

1
2
3
4 **STATE OF ALASKA**
5 **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**
6 **BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS AND**
7 **LAND SURVEYORS**

8
9 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING**
10 **Wednesday, November 8 – Thursday, November 9, 2017**

11
12 By authority of AS 08/01.070(2), and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, a scheduled meeting of
13 the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors was held on Wednesday, November 8 and
14 Thursday, November 9, 2017 at KPB Architects, Anchorage, Alaska.

15
16 **Agenda Item 1 - Call to Order/Roll Call**

17 The meeting was called to order at 10:05am by Chair Dave Hale.

18
19 **Board members present, constituting a quorum:**

20 Dave Hale PS, Surveyor
21 Brian Hanson, PE, Civil Engineer, Mining Engineer
22 Catherine Fritz, Architect
23 John Kerr, PS, Surveyor
24 Jeff Koonce, Architect
25 Colin Maynard, PE, Civil Engineer, Structural Engineer
26 Bill Mott, PE, Chemical Engineer, Metallurgical and Materials Engineer
27 Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect

28
29 The following board member attended telephonically:

30 Elizabeth Johnston, PE Electrical Engineer, Fire Protection Engineer

31
32 The following board members were excused by the Chair:

33 Fred Wallis, Mining Engineer
34 Richard “Vernon” Jones, Public Member

35
36 Attending from the Division of Corporations, Business, and Professional Licensing were:

37 Alysia Jones, Executive Administrator

38
39 The following staff attended telephonically:

40 Sara Chambers, Deputy Director
41 Melissa Dumas, Administrative Officer
42 Heather Noe, Licensing Examiner

43
44 **Agenda Item 2 - Review/Amend Agenda**

45 The board reviewed the agenda. Hale requested the topic of proposed language for guidance manual on industrial exemption
46 and boundary surveys be added as D. under Agenda Item 16. New Business.

47
48 **On a Motion duly made by Colin Maynard, seconded by Brian Hanson, and approved unanimously, it was**
49 **RESOLVED to accept the agenda as revised.**

50
51 **Agenda Item 3 - Ethics Reporting**

52 There were no ethic violations to report.

53
54 Hanson reported he attended the NCEES Board of Directors meeting in Boston last week, and will be doing a board visit in
55 Salt Lake City next week for NCEES. Both Hanson and Maynard are members of the NCEES UPLG committee and have

1 meetings in San Diego and Nashville. Hanson, Maynard, R. Jones, Wallis and the E.A. attended the NCEES Annual Meeting
2 in Miami in August. All travel was paid by NCEES.

3
4 Urfer attended the CLARB Annual Meeting in Boise in September. This was funded by the State of Alaska.

5
6 Fritz mentioned she had attended the NCARB Annual Meeting and had not been able to report that at the August meeting
7 due to flight delays and her arrival at the meeting.

8
9 Hale mentioned that he and Maynard had dinner with the NCARB Board of Directors in Girdwood in September.

10
11 Johnston stated she had attended the IEEE meeting in Australia in August.

12 13 **Agenda Item 4 - Review/Approve Minutes**

14 E.A. noted corrections provided by Maynard had already been made and were indicated in the addendum. Urfer indicated
15 she would email a few additional edits. These were emailed to and updated by A. Jones during the meeting.

16
17 **On a Motion duly made by Koonce, seconded by Maynard, and approved unanimously, it was**
18 **RESOLVED to approve the August 2017 meeting minutes with edits provided by Colin Maynard.**
19

20 **Agenda Item 5 - Financial Report**

21 *5. A. FY 17 4th Quarter Financial Report-* CBPL Deputy Director Sara Chambers joined the meeting and introduced the
22 Divisions new Administrative Officer Melissa Dumas. Chambers walked the board through the 4th Quarter Report which
23 contained all year-end revenue and expenditures. Chambers then went over the Indirect Allocation documents which
24 contained information regarding costs that are not directly attributable to a singular program or profession and mentioned
25 there was a more detailed explanation of the methodology in the board manual. She explained the difference between the
26 even (renewal) and odd (non-renewal) years, and noted indirect went up slightly overall in part because the State is
27 working on cost saving methodology and the State is cutting cost allocations statewide which has required the Division to
28 cover more departmental costs because revenue is not offsetting the expense any more.

29
30 Hanson asked if the allocation percentage has changed from year to year. He noted it is 7.79 percent this year. Chambers
31 said that percentage is a fraction of indirect. Chambers stated it is tracked annually and stated AELS is 8.86% of all
32 professional licensee programs, which is slightly up, but down over a longer historical trend. Hanson stated that is good
33 information to have in the annual report. Chambers said she would ensure all staff have that information to include in future
34 reports. Hanson asked if the indirect allocation is in line with previous years. Chambers said she can get that information
35 and provide it through A.Jones to the board. She added that her gut feeling is that it went up due to the new accounting and
36 human resources system and that as the system and processes are more refined then we'll see indirect go down.

