy to the Board. Senior Investigator Kennedy addressed the board, distributed his
16 business card praised John's work and offered his assistance when and if needed. John
17 thanked all for their help when he calls them.

18
19 **Agenda item 9 – Board Correspondence received since August 2015.**

20
21 The Chair skipped CLARB since Urfer had not arrived yet.

22
23 Rearick and Koonce: Reported on the correspondence received from NCARB. There was a
24 short discussion on the Integrated Path to Licensure where several colleges will be setting up a
25 program that would make allow students to become licensed upon graduation. The program
26 would probably include some work with a firm and would take longer than five years but he
27 doesn't know how long at this time. He doesn't think there will be a lot of students taking this
28 route because it will only be offered by a few select schools and would require a highly
29 motivated individual.

30
31 He explained the changes in the IDP program and the move to get rid of the term "Intern" which
32 resulted in a short discussion.

33
34 There was a short discussion on the NC Dental Board issue. Jones added that it wasn't likely to
35 affect this Board because all members are appointed by the Governor and all regulatory actions
36 are reviewed by law twice.

37
38 Hanson and Maynard: Reported on the discussion at the Annual conference concerning
39 changes to the Model law re structural engineering. Hanson noted that our Board voted in favor
40 of the change.

41
42 NCEES will be presenting a surveying award to a university pretty much the same as they do
43 the engineering award.

44
45 The PE exams will start going to CBT in 2018. They won't all go at once, he thinks chemical
46 and nuclear will be first and they will migrate three exams a year after that. Disciplines that
47 have multiple exams like civil, electrical and mechanical will all go at once, for example all the
48 civil exams will go to CBT at the same time etc.

49
50 The Board then moved through all the emails/letters received and assigned action as
51 necessary.

1
2 Emily Winfield requested a waiver of the FE exam because she graduated from a Canadian
3 University. This was disapproved because she is not license in a province or territory of
4 Canada as stipulated in the regulation.

5
6 Board Members whose first term expires next year are reminded to reapply if they want a
7 second term.

8
9 Re KEE Construction/KPB permit requirements: It was noted that jurisdictions can make their
10 requirements more stringent than the State requirements but not less stringent.

11
12 Re Daniel Moran FE/PE requirements: The Board provided him with options to meet the
13 requirements. He could have his education evaluated to see if he could qualify for a BSCE or if
14 what he has is equivalent to a BSCE.

15
16 Re request for exemption to use engineering in the company name: Since this company has
17 been in business using this name for many years and they do not offer engineering. They
18 develop websites for engineering companies. So as long as they remove the secondary NIACS
19 code for engineering from their business license and as long as it is plain in their advertising
20 they do not offer engineering they may retain their name. Discussion revealed that the
21 Supreme Court had ruled that the term "engineer" is in the public domain and as long as they
22 are not offering engineering services we can't keep them from using it.

23
24 Re structural experience needed to take the SE exam: Currently any structural experience will
25 be accepted. If the new regulation takes effect then experience would have to be in significant
26 structures because other structural could be done as a civil engineer.

27
28 Re Retention of originals: The question is if the original was scanned and retained electronically
29 would that meet the requirement. There was a lengthy discussion on this issue. The Statute of
30 Repose is 10 years. Current regulations require retention of a stamped and signed original. It
31 was decided that the length of time would be up to the company.

32
33 10:15 – 10:25 Break

34
35 **Agenda item 10 – Correspondence sent since August 2015**

36
37 Maynard sent an email to Kurt Olsen and asked him to sponsor a bill to make the landscape
38 architect a permanent voting seat. He said he would.

39
40 There was a discussion on the board title. On the Regulations booklet distributed this meeting
41 the title on the book was Architects, Engineers, Land Surveyors and Landscape Architects. The
42 Board felt this was wrong and asked Jones to check into it.

43
44 They discussed the mix up in who was assigned to which seat.

45
46 Maynard sent an email to Sen. McGuire and Rep. Colver re the FE/FS regulations. The Board
47 position is to repeal the regulations requiring applying for the FE and FS exams and just require
48 that applicants verify that they have passed the fundamentals exam when they apply for the
49 professional exam.

