

1 These draft minutes were prepared by staff and have not yet been approved by the Board.

2
3 **STATE OF ALASKA**

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

8
9 **Minutes of Meeting**
10 **November 3-4, 2016**

11
12 By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, the
13 Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors held a meeting November 3-4,
14 2016 in Anchorage, AK.

15
16 **Thursday November 3, 2016**

17
18 **Agenda Item 1 - Call to Order and Roll Call**

19
20 11:08 a.m. The Vice-Chair called the meeting to order. Roll call, all present except Kathleen
21 Schedler, excused by the Chair and Brian Hanson, excused by the Vice-Chair.

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

- 24
25
 - Dave Hale, Land Surveyor, vice Chair
 - Jeffrey Koonce, Architect, Secretary
 - Colin Maynard, PE, SE
 - Catherine Fritz, Architect
 - Eric Eriksen, PE
 - Fred Wallis, PE
 - John Kerr, Land Surveyor
 - Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect
 - Richard Jones, Public Member
 - Brian Hanson, PE (teleconference Nov. 3 11:30 A.M., present Nov. 3 1:15 P.M., absent Nov. 4)

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 Representing the Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing were:

- 38
39
 - Janey Hovenden, Director
 - Sara Chambers, Operations Manager
 - John Savage Investigator
 - Charles Ward and Marilyn Zimmerman, division paralegals
 - Sarena Hackenmiller, Licensing Examiner

40
41
42
43
44
45 Members of the Public present for portions of the meeting:

- 46
47
 - Peter Giessel, PE, SE representing himself
 - Beau Bivens, representing Alaska Aerial Media

- 1 • Ryan Marlow, representing Alaska Aerial Media
- 2 • Nick Morrison, representing Alaska Aerial Media
- 3 • Megyn Greider, representing Attorney General's office

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

- 6
7 • Jesse Escamilla, representing himself

8
9 **Agenda item 2 - review and approve agenda.**

10
11 An addition to new business was made under Item I, "References."

12
13 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, Seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
14 **RESOLVED to accept the agenda as amended.**

15
16 **Agenda item 3 - ethics reporting.**

17
18 Several members reported having attended the NCEES Annual meeting which was funded by
19 NCEES. Hanson and Sarena attended an NCARB Summit which was funded by NCARB.

20
21 Note: Committee meetings are fully funded by the respective National organization and the
22 individuals are representing their profession not the Board or State.

23
24 **Agenda item 4 - review and approve the August 2016 minutes.**

25
26 No edits. A motion to amend the minutes was proposed as the Board had previously taken action on
27 disciplinary action on registrants that had not yet been given due process.

28
29 **On a motion duly made by Hale, Seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it was**
30 **RESOLVED to strike from the record 2 motions made at the August 6th AELS Board meeting**
31 **regarding the suspension of Earnest E. Schaaf's Professional Land Surveying license, and to**
32 **fine Stuart H. Stovin for violations of 12 AAC 36.540.**

33
34 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it was**
35 **RESOLVED to approve the August 2016 minutes as amended.**

36
37 The next item is the investigative report from John.

38
39 **Agenda item 5 - Investigative Report.**

40
41 John Savage gives his report on the investigative report. He discusses an exemption that the Board
42 had made years ago concerning design professionals which he would like to see carried over into
43 the guidance manual. This specific exemption may be getting looked at right now. It has to do with
44 general contractors, not specialty contractors, who think they can do all the design work
45 themselves. It is something that the Board needs to look into now. John believes it might be the
46 contractors association, the AGC, looking into it.

47
48 Note: AGC stands for The Associated General Contractors of Alaska.

49
50 Maynard explains that the exemption allows specialty contractors to do certain things, but that if

1 you are a specialty contractor you must have an electrical and mechanical administrator on your
2 staff.

3
4 Savage concludes by saying he thinks that there is a lack of education on the public safety reason
5 behind the exemption.

6
7 Maynard is tasked with drafting a letter to Paul Seaton in response.

8
9 **Agenda item 14 - Regulation update.**

10
11 Item A. Changes to 12 AAC 36.063 Engineering Education and Work Experience and Requirements,
12 12 AAC 36.108 Applications for Registration as a Structural Engineer, 12 AAC 36.180 Seal, 12 AAC
13 36.185 Use of Seals, and 12 AAC 36.990.

14
15 Sarena: These are the structural engineering regulations which went into effect September 9. The
16 Board is currently accepting applications and receiving a lot of phone calls.

17
18 Item B. Changes to 12 AAC 36.063, 12 AAC 36.063, 12 AAC 36.064 and 12 AAC 36.065 re: removal of
19 the requirement to apply to the Board for the FE and FS exams.

20
21 Sarena: These are regulations that need to be put out for public comment. John Koonce will be
22 introducing housekeeping legislation later in our meeting regarding NCARB's IDP to AXP change
23 and the Board can vote to put these out for comment at the same time to save money.

24
25 Fritz adds that she would like to start a regulation project on comity requirements for architects.

26
27 **Agenda item 15 - Correspondence received since August 2016.**

28
29 Item A. CLARB - Luanne begins that CLARB is working on some changes to the exam as well as
30 changes to how they're keeping records. CLARB is involved with sunset and they are trying to be
31 ready to defend the practice, as there is pushback by the general public on licensing; whether or not
32 it needs to be continued.

33
34 Item B. NCARB - Koonce states that on our agenda there are several things listed. The most
35 significant is the Mutual Recognition Agreement between New Zealand, Australia, and the United
36 States. It was approved at NCARB Nationals but it is up to each state to accept. 28 states must ratify
37 by the end of the year. We need to have a discussion on this.

38
39 Note: "NCARB MRA" was added to New Business, letter J.

40
41 Item C. NCEES - Maynard begins by saying Brian Hanson is the new Vice President of the NCEES
42 Western Zone. They did not accept a UPLG recommendation to have a parallel structural engineer
43 to professional engineer/land surveyor. There are pieces in the law and rules that reference them
44 but they are not completely matching. They are looking for nominations for the national service
45 award. Also there are proposed changes to the accredited engineering programs.

46
47 Note: 11:30 Brian Hanson calls in to the teleconference.