37
38 The board thanked Chambers for providing the information. Maynard noted it was the first time he remembers having it at
39 the November meeting rather than the February meeting. Chambers added that AELS staff would provide the board the 1st
40 quarter report of FY18 electronically and they will be available to review and discuss at the February meeting.

41 42 *5. B. Board Evaluation Summary Report*

Nov082017_1- 19:33

43 A. Jones explained at the August meeting board requested a summary of the board evaluations completed at the April
44 meeting. A.Jones tallied the responses and compiled the comments into a summary report found in the addendum.

45 46 *5. C. Update Office of Administrative Hearing Training*

47 A. Jones explained Judge Frederick had been unable to provide training at this meeting due to scheduled leave, but that she
48 was willing and interested in providing training for the board. A.Jones asked the board if they preferred a training
49 specifically for the AELS board or if they would be interested in expanding the audience to include board members from
50 other programs and splitting the cost with those boards. Fritz asked what the difference in fees would be. A.Jones explained
51 the fee is \$192 for a one-hour session. Chambers said she would like to open it up to other boards as Judge Frederick's
52 delivery would be very similar to the 21 boards and suggested scheduling a WebEx or other online session. Fritz stated that
53 in-person, AELS would be much more effective and noted her preference would be to work the training into the regular
54 board meeting schedule. The board unanimously agreed and Chambers stated it was a wise investment.

1 TASK: Chair asked A. Jones to follow up with Judge Frederick and schedule training.

2
3 The board meeting returned to Agenda Item 5.B. Based upon the report, the Chair stated one area that needs improvement
4 is being prepared to discuss the items in the board packet. A. Jones asked if there was anything staff could do to help the
5 board members and offered to adjust the timeframe. Kerr mentioned the current timeframe of two weeks prior to the meeting
6 and supplying an addendum worked well.

7
8 Maynard asked how frequently the evaluation needed to be completed. Several board members confirmed the evaluation
9 only needed to be completed once a year and all agreed the spring meeting seemed most appropriate so the information
10 could be included in the annual report.

11
12 Chambers asked the board how the laptops are working. Hanson and Koonce said they work fine. Fritz expressed her
13 frustration in the process, noting that she downloads the packet from ZendTo, makes notes/ highlights items in the PDF file
14 for herself, but then does not have access to her marked up version on the CBPL laptops. Fritz asked if she can connect her
15 personal USB drive to the State laptops. Chambers stated that as long as there was no confidential information on the USB
16 drive it should be fine. Chambers stated that the Division is looking at board management software that would resolve these
17 types of issues.

18
19 TASK: Chambers asked A. Jones to follow up with her before the next meeting to address this issue if the new solution is
20 not available before the next meeting.

21
22 Fritz added the initial discussion was to provide tablets to all board members and the tablets would be for State board
23 business only, which would have solved these issues, whereas the laptops that were purchased instead to not address the
24 original issues. Chambers said the AELS Board and Board of Nursing have been the pilot programs for the encrypted drives
25 and acknowledged there are pros and cons for every solution. Chambers added providing tablets to every board member
26 was impractical and expensive as CBPL has 150 board members. Chambers welcomed the boards input and feedback and
27 encouraged the board to let A.Jones know so issues can be actively addressed.

28
29 The board thanks Chambers for her report and comments.

30
31 **Agenda Item 6 - National Organization Meeting Reports & Correspondence**

Nov082017_2: 01:11

32 **6. A. CLARB**

33 Urfer reported that it was a very interesting meeting with a lot of discussion about changing their model law definition.
34 The change did pass, however there was a lot of concern surrounding how the changes would affect the field of
35 practice. She mentioned there is a lot of collaboration going on between NCARB, CLARB and FARB to minimize the
36 attacks on licensure. Urfer mentioned another major topic of discussion was the security of boards and the group
37 determined multi-discipline boards appeared to be safer from deregulation threats because they already have the
38 relationships with other professions. Urfer noted those in attendance were very interested in the way Alaska is structured
39 with the APDC board, their role is and how they interact with legislators and this board. Urfer was asked to present on this
40 topic and several jurisdictions said they would bring that information back to their boards.

41
42 Fritz asked whether Alaska uses CLARB's model law in our regulations. Urfer stated that we do, however it is 20 years
43 old, which was, in part, why they were making changes at the annual meeting. Urfer said this issue will come up later in
44 the meeting and explained that currently the scope has been narrowed and does not accurately reflect what landscape
45 architects do.