50
51 **Agenda item 11 – Old Business**

1
2 Sarena give an update on plans for the Western Zone meeting in Anchorage next year.
3
4 Sara Chambers called for the Financial Report.
5
6 **Agenda item 7 – Financial Report.**
7
8 10:39 – Urfer arrived.
9
10 On the phone were Sara Chambers, Janey Hovenden and Martha Hewlett.
11
12 Martha Hewlett: Gives the Financial Report. She emphasizes how important it is to make sure
13 we get third party reimbursements when available. The Legislature allows up to \$20K to be
14 returned to the Boards.
15
16 She went through the end of year report line by line explaining what was included in each.
17
18 Chair: Asks about any excess over \$20K in third party reimbursements.
19
20 Hewlett: Responds that anything over \$20K goes into the General Fund. She again
21 emphasizes how important it is to get all third party reimbursements because the more that is
22 reflected in accounting the more likely the Legislature is to increase the amount allow to be
23 returned to the Boards.
24
25 She explains how the salaries of the front desk staff are allocated to the Boards by the number
26 of transactions they perform for each program and that it would be less in non-renewal years
27 and more in a renewal year.
28
29 Chambers: Explains the new online renewal system and how it should reduce the number of
30 transactions performed by the front desk staff.
31
32 Kerr: Asks what changed between FY13 and FY14 that reduced the indirect costs.
33
34 Hewlett: Explains that they reviewed and changed the methodology for allocation of indirect
35 costs.
36
37 Chambers: Advises that the FY15 report will be updated and sent out to Board Members soon.
38 She gives Martha credit for the change of methodology of allocating the costs to the programs.
39
40 The Chair thanks them for their time and report. Call ended.
41
42 He calls on Luanne Urfer to report on CLARB correspondence.
43
44 She gave a short report on some changes CLARB discussed at the Annual Meeting.
45
46 Chair returns to item 11 A. Western Zone meeting.
47
48 Hackenmiller, Hanson and Maynard: Report on planning to date. She notes that NCEES has
49 provided \$15K of funding. She advises that the Fairbanks Visitors Bureau will be donating item
50 for the gift packages.
51

1 Chair: item 11 b. Chair opts to remove decoupling from future agendas.

2
3 Hackenmiller reports that several applicants will be taking the exam in California because they
4 can take it with less experience then will be applying in Alaska once they meet our
5 requirements.

6
7 Item 11 c. Chair will send a letter to the various schools to get up to date syllabuses for the
8 courses.

9
10 Item 11 d. Jones reports on a query of other board re moving state specific surveying exams to
11 CBT. He advises that Procurement is in discussions with providers to see what is available for
12 us to move to CBT for the AKLS.

13
14 Hanson: Reports that NCEES is discussing how CBT for State specific exam for small numbers
15 of applicants could be done. He feels that they will be able to provide the best information on
16 this.

17
18 The conversation continued for a short period. It was asked how we would provide reference
19 materials. Hanson explained how the test centers operate and that all reference materials have
20 to be provided electronically. Jones indicated that the main reason for pursuing CBT for the
21 AKLS is cost savings. Jones will ask Sara Chambers to address this subject during the
22 February meeting since she has been through developing an exam from scratch for another
23 Board.

24
25 There was more discussion on the retention of documents and the Statute of Repose with no
26 new info.

27
28 **Agenda item 17 – New Business.**

29
30 There was discussion on item a. regarding Board policy on the use of titles for interns and
31 EIT's/LSIT's.

32
33 Some Board members felt that the policy should remain as is. Some felt that it should be
34 removed if we can't regulate interns it shouldn't be in our policy document. Some states license
35 EIT's and LSIT's but when we tried to establish a numbered certificate for them the Legislature
36 stepped in and advised that the Board has no Statutory authority to regulate trainees. Rearick
37 moved to remove the policy and a lively discussion followed.

38
39 **A motion duly made by Rearick to remove Policies and Historical Information 11 under**
40 **General Board Policies, g. Titles for Interns. Motion failed.**

41
42 11:57 Break for Lunch. Off record

43
44 1:15 p.m. On record, roll call all present.

45
46 **Agenda item 13 – Public Comment**

47
48 Note: The Board will take oral comment on the regulation project presently out for public notice.

49
50 Alfred Mangus: (via phone) thank you Mr. Chair. My name is Alfred Mangus I first got licensed
51 in Alaska as a civil engineer in 1981. My primary concern on the revisions that are proposed for

1 adding the structural engineer's license are mainly the grandfathering clause. I started my
2 career after receiving my Master's Degree in Structural Engineering. One of my concerns is
3 that there doesn't seem to be any credit in the grandfathering clause for people with advanced
4 education in structural engineering such as a Master of Science degree in civil engineering from
5 a famous university and structural engineering which I have and people which have additional
6 experience in structural engineering such as a Doctorate degree is really not included in the
7 grandfathering clause. (he asks if this is interactive or do we just want him to make a statement.
8 Chair responds just make a statement) Another thing in terms of the way an engineer develops
9 their career and an architect, and we have an architect waiting to testify, is the mentoring
10 process. My mentors were people designing complex structures in Alaska at the time so I was
11 mentored coming from famous structural engineering professors to working by practicing
12 engineers, civil engineers, which was the only license at the time in Anchorage Alaska on
13 different types of complicated structures. So I did structural engineering work for my entire
14 career, however, in the provisions they say that only people who are doing design calculations
15 in the last 10 years, 120 months, are eligible to be grandfathered. That would eliminate me from
16 receiving grandfathering of a structural license in the State of Alaska. I don't feel that that is in
17 the best interest of the tax payers, or the general public or the Board. So that's my main
18 concern about this document that was sent to me. I'm a government engineer currently. A lot
19 of government engineers do independent peer review of a designers structural, if they're doing a
20 structural peer review with a Building department or a bridge owner such as the Department of
21 Transportation or other agency that owns bridges whether it be an oil company or whatever.
22 They don't really do design calculations per se they look at what the consulting design
23 organization does and make comments. So that's primarily what I've done for the last 12 years
24 so if you take the literal written proposed text I would be ineligible to be a structural engineer in
25 Alaska even though I've designed structures for 9 years in Alaska, I've designed structures
26 located in Washington state, Arizona state and also the State of California. So none of those
27 provisions even though I'm 62 years old, have broad and extensive experience, I've written two
28 bestselling chapters in structural engineering text books. One was on timber engineering, the
29 Wood Engineering Construction Handbook book that was published with three additions on
30 timber foundations including some projects in Alaska and then very complicated, specialized
31 type of steel bridge system called the Orthotropic Steel Deck Bridge System. The most famous
32 bridge using that system is the Yukon River Bridge, across the Yukon River in Alaska designed
33 by one of my employers, one of my mentors, that carries a pipeline. So feel like the way this
34 provision is written it's taking away future career opportunities from me the way it's written by
35 the Legislature with the assumption that only things done in last 10 years have any value or
36 importance. So I've sent a list of 12 questions to Jun, I don't think I'll read through those unless
37 you want me to but one that is kind of better written of these 10 questions is, if structures were
38 designed by somebody like myself thirty years ago and they were built and still standing and
39 functioning why, and I did the calculations, why wouldn't this be considered valid structural
40 design calculation experience? I've designed structures for 10, 15, 20 years, I don't know what
41 the clock time is of actually doing design calculations for my career and those structures are still
42 standing in Alaska, still working, why wouldn't that be valid grandfathering experience? The
43 way the law is written it said anything, only things with design calculations for the last 10 years.
44 Now one of the things that has happened is that more and more computer software is being
45 used to design structures. So one of my jobs with my government employer is to verify, we
46 think that the design was done and that a true independent check was done. The true
47 independent checker is supposed to do their own computer calculations but because a machine
48 prints out pages, you don't know if it's the same file with a different name at the top or different
49 calculations. So that's, I feel, a very difficult practical solution for the Board to determine who
50 actually did those computer calculations. When I started my career we didn't really have
51 personnel computers we had to go to a mainframe IBM 360 that was in Seattle via phone

1 modem and then if we wanted a plot of the structure we had to go up to the Boeing Office in
2 Anchorage. So some of my original calculations, some of which I have, because most of the
3 files belong to employers or were thrown away, they were hand calculations I did win a
4 nationally recognized welding award and I do have the hand calculations for that award. So,
5 those are my practical concerns about the thing, am I treated fairly in the review process by the
6 Board and grandfathering other people that, you know, if you're looking a reams of computer
7 calculations how do you know who actually did those? So those are my concerns. I don't know
8 if the Board wants to ask me any questions while I'm on the phone and have a dialog or am I
9 just to give a statement.

10
11 Chair: Just give a statement.

12
13 So that's my concern, I don't feel that, um, I feel that I'm being grandfathered out. I don't know
14 why there's this massive fee of being charged for work that I'm already legally allowed to do in
15 the State of Alaska. So my main concerns, 99% are the grandfathering rule and the
16 grandfathering process. Most owners and agencies around the country decide who they want
17 to do their work and usually they want an expert who's done similar projects. And they have the
18 right to require, if it's licensing, if they want a structural license to design a small building and
19 they own the small building then they can require that. I appreciate the opportunity to express
20 my concerns but I don't think that the grandfathering technic, I'm not sure that's been used by
21 other people or other agencies, I should say. They usually use the amount of experience, I
22 know that when they created the geotechnical title in the State of California you had to have 10
23 years of geotechnical experience to get the geotechnical license in the State of California, so, as
24 it's written I don't think I'd be allowed to be grandfathered even though I may have a lot more
25 experience than someone younger than myself who, you know 30 years old and has 10 years
26 design experience would get by.

27
28 Chair: Thank you.

29
30 Danial Moran: Well I'm here, a little bit off subject, I'm applying for the FE. I don't know if you
31 want me to sit here or standup, it feels kind of funny standing, I think I'll sit down. I'm applying
32 to take the FE exam and I know the requirements are a certain amount of ABET education. I do
33 have some of that although I don't meet the current standards. I started college in 1999 working
34 under various civil engineers for 12 years in the State of Alaska now. I know I missed the
35 deadline but I've got an educational equivalent. I would like for the Board to take a look at my
36 packet and at least give me a recommendation on what I might need to get in there. I've got an
37 education that is equivalent to a Bachelor's degree. He asks to submit some supplemental
38 information to his file. He offers to answer questions if the Board wants to ask any.

39
40 Peter Giessel: Hi, my name is Peter Giessel spelled golf, india, echo, sierra, sierra, echo, lima.
41 My comments are twofold. The first is about the grandfathering clause of the structural
42 engineering license. My concern is that it penalizes the people who just barely miss the
43 deadline by requiring additional work experience before they can sit for the SE exam whereas
44 people who just barely make the deadline can be grandfathered. I don't feel that this is right. I
45 think that the people that are applying for grandfathering should have the same experience
46 requirements as the people taking the exam. So I would urge you to include the new sub-
47 section, requirements, a. to the requirements for grandfathering that they also have to meet the
48 experience requirements of 12 AAC 36.063 (k) to grandfather. There has been a lot of talk in
49 the board minutes, at least, about how our SE licensure is similar to Washington. I would like to
50 point out that Washington did not allow any grandfathering what so ever, zero, none. You could
51 never call yourself an SE unless you passed the 16 hour SE exam. The second comment I

1 have is about a discussion that happened a couple years back, a discussion about the Seismic
2 Commission and possibly an additional seismic test for civil engineers to take to become
3 licensed. My comments on that was that I took the civil structural PE exam. I did not have a
4 copy of the International Building Codes or ASCE 7 and was able to pass the very limited
5 seismic portion of the civil structural exam without any of the codes about seismic. So the civil
6 structural, not the 16 hour structural exam, the 8 hour civil structural does not touch on seismic
7 anymore. It's extremely weak on seismic. I would suggest that the current exam may be
8 significantly less rigorous than maybe some members remember their own exam. So I put that
9 out there, thank you.

10
11 Anson Moxness: Mr. Moxness is applying for the PE exam and his employer, Lars Spurkland,
12 passed away suddenly last year and he is asking if James Crewdson who is a plan reviewer for
13 the muni was to certify that he did the design work on projects submitted by Spurkland
14 Engineering if the Board would accept that.

15
16 Richard Conneen: Mr. Conneen is requesting an exemption from the continuing education
17 requirement for this renewal. His children have some special education requirements and he
18 had to move to Texas and open another office to accommodate that. He kept his Juneau office
19 open at the same time and is asking to be exempted from the CE requirement because of the
20 time it takes to get a new office operational, the travel involved with keeping his Juneau office
21 open and stress of his situation.

22
23 Mr. Swank: He advises everyone to speak up if they have questions as he has approximately a
24 40% hearing loss. My name is Albert Swank, PE, I'm a registered civil and mechanical in this
25 State as well as Washington. I've been practicing for 40 years now in this State and elsewhere.
26 Quickly make it short and simple, I have offices here, I've had offices in Vancouver B.C. and
27 offices in Washington State. I managed one of the largest structural engineering firms in
28 Canada. (unintelligible) staff of 100 structures from 0 to 40 stories, bridges across the Columbia,
29 I could go on and on. I'm intimately familiar with the practice both out of state, in state etc. My
30 firm, my particular firm I chose to become a sole practitioner about 10 years ago. Therefore I
31 have no other engineers on my staff etc. I travel around as necessary between here and
32 Washington, around the United State on projects. So in reference to my main focus is going to
33 be again in reference to the grandfathering issue, the grandfathering clause, and the way you
34 have worded it, the review criteria for this Board, the way it is worded etc. and there are major
35 problems with it as far as I'm concerned. I'm going to quickly point out, right now, that I'm, and
36 I'll just state it, I'm highly experienced within the legal realm within this profession. I'm an expert
37 in engineering in many areas in both, massive cases from a technical point of view, from a legal
38 point of view from an ethics point of view etc. This State when they broke out the surveying
39 license from the civil set a precedent legally. They grandfathered all surveyors at that point in
40 time, that's a very critical element, and that grandfathering, without any additional testing, etc.
41 occurred and happened. Now, back to this issue, I understand that you can't stop time. This
42 state has grown dramatically in my career and my career has started again from 100% manual
43 as far as pre-computer to, as we sit today, the opposite spectrum. And I have very definite
44 opinions on that point. I'm highly involved in the computer, we'll say computer field analysis etc.
45 way beyond anything in structural. This deals in very high end mechanical physics codes I
46 could go on and on and on. Now, the engineers coming up now and SE's applying have, as
47 many of us know, have dramatic shortcomings. They do not have any practical experience.
48 We've had some testimony previously, as one of your first testimonies, dealing with an
49 individual that basically brought that up. There is nothing that substitutes for experience.
50 Education and schooling, University education and schooling is the beginning of the process it
51 does not create an engineer at all. Now, back to the grandfathering issue. The rules and you're

1 also aware that previously when the Board addressed this issue, I had very major concerns over
2 it because of conflicts of interest and I pointed that out. I contacted the AG's Office, I contacted
3 the Director of Boards, the Governor, everybody. I brought it all to a head etc. I'm hoping that
4 this can be done in a very professional way. I've also had one prior experience with the Board
5 on similar conflicts of interest. And I will state what amazes me, I'm going to back to this, what
6 amazes me is having my own Board, the Board of Architects and Engineers who enforce and
7 create our continuing education where one of the primary areas is in ethics does not understand
8 the conflicts of interest law in their own profession. I'll leave that alone right at that point. Now
9 back to the grandfathering. You are going to have defined testing procedures for the SE license.
10 They are going to be defined by both the National Organization as well as this Board what those
11 requirements will be. In reference to the grandfather clause here you have stated again a 10
12 year requirement, submit a couple of projects etc. some references. You have not however
13 defined, legally defined what that review process will be. What that acceptance process will be
14 by the administration of this Board. You can't have it both ways. You can't un-define legally
15 one thing and define legally the other thing. It doesn't work in a court of law. Now, on that
16 point, however, you can define it and I'll quickly point out a couple of things. People who have
17 turned in to this administration, Board administration, for specialty licenses in other areas have
18 already documented totally inconsistencies, some have been approved, some haven't. No
19 justification or reason being given for the ones that weren't approved. You already have this
20 problem, it's going to grow and it needs to be addressed and if it needs to come to a head on
21 this one then I guess we will with the SE license. So it needs to be addressed. Now, back to,
22 again, my point, I have nobody that can sign for me. I have no other professional staff. Now am
23 I just going to walk around this city with people that know me etc. and say please sign? It
24 doesn't work that way and in actuality it's not ethical, my point. The tenure, I've already stated
25 the issue of you set a precedent from the grandfather previously, now you're doing this. I have
26 to cover one thing quickly so I have to back up. What is the real need for this? And I've
27 touched on this, well I've not touched on the need but I've touched on the reason. Is this going
28 to improve the economics of this State? No. Is there a public life safety issue? No. There is no
29 need in reality. Can we stop it, and for all probability, no. Because simply as each state has
30 developed, it's developed, it's happened, how has it happened though? We need to be very
31 careful on that ethical issue as well. It happened by National Societies lobbying our
32 administration and it's all based on money and income to certain groups, certain people and that
33 was also the action of this very Board previously on this very issue. They way it was written and
34 the scope it was written would have removed 80 to 90% of the income of civil engineers
35 practicing in this area and sluffed it over to a few structural firms that specialize. Sorry, that's
36 ethical I hate to tell you and on and on. Now, the whole grandfather issue has to be looked at
37 very carefully. And, again, the primary function of this Board is protection of public life safety
38 and the people and the economic impacts. It doesn't matter what you do either way, it's not
39 going to change. If you didn't do anything today, it wouldn't change. If we do, do it, it wouldn't
40 change unless you can start producing the cases that have been before you on non-
41 performance, technically, non-performance or whatever, incompetence etc. And you can't, you
42 can't justify anything else so grandfathering needs to be looked at very carefully. It needs to be
43 looked at on how you're going to review it. It needs to be defined legally. In reality just be given,
44 you pick the date and just do it or you don't do this. I doubt whether we can stop not doing this.
45 So you need to be able to define what that review criteria will be and you need to define how
46 those references for cases like my own because, again, they don't exist. And also, one of the
47 last things I'm going to talk about then I'll stop is that after 40 years I can walk into any project,
48 anything, it doesn't matter what it is, any type of structural facility it is and I'm sure Colin can do
49 it too. You can literally visually review and pretty much see where the problems are or they
50 aren't. Can a kid coming out of school do that? No. That would come with experience. It only
51 comes with being to concept the magnitude of forces etc. what type of structure it is, on and on

1 and on. The experience is a huge issue in that grandfathering. Also if you take a look in the
2 regulations there was, I believe, I don't know if it still exists but there used to be the requirement
3 of 20 years of experience would allow somebody to not go through the, I forget how it was
4 worded but anyhow the EIT. You're automatically waived to go ahead and take you're EIT and
5 then in turn progress. I don't know if that still exists or not but anyway that also is a similar
6 point. So, all the issues involved in the grandfathering are my primary concern. That and the
7 ethical issues and the conflict of interest issues and I hope it all gets resolved appropriately,
8 professionally and ethically. Anybody have any questions?
9

10 Chair: Thank you. I don't see any other people to testify so.....

11 Hackenmiller: Chris did you want to testify or just listen?

12 Mr. Miller: I'll just listen. I'll be back, ready in the next month.

13 Hackenmiller: Ok we are going to close public comment and go into executive session.

14
15
16
17
18 **On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it was**
19 **RESOLVED to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(3) to review**
20 **applicant files.**

21
22 2:05p.m. Off Record. Staff (Hackenmiller and Jones) remained in the room

23
24 3:07 p.m. Recessed for the day.

25
26
27 **Friday November 6, 2015**

28
29 9:00a.m. On Record, Roll Call, all present except John Kerr.

30
31 Chair: The first order of business is to address the waiver of CEU's.

32
33 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Christensen it was resolved to allow**
34 **Richard Conneen Architect #9527 a 90 day extension to complete CUE's for the current**
35 **renewal period.**

36
37 9:09 Kerr arrived.

38
39 After a lengthy discussion with offering an amendment to cut the number required of him in half
40 for this period and arguments to just grant the exemption as requested it was decided that the
41 extension would give him plenty of time, almost 150 days, to meet the requirements without
42 putting pressure on him. Richard Rearick withdrew his amendment.

43
44 Motion passed with Schedler abstaining.

45
46 Item 17 b. Corporate Authorization.

47
48 Discussion centered on whether the individual signing the drawings had to be the corporations
49 designated responsible charge or whether or not anyone working under the responsible charge

1 could sign drawings. The result was that registrants working under the responsible charge could
2 sign and take responsibility but the responsible charge is responsible as well and should be
3 reviewing their work.