48
49 Item D: Email from Tom Newman re: Sarah Glaves

50

1 Vice-Chair explains that Sarah Glaves took her Alaska Land Surveying exam on a Friday this April
2 and the following Monday she was in a plane accident and died. Tom asked the Board if we could
3 recognize her. We can agree on that on 18-A.

4
5 **Agenda item 16: Correspondence sent since August 2016.**

6
7 Item A: Email from Jerry Carter –

8
9 Sarena states that Pat Tami, PLS, president-elect of NCEES, may come to our meeting in Juneau in
10 February. He will make a presentation and shadow.

11
12 **Agenda item 17 - Old business.**

13
14 Item A: Arctic Engineering Requirement Evaluation – Maynard would like to send a letter to those
15 who offer courses in Arctic Engineering to check in with them and see if they have changed
16 instructors, texts, etc. There are 5 courses at UAA, 2 courses at UAF and 1 at the University of
17 Washington. It would be worthwhile to figure out the content being taught, whether the Board
18 thinks the course is still good, and whether the people teaching are qualified to be teaching it.

19
20 There is a discussion on the wording regarding the responder’s motivation to reply.

21
22 Vice-Chair asks if this something we do every so many years. Maynard responds that as far as the
23 Board knows, we have never done it. The Northern Design course was created in the 90’s and was
24 reviewed and approved and re-reviewed a few years later, but since then, every instructor has been
25 replaced, as well as the person running it. He says that part of the concern is also that there were
26 chemical engineers in the northern design course learning about buildings which doesn’t really
27 help them. Nor with Naval Engineers, it doesn’t help them to learn about ice growth and roads.
28 Maynard suggests that associations create their own course.

29
30 Item B: Bill to make Landscape Architect seat permanent, voting seat - Maynard: We will wait under
31 after the election next Tuesday. The House and Senate will organize at that time and we will look
32 for a place for the bill and a sponsor.

33
34 Item C: Practice of Land Surveying definition – chart - Kerr developed a chart to break down the
35 definition of land surveying in statute as there is a lot of confusion on it. He discussed the definition
36 with a number of land surveyors who have worked in Alaska for many years. He then converted the
37 analysis into a flow chart so one could discover if the activity they are doing is or is not land
38 surveying. There are areas for interpretation, as any statute would have. Kerr mentioned that he
39 did this when he was first appointed to the Board 4 years prior so he could have a full
40 understanding of the definition and the technical perspective. He has used it and shared it with
41 others and believes it is functional. It provides a framework for assessment and he would like to see
42 it in the guidance manual. He believes that it provides an unbiased, acceptable analysis of the
43 statute.

44
45 Vice-Chair thinks it is a great tool for staff to forward to callers and for John to use in investigation.

46
47 Kerr asks that this be part of the guidance manual discussion in committee. He explains that he and
48 Hale are doing a presentation on land surveying and will add this at the end. He would like if the
49 attorney general’s office took a look at it to make sure it was defensible. This will be discussed more
50 in new business, Item F.

1
2 Note: Hanson mentions from the phone that somebody is rustling papers and he cannot hear.

3
4 **Agenda item 18 – New business.**

5
6 Item A. Email from Thomas Newman re: Sarah Glaves

7
8 Hale reads the language on the certificate for Brian who is on the phone and cannot see. “The Board
9 is issuing this certificate in memory of Sarah May Glaves to acknowledge her dedication to the
10 profession of land surveying and progress toward achieving professional licensure.”

11
12 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Koonce and passed unanimously it was**
13 **RESOLVED to issue a certificate regarding Sarah Glaves.**

14
15 Item B. Email from Jesse Escamilla re: new Structural Engineering regulations

16
17 Maynard believes that it would be good to collect Board responses regarding these new regulations
18 and create a page to be inserted into the guidance manual.

19
20 Vice-Chair says that it seems like every response that the Board gives is kind of a policy. The
21 guidance is our interpretation of the regulations, so it makes sense that we memorialize it.

22
23 A brief discussion ensues regarding at which point responses become policies and go into Board
24 policy or the Guidance Manual. Maynard concludes that this is only one question. We aren’t ready
25 for committee.

26
27 12:04 p.m. recessed for lunch.

28
29 1:21 p.m. on record. Roll Call, all present except Schedler.

30
31 Note: Chair Brian Hanson has arrived.

32
33 **Agenda item 7 – Public Comment**

34
35 Peter Giessel thanks the board for all of their efforts and commitment to the three-legged stool of
36 education, experience, and exams.

37
38 Beau Bivens from Alaska Aerial Media (AAM) explains how their company doing aerial mapping
39 works. Then he goes into regulation that applies to that process. They would like some type of
40 statement from the Board regarding the interpretation of this statute in relation to UAS, drone use.
41 They wonder if the Board has a plan on how to enforce that or make companies aware that this
42 exists.

43
44 Chair explains that this has been ramping up over the last couple of years and that the Board is now
45 taking some action on this. He says that the Board is aware of it and wants to be involved in the
46 discussion and letting people know but may not be able to decide that today.

47
48 Hale asks if you’re working with a surveyor, are your final products getting stamped.

49
50 Bivens replies that the final project is usually a digital file. We can include a letter stating what the

1 surveyor did with the ground control in our deliverables. Whoever lays the ground control is able to
2 stamp on final drawings. The stamped results are coming from the surveyors.

3
4 Usually the client will come to us and we're the primary and we subcontract out a licensed surveyor
5 to lay the ground control points. Then we include some type of information about the survey on the
6 deliverables. They are delivering the stamped results. Not AAM.

7
8 Kerr starts by saying that the statute addresses services, processes, and activities that fall under the
9 definition but it is entirely silent as to what technology is used. AAM's activities fall under the
10 definition of land surveying – measurement is one of the activities. The company doesn't get a pass
11 just because they are measuring from a drone. The goal is to protect the public, that there is
12 someone accountable doing the work. AAM knows that their work is highly technical and arcane,
13 but the clients don't know whether they are getting valid maps and answers, and the company is
14 accountable only to the market forces; they are not licensed. Licensing verifies education, that one
15 has been tested, has appropriate experience to do the work. The board wants to see people get in
16 compliance with the law. There are a lot of good reasons that the law is there, primarily to protect
17 the client. The clients will never know until way down the road. (Kerr hands Bivens his flow chart
18 about the Board's interpretation of the definition of land surveying). He continues that they may
19 have possible presentation material to share with AAM for the UAS meeting. The board want the
20 company to succeed but their highest interest is in protecting the public and at this point there is no
21 way the public can evaluate whether what AAM is doing is valid or not.