46
47 The board asked Urfer if she was running for leadership candidates. Urfer said she does not plan on running. She also
48 added that CLARB's CEO Joel Albizo is now the President of FARB. Urfer then directed the board to look at the CLARB
49 item regarding global standards that was included in the board packet addendum. CLARB is setting the standard and
50 several countries are working with FARB to make sure everything fits together. Kerr asked if CLARB has been pushing
51 for mobility. Urfer responded that CLARB already has some international licensure and was surprised by how different
52 countries are structured.

53
54 **6. B. NCARB**

Nov082017_2 - 09:39

1 Koonce thanked Colin and Dave for attending the dinner with NCARB Board of Directors. He mentioned the 4.0 testing
2 will be sun-setting. Koonce then directed the board's attention to item 6.B.2.j. and asked for recommendations on who to
3 reach out to for assistance with completing the state history for NCARB's Centennial. The board discussed assigning it to
4 Vern. The board also mentioned several former board members including: Wayne Jensen, Ken Maynard, Jeff Wilson, and
5 Richard Rearick. Koonce also asked if ADPC might have information. Fritz suggested contacting Jeff Wilson from the
6 AIA Chapter. Maynard suggested checking with the State archives and Fritz offered to do some research in Juneau.

7
8 Fritz suggested some of the material might be appropriate for the AELS board's annual report.

9
10 Fritz added that WCARB, the regional organization is having a strategic planning meeting in Las Vegas in November to
11 get clarity on the regional organization's mission and goals within the scope of the national organization. A draft
12 document will be presented at the WCARB meeting in Wichita in March 2018.

13 14 6. C. NCEES

Nov082017_2 – 16:26

15 Hanson mentioned the annual meeting was held in August in Miami and the key item of interest to our board would likely
16 be the surveying depth exam is moving forward and a committee is currently looking at that. He mentioned the software
17 engineer examination is on probation, which means it will be administered this year, but will likely go away in the
18 following years. Hanson explained the minimum number of examinees required for an exam is 100 and that an action plan
19 is developed when the numbers go below that minimum. Hanson stated that he agreed with R. Jones assessment of the
20 UAV session focused on the technology/ marketing vs. the licensure aspect. Kerr stated there had been a similar issue at
21 the meeting in Williamsburg and suggested that NCEES do a more thorough vetting process of presentations for the
22 meetings. Kerr added that there are a number of boards dealing with the same issue regarding this technology and the
23 board discussed the possibility of working with NCEES to offer a panel session. Maynard stated that there was not a lot of
24 disagreement during the business session and items that did get pulled were mostly for wordsmithing. A. Jones stated the
25 western zone resolution regarding multiple votes for multidisciplinary boards did not pass.

26
27 Maynard asked if item 6.C.2.b, the Emeritus Survey had been completed. A. Jones responded that R. Jones had completed
28 it.

29
30 Hanson mentioned the FE/FS exam will be reduced to \$50 and said the record for rescheduling the FE is 22 times. Hanson
31 shared some graphs on exams, which indicated over the past two years there has been an increase in FS exam takers (over
32 1,000 examinees). The PS exam has seen a slight increase over the past year and the SE exam is basically flat. Hanson
33 stated PE examinees were over 4,000 last year and attributed the sharp increase to NCEES eliminating the requirement to
34 have experience before testing (decoupling). Hanson noted this might be an issue that the board will need to address in the
35 future. He explained some states will not license you if you took the test early, but that currently our regulations for
36 comity do not specify that. Hanson said the FE is back up around 4,700 examinees.

37
38 Hanson mentioned that Jerry Carter, NCEES CEO is retiring.

39 40 6. D. Outreach Reports

Nov082017_2 – 28:32

41 Kerr said he presented on licensure requirements in Alaska for mappers at the annual UAS group meeting in Fairbanks,
42 which included a lot of industry people, Department of Defense, and University of Alaska. He said there were 45-60
43 people in the audience, it was well received and they were glad to hear the information. Since he was in Fairbanks, he
44 gave the same presentation to DNR staff (approximately 20 people) and was then asked to give the presentation to DNR
45 staff in Anchorage. The Chair and Kerr gave the presentation to the Anchorage staff earlier this week and several DNR
46 staff members in outlying areas attended remotely. Kerr said there was a request to give the same presentation at the
47 Kenai Peninsula Borough, but they respectfully decline an in-person presentation given the travel time in relation to the
48 presentation timeframe. The Chair said they discussed options for putting together something that could be sent to areas
49 that are not conducive to an in-person presentation. Kerr explained the presentation includes information about the statutes
50 relating to all measurement tools/ platforms and includes a lot of examples. The Chair said the main point is to talk about
51 licensure and how it applies to mapping and the end product and not the acquisition, which is what everyone focuses on.

52
53 The board suggested the Chair and Kerr doing a presentation at the NCEES Annual Meeting, potentially with
54 representatives from other states on this topic. Hanson requested there be a copy of the presentation in our record.

1 Maynard added for the past four to five years he has spoken to UAA's Civil Engineering Department's wrap up course
2 about licensing and professional development. Maynard said UAA's Electrical and Mechanical Departments have a
3 similar course and has been invited to speak to the mechanical engineer wrap up class as well. The Chair added that he has
4 been asked to talk to UAA's Geomatics students about licensure in December.

5
6 Maynard says UAA does not require students to pass the FE, whereas UAF does and said it might be worthwhile to talk
7 with UAA to see if that can be changed.

8
9 The board returned to the discussion of making the UAV presentation available on the website. Kerr said it is not a stand-
10 alone presentation at this point, but he will work with staff to put it in a format that will work. Kerr added the key part is
11 the Q&A portion and interaction with the audience, but the board recognized it is not always feasible to offer the in-
12 person.

13
14 Fritz asked the board if it was worth contacting someone at UAA and offer our assistance and expertise to provide
15 consistency relative to licensing to their programs.

16
17 Urfer mentioned there are no architecture or landscape architecture programs in Alaska and it shared that it was suggested
18 at the CLARB meeting that the board adopt a school or program and look at seeing if there is a way to get in-state tuition
19 for those programs as they are not available here.

20
21 **Agenda Item 7 – Correspondence**

Nov082018_2 – 42:00

22 *7. B. Letter from Jesse Engineering Co.* - The board discussed the inconsistencies of the name and their letterhead and said
23 there was no information provided that qualifies them for them an exemption. Fritz pulled up information on Google and
24 stated it said “formerly Jesse Engineering Co.”.

25
26 Kerr suggested the board draft language to be added to the guidance manual that explains when an exemption would be
27 provided. The Chair stated that typically it has been granted for those companies that have been in business for 30+ years
28 and it has just come up. Hanson gave the example of a company with marine engineering in the name that does not do
29 engineering, but has been in business for 30+ years and something happened with their business license that caused it to be
30 flagged. Hanson added it is similar to not being able to use of the word “City” in a business name because it implies you
31 are a government entity.

32
33 Fritz stated her concerned with using age as an indicator. Several members stated that age is not the only factor. Hanson
34 said if it is Jesse Engineering Co. DBA Jesse Co. that would be okay.

35
36 The Chair asked if anyone has an issue with the motion. Kerr recommended we explain that the name on the letterhead
37 (Jesse Co.) does meet our requirements. Fritz recommended working with Business Licensing to see if DBA is a possibility.

38
39 **On a Motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hanson, and approved unanimously, it was**
40 **RESOLVED to send Jesse Co. a letter denying their request to use the name Jesse**
41 **Engineering in Alaska.**

42
43 TASK: The Chair will write a response to Jesse Engineering Co. and A. Jones will notify Business Licensing.

44
45 *7. C. Request for deadline extension for SE application under 12 AAC 36.108*

Nov082018_2 – 59:42

46 A. Jones said she has received numerous complaints regarding this item, but only one individual submitted an official
47 request for an extension. A. Jones explained she included some of the notifications that were sent either by mail or
48 electronically to registrants/ interested parties regarding the change for the boards reference. The board discussed the
49 regulation announcement was done in accordance with public notice procedures multiple times. Hanson said there is a lot
50 of information on the listserv. Fritz asked if we put out a hard copy notice regarding the listserv. A. Jones replied not
51 during her time, however the information is on the website and in correspondence registrants and interested parties are
52 encouraged to join. Fritz suggested the next time we mail a notice that we can promote the listserv.

53
54 The board discussed what would be required to provide an exemption, which would include starting a new regulation
55 Project, with the appropriate notice, comment period, voted in, approved by AG's office and signed by Lt. Governor's

1 Office, which would take about a year. Hanson said we do have the authority to provide an exemption if there was an
2 exceptional circumstance. Fritz mentioned she has received three phone calls and directed these individuals to go through
3 A. Jones and provide a written request. She added that the issue appeared to be in the lack of notification, which is why
4 she was asking about the notifications. Fritz urged the board and staff to consider how we can improve notifications to
5 better inform registrants of how they can stay informed. Mott asked about presenting at Civil Engineering Society and
6 Maynard responded members of the board had made presentations at multiple meetings. The Chair said the board is not in
7 charge of disseminating information and that is the State's duty. The board also discussed a registrant's responsibility to
8 stay up to date.

9
10 Hanson suggested we compile an outline of all information that was disseminated regarding this regulation project before
11 responding.

12
13 TASK: A. Jones will collect information regarding the notifications that went out related to the regulations change and
14 Maynard offered to help with the letter.

15
16 The Board skipped 7.D.

17
18 *7. F. ASPLS Code of Ethics* - The Chair said he sent a response that it was not related to the board and said they'll need to
19 go back to ASPLS for an answer.

20
21 *7.E. Question RE: Record Drawings* - Maynard said this has already been addressed and explained you can't stamp record
22 drawings unