

1
2
3
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 **May 5-6, 2016**
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 February
18 10-11, 2016 in Juneau, AK.

19
20 **Thursday May 5, 2016**
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 Eric Eriksen, who
25 was excused by the Chair.

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

- 28
29
 - Colin Maynard, Civil Engineer, Structural Engineer, Chair
 - Kathleen Schedler, Mechanical Engineer, Secretary
 - Brian Hanson, Civil Engineer, Mining Engineer
 - Catherine Fritz, Architect
 - Jeffrey Koonce, Architect
 - John Kerr, Land Surveyor
 - Dave Hale, Land Surveyor
 - Fred Wallis, Mining Engineer
 - Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect
38

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

- 40
41
42
 - Sara Chambers, Operations Manager
 - Martha Hewlett, Administrative Officer II
 - John Savage Investigator
 - Vernon Jones, Executive Administrator.
 - Sarena Hackenmiller, Licensing Examiner.
47

48 Members of the Public present for portions of the meeting:
49

- 1 • Chris Miller, PE representing himself
- 2 • Joseph Notkin, Architect representing APDC, AIA

3
4 The following members of the public attended via telephone for portions of the meeting.

- 5
6 • Chris Miller, representing Design Alaska

7
8 Chair: Advises the Board that our Public Member, John Christensen has resigned due to health
9 reasons. He then acknowledges the two new members and asks the Board to introduce
10 themselves.

11
12 **Agenda item 2 - review and approve agenda.**

13
14 Chair asks if anyone has any amendments to the agenda.

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

18
19 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, Seconded by Koonce and passed unanimously it was**
20 **RESOLVED to accept the agenda as amended.**

21
22 **Agenda item 3 - ethics reporting.**

23
24 Hanson attended an NCEES EPE Committee meeting in January.

25
26 Hale attended an NSPS meeting paid for by ASPLS.

27
28 Koonce and Hackenmiller attended the NCARB Regional Summit in Savannah GA.

29
30 Note: Committee meetings are fully funded by the respective National organization and the
31 individuals are representing their profession not the Board or State.

32
33 **Agenda item 4 – review and approve the February 2016 minutes.**

34
35 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it was**
36 **RESOLVED to approve the February 2016 minutes as written.**

37
38 **Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report.**

39
40 Note: just realized that the phone line had not been activated. No one was online.

41
42 Savage: Reviews the Board report and provides some training for the new members regarding
43 the investigative process and how he uses the Investigative Advisory Committee. He reports
44 that a couple of senior Investigators had retired.

45
46 There was discussion on how to file a complaint, how much confidentiality is afforded the
47 individual that files the complaint. The Investigator does not voluntarily disclose the name but in
48 most cases the object of the complaint knows or suspects who filed it. There was a suggestion
49 that the web page could provide better information on the process. Vern will look at it. The
50 Board asked John if he could put some sort of generic description of each case in the Board
51 report so the Board will know what the case was about. No names, just a broad brush

1 description. John will look into it.

2
3 **Agenda item 6 – Regulation update.**

4
5 A. Change to 12 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals. New Sections g. and h.

6
7 Chair notes that this was adopted at the February meeting and is somewhere in the review
8 process with Law and the Governor's office.

9
10 B. Changes to 12 AAC 36.063, Engineering Education and Work Experience
11 Requirements, 12 AAC 36.108 Application for Registration as a Structural Engineer,
12 12 AAC 36.180 Seals, 12 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals and 12 AAC 36.990 Definitions.

13
14 Chair notes that this was tabled at the February meeting and asks for a motion to bring it off the
15 table.

16
17 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Koonce and passed unanimously it was**
18 **RESOLVED to take item 6 B. off of the table.**

19
20 Chair opens discussion on item 6 B.

21
22 Kerr asks if the chair is still recused from this.

23
24 Chair answers that he is still recused.

25
26 Hanson briefly reviews the motion and hopes everyone read the minutes from February as there
27 was a lot of good information in them.

28
29 Chair advises for the record that the public comment from November and February both written
30 and in the minutes was sent to the new members so they will be up to date on the issues.

31
32 Hanson believes the comments are generally in opposition to the regulation but that it's primarily
33 from a small group. He notes that the bridge engineers are against anything that has to do with
34 bridges. He explains the history of adding the new branches back in 2010 and that he went
35 back and reviewed the minutes from those meetings and that the Board didn't intend to take
36 away anything that anyone had been practicing. He mentions the 12 AAC 36.106 Registration
37 in Additional Branches of Engineering (Grandfathering clause). He thinks the major issue is
38 with the definition of significant structures.

39
40 Koonce adds that one of the questions asked was what the reason is for this change and he
41 thought we were going to write something but hasn't seen anything and can't answer that
42 question.

43
44 Hale responds that the purpose is to preemptively stop a failure from happening. We're not
45 going to wait for a building or bridge to collapse.

46
47 Koonce asks if it's too late to add an explanation.

48
49 Chair responds that it is too late.

50
51 Catherine asks how much the project could be amended before a new public notice is required.

1
2 Chair responds that minor changes would not require a re-notice but major changes would.
3
4 Note: Chris Miller joined the meeting via phone.
5
6 Hanson adds that we should not worry about whether it has to be re noticed. If changes need to
7 be made we should make them.
8
9 Kerr agrees with Brian regarding the majority of comments being in opposition. He felt the
10 bridge engineers made some good points about the ambiguity of some of the wording.
11
12 Catherine asks what specific section they are talking about.
13
14 Hanson responds that it's item f in the definitions regarding piers. Hale adds that they thought
15 the numbers were kind of arbitrary. Hanson continues that he had thought about forgetting
16 bridge size and just changing it over to the National Highway System. If it's part of the National
17 Highway system it needs a structural engineer.
18
19 Catherine asks about private bridges.
20
21 Kerr argues that it's the private bridges that need regulation. He would exempt the Nation
22 Highway System because they are already being handled by the top experts in the field and it's
23 the small private bridges that could potentially be done by someone unqualified and would risk
24 people's lives. He adds that he was convinced to remove all bridges until he asked if they
25 inspected private bridges and they related the story about one that they did inspect and if it had
26 been public they would have shut it down. He thinks these are the bridges that need protection,
27 that public highway bridges are already protected under our current system.
28
29 Catherine shares that she heard some of the testimony at the February meeting and was struck
30 by the fact that there are several kind of things that are exempted from licensing and one of
31 those is that people that do review of plans don't have to be licensed to do that review which
32 she always thought was kind of strange and if we are going to require that bridge engineers be
33 licensed structural engineers why wouldn't we require plan reviews to be licensed architects or
34 engineers?
35
36 Hale notes that everyone is pretty much centered around bridges. Is there a way to make it
37 more clear without re-noticing it.
38
39 Jones interjects that he believes that any change made will require a re-notice.
40
41 Hanson doesn't think that should be a consideration. We need to accept it as is or make
42 whatever changes that need to be made.
43
44 Catherine asks if this was modeled after another State's regulation.
45
46 Hanson responds that it was modeled after Washington and that the west coast was pretty
47 much the same, California is a little weaker. Chair adds that California only requires structural
48 engineers on hospitals and schools but they are working on adding bridges. Hanson notes that
49 they had an earthquake that caused several bridges to collapse. He adds that federal oversight
50 is not always a guarantee that something was properly engineered or inspected.
51

1 Kerr asks about piers. Is it bridge piers or marine structures and if so should we separate the
2 two. He would take off the length and pier verbiage and just say bridges that were not part of
3 the National Highway System or that are not designed or maintained by DOT. Hanson would
4 not exempt DOT. Kerr thinks they made a good case that they had the expertise. Hanson
5 responds that they do right now but what about three years from now when everyone retires. If
6 you're going to exempt someone exempt all state employees not just bridge engineers. Kerr
7 responds that they made a good case. Hanson adds that he isn't saying their system isn't a
8 good one, it's not personnel he's just saying what if. Things change over time. Catherine thinks
9 the bridge engineers make a good case but doesn't have a problem with requiring them to have
10 a structural license but thinks the verbiage concerning length and piers needs to be worked on.
11 She asks about other sections such as medical facilities of over a certain number of beds. What
12 is the number of people, the size or area of something, an occupant load etc. based on? Is it
13 something that triggers a requirement or are they somewhat arbitrary? Chair responds that the
14 language matches the language in the Washington and Oregon regulation and the risk table in
15 chapter 16 of the IBC. She continues that if it means something and has been vetted by the
16 other states then ok, if the 200 ft. means something and is not arbitrary than she is more
17 comfortable with it.

18
19 Chair asks if there is further discussion or if anyone has an amendment they would like to make.

20
21 Kerr would like to see bridges and marine facilities separated if in fact they are combined in item
22 f. He is generally not comfortable with the whole thing but he thinks it's good to have a
23 structural engineering firm for critical significant structures. Catherine starts to make a motion
24 regarding marine structures and is informed that she needs to write it out so it can be read into
25 the record. Kerr suggests it might need to go to a committee. She withdraws her motion while
26 she figures it out.

27
28 Chair adds that we can do that as a different regulation project or we can table this for another
29 three months. And if you want to postpone this until tomorrow morning to come up with an
30 amendment we can do that too.

31
32 Kerr asks if we can get an expert in marine structures to craft language for what a significant
33 structure is in their world.

34
35 Chair responds we can it depends on when you want that done by. Do you want to include it in
36 this or in a separate regulation project.

37
38 Catherine would be comfortable with looking at Hawaii and Washington to see what they have
39 regarding marine structures. Chair interjects that Hawaii requires all structures be done by a
40 structural engineer.

41
42 There was a short discussion on the wording in f. regarding length of span and surface area of
43 piers. Total span was defined as abutment to abutment not pier to pier. Hale thinks that this will
44 never be perfect but it's the best we can do right now. Wallis sees a lot of good things in this
45 regulation but this is Alaska and we are protecting Joe engineer in Nome who is building a 50
46 foot bridge across Dry Creek so he can do that without getting someone to come up from
47 Anchorage or Seattle. But if we're going to build a Port of Anchorage bridge across to the other
48 side we better have someone with more knowledge working on it and I think that's what we're
49 getting by having a standard like the other states, we're still protecting the little guy but for our
50 major stuff we're covered. Hanson adds that people can always find something wrong but
51 never tell us how we can fix it so what we have is what we have that's what the motion is, to

1 approve what we have. He would be ok with separating bridge span and piers.

2
3 Note: Division dialed in for their financial report.

4
5 Chair stops the discussion to move to item 7.

6
7 **Agenda item 7 – Financial Report.**

8
9 Sara Chambers confirms that the Board has the latest report with the account code information
10 and turns it over to Marth Hewlett,

11
12 Martha Hewlett goes through the direct expenditures line item by line item. She advises that
13 indirect expenditures are just a place holder based on last the years expenditures as they are
14 not credited until the end of the year. This figure represents approximately ¾ of the total and
15 when you get your 4th quarter report it will have the actual expenses.

16
17 Hanson asks if the indirect methodology will be the same as last years.

18
19 Hewlett responds that the methodology will remain the same. Chambers interjects that although
20 the methodology will be the same the number will be a little higher because this is a renewal
21 year and the front desk staff is spending more time on the financial transactions for the Board.

22
23 Chambers asks to take a few more minutes to touch on a few other topics. She asks for any
24 feedback on how the updated online renewal went this year. Chair responds it was easy for me.
25 Brian notes that you couldn't do a license number look-up when doing the renewal. Jones adds
26 that the only real problem was that when they went to the new database they began using the
27 letters and numbers and most of the calls were that they were entering the number but leaving
28 out the AELC or whatever. Chambers adds that that is a function of the new licensing program
29 and the possible need for education through the year. Chair adds that for those with multiple
30 licenses they had to go through each separately and it would be nice to be able to do it in one
31 transaction, we have one individual with 8 licenses.

32
33 Chambers goes into the travel restrictions brought on by the budget shortfall. She notes that
34 the letter from the Board made it up the chain and that the Commissioner is sensitive to Board
35 needs and desires. She wanted to make sure the Board knew that their letter was received by
36 the highest levels and they are aware on the Board view point. She advises that there are other
37 changes coming from the Depart of Administration regarding reimbursement of meals and
38 mileage reimbursement to try to realize cost savings while providing equitable reimbursement to
39 Boards. She assures the Board that Martha and I and Director Hovenden are very sensitive to
40 the fact that the Board members are volunteers. She moves into the use of thumb drives for file
41 review and has asked for staff to come back with some feedback on how it worked. She adds
42 that this Board as well as some other Boards is interested in being issued tablets/computers in
43 order to do the work more efficiently. Our program coordinator Colleen Kautz is working with IT
44 to nail down the best models that would be most cost effective as well as provide the speed and
45 storage capacity to meet the Board needs. The question this project hinges on is whether it's
46 feasible to fund it out capitol funds because the Division doesn't presently have the spending
47 authority to add that several thousand dollar cost on. So we are looking at options and methods
48 to find a reasonable funding source.

49
50 Hanson doesn't see why the individual Boards can't make a direct purchase for their Board
51 rather than have it be a Division owned tablet that you're checking out. It's part of being a

1 Board Member. You're issued a tablet, you get a State issued email that all your Board
2 correspondence goes to instead of us using our private email's or google account or whatever
3 or work email. In my three years on the Board I can tell you a \$300 tablet is a lot cheaper than
4 the 32 binders worth of paperwork that I've accumulated over the years. I see the shipping tag
5 on these things Vern sends out every meeting. \$7, \$15 it adds up in a hurry. He adds that the
6 use of the secure webpage in February by Colin and himself was no problem at all. He
7 encourages the Division to use the Board money to purchase tablets for each Board. Koonce
8 interjects just turn it in when you're done. Hanson responds, or not, the way technology is going
9 if you get 4 years out of a tablet you're doing good.

10
11 Catherine adds that the school districts around the state have made some great strides using
12 tablets that were put in the hands of teachers, administrators and Boards and that the
13 procurement process size of storage capability and what happens at the end of the tablet's life
14 have been dealt with for quite a few years in the education field so maybe occupational
15 licensing could learn from the Department of Education.

16
17 Chambers acknowledges that those are good points and really appreciates the Department of
18 Education and Early Development reminder. She reminds the Board that just because they
19 have a surplus doesn't mean they can spend it. The appropriation is given to the Division and is
20 for all Boards. We have almost 150 Board members and that may be something to look for in
21 the future. That idea while it sounds fantastic it's not within the realm of possibility in the near
22 future due to the IT expense, upkeep and so forth. We are working on moving into the 21st
23 Century in the most cost effective way and doing so on a shoe string. Keep the good ideas
24 coming and feel free to let Vern know or contact me directly.

25
26 Hanson asks who to send the letter to. He spent \$500 on a tablet a few years ago and it has
27 had zero ongoing expense. He would argue there are ways to accomplish this without
28 Hackenmiller interjects, without being the Medical Board who just personally bought everyone,
29 Hanson continues, exactly or we personally buy what we want to use up to a certain price and
30 we submit an expense form. There are ways of doing it above board correctly.

31
32 Chambers responds that she appreciates that but a government purchase is different than a
33 personnel purchase and it's not an ethics issue, it's not a matter of not trusting Board members
34 or anything like. We have to operate differently than individuals do in making a similar
35 purchase. She wants to continue to strive to get what we need within the constraints and rules
36 we have and I want to hear all the good ideas, put them on the table and sort through them.
37 She is happy to receive letters and emails from Board Members at any time.

38
39 Hanson wishes she were here because he is wringing his hands and putting them on his head.
40 It's not personal but right now what I had to do is bring my work computer that my company paid
41 for to a State Board meeting and I'm using my companies computer, a private business to do
42 State work without compensation or funding of that electronic piece of equipment that's a tool
43 that the State is taking advantage of. So I just throw that out there for your consideration.
44 There might be a couple of individuals here that have a personal computer but these are
45 corporate computers that are providing a benefit to the State of Alaska. Chair adds that we are
46 going through the Sunset process so maybe we will try to add a line that the Board has authority
47 to buy equipment with their funds.

48
49 Chambers again thank you and your employers for your volunteer service to the State and keep
50 your ideas coming. If you're look for suggestions on legislative fixes we can certainly discuss
51 those as well but today within the scope that we have we are doing everything we can to meet

1 your needs and as you know and as we've discussed for years now private entities and
2 individuals are very different than State Government. I will continue to articulate to ease your
3 frustrations. We are moving closer each day so thank you.
4

5 This is Kathleen Schedler and guess I felt like you don't really hear us and might be paying lip
6 service to us. Your first statement was well it isn't like you can go spend the \$1.5M. We aren't
7 asking that at all we are asking to probably spend three thousand to five thousand of which you
8 would immediately receive a refund of at least \$1500 to \$2000 that's just in labor putting these
9 books together and mailing and paper fees. So don't take us immediately to that we want
10 spend 1.5 million dollars that's quite flammatory and I really am offended. The State is not the
11 wild beast that you portray it to be that it is absolutely impossible to come up with a way for a
12 Board to come up with such a miniscule expenditure that enables us to do our work. And then
13 also to come tongue in cheek and thank us for volunteering our own equipment, I would like to
14 see what happens if one of the thumb drives that we insert corrupt our personnel computers and
15 the State is liable to reimburse us for the cost of that computer. Because that's exactly what
16 should happen, we should never be asked as a volunteer to bring our own equipment to a
17 Board Meeting so that we can conduct our business. There isn't another Board in the State
18 that, I mean I just think it's reprehensible. So the State is not the beast that cannot make a
19 \$3,500 dollar expenditure. So with that I think we best close.
20

21 Chambers, Kathleen thank you for your feedback I apologize if I offended you. That was not my
22 intent I just don't want to take up a lot of the Board's time going over budget authority and
23 Martha referred to where that information is on line and we had gone over that before. But I
24 certainly can walk through why it is a more complex matter...Schedler interjects, we just want a
25 solution we don't want to see the behind of where we've been we want to see the future of
26 where we can go. Chambers continues, well it may be time for us to talk about some
27 Legislative things that the Board can do Legislatively to change the way things are today and we
28 can certainly talk about those at a future time. I apologize if I offended you, I can guarantee that
29 I take my job, your job and the roll of our partnership very seriously for what I do 9 to 10 hours a
30 day five days a week and the passion that I have, so my comments are not tongue in cheek and
31 the work that we do I hope can rise above being clarified as reprehensible and hope that we can
32 work on correcting any issues that were raised today in a collaborative manner, so thank you.
33

34 Chair asks Sara to send us a letter of what Statutory changes we should lobby for being as we
35 are going through the Sunset process possibly that can get tacked on to that, as it's something
36 we can discuss with Legislators as part of that process.
37

38 Chambers responds that maybe we can have a phone call about that in the future.
39

40 Kerr asks if there is a schedule for when we might expect this to be resolved.
41

42 Chambers responds that the Division has provided all their research to IT. All purchases have
43 to go through IT for their review and approval and our Program Coordinator is working with them
44 on that so if we have the green light to use capital funding for that purpose which we are hoping
45 that that will be the case then we should be able to have something like that in place for your
46 next Board Meeting. I understand that's a lot of what if's so I will get more updates from Colleen
47 on where IT is and when we can anticipate the timeline and then let Vern know.
48

49 Kerr then asks if members will be able to opt out of taking charge of one of these tablets.
50

51 Chambers replies, well it's our goal to have one system and if we're looking for the cost savings

1 by not providing the paper documentation then it would defeat the purpose by continuing to
2 have two systems to have to follow since we would have to buy the tablet anyway.

3
4 Kerr clarifies that he is not advocating having two systems he just doesn't want to have another
5 thing to lug around.

6
7 Several chime in that Vern will do the lugging.

8
9 Chambers clarifies that under the model that they are looking at right now tablets would be
10 provided to Board Members at the Board Meeting and then taken back after the meeting.

11
12 Kerr then asks how we would review our Board Packets prior to the meeting if that happens.

13
14 Chambers responds that they would be available on the online portal.

15
16 11:05 Break

17
18 11:15 back on record.

19
20 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
21 **RESOLVED that due to the current mandated electronic review process the AELS Board**
22 **would like to purchase tablets and/or other electronic devices for Board Members and**
23 **Staff to be used to conduct Board business.**

24
25 Chair: Now we will go back to 6 B. What is the will of the body?

26
27 The discussion returned to sub-para f. and the question of separating the span verbiage from
28 the pier verbiage. Hanson pulled up the Washington language and stated that it's exactly the
29 same and has been working fine for years. He stated that when you talk about the total span of
30 a bridge it's the total length of the bridge not pier to pier but total length abutment to abutment.
31 He adds that DOT uses pretty much the same design for most bridges which is 145 ft. pre-
32 stressed girders. He doesn't feel the language needs to be changed. Discussion continued on
33 the connection between the span and pier and whether span meant abutment to abutment or
34 pier to pier and whether marine structures needed to be separated or added. Catherine
35 reminds everyone that the people who review these for permitting may not be engineers so their
36 interpretation may be different than yours. The end result was that the language has worked
37 fine for years in another jurisdiction so it should be left as is. It was requested that the motion be
38 read again.

39
40 Chair: reads the motion – to adopt changes to 12 AAC 36.063, 12 AAC 36.108, 12 AAC 36.180,
41 12 AAC 36.185 and 12 AAC 36.990 as public noticed.

42
43 Catherine asks what the options are if the motion is tabled while changes are made or if it fails
44 what is the vehicle to bring it back.

45
46 Chair: We can table it or if it passes we can initiate a regulation project to discuss marine or add
47 it now which would require a re-public notice and we could adopt in August or if it fails we can
48 start a new regulation project.

49
50 Catherine would be fine with passing as is if a project to work on marine structures was initiated.
51

1 Chair asks for a roll call vote with the following results:

2
3 Eriksen, absent; Hale yes; Hanson yes; Kerr no; Koonce no; Maynard abstain; Fritz yes:
4 Schedler no; Wallis yes; 4 yes 3 no 1 abstain.

5
6 Note: There was some confusion on whether it needed a majority of the members present or a
7 majority of the Board. Chair will do some research during lunch and find out.

8
9 Chair: started discussing item D under old business. Item C is a change to 12 AAC 36.050
10 Application Deadlines. The reason for this change is so that Staff has time to get applications
11 ready for Board review. The move to electronic everything has slowed the process down
12 somewhat. Each evolution has to be done from start to finish before moving on to the next one.
13 All items received via email have to be scanned, all incoming mail is scanned. Where before
14 you could take action, print a copy and put in a folder or toss a copy in a basket to be filed later
15 now it all has to be done before moving on. Files for board review have to be transferred to
16 thumb drives. It just takes longer. There were a couple of comments from the public but they
17 were actually questions asking why instead of comments. I explained the reason to them and
18 heard no further from them.

19
20 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
21 **RESOLVED to adopt changes to 12 AAC 36.050 Application Deadlines as public noticed.**

22
23 **Agenda item 9 – Correspondence Received since February 2016.**

24 CLARB

25 Luanne explains CLARB's task analysis project and the LEED certification
26 process. They had asked the Board for email addresses and the Board refused so Luanne
27 went to the Society and asked them to distribute the survey. She asks who to send the support
28 she got for the landscape architect change to permanent and was told they could send it to the
29 Legislature next session.

30
31 NCARB

32 Jeff reviews the correspondence from NCARB. He notes that the ARE is being
33 updated to 5.0 which will be out later this year. There were a couple of letters from candidates
34 for office. He mentioned a resolution that will be introduced at Annual. Chair asks if any of the
35 resolutions are in violation of our Statutes. Jeff talked about a resolution to accept an
36 agreement with Australia and New Zealand similar to the one with Canada. Catherine asks if
37 the Board has info on the AXP change and what it's all about. Jeff will send her the info he has
38 received. He asks about the voting delegate designation for the Annual Meeting.

39
40 NCEES

41 Brian summarizes the BOD report and CEO email re competency model. There
42 were several nominations for office. Southern zone has a resolution in regarding experience
43 verification in the council record. National Surveying Education Award was approved. There
44 was correspondence regarding ABET Criterion 3 and 5 that Colin explained.

45
46 11:50 am break for lunch.

47
48 1:07 pm called to order. Roll call, all present except Eriksen.

49
50 Chair reports that his research on the voting shows that it needs a majority of the Board not the
51 quorum so we need 6 votes to pass it so the motion on the structural regulations failed.

1
2 Kerr asks if it can be re-voted.

3
4 Chair responds that it can be brought back up for vote in the next 24 hours and if it doesn't pass
5 we can start from scratch.

6
7 **Agenda item 13 – Public Comment**

8
9 Chris Miller: I'm Chris Miller, I'm president of Design Alaska, mechanical, controls, fire
10 protection, environmental all have been grandfathered. I appreciate being able to listen in to the
11 meetings. It's nice to hear the robust debate, it's a hard job that you have to do and I appreciate
12 being able to hear the work you're doing. Welcome to the new, I heard a new voice this
13 morning, (Catherine and Fred introduce themselves). I'll be around every time you come to
14 Fairbanks. My topic today is within the last two weeks I've gotten a whole bunch of things about
15 mechanical administrators doing designs, providing drawings, not only mechanical but electrical
16 administrators, plumbers. What is, they were basically saying well this, contractors do it I don't
17 need a design I'll let my mechanical contractor do it. It was weird that it kind of came out of the
18 blue. I hadn't heard that in years. There has been a recent rash of it. We all understand that
19 replacing a boiler or similar thing in a boiler room, replacing a panel or replacing a, all
20 maintenance related, it may require a permit but doesn't require signed stamped architectural
21 drawings because it's not changing the life safety of the public. These were not doing that.
22 These were adding ventilation systems, redoing an entire office, replacing, adding walls redoing
23 the light fixtures, redoing the power. There some provisions in the code about exceptions and
24 what-not but I started digging through and where is this coming from is there some basis in the
25 regulations that somebody says I don't need architects and engineers, contractors can do it. I
26 couldn't find any basis in the regulations, in the muni or the city of Fairbanks or something that's
27 a little quirky that somebody could make that stretch. I'm dealing with it. People that I'm working
28 with have come to ask me I tell them flat out that I think it's in your best interest to have
29 architects and engineers do your drawings and prepare your designs and have your contractors
30 build it. If you want to do a design build method and ask your contractors to provide designers
31 to do it I'm totally fine with that but there should be seals on these drawings when you're done.
32 So I don't know where it came from but I went and looked at the Building Official Guidance
33 package you guys been working on and putting out, looking to see if there was a clear line
34 drawn in there. It's supposed to be designed by licensed individuals and a mechanical
35 administrator is not a licensed individual by this definition they are different licensed individuals.
36 Anyway I just thought I'd share that with you, I don't know if there is an education opportunity
37 coming up or some other way and of course I will keep working and let you know what I find out
38 here in the field and I'm not playing a turf war I just want to make sure we are all being clear and
39 serving the public.

40
41 Chair notes that this isn't the first time this has come up.

42
43 Miller: I'm sure it's not but I hadn't heard it in years until the last two weeks, three different
44 projects within the last two weeks.

45
46 Brian thanks him for bringing this to the Board and reads the section of AS 08.48.331 (7) that
47 they specialty contractors mistakenly use to do design work. He gives some history on the
48 problems with this exemption referring to the issue with pre-fab steel buildings. Chair interjects
49 that the Board modified this exemption a few years ago because of this kind of problem. Brian
50 points out that it is a Statute and not a Regulation and would have to go through the Legislature.
51

1 Miller: Understands why that clause was written there, there's perfectly good reasons why that
2 clause was in there. He cites fire sprinkler design and control systems design which were
3 traditionally been prepared by the craftsmen of the trade but there was a basic document that
4 was prepared by a licensed professional. He thanks the board and he knows where that clause
5 is and will continue to try to educate.
6

7 Brian advises that people can file complaints and Kerr asks if he would be reluctant to file a
8 complaint against people he works closely with.
9

10 Miller: He tries to look at problems not results that are bad, not, something not safe, I try to
11 point that out and I usually go through the Building Departments, the inspecting authorities is the
12 way to go instead of when I see somebody building something I don't know what's going on
13 over there I'm going to pick up the phone and call. It's my ethic I look for safety problems that
14 could happen, I look for locked doors at night clubs, fire sprinkler system is disabled, wall put up
15 that are wrong. Those are the kind of things that cause me to pick up the phone and call the
16 Building Officials hey something went wrong here, what went wrong I never hear about. The
17 Building Officials take care of it. Both the State and the City have been reactionary to taking
18 care of that so that's the way I approach it. If I see a chronic thing that may be a different story.
19 Thank you.
20

21 Joe Notkin: Good afternoon, I hope you guys are enjoying your northern weather. I'm Joe
22 Notkin, architect, immediate past president of the AIA so welcome to Fairbanks and I'm here to
23 welcome our new architect member to the Board, Catherine Fritz. We're very happy to have her
24 onboard and I just want to say I'm very happy the Board is continuing the practice of meeting in
25 the different cities of Alaska. I don't know if you are under pressure but we really appreciate the
26 opportunity to have you in Fairbanks and I hope this will continue. That's it.
27

28 Chair: We'll spend another 10 minutes or so going through correspondence then go into
29 executive session. Item 9 E. which is the Board Meeting Management Handbook.
30

31 Discussion centered around the paragraph at the bottom of page 12 regarding Board Members
32 downloading the Board Packets to their tablet or laptops. Comment was that we don't have
33 tablets or laptops. Sarena explained that other boards use the secure webpage to review board
34 packets and how the Med Board reviews applications on the webpage and then votes via email
35 and Vern explained that the Board could review in advance of the meeting and then read them
36 into the record at the meeting and vote on them. Sarena pointed out the possibility of one day
37 meetings doing things this way. However this would require that tablets be issued to members
38 so they would have them between meetings. This would shorten the executive sessions
39 considerably.
40

41 **Agenda item 10 – Correspondence Received since February 2016.**

42

43 Chair draws attention to item A. which was his letter to the Governor regarding travel which he
44 felt worked because we are all here. Item B. was nominating Brian Hanson for Western Zone
45 vice President which we will find out in a couple weeks if there is support for that.
46

47 **Agenda item 11 – Old Business**

48

49 Chair: item A. Western Zone meeting in Anchorage.

50 There was discussion on speakers and other arrangements. Pretty much everything is
51 set except for speakers. Suggestions were the Mayor, Commissioner of DCCED, someone

1 from the Muni plan reviewers, building official etc. or possibly a Legislator if they are back in
2 town by then. Expecting approximately 88-90 attendees.

3
4 Item B. Arctic Engineering requirement review:

5 The courses haven't been evaluated for years and the Board wants to reevaluate the
6 courses and instructors to ensure the courses are up to date and are being taught by qualified
7 instructors.

8
9 Item C. Bill to make LA seat permanent, voting seat.

10 Never got filed so we will have to find a sponsor after the election and we find out who
11 the chairs of the Senate and House Commerce Committees are and talk to them about
12 sponsoring in a Committee Bill. It's also possible to tack it onto the Sunset Bill. We Sunset on
13 June 30, 2017 if they don't extend us we have a year to shut down business. You may have
14 gotten calls from Leg Audit about this. Chair explains the sunset process.

15
16 **On a motion duly made by Hale, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it was**
17 **RESOLVED to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(3) to review**
18 **disciplinary case number 2015-001720, and 2015-000957 and 2015-000958.**

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

23
24 1:30 p.m. off record in Executive Session. Note: At the request of the Board the Executive
25 Administrator (Vernon Jones) and Licensing Examiner (Sarena Hackenmiller) remained in the
26 room during the entire executive session but did not participate in the discussion of the
27 disciplinary cases.

28
29 4:50 p.m. Out of Executive Session and back on Record.

30
31 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it was**
32 **RESOLVED to accept imposition of civil fine in case 2015-001720 against Robert W.**
33 **Basler in the amount of \$500.00.**

34
35 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
36 **RESOLVED to accept imposition of civil fine in case 2015-000957 and case 2015-000958**
37 **against Emmanuel Bergee in the amount of \$1000.00**

38
39 4:55 p.m. Recessed for the day.

40
41
42 **Friday May 6, 2016**

43
44 9:00 a.m. Called to order, roll call, all present except Eriksen who was excused by the Chair.

45
46 Item 11 D. FE/FS regulation changes.

47
48 The Board had two possibilities to choose from:

49
50 Version 1 modified 12 AAC 36.062 Eligibility for the Fundamentals of Engineer
51 Examination and 12 AAC 36.063, Engineering Education and Work Experience

1 Requirements, 12 AAC 36.064 Eligibility for the Fundamentals of Land Surveying
2 Examination and 12 AAC 36.065 Eligibility for the Professional Land Surveying
3 Examination.

4 Version 2 repealed 12 AAC 36.062 and 12 AAC 36.064 and modified 12 AAC
5 36.063 and 12 AAC 36.065.

6
7 Chair explains that the first version keeps the requirements for the fundamentals examinations
8 but doesn't require that examinees apply to this Board. The second version gets rid of the
9 requirements and just requires that an individual has to have passed the fundamentals exam to
10 qualify for the PE or PS examinations. He brings the new members up to date on the reason for
11 this project and why the Board is trying to get out from under having to approve the
12 fundamentals examinations. After a brief discussion the Board moved to approve version 2.
13 The points were that with the introduction of CBT NCEES dropped the requirement for
14 examinees to take the exam in the state where they applied so anyone can claim any state. An
15 applicant just has to attest to NCEES that they have met the requirements of the state they are
16 claiming and some states have no requirements or allow the exam anytime and no one really
17 checks to see if they have in fact met the requirements they claim to have met.

18
19 **On a motion duly made by Hale, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it was**
20 **RESOLVED to approve for public notice version number 2 of the Eligibility for**
21 **Fundamentals of Engineering Examination and the Eligibility for the Fundamentals of**
22 **Land Surveying Examination.**

23
24 Item E. Board officer election.

25
26 Nominations for Chair: Schedler nominates Brian Hanson. No other nominations. The
27 Board voted unanimously for Brian for Chair.

28
29 Nominations for Vice Chair: Schedler nominates Dave Hale. No other nominations. The
30 board voted unanimously for Dave for vice Chair.

31
32 Nominations for Secretary: Schedler nominates Jeff Koonce. No other nominations.
33 The Board voted unanimously for Jeff for Secretary.

34
35 The new officers will assume the duties effective July 1, 2016.

36
37 Kerr brought SB118 and there was a short discussion on it. The Chair wrote a letter to the
38 sponsors and AELS was removed from the Bill by a Committee Substitute but so far no one has
39 seen a copy of the new version.

40 41 **Agenda item 17 – New Business**

42
43 Item A. ABET EAC Criterion Changes.

44 Chair explains what it's about and ask if any discussion. No takers.

45
46 Item B. AS 08.48.311 Exemptions (a)(9) re surveyors.

47 Kerr explains that he got a call from students in the geomatics program that were
48 studying the regulations and noted that teaching land surveying was considered the practicing
49 of Land Surveying and that those teaching were not exempted from licensure and asked if their
50 professors should all be licensed. He checked the regulations and sure enough land surveying
51 was not included in the section that excluded those teaching in institutions of higher learning.

1 Consensus was that this was an inadvertent omission and the Chair suggested it could be
2 tacked on the sunset bill as housekeeping language. Point was made that if the department
3 head was licensed then the others would be working under a licensed individual and would be
4 ok.
5

6 **On a motion duly made by Kerr, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it was**
7 **RESOLVED to pursue revising AS 08.48.331(9) to read a person who is employed by a**
8 **postsecondary education institution to teach engineering, architecture, land surveying or**
9 **landscape architecture courses while teaching these classes.**

10
11 Item C. Question from DNR – email string between Kerr and Gervelis.

12 Chair explains the QBS Statute for the State as it relates to competitive bids and
13 there are some who think that surveying is competitive. Discussion followed regarding a suite
14 against DNR a number of years ago where certain surveys that someone thought was repetitive
15 and didn't want to go through the procurement process. DNR is asking the Board to write a
16 letter explaining that these surveys are not repetitious and provided some sample jobs that were
17 already completed. Kerr reported that the Chair advised him that he could reply as an individual
18 but not on behalf of the Board so he responded with his opinion to DNR who did not include
19 price as part of the criteria but they would really like to have something from the Board. He
20 thinks they are all good now. Chair adds that the Board could reply that while every project
21 uses the same tools they are all different so you would be hard pressed to say that surveying is
22 repetitive. Discussion continued for a short while on the Boards roll and how to word a reply.
23

24 Item D. Regulation Projects.

25 Chair notes the Regulation FAQ worksheet and thinks one should go out with
26 every regulation project we do. Chair will do one for the FE/FS project. Koonce thinks that by
27 doing this form we will answer a lot of the questions of the public.
28

29 Item E. Annual Report.

30 Jones included that to show what it entails and to ask the Board for help on next
31 year's goals.
32

33 Item F. Trail design in State recreation areas.

34 Jones explains what led up to this. Matsu Borough sent us a copy of an RFP
35 and asked if it needed a licensed professional to design it. Hanson looked it over and
36 responded that it needed a civil engineer, landscape architect or a surveyor to design. I passed
37 this on and then got an email from DNR who was using a statute that said any improvement to
38 State Lands over \$100,000 had to be overseen by a licensed professional and this project was
39 less than \$100K. I explained that the price had nothing to do with it, the safety of the public was
40 the deciding factor and the RFP asked for the contractor to provide a professional design. She
41 then said if the approving authority decides and I stopped her and said it's not the approving
42 authority that decides it's the project that decides. Anyway she then got in a panic because she
43 had a dozen or so projects due to start and wanted if she had to stop them all. I passed them to
44 Brian for review. Hanson adds it was more than a dozen it was more like 35 projects ranging
45 from \$10K to \$100K and I go to number 3 on the list, they wanted an opinion of every single
46 project and I provided a generic opinion. I got to project number 3 and it said we are going to go
47 back out and redo bridge approaches because the last one was poorly chosen and is unsafe
48 and they're going to put guard rails up per code and I thought to myself, well had you hired a
49 design professional in the first place their insurance would be paying for the repairs. He repeats
50 that the RFP required the contractor to provide a professional design and gives all these criteria
51 and that's a no brainer to me they're asking if they need professional design and it's in their

1 RFP. Hanson suggested to them that on some of the projects they needed a design
2 professional, on other it would be desirable to have a design professional and that they could
3 use their in house staff for review or hire a consultant. He doesn't think this is the end of it. Kerr
4 interjects that they definitely need a surveyor to insure that they are in fact on public property.
5 Hanson notes that this is a Borough project and they seem to be on top of it. He relates another
6 project that was adjacent to his land where they notified him and all the steps they took to make
7 sure they didn't cross over the boundary. We should continue to track this. There was some
8 discussion about AS 36.95.160 being in conflict with our Statutes.
9

10 Item G. Remote Sensing Mapping.

11 Hale explains how UAV's are being used, they have cameras , they can map the
12 earth, take movies etc. and looked up a company on the web and they were advertising
13 surveying as one of their services. He went to a presentation and asked if are capable and are
14 they using design engineering mapping, mapping for design engineering and he responded
15 absolutely, you can use it for that. He then asked if they had a surveyor on staff and they
16 replied, no. This is what we're getting into nationally and here in Alaska, everyone is going out
17 any buying these things because there is a huge amount of potential there. He goes on to
18 explain how there could also be a huge amount of potential harm to the public. It's not limited to
19 UAV's it's going to tie into the whole definition of land surveying, Ariel Photography, making
20 maps by non-licensed individuals, in some cases hydrographic surveys. All of this remote
21 sensing stuff, a lot of it's occurring without the benefit of a professional land surveyor. Hanson
22 looks at UAV's as a tool like an instrument sitting on a tripod. The tool itself is not going to harm
23 the public. It's the person that you put behind it and the product that comes out of it. He knows
24 of a firm in Wyoming that is using those almost exclusively to do all their surveying. They have
25 PLS's on staff but they can do them at a tenth of the cost. Kerr adds that it does fall within our
26 definition of surveying. Chair adds that it depends on what they are using it for. Hale things the
27 Board should have a position paper on it. Discussion continued regarding the nation wide use
28 by companies to do mapping without having surveyors on staff. There are a lot of things
29 happening that are illegal but aren't being reported. He thinks a position paper would be a good
30 tool to educate people, something in place to mail out if you see someone advertising
31 surveying/mapping that don't have surveyors employed. Catherine agrees and asks if he knows
32 of any jurisdiction that has modified their laws? Discussion continued in this vane for a short
33 time with the result that Kerr will write a letter to give to the Chair. Koonce suggests that it also
34 be sent to the University programs. Other suggestions were to put into the APDC newsletter.
35

36 Koonce brings up the change from IDP to AXP and a short discussion resulted in a motion for a
37 regulation project.
38

39 Urfer asks that the letter that Kerr is going to write about surveying be distributed to all the
40 societies because even though someone from each society attends the APDC meetings the
41 word doesn't all get back to all the members. She also wants to address 12 AAC 36.109
42 regarding landscape architect by comity. She notes that is says CLARB Certificate or all this
43 other stuff. She notes that the Council Certificate really doesn't match what our regulations
44 require. Chair asks her to make a motion for a regulation project if she thinks it needs to be
45 changed.
46

47 10:25 Break
48

49 10:35 back on record.
50

51 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**

1 **RESOLVED to write a regulation project addressing the change of Intern Development**
2 **program to Architectural Experience Program**

3
4 Chair asks Luanne if she has her motion ready.

5
6 **On a motion duly made by Urfer, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
7 **RESOLVED to start a regulation project to change 12 AAC 36.109(1) to require that if a**
8 **CLARB Council Record is used it has to be in compliance with Alaska regulations.**

9
10 Chair asks her to fill out the Regulation Project FAQ form. John you said you had something?

11
12 **On a motion duly made by Kerr, seconded by Schedler and passed unanimously it was**
13 **RESOLVED to change the sanction guidelines related to lapsed licenses to make the**
14 **minimum civil fine a fine of not less than two times the cost of all back license fees.**

15
16 There was a discussion on instating a penalty for late renewal. Present practice is that as long
17 as they don't practice they can let their license lapse until they get work then renew or reinstate
18 by just paying the current license fee. Unless they self-report, someone complains or is caught
19 during a site visit by the Investigator we have no way of knowing if they were practicing or not.
20 It was suggested that if they wait 4.5 years to renew they should have to pay back license fees
21 to when they let it lapse.

22
23 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
24 **RESOLVED to start a regulation project to provide for a penalty for late renewal.**

25
26 Chair asks if there are any other motions.

27
28 **On a motion duly made by Kerr, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it was**
29 **RESOLVED to reintroduce 12 AAC 36.063, 12 AAC 36.108, 12 AAC 36.180, 12 AAC 36.185**
30 **and 12 AAC 36.990 related structural engineering.**

31
32 Chair asks if he wants to start a new regulation project. Kerr responds that he wants to
33 reconsider the vote. Chair, all this will do is open up the discussion before the vote yesterday.

34
35 Kerr: Thinks there is a lot of support for this and that he voted no because some of the
36 language is problematic, I think it needs to be, potentially problematic, I think it would be good if
37 we have a regulation project after it passes, if it passes and it becomes regulation, to find out if
38 we need to deal with marine facilities. I don't know if we need to but that was one thing that
39 looked like it was missing and to make sure the bridges section is clear and there's basis for it.
40 So that's why I voted no and after thinking about I hate to see all this public notice be wasted
41 and gone and we can look at modifying it after it becomes law.

42
43 Koonce adds that the previous discussion was confusing in that it wasn't clear if they were
44 talking about onshore or offshore.

45
46 Chair so now we are back to the original motion. Hale asks if we need a new motion. Chair
47 says that the vote is expunged and so we are back to the motion and asks that it be re-read.

48
49 Kerr: Asks how many votes are needed to pass. Note: It has to be a majority of the Board
50 which would be 6 votes.

51

1 Jones re-reads the motion – motion was to adopt changes to 12 AAC 36.063, 12 AAC 36.108,
2 12 AAC 36.180, 12 AAC 36.185 and 12 AAC 36.990 as public noticed. These were the
3 regulations that would require a structural engineer for significant structures.
4

5 Chair asks if there is discussion.
6

7 Hale will support it knowing that it is not perfect but nothing ever will be. He sees it as a good
8 start and thinks most people see it as a positive step.
9

10 Chair asks if there is further comment, seeing none he asks for a roll call vote.
11

12 Jones reads the roll, Eriksen, absent, Hale, yes, Hanson, yes, Kerr, yes, Koonce, yes, Maynard,
13 abstain, Fritz, Yes, Schedler asks if she can abstain, Jones replies no she has to vote unless
14 there is a conflict of interest. She votes no, Wallis, yes. Jones 6 yes 1 no and 1 abstain so it
15 passes.
16

17 **Agenda item 18 – Special Committees**

18

19 Licensure Implementation: No report.
20

21 Registration and Practice: No report.
22

23 Licensure Mobility: No report.
24

25 **Standing Committees**

26

27 Investigative Advisory Committee: Chair explains how this works to the new members.
28 When the John gets a complaint he will determine which Board Member will have the most
29 knowledge on that issue and calls them. Then at that point they become ineligible to vote if it
30 comes to the Board as a consent agreement or if the Board becomes the jury. Jones adds that
31 John will only call one architect or one surveyor or one engineer so don't get ahold of your
32 partner and taint him too because we still need someone in that profession able to vote if it
33 comes to the Board. Chair adds you're on your lonesome, don't taint anybody else when he
34 comes to you.
35

36 Guidance Manual: Luanne has sent it out to the Board but hasn't gotten any feedback
37 yet. Luanne believes that even though it was originally for Building Officials there are many
38 people using it so it need to target a larger audience. Chair adds that it now includes all our
39 policies and guidelines. Chair advises her to assign each section to one or two individuals for
40 review and update. Jones will publish an update with the new preamble
41

42 Legislative Liaison: Eric will be off the Board in March so we should assign a new chair
43 for that.
44

45 Emeritus Status: Chair asks if anyone needs to be in emeritus status. Jones will check
46 the NCEES Board roster to see who which ex-members are still active. Hanson advises that
47 anyone who has attended an NCEES meeting is in My NCEES and can go to that webpage and
48 see all that are included and if you click on an individual it will list what committees they are on.
49

50 Budget Committee: He thinks our hands are tied as far as expenditures. Chair brings
51 the new members up to speed on how our indirect expenditures were determined in the past

1 and the improvements made. For the benefit of the new members Jones explains the way our
2 budget is determined. Each board submits requests via their Annual Report, the Division works
3 up a budget request which is submitted to the Legislature and whatever they approve is what
4 the Division has to work with. This is why Sara said yesterday that she couldn't just go out and
5 buy 150 tablets. It's like your kid's PFD, it's their PFD but Mom and Dad say how much and
6 what it can be spent on. Chair then explains the fee setting process, the board recommends a
7 fee level and the Division then makes the final decision on what the fee will be. Boards have to
8 support themselves through their fees so they will fluctuate. He explains how during a Sunset
9 Audit an error in crediting online renewal fees was discovered and we ended up with a million
10 dollar surplus. They reduced the fees which produced a deficit and this causes a yoyo effect
11 and we are trying to slow that be making the reduction and increases gradual. This Board
12 wants to have a surplus so if we get some large legal fees we won't be in the red.
13

14 Continuing Education Committee: It was reported that the Audit was going along fine. A
15 few Registrants need to send more documentation and we have a couple candidates that may
16 need to be sent to the Paralegal for disciplinary action. Those will have to be brought to the
17 Board for a motion at the next meeting. When Jones gets caught up from the meeting needs he
18 will send out second letters to the few that haven't responded.
19

20 Note: This audit comes in the middle of the winter so a lot of Registrants are out of State on
21 vacation or working out of the country and their mail is not forwarded or not forwarded in a
22 timely manner so Vern is lenient in granting extensions to provide documentation in those
23 cases.
24

25 Hanson thinks that if we have people that haven't responded we should suspend their licenses.
26

27 Discussion continued on whether we should suspend the license of anyone who's mail is
28 returned undeliverable because they didn't file an address correction. Chair cautions against
29 just doing it w
30

31 IDP Liaison: Koonce gives a short report mentioning the change to AXP.
32

33 **Agenda Item 19 – Board Travel.**

34

35 Travel Restrictions: Jones gives a report on the status of travel. So far we have been
36 successful getting all of our travel. He explains the Travel Action Summary Report to be filed
37 after the travel is completed. He also explains that when there is 3rd party reimbursement that
38 the traveler will file send his receipts to Vern and he will forward to travel08 for payment. Once
39 the State has paid the traveler Vern will send a request to the National Organization for
40 reimbursement to the State.
41

42 NCEES Western Zone, May 19-21, 2016 in Anchorage. For those who have been
43 approved – see you there.
44

45 NCARB Annual June 15-18, 2016 Seattle, WA: Koonce and Jones are approved. Fritz
46 had a schedule conflict. There was a short discussion on sending the Licensing Examiner to
47 National meetings. Vernon advises that any travel not on the Annual Report needs a motion to
48 show Board support.
49

50 **On a motion duly made by Schedler, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
51 **RESOLVED to include Sarena in the travel request to attend NCARB's Annual Meeting**

1 **June 15-18, 2016 in Seattle, WA.**

2
3 NCEES Annual August 24-27, 2016 in Indianapolis, IN. Chair asks who wants to go.
4 NCEEs will fund voting delegates and will also fund new members and MBE's who haven't
5 been to an NCEES meeting and were appointed to the Board less than 24 months ago. So
6 Fred and Catherine could be funded by NCEES. Fred will check his schedule and let Vern
7 know. Vern will send Catherine a copy of the agenda when received so she can see what will
8 be offered and will check her calendar.

9
10 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it was**
11 **RESOLVED to support John Savage, Sarena Hackenmiller and Vern Jones to attend the**
12 **NCEES Annual in Indianapolis, IN.**

13
14 CLARB Annual September 22-24, 2016 in Philadelphia, PA: Vern advises that approval
15 of this one may be questionable because CLARB does not provide funding for delegates.
16 Sarena adds that the travel policy allows for 3rd party reimbursement, program receipts or both.

17
18 Chair asks for a report on the NCARB Summit while we wait for a motion on the CLARB
19 meeting.

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

22
23 NCARB Regional Summit in Savannah, GA attended by Jeff and Sarena.

24
25 Koonce reports that there were 11 different resolutions and a contested election. Koonce was
26 appointed to the Education Committee. The resolutions will be voted on in Seattle at the Annual
27 Meeting.

28
29 Hackenmiller reports on her attendance at the MBE meeting as an invaluable experience. They
30 discussed the differences in regulations from State to State.

31
32 **On a motion duly made by Hale, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it was**
33 **RESOLVED to send Luanne Urfer and Vern Jones to the CLARB Annual Meeting in**
34 **Philadelphia, PA in September 2016.**

35
36 Hanson advises that in light of the travel restrictions all attendees at these National Meetings
37 everyone should provide a written report on what the meeting was about and what forums they
38 attended etc. We used to do this religiously but have kind of gotten away from it. If a number of
39 people attend the report can be coordinated. It can be a memo to the Board Chair. Get it to
40 Vern so it can go into the packet for the next Board meeting.

41
42 **Agenda item 22 – Licensing Examiner Report.**

43
44 Sarena explains her report which was on the number of applicants and the AKLS
45 examinee count. She will try to continue to keep the data coming for each meeting. She asks
46 the board to let her know if there is any specific data they would like to see in the report.

47
48 Jones asks who will be the funded delegates for the NCEES Annual. After discussion it was
49 decided that the funded voting delegates will be Colin and Dave.

50
51 There was discussion on how the funded delegate program works. Jones advises that the

1 check NCEES gives funded attendees for M&IE shall not be cashed. It must be signed over to
2 the State and the State will pay your M&IE. Save your receipts. He reviews again how it will
3 work for NCARB meetings. The state will pay the traveler and then Vern will request
4 reimbursement from NCARB for the amount the State paid. Chair adds that anytime you are
5 approved you can have the State Travel Office (STO) make your reservations for you. This will
6 save the State money and you don't have to front any money. You still have to provide your
7 receipts though. It was pointed out that if you use the STO the State will save money on Hotel
8 tax as they use their State credit card to pay the bill. Colin reports that when he arrived at
9 Sophie's Station all he had to do was show his ID and they give him his room key. When he
10 checked out he gave them the key and they gave him a receipt, very simple. They will email
11 you an itinerary for your approval before they book it.

12
13 Chair asks if there is a motion on the funded delegates for NCEES Annual.

14
15 **On a motion duly made by Kerr, seconded by Schedler and passed unanimously it was**
16 **RESOLVED to have Dave Hale and Colin Maynard be the NCEES funded delegates for the**
17 **2016 Annual Meeting in Indiana.**

18
19 **Agenda Item 23 – Board Tasks (to do list).**

20
21 Jones has to post the Guidance Manual update and check emeritus status list and check on
22 November meeting space. Maynard has Guidance Manual and Goals for the Annual Report.
23 Dave has the Guidance Manual and work with Kerr on the letter re mapping. Koonce has a
24 regulation project for ASP and one for fines and fees. Urfer has a regulation project re LSA by
25 Comity. Everyone has the Guidance Manual, Urfer to assign sections. Hanson has the AS 38.
26 95.160. Fritz will help Eriksen with the Legislative Liaison Committee.

27
28 **Agenda item 24 – Read Applications into the Record.**

29
30 **On a motion duly made by Hale, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
31 **RESOLVED to APPROVE the following list of applicants for registration by comity,**
32 **examination and in additional branches of engineering with the stipulation that the**
33 **information in the applicant's file will take precedence over the information in the**
34 **minutes:**

35
36 *The following subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*
37 *meanings:*

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

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

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

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

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

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

45 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

- 1 'Arctic course' denotes a Board-approved arctic engineering course
- 2 CA refers to conditionally approved
- 3

APPROVED	ABBOTT, JASON		
APPROVED	BAROVSKY, DOUGLAS		
APPROVED	BRIDGES, KERRI		
APPROVED	BROCK, VERNON		
APPROVED	CANODE, HOWARD		
APPROVED	DAVENPORT, MICHAEL		
APPROVED	DEESE, MICHAEL		
APPROVED	EILERS, THERESA		
APPROVED	FERGUSON, JACKSON	<i>Licensed</i>	
APPROVED	GILLILAND, SIMON - IN PAPER		
APPROVED	GLYNN, MARK		
APPROVED	HANDY, TIMOTHY	<i>Licensed</i>	
APPROVED	HARDEN, CHAD	<i>Licensed</i>	
APPROVED	KOERNER, JULIAN		
APPROVED	MANNING, STEVEN		
APPROVED	MATHERNE, KIM	<i>Licensed</i>	
APPROVED	ROBBINS, DAVID C.	<i>Licensed</i>	
APPROVED	SOMMERFELD, SHELLEY		
APPROVED	VARNEY, GREGORY	<i>Licensed</i>	
APPROVED	WESTOVER, THOMAS		
APPROVED	ZHAO, YU	<i>SE Licensed</i>	
APPROVED	ZHAO, YU		
CA	AGBAYANI, BENITO		
CA	AMOR, WILLIAM		
CA	BECIA, SIERRA		
CA	BUCCOLA, GREG		<i>Arctic</i>
CA	BURKE, NATHAN		
CA	CHASE, JESSE	<i>Licensed</i>	
CA	CICINI, PAUL		
CA	DHARMARAJAH, HERMAN		
CA	DICKSON, DONALD		
CA	DUNHAM, CONNOR		
CA	EIDE, JEFFREY CARL		

CA	ELFERING, KELSEY		
CA	GALAMBUSH, TENOR		
CA	GORDY, ALLISON		
CA	GRAVES, JACOB		
CA	HUANG, CHUN-TI	<i>Licensed</i>	
CA	KANEN, BRIAN	<i>Emailed</i>	<i>Arctic</i>
CA	KING, RYAN		
CA	MARSH, AARON		
CA	MILES, JASON		
CA	ORTEGA, ABRAM		
CA	PANEK, GREGORY		
CA	PINTO, MARIA JOSE LOBO (FE)	<i>Emailed</i>	<i>Exam</i>
CA	REEVES, JOHN		
CA	REIN, JASON		
CA	RENZ, MARK		<i>Arctic</i>
CA	ROGERS, COREY		
CA	SCHELL, STEVEN		
CA	SHEARER, NATHAN		
CA	SORENSEN, CLARK		
CA	STUTZMAN, ASHLEY		
CA	TAKAHASHI, ALEX		
CA	VAN NORTWICK, NATE		

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

INCOMPLETE	COFFEE, NATHAN
INCOMPLETE	KEITH, CAMERON (FS)
INCOMPLETE	KNIGHT, CHELSEA (FE)

INCOMPLETE	PROZERALIK, MARK
INCOMPLETE	SPANGLER, ALLAN
INCOMPLETE	STAPP, STEVE
INCOMPLETE	VARLEY, JEFF
INCOMPLETE	WELLS, GAVIN

1

2 **Agenda item 25 – Calendar of Events**

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

Board meetings: Jones advises that space in the Atwood Bldg. is limited and in high demand and that there is no rooms available for the first week of November so he asked for the following week and got a room for the 9th and 10th. The Division recommends that you choose more than one week and consider having the meetings earlier in the week. It seems everyone wants Thursday and Friday. Koonce and Maynard both offer conferences rooms in their offices for consideration. Jones will check on the possibility of using one of their spaces. Urfer offers her office in Palmer. Jones adds the if the meetings were started at 11am it would save a nights hotel. There was some discussion on what happens if the meeting goes longer. Chair offers that we could start earlier on the second day. Hanson suggests looking at the agenda in August and deciding on start time then. Jones adds that this was just a suggestion not a mandate. The August meeting will start at 9am we will determine then if the November meeting can start at the later hour.

August 4-5, 2016 in Anchorage
 Maynard will not be here for the 4th and 5th.
 Eriksen may not be able to make it depending on his company's schedule.

November 3-4, 2016 in Anchorage
 Schedler will not be available for the 3rd and 4th.

February 8-9, 2017 in Juneau

National Meetings:

- NCEES WZone May 19-21, 2016 in Anchorage, AK.
(Board)
- NCARB Annual June 15-18, 2016, in Seattle, WA
(Koonce, Jones)
- NCEES Annual August 24-27, 2016 in Indianapolis, IN
(Maynard, Hale, Kerr, Wallis, Schedler, Eriksen, Jones)

4 **Agenda item 26 – Board Member Comments**
5

6 Hanson welcomes the new members and tells them that now is a good opportunity to
7 get involved nationally. He thanks the Board for the nomination for Chair.
8

9 Schedler welcomes the new members and new officers. She appreciates the lively
10 discussions, we don't always agree and we shouldn't.
11

12 Hackenmiller: Thanks everyone for a great meeting and hopes that the application
13 review was ok and welcomes feedback. She welcomes the new members and
14 appreciates Board support for her attending these meetings and to get more involved in
15 National Conferences.
16

17 Urfer welcomes the new members and thanks Sarena for the work she does on the
18 applications.
19

20 Wallis thanks everyone for the welcome and enjoyed the group dinner.
21

22 Koonce thinks it was a great meeting and welcomes the new members. The thanks
23 staff for their work.
24

25 Fritz thanks everyone for the warm welcome and the mentoring guidance.
26

27 Kerr welcomes the new members and notes that we are a combined board and that
28 makes it challenging for some of the regulation projects but that it makes the decisions
29 that come out of this Board stronger, he thinks we have a great board.
30

31 Hale notes that John used all his time so he just says thanks.
32

33 Jones welcomes new members and offers help anytime they have a question. He also
34 likes the fact that the Board can disagree and still remain friends.
35

36 Maynard thanks all for their support while he's been Chair. He talks a little about
37 National meetings and the make-up of other boards and the differences between them
38 and encourages the new members to get involved.
39

40 Chair signs the adoption order for the regulation and adjourns the meeting.
41

42 12:10 p.m. Meeting adjourned
43
44
45
46
47

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

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

Brian Hanson, PE Chair
Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers and Land Surveyors

Date: _____