4
5 **Agenda item 18 – Special Committees.**
6

7 Licensure Implementation: In answer to a question regarding experience for the SE exam
8 it was decided that any experience would suffice currently but if the regulations change is
9 adopted then experience would have to be in significant structures.

10
11 Registration and Practice: Rearick recaps the discussion yesterday regarding whether or
12 not an electronic copy could be retained as the original. This instigated additional discussion on
13 the subject. And again after argument, for and against, it was determined that the original
14 document with original signature should be retained and that an original document with an
15 electronic signature must have software to remove the signature if the document is altered. The
16 length of retention is up to the company.

17
18 Licensure Mobility: There was some discussion on the CE regulations where it says if
19 you meet your home state requirements you meet ours.

20
21 Investigative Advisory: No report
22

23 Guidance Manual: Luanne reported that aside from the introductory section she didn't
24 change anything. That will be on the next go around. The Board was fine with the edits to date
25 and will provide input for content next meeting.

26
27 Legislative Liaison: Two issues, one is making the landscape architect seat a permanent
28 voting seat. That bill will be introduced by the House Commerce Committee. The other is to get
29 language to Sen. McGuire and Rep. Colver regarding the FE/FS issue.

30
31 Emeritus Status: Nothing new.
32

33 Budget Committee: Nothing to report.
34

35 Continuing Education: Audit is coming up with the renewal this December. Letters will
36 go out in February. On-line renewal will stay up until 9/30/17.

37
38 IDP Liaison: NCARB is changing the name. Not sure what it will be called.
39

40 **Agenda item 19 – Board Travel.**
41

42 NCEES MBE exchange on February 6, 2016 in Atlanta GA. Jones will not attend due to
43 the fact that it was not in the Annual Report and it's only one day and requires travel all the way
44 across the country and there is no way to get back without overnighting in Seattle. Brian has
45 EPE in January and Colin has UPLG in January.
46

1 **Agenda Item 20 – National Meeting Reports.**

2
3 NCEES Annual: Brian reported that structural engineering failed by one vote after much
4 discussion and a call for the question. He felt that everyone was just tired of discussion it and
5 that the language will be fine-tuned and it will be presented again. Kerr reported on the
6 surveying motions. Funding was approved for national award to a surveying program. Brian
7 and Colin reported on a group of young professionals that attended the meeting. NCEES is
8 working on ways to get younger engineers and surveyors to pursue licensure.

9
10 CLARB Annual: Luanne reported on the Annual meeting in New Orleans. Vern
11 reported on the MBE portion of the meeting.

12
13 **Agenda item 22 – Licensing Examiner Report.**

14
15 No report this meeting.

16
17 **Agenda item 23 – Board Tasks (To do List)**

18
19 Chair – respond to 9 c 2, 9 h, and send letter to the university requesting syllabus of the
20 arctic courses and professor bios. Provide language for the bill on the landscape architect seat.
21 Follow up with Sen. McGuire and Rep. Colver re the FE/FS issue.

22
23 Jones – respond to 9 e, 9 k, 9 l, and 9 m.

24
25 **Agenda item 24 – Read Applications into the Record.**

26
27 **On a motion duly made by Walters, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it was**
28 **RESOLVED to APPROVE the following list or applicants for registration by comity,**
29 **examination and in additional branches of engineering with the stipulation that the**
30 **information in the applicant’s file will take precedence over the information in the**
31 **minutes:**

32
33 *The following subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*
34 *meanings:*

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

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

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

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

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

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

42 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

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

2

BARRETT, STEVEN	Approved	
BEATTIE, KYLE C.	APPROVED	
CHARRON, NANCY	APPROVED	
COOK, ROBERT	APPROVED	
ECKHART, NICHOLAS	approved	
FRAZIER, ANDREW M.	Approved	
HANSON, BRIAN	APPROVED	
SAUNDERS, SAMUEL	APPROVED	
STAHLEY, PETER A.	APPROVED	
USKOSKI, VALERIE	APPROVED	
WILLIAMS, MARK	Approved	
BEGLEY, JAMES P.	CA	
BHATTACHARYA, JOY	CA	
CARTER, GARRETT	CA	
CARTER, GARRETT	CA	
DAVISSON, ADAM	CA	
DEHLE, BRAD M.	CA	
FALKE, CHRISTOPH	CA	
GERHART, TODD	CA	
GORSLINE, GABRIEL	CA	
HATFIELD, ALAN D.	CA	
HOSIER, MYRON	CA	
HUI, ANTHONY K.	CA	
JOHANSSON, KARL	CA	
KARCHERE, BRENDAN J.	CA	
KENT, RANDY	CA	
KOZAK, MICHAELLA	CA	
LALLY, JOHN	CA	JPQ
LISKA, CHRISTOPHER	CA	
LONG, LINYI	CA	
MOLL, MICHAEL	CA	
MOOSE, JESSE	CA	
MORSE, AARON	CA	
NUHFER, MICHAEL A.	CA	
OBERST, DOUGLAS P.	CA	
OETTLE, NICOLAS	CA	
PARANJPYE, NARANJAN	CA	
PHAN, VU T.	CA	
PLAYER, BRIAN K	CA	

REED, KRISTOPHER	CA
RIDER, JEFFREY M.	CA
SAETTONE, JOSE MIGUEL	CA
SCARBOROUGH, JOSEPH	CA
SCHROEDER, MARK	CA
SEELBACH, JOHN	CA
SHARAF, ASHRAF FATHY	CA
SMITH, DAVID MILLS	CA
SNYDER, DANIELLE	CA
STREHLER, JENNIFER L.	CA
SWEET, KENNETH J.	CA
WALES, JAMES	ca
WEISIGER, JEFFREY D.	CA
WIDMER, KIMRA	CA
WILCOX, GARTH	CA
WILLIAMSON, KERI	CA
WILLIAR, CHARISSA	CA
BOLTZ, James	CA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

On a motion duly made by Walters, seconded by Eriksen 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.

WELL, WILLIAM	INCOMPLETE
BROWN, AARON	incomplete

8

Agenda item 25 – Calendar of Events

9

Board meetings:

- February 10-11, 2016 in Juneau (Oral testimony on the SE regulations on the 10th at 1:15p.m.)
- May 5-6, 2016 in Fairbanks
- August 4-5, 2016 in Anchorage
- November 3-4, 2016 in Anchorage

10

National Meetings:

- NCARB Regional March 10-12, 2016 in Savannah GA.
(Koonce, Jones)
- NCEES WZone May 19-21, 2016 in Anchorage, AK.
(Board)
- NCARB Annual June 15-18, 2016, in Seattle, WA
(Koonce, Jones)

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 NCEES Annual August 24-27, 2016 in Indianapolis, IN
2 (To be determined)
3 CLARB Annual September 22-24, 2016 in Philadelphia, PA
4 (Urfer, Jones)
5

6 **Agenda item 26 – Board Member Comments**
7

8 All members felt it was a good meeting, they thanked staff for their work, and
9 several commented on how easy it was to review the files this time and commented on
10 how professional the board keeps discussions. Rearick commented on how well the
11 Board works together. We can disagree but still remain cordial and friendly. Walters
12 will not be able to make the next meeting and will not request re-appointment. Eriksen
13 will probably be able to make either the August meeting or the WZone but not both due
14 to work. Hanson is looking forward to going fully electronic on application review. He
15 comments on the need to review all the public comments diligently and make the right
16 decision. He adds that we won't make all the people happy but that's not why we are
17 here. We are here to protect the public health, safety and welfare. Several commented
18 on how easy it was to review the files this time. Jones how Sarena is bringing us into
19 the electronic age and advised that next meeting would be a test of a new file review
20 system. The files would be on thumb drives and members would review them on
21 laptops and if this works well it would be the way it is done going forward. He added
22 that he had talked to the Division about purchasing tablets for this Board out of AELS
23 funds and was told that it may not be possible to provide boards with individual tablets.
24 Hanson read from the Statute that the Board may make expenditures from appropriated
25 funds for any purpose that is reasonably necessary for the performance of its duties.
26 Maynard asks the board to make sure they review all the comments in the next Board
27 Packet and be ready to discuss at the meeting. He will probably have Kathleen take the
28 chair during the public comment as he will not be participating in the discussion or the
29 voting.

30
31 10:29 a.m. Meeting adjourned
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

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

DRAFT

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

Approved:

Colin Maynard, PE, SE Chair
Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers and Land Surveyors

Date: _____

DRAFT