22
23 Eriksen states that in the past people have been using airplanes to collect data which is the same as
24 this.

25
26 Maynard sees the drone as a tool and the final product is surveying, so a surveyor needs to do that.

27
28 Hale asks if providing mapping products triggers the requirement for a corporation.

29
30 Kerr replies that if they're practicing land surveying, yes.

31
32 Chair: Not every product that they're producing is going to require a land surveyor. Shooting a
33 video, not land surveying, taking a still image, not land surveying. But anytime you drop
34 topography, elevations, survey boundaries, ortho-rectified photos, or when you're calling that
35 surveyor out to set corners or set targets, those will require a land surveyor. No different than
36 having a rod-man on your crew. It's just the tool they're using, as long as they have someone in
37 responsible charge for the work.

38
39 Kerr says that if you offer the service, no matter what percentage, it would fall under land surveying
40 and you would be required to have a Certificate of Authorization.

41
42 Bivens ends by saying that AAM will move forward with licensing.

43
44 Jesse Escamilla speaks from the telephone and is representing himself. He begins by separating
45 himself from the State of Alaska bridge engineers who have come to the Board for comment in the
46 past. Escamilla's initial worry is that the Board does not have a bridge expert but regulations are
47 still being passed regarding bridges. He brings up an argument that Hanson had made in a prior
48 meeting about an earthquake and a bridge that collapsed in 1989. Those were pre-seismic design,
49 but now they know those fail and they've switched to a displacement-based design, which allows
50 bridges to move. He does not believe that these arguments were valid, and there was no one to

1 question them. There was some conversation that the Alaska SE regulations were modeled after
2 WA and west coast regulations; that they are pretty much the same. This regulation the Board
3 wrote mostly follows Washington. Hawaii and Illinois requires all structures. WA is the only other
4 one that requires bridges. Every other state requires certain significant structures but omits
5 bridges. Idaho, Nebraska, and New Mexico have SE licenses but do not require it on any of their
6 structural plans. He states again that some things that the Board was saying were not true but there
7 is no one there to rebut which is frustrating. Maybe opinions of what was voted on would change if
8 there were more truth in this. He asserts that if we're going to do it let's do it right. He mentioned
9 that Hanson had previously pointed out that people give feedback but never tell the Board how to
10 fix it, so Escamilla offers the following solution: If you're talking to a bridge engineer about how you
11 want to define a significant structure, maybe you want to go to something that is complex and
12 requires a higher degree of calculations, higher order of analysis, something we know that is more
13 complex. There was a discussion earlier about how a railing on a bridge is the same on 50 versus
14 200. You can say the same thing for 2 80-foot span bridges, which are 160 feet versus 2 100-foot
15 bridges, which are 200 feet. The Board can use the logic they used earlier to say there is no
16 difference, because there's not. He recommends looking into getting a bridge expert. Before you
17 make these rulings, you should discuss them with someone knowledgeable in the field. This is
18 highly technical, and there's just a select few bridge engineers that actually practice this. He
19 concludes by stating that this affects his livelihood and other people in his office.
20

21 **Agenda item 18-B**

22
23 The Board returns to the email from Jesse Escamilla included in the Board packet. This regards
24 Board responses to his questions regarding the new structural regulations. The authors Hanson and
25 Maynard wanted to make sure the Board agrees on the response. It moves into a discussion about if
26 the program wants to start an FAQ or policy for questions regarding structural engineering.
27

28 Jones reminds the Board that if they're going to make a policy they need to do so, then make a
29 motion, and put it in writing. The Board has received different opinions from AGs. If it's not in
30 regulation then it doesn't matter, but other AG's say that if its consistent policy then it will hold up.
31

32 There's a discussion on if we could start an internal document about rationalizations for
33 interpretations. The conversation devolves into a discussion on health, safety, and welfare of the
34 public and inconsistent continuing education approvals.
35

36 Jones spoke to a prior PLS on the Board, Heieren, who recently sent an e-mail to the AAG. Heieren
37 defends how gun safety or other courses should count toward land surveying.
38

39 Hale asks how that plays into professional competence. Eriksen thinks our answers fit into policy.
40

41 Jones continues the Board could accept personal safety courses as a portion of the requirements,
42 25%, 40%, whatever. It doesn't have a bearing on the technical aspects but it has a bearing on
43 completing the job of surveying a parcel of land.
44

45 Hale argues that it doesn't protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public.
46

47 Chair states that if the Board is interpreting something that they feel is not explicit in the
48 regulations and could be interpreted another way then we ought to record that decision. The board
49 has to ensure consistency in acceptable CE courses or in who is required to build a bridge, for
50 example.

1
2 Kerr can't see how bear safety meets the requirements of the statute. Public safety is the goal of the
3 Board, but this regards safety of the individual.

4
5 Chair assumes there was a rational reason to include that but brings the conversation back to item
6 3 and the responses in the letter at hand. He asks if there is anything special in the response that
7 really isn't explicit. If yes, we need to put it into policy and maintain its continuity. This specific item
8 was brought to the Board to see if the rest of them agreed before they sent it along, and if so, then
9 no policy needs to be made.

10
11 Maynard doesn't think we need to do a policy statement since it would be very long and suggest we
12 just do an FAQ on the regulations.

13
14 Chair asks if anyone has any changes or additions to the response given in 18-B item 3.

15
16 Hale thinks you can answer the questions based on the regulations.

17
18 Kerr thinks that the only thing that is ambiguous is when the members reply "specifications are
19 *usually* done by an engineer" which questions what constitutes "usually."

20
21 Maynard and Fritz reply that if the specs are less than 200 feet then it doesn't matter. If you're not
22 changing the design of the bridge then it doesn't matter.

23
24 Fritz believes that we have an obligation to respond to questions as they come through, whether
25 one-on-one or more proactively by putting in guidance manuals, etc. The board could tell them to
26 read the regulations and decide, but that's not good practice. It's definitely appropriate to respond
27 in writing, and it may be appropriate to do something more than that.

28
29 Maynard asserts that if someone asks questions we have to respond.

30
31 Chair says that we need to wait and see if we get more questions on this regulation change. If we get
32 enough of them we can start putting them together. He doesn't believe there are a lot of questions
33 yet, and we got a lot more the first time around when the board brought structural in. It hasn't been
34 two months since they went into effect. He continues that it's our obligation to let everyone know
35 that these are regulations are out there and let them know when grandfathering is going to expire.
36 No one objects to the response given in item 18-B so the chair concludes that we will send it as a
37 response.

38
39 **Agenda item 8 - Financial Report.**

40
41 Sara Chambers, CBPL Operations Manager and Janey Hovenden, CBPL Director introduce
42 themselves. First, Sara lets the Board know that the 4th quarter reports are not yet available due to
43 the state conversion over to a new accounting system and being low on staff. They are running late
44 on getting boards a final report. The division is expecting to receive an updated draft within a week
45 which will be finalized and posted on the website. At that time staff can forward the information to
46 the Board so we can go over it at the next meeting. Sara makes sure that the Board knows that
47 when they receive the report they can e-mail staff or management with any questions they may
48 have.

49
50 Sara then goes on to discuss the progress of the tablets or laptops for use. They will be placing an

1 order for laptops that are lightweight but powerful enough to meet the business needs of the Board.
2 They should be able to be used at the next meeting.
3
4 Chair asks if the staff will have to carry them to every meeting.
5
6 Sara responds that they are planning to order enough for the Juneau office and Anchorage office so
7 they will be available for ease of use. She is going to ask Boards about how many people are
8 planning on using these. If we need to carry any to another location to make up for the number that
9 are not there then the staff will do that. Filling in the gaps is the next step.
10
11 Chair says that he would love to use one since he does not have a laptop anymore.
12
13 Sarena asks if applications will be able to be uploaded onto the laptops.
14
15 Sara responds absolutely, she thinks it will take care of all Board needs including large volumes of
16 documentation, audio-visual presentations, etc. They are full servicing. We will educate board
17 members on how to use them, work with the staff so they understand the capabilities. These have
18 more utilities than expected and the costs are shared across each board. IT was concerned about
19 the security and the maintenance, which is why it took so long. The division expressed that one of
20 the requirements that we have is that they will be wiped after every Board meeting. IT will manage
21 that.
22
23 Fritz asks how preparation for the Board meeting will change as we received the information
24 through the ZendTo site for this meeting. How that will affect our liabilities if we download the
25 information beforehand.
26
27 Sara understands this is an issue and they have a few strategies. They are pursuing the use of state
28 e-mail addresses for Board members so you can access information securely through e-mail. They
29 are also working on Board management software, where information can be uploaded to a website
30 so the Board wouldn't have to download information to a computer. It will make it easier for
31 meeting management and document preparation for staff. E-mail address division-wide will cost
32 \$21,000. Software is unknown.
33
34 Fritz asks Sara to clarify how the e-mail addresses will work with security. Sara discusses its
35 security and the possibilities of an AG discovery request to see a Board member's computer.
36
37 Discussion continued for a short period.
38
39 Maynard asks about the status of the Executive Administrator position recruitment.
40
41 Sara replies that the second recruitment closed that Monday so she is reviewing the candidates
42 right now. She admits that it is not as quick as she had hoped but she will let the Board know what
43 the next steps will be. Sarena is doing a good job holding down the fort and she knows the Board
44 appreciates that.
45
46 Jones asks if Sarena can get acting status so she can receive credit for this experience.
47
48 Sara replies that she had this discussion with Sarena and that it is not something she can discuss
49 with the Board at this time.
50

1 Chair asks if there are any other questions or comments.
2
3 Sara thanks the Board for their time and says that they will keep the Board updated on the next
4 steps.
5
6 Sarena notes that the next telephonic meeting will not start for 10 minutes.
7
8 2:27 p.m. Break.
9
10 2:36 p.m. Back on the record.
11
12 **Agenda item 9 - Memorandum and Meeting with Charles Ward, former paralegal of the**
13 **division re: Retired Licenses**
14
15 Charles Ward introduces himself as the former paralegal and Marilyn Zimmerman is the current
16 paralegal, both with CBPL. Ward has two things to bring up. One is the investigator report issues
17 that he will discuss in executive session, and the other is a memorandum that he wrote to the Board
18 regarding the option of registrants to retire their license while they have an unresolved continuing
19 education audit which has implications for other investigations. He wanted to bring this to the
20 Board's attention so that they understand the situation.
21
22 Chair asks if the Board has any questions. Essentially anyone can retire their license if they are
23 under investigations.
24
25 Ward says that the Board can still continue investigations into retired licenses but with limited
26 resources, the division may decide to allocate their resources elsewhere. If the person decided to
27 retire then there would not be a disciplinary action.
28
29 Chair asks if investigations can take action against a retired license.
30
31 Ward replies that yes, they certainly can, but it is a matter of allocation of division resources. The
32 division may ask if the Board and the division should be inclined to continue pursuing
33 investigations and possible disciplinary actions against a retired individual.
34
35 Chair believes that the fines do not pay for the amount of effort it takes. Ward agrees.
36
37 Jones says this began because someone renewed their license without completing the CE
38 requirements and when he was audited he wished to retire his license without completing the
39 requirements. Ward does not wish to speak about any specific case but says that this situation has
40 occurred at least 3 times and he believes John Savage (AEL Investigator) has had this issue as well.
41
42 Kerr asks if we can offer retirement status for those in good standing, and if you are not in good
43 standing you'd have to surrender your license.
44
45 Ward says you are considered in good standing if there is not a current license action. The AAG
46 agreed that if there's no license action then it would be very difficult for the Board to say that they
47 are not in good standing.
48
49 Hale reads through the disciplinary power of the Board, where we can impose limitations or
50 conditions on the practice of a licensee so if they go into retirement and come back out of

1 retirement we can impose that requirement, like catch up on CE.

2
3 Ward replies that if someone has surrendered their license or let it lapse and tried to come back, it
4 would be different than retiring. The Board has laid out requirements for reactivating and
5 reinstating, and they are discussed differently in the regulations. He is unsure if the Board could put
6 limitations on a registrant who is trying to reactivate a retired license. The division could jump back
7 in with their investigation, but if there's a 4-year gap, you will have different staff or investigators. It
8 may be problematic to pick that investigation back up.

9
10 Chair asks if we are putting ourselves at risk of a lawsuit if someone retires their license without
11 completing the CEUs.

12
13 The way that Ward currently approaches this situation is to tell the registrant that they can retire
14 their license but the investigation is not going to stop. He cannot force them to comply but if they do
15 not, then the division will pursue disciplinary action. Usually the registrant then complies.

16
17 Maynard says that our regulation states that if you want to reactivate that you have to meet CE
18 requirements.

19
20 Ward agrees, and says that if someone had a CE audit issue and then retire their license and tried to
21 reactivate it, they would have a CE requirement to complete to reactivate. But that doesn't address
22 the CEs that they did not do when they retired their license and there would be no disciplinary
23 action. Concluding these investigations take division time and resources. We don't want to create a
24 false impression that you can retire your license and come back if you don't complete the CE's.

25
26 Chair thanks Ward for his time and asks the Board if they have questions.

27
28 Jones asks if Charles Ward was looking for an answer from the Board. Ward says no, he just wanted
29 the Board to be aware. At present the division is going to continue pursuing the CE investigations. It
30 does costs time and money so if the Board wanted to take away the option of retiring your license if
31 you are under investigation then they would need to move forward. It certainly would be a
32 regulation change but it may be a statute change. The statute does provide for the ability to retire a
33 license under conditions set out by the Board.

34
35 Hale discusses the regulation that gives them some latitude.

36
37 **On a motion duly made by Hale, seconded by Kerr Maynard passed unanimously it was**
38 **RESOLVED to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310 (c)(3) to review**
39 **disciplinary case number 2016-001053.**

40
41 Charles Ward and Marilyn Zimmerman were invited by the Board to call into an Executive Session
42 conference line. Sarena remained in the room.

43
44 3:07 p.m. Back on the record.

45
46 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it was**
47 **RESOLVED to accept the voluntary surrender of architect registration by Stuart H. Stovin,**
48 **case number 2016-001053.**

49
50 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it was**

1 **RESOLVED to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310 (c)(3) to review**
2 **applicant files.**

3
4 Sarena remained in the room.

5
6 3:08 p.m. in Executive Session.

7
8 5:15 p.m. Recessed for the day.
9

10 **Friday, November 4, 2016**

11
12 9:00 a.m. On record, Roll Call all present except Schedler and Hanson. Vice-Chair Hale will be taking
13 over for Hanson.

14
15 There is a motion about the Arctic engineering requirement which was item 17-A.

16
17 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Koonce and passed unanimously it was**
18 **RESOLVED to send letters to the instructors of the approved arctic engineering classes to**
19 **request information about their classes.**

20
21 There is a brief discussion regarding typos.

22
23 **Agenda item 18 – New Business, continued.**

24
25 Item 18-C, Sunset Audit Report. Maynard explains that this audit says that the Board is doing well
26 and they have one recommendation, which is to make the landscape architect permanent. The
27 Board discusses travel for the next meeting in February and the possibility to fly in earlier to
28 discuss this with the legislature.

29
30 Sarena asks who would like to do this – Kerr, Maynard, Urfer, Fritz, and Hale.

31
32 Maynard concludes that there is no action on the audit report.

33
34 Item 18-D regards NCARB’s change of the name of the “IDP” program to the “AXP” program.

35
36 Note: The Board’s regulations include the prior program name (“IDP”) and therefore need to be
37 updated to the new program name, “AXP.”

38
39 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
40 **RESOLVED to make changes to 12 AAC 36.060, 12 AAC 36.061, and 12 AAC 36.990 regarding**
41 **changes from IDP to AXP.**

42
43 Fritz asks if we need to modify anything in the guidance manual since the Board has a policy that
44 architects can call themselves intern if they are in training. The Board has no immediate response
45 but later in the meeting, in discussion regarding the NCARB MRA, decides to look into this at the
46 February meeting.

47
48 Item 18-E Appointments to the AEL Board. Richard “Vernon” Jones, the prior AEL Executive
49 Administrator, was appointed as the public member. John Kerr and Jeff Koonce were reappointed. A
50 new Electrical Engineer will be appointed in March, Elizabeth Johnston.

1
2 Item 18-F Presentation on land surveying. Kerr starts by saying there is confusion regarding the
3 definition of land surveying. He put together a PowerPoint presentation to discuss geospatial
4 mapping. He goes over each slide and mentions that there will be a lot of editing as there is too
5 much information on each slide. It describes the activities that can be considered land surveying.
6 The slides generally break down the definition of land surveying and show how to get in
7 compliance.
8
9 Hale says this is something we can send people, use it as a tool. It is a positive way to get people to
10 move forward.
11
12 Kerr says that it may be something to add to the guidance manual, or the flow chart, or both. It
13 would be good to know if this is defensible. There are also a lot of examples that are not land
14 surveying so we explain the difference.
15
16 Urfer would like to be involved on this as it makes an impact on landscape architecture. She
17 believes there are may be some pushback from state planners who feel like they own GIS. She
18 believes planning needs to be addressed. A discussion ensues about schematic or concept designs
19 versus maps. Kerr would like to talk to the planners.
20
21 Kerr would like to present at the UAS users group meeting the following week.
22
23 Fritz asks if there is something in Juneau maybe getting folks together from DNR, Fish and Game.
24 Kerr wonders if it's something we could do that before our next Board meeting. Eriksen mentions
25 that there is a meeting where every engineer gets together once a month, which happens to
26 coincide with our meeting. There is a luncheon at which the Board could present or a separate
27 meeting. Fritz suggests having someone from the AG's office. Sarena asks that they get these details
28 together so the next meeting can be organized around it.
29
30 Item 18-G Mission Solutions LLC re: Software Engineering, licensing. Eriksen discusses
31 correspondence between a paralegal for the company and the Board who practice software
32 engineering. He notes that this has happened at least twice. NCEES has added a software
33 engineering exam so the Board has in the past prepared some draft definitions but there was
34 feedback to not license them. This is an example of why the Board wants to license software
35 engineers and why we went to general licensure for most disciplines. They should have a pathway
36 in our state. He suggests a regulation project to add software engineering as a discipline that we
37 license. But this is specifically discussing offering "engineering" in regards to software engineering,
38 from this company. It is not unfamiliar to us in Alaska.
39
40 Maynard adds that NCEES does not define the disciplines since most of the states do not license by
41 discipline so it is hard to come up with a definition for software engineering. We need to define it to
42 give the public and John (AEL investigator) to say, this is software engineering that we care about
43 versus not.
44
45 Eriksen agrees, and says that we need guidelines to interpret the definition.
46
47 Sarena asks for some guidance for this company specifically, who is going to change their NAICS
48 code from engineering services, but do not know if they can still practice software engineering.
49
50 Eriksen we don't have a definition of software engineering.

1
2 Kerr adds that it is something that should be licensed. Maynard says we should not license
3 programmers; we should only license engineering programmers.
4

5 Eriksen requests that we find our old Board packet when the board discussed software engineering.
6

7 Urfer and Fritz discuss the misuse of the title “platform architect.” The Board then talks about how
8 many job descriptions and titles use the word architect or engineer and it is impossible to go after
9 every one of them.
10

11 Maynard suggests that we pose the software engineering question on NCEES to other state Boards.
12

13 **Item 19 – Continuing Education Audit Question & meeting with Megyn Greider, AAG.**
14

15 Ms. Greider introduces herself and states that it is her first visit with this Board. This meeting will
16 be about the habit of approving continuing education courses and if the Board must make a public
17 statement when they decide not to approve courses that previous members had approved, based on
18 their interpretation of the CE regulations.
19

20 She begins by stating that there is no affirmative judicial statement saying what the Board must or
21 what they should or cementing the Board’s opinion. The board is left with what the statute dictates
22 and regulations. These classes include shotgun safety, ATV safety...a previous member submitted
23 his rationale for this. But, the Board does not need to submit any statement to the public to shift
24 away from that habit. This is not precedent because there’s not a judicial requirement. So the order
25 is statute, regulation, then policy statements posted online – which may not be given deference, but
26 may be considered. The Board has none of those; they just have a habit, which is not given any
27 consideration. The regulations articulate the purpose behind the CEUs. So, the Board’s habit of
28 accepting gun safety, field safety, etc.; they can continue to accept those if they choose but they are
29 not bound to it.
30

31 Hale says that we would like to be consistent. Can be memorialize that without it becoming pre-
32 approval?
33

34 Greider says that you have sent out a letter, meeting summaries, and guidance. You have set your
35 expectations for registrants. You need not write something and affirmatively post it. Once you do
36 that, it can be considered, and lock you in.
37

38 Hale’s problem is that some Board members will approve courses and then a future Board member
39 will not so we are looking for a way to memorialize that internally. She adds that ok; you’re looking
40 for a way to be consistent. Make sure you go to your national societies and ask each other if you’d
41 approve certain courses or not. It seems like the rationale for approving courses was not tracked.
42

43 Hale, yes, it has been very subjective. Is it a bad idea for us to have an internal document?
44

45 Kerr says no, I would not like to have that document. Things change all the time. The regulation is
46 pretty clear.
47

48 Maynard recommends adding a sentence after our requirements that say “classes for the health,
49 safety, welfare of the public, *not the professional*”. He says there is no problem with this.
50

1 Greider adds, 36.510 (g)(1), this isn't just health, safety, welfare of the public, it's more than that.
2 The licensees must comply with these regulations. It must also be relevant to the practice of the
3 registrants, which are defined in your statute.
4

5 Fritz adds that interpretation will always exist. We don't want to tie our hands to the point where
6 we can't do that anymore.
7

8 Greider adds that they Board may ask the licensee to explain why he believes his course was
9 relevant. That's the practice of discretion.
10

11 The Board then moves onto the flowchart. The reasoning for this flowchart is because the Board
12 wants to give guidance on whether or not someone is doing land surveying. The Board would use
13 this to send to the public.
14

15 Kerr would like to make sure that this document is defensible. There is a lot of interpretation within
16 each of the decision diamonds. The definition is too hard to understand so we had to break it down.
17

18 Greider says that this is an accurate parsing. If this is how the Board is going to interpret the
19 practice of land surveying in the regulation, then this is ok.
20

21 Kerr adds that he wants to make it clear that nothing on this chart impacts the legal interpretation
22 of the statute.
23

24 Greider confirms that if this document is out there then it would be considered and the Board
25 would be held to it. She reminds the Board to make sure this document is put out there in an official
26 manner.
27

28 Question from Kerr. Florida board never meets without an attorney present, but I don't think we
29 need this level of oversight. Can we get more AG time?
30

31 Megyn makes sure that the Board understands that we are in a budget shortfall and that the legal
32 fees come from registrants. Those legal fees are quite costly. It is always worthwhile to run the
33 budget to see if it's possible. The Board's request for an AAG would go through Sara Chambers,
34 CBPL Operations Manager, who is being very thoughtful on the onus around licensing fees. Finally,
35 there are only 3 AAGs instead of 6 so their time is very limited. They do want to meet with boards,
36 in fact in some issues, meeting would cut down on long-term costs. She does not know what the
37 costs are.
38

39 Kerr concludes that as a Board we are not abusing or wasting your time. Probably every time we
40 need to contact you is a worthwhile thing. There is a downstream impact for these things compared
41 to the costs of the legal advice.
42

43 We will discuss delegating staff to approve NCARB certificates at the next meeting. Greider leaves
44 the meeting.
45

46 The Board agrees that the AAG coming was a positive thing. Jones reminds the Board not to call the
47 AAG unless there's a really good reason since it is very expensive.
48

49 **Back to Item 18 - New Business.**
50

1 Item 18-H Engineering Statute Clean-Up. Maynard starts by stating a company cannot be an
2 electrical contractor or mechanical contractor unless they have an electrical or mechanical
3 administrator on their staff.

4
5 Savage continues that exemption #7, for years people were building under that exemption. It had
6 been allowed because of the poor wording. We finally got it changed to say you can do that off the
7 drawings of the appropriate design professional. Now they're making a run at it again to change it
8 back. There is a lot of misunderstanding out there even at the official level. Electrical or Mechanical
9 Administrators think they can put an administrator license on there and design the work.
10 Misconception. Electrical Administrator's job is to oversee the work that the journeyman is doing.
11 That's all they're licensed to do.

12
13 Maynard says we do not want to delete the words, "design professional" from it.

14
15 Hale we do not want to change it at all right, so we need to educate Paul Seaton, right? Explain why
16 we did it in the first place.

17
18 Maynard we do not want the administrator to design something and sign off on it.

19
20 Koonce how can they change statute?

21
22 Maynard, the legislature can do whatever they want without us knowing. I will write a letter. They
23 do not get to do engineering. They get to implement the design. Not allowed to design anything.

24
25 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Fritz and passed unanimously it was**
26 **RESOLVED that we public notice changes to 12 AAC 36.062, 12 AAC 36.063, 12 AAC 36.064 &**
27 **12 AAC 36.065 regarding FE and FS Examinations, and, 12 AAC 36.060, 12 AAC 36.061, 12**
28 **AAC 36.990 regarding IDP and AXP changes.**

29
30 Discussion: These will be public noticed for 60 days with no mail-out. Written comment only.

31
32 Item 18-I Reference for Structural Engineering. Maynard explains that there's someone who would
33 like to be licensed a structural but he only has one structural reference but our comity application
34 says you must have two. It might make sense to change the language to say, "in a related branch."

35
36 The regulations for examination say "or substantially similar" are already in the regulations so
37 examinees have that flexibility already.

38
39 Sarena explains specific scenarios where comity applicants are not eligible for licensure in our state
40 because they have very specific disciplines and do not know or have not worked with anyone else
41 in that specific discipline to be their reference.

42
43 The way our regulations say it, it must be "in our discipline." This addresses the comity regulations.
44 Maynard also addressed a clean-up since subparagraph (g) references the incorrect.

45
46 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Jones and passed unanimously it was**
47 **RESOLVED that the Board modifies 12 AAC 36.105 to allow comparable branches to verify**
48 **experience and to correct references in subparagraph (g).**

49
50 Sarena asks if this negatively affects our registrants, since she must rationalize that in an FAQ. The

1 Board cannot see any negative effects.

2
3 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
4 **RESOLVED that the regulation project regarding comparable branch references be public**
5 **noticed with the FE/FS and AXP regulation projects.**

6
7 Item 18-J NCARB MRA. Koonce explains that NCARB has put forth a Mutual Recognition Agreement.

8
9 Jones is confused by this. Maynard and Sarena explain how this is different than them applying by
10 comity. If Alaska signs the MRA, the applicant can receive a special NCARB certificate that would be
11 eligible for acceptance in Alaska. If we do not sign the MRA, their NCARB certificate could not be
12 accepted in Alaska. Hale does not want to prohibit licensure. The Board agrees that this is good for
13 licensure mobility.

14
15 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Fritz and passed unanimously it was**
16 **RESOLVED to accept the NCARB Resolution 2016-01 “Mutual Recognition Arrangement with**
17 **Australia and New Zealand” by signing the attached agreement.**

18
19 Item 18-K Guidance Manual. Urfer discusses her efforts on the guidance manual and the Board
20 discusses a way to make changes, track them, and send them to staff.

21
22 **Agenda item 20 - Special & Standing Committees**

23
24 Vice-Chair did a quick run through the various special committees. Vern and Jeff are added to the
25 Licensure Implementation committee. The Board decides to strike the Registration and Practice
26 special committee and add Land Surveying Outreach to special committees. Hale will be the Chair,
27 and Kerr and Urfer will be added as Members. Move Licensure Mobility to a standing committee.

28
29 Fritz and Jones will be working on a regulation project on their own. Added to the To Do List.

30
31 **On a motion duly made by Fritz, seconded by Koonce and passed unanimously it was**
32 **RESOLVED to develop a regulation project to review architectural registration by comity: 12**
33 **AAC 36.103 and 12 AAC 36.060.**

34
35 Legislative Liaison: Sarena asks for justification for the February meeting. Legislatively, there was
36 the sunset audit and landscape architect position. Eriksen reminds Maynard about the exemption
37 and administrator issues. Kerr says there was a draft about DNR requiring the AEL Board to review
38 plans, and it might come back this year.

39
40 Nothing on emeritus or budget. Kerr would like to see information on AAG charges.

41
42 The Board again discusses the issue on personal safety courses not counting as continuing
43 education.

44
45 AXP Liaison – Koonce. Fritz wants to change the committee to include more NCARB information.
46 Maynard explains that this committee was set up to communicate with examinees that are not yet
47 registered.

48
49 Kerr asks about electronic plans digital seals. He says that the DOT wants the original wet seal
50 document, which protects the registrant from an altered plan. Is DOT the document owner? It

1 should be to protect the registrant and not the client.

2
3 Fritz: Public owners can own the document if it's in the contract. You have two signed copies; there
4 could be differences between the two. Most owners, city of Juneau's public policy, don't care about
5 the wet seal.

6
7 Kerr adds, if this is designed to protect the registrant then requirement by DOT is compromising
8 protection of the registrants.

9
10 Maynard thinks that this is particular to surveying.

11
12 Hale says to record the document. Recording and/or copyright is the only way to really verify.

13
14 Use of Seals, in our regulations. Must have wet signed in your files or if it's electronic the signature
15 must disappear if it's ever altered.

16
17 **Agenda item 21 - National Meeting Reports**

18
19 Item A. NCARB MBE/MBC Meeting. Sarena gives a report on this meeting which she and Brian
20 Hanson, Chair, attended. Main theme of the meeting was impediments to licensure. NCARB
21 discussed its role in disciplinary action, continuing education, and legislative support. They also had
22 a session on media relations to the public which was very informative.

23
24 Item B. NCEES Annual in Indianapolis, IN. Maynard reports that it was fairly uneventful. Pat Tami
25 was voted as the president-elect and Brian Hanson was elected Vice-President of the western zones.
26 Surveyors reported on the lack of movement toward the AKLS becoming a computer-based test.
27 Chemical is the first CBT PE exam and will come online in 2018. Kerr asked other jurisdictions
28 about continuing education and it confirmed that our statute is in line with everyone except
29 Washington's, which says you can take safety courses. Some states require ethics. Some architects
30 would like business management classes, which is included in our regulations.

31
32 Fritz submitted a reflection about the meeting and asked if this was necessary. Sarena replied that
33 we do have to submit at least one for the group and thanks Fritz for this contribution. Then Sarena
34 asked if members could follow her lead and write a summary of what they learned at the meeting
35 and submit it to Sarena to keep. This is excellent justification for the Board and for that travel.

36
37 Item C. CLARB Annual in Philadelphia, PA. Urfer reports that this CLARB meeting was really well
38 done and there were a lot of discussions. Deregulation was the theme. Steven McNutt from NCARB
39 came in and talked about anti-trust, how the engineers need to get on track with FARB, which
40 advocates on behalf of all of the licensing boards. We had a number of different speakers on how to
41 reach the legislators. They discussed the best way to do this is to talk about the things they may
42 have experienced, like a national park, and why it's important to keep landscape architects.

43
44 Maynard agrees that combined boards make the industries better.

45
46 **Agenda item 24- Licensing Examiner Report**

47
48 Sarena went over the information she provided including the number of licenses issued and exam
49 stats. At next meeting she will provide data from the entire SY16.

50

1 **Agenda item 25 – Board Tasks**

2

3 Chair goes over the tasks from last meeting and those assigned this meeting.

4

5 **Agenda item 26 – Read Applications into the Record.**

6

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

16 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

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

18 CA refers to conditionally approved

19

20 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
21 **RESOLVED to APPROVE the following list of applicants for registration by comity,**
22 **examination and in additional branches of engineering with the stipulation that the**
23 **information in the applicants’ files will take precedence over the information in the minutes.**

24

COM	ME	ALGER, JOHN
COM	CE	BRANDON, STEVEN H.
COM	SE	BUCHOLC, JEFFREY PAUL
COM	A	COX, HAROLD WAYNE (JR.)
COM	CE	COY, BRADLY
COM	CE	ELLER, KIANA P.
COM	ME	FARRER, JAMES
COM	CE	FORSTING, JEREMY
COM	SE	HAGBERG, ERIC
G’PA	SE	JACOBS, JOSEPH P.
G’PA	SE	JOHNSON, BRIAN PAUL
COM	ME	KESSLER, MICHAEL
COM	ME	MALTBY, STEVEN
COM	EE	NOWICKI, DAVID
COM	A	PALANCA, JOSEPH
EXAM	CE	PERRETT, MATTHEW
COM	ME	WASEL, WAHEED

25

1 **The following applicants were found conditionally approved pending completion of certain**
 2 **missing requirements:**

EXAM	CE	BRADDOCK, LYNN MARIE
COM	SE	CHAPPELL, JESSICA SHARP
COM	CE	CHARCHENKO, JOHN
COM	A	CLARK, AARON
EXAM	EC	DARNALL, TIMOTHY
COM	CS	DAVIS, PAUL
EXAM	CE	GRAETZ, ETHAN E.
EXAM	CE	HAYEK (RING), DANA
COM	EC	HSIEH, PATRICK
COM	A	HUCKINS, ELIZABETH
EXAM	SE	MEGLI, EVERET
EXAM	EV	PALMER, DANE
COM	CE	RINGSTAD, NICHOLAS
COM	A	ROACH, DANIEL
EXAM	ME	SPARGUR, JEREMY
COM	CE	STAHLECKER, CURTIS D.
EXAM	A	STEKOLL, SPENCER
COM	CE	SZOBONYA, PETER
G'PA	SE	THOMSEN, ANTHONY C.
COM	MN	TIAN, SHUQING
COM	CE	WREN, JESSICA

4
 5 **On a motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Kerr and passed unanimously it was**
 6 **RESOLVED that the following list of applicants for registration by comity, examination and in**
 7 **additional branches of engineering are found INCOMPLETE with the stipulation that the**
 8 **information in the applicant's files will take precedence over the information in the minutes.**

G'PA	SE	KREINER, JONATHAN SABIA
G'PA	SE	MARTINEAU, PAUL A.
G'PA	SE	MENZIES, SCOT A.
COM	LS	PIAGENTINI, VINCENT
COM	EC	ROBERTSON, IAN

10
 11 **Agenda item 27 – Review Calendar of Events**

12
 13 Board meeting dates:
 14 February 8-9, 2017 Juneau
 15 May 4-5, 2017 Anchorage (can ask for Fairbanks)
 16 August 3-4, 2017 Anchorage
 17 November 2-3, 2017 Anchorage

18
 19 National Meeting dates:

1 March 10-11 NCARB Regional, Jersey City, NJ
2 May 18-20 NCEES Western Zones Meeting, Denver, CO
3 June 21-24 NCARB Annual Meeting, Boston, MA
4 August 23-26 NCEES Annual, Miami Beach, FL
5 September 14-16 CLARB Annual, Boise, ID
6

7 **Agenda item 28 Board Member Comments**
8

9 The Board especially thanks Jeff Koonce for the use of his conference room and office space in
10 downtown Anchorage at KP Architects. They welcome Richard Jones to the public member seat
11 and agree that it was a good meeting.
12

13 12:45 p.m. adjourned.
14
15

16
17 Respectfully submitted:
18
19
20
21

22 _____
23 Sarena Hackenmiller, Licensing Examiner
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Approved:
32
33
34
35

36 _____
37 Brian Hanson, PE Chair
38 Board of Registration for Architects,
39 Engineers and Land Surveyors
40
41

42
43 Date: _____
44
45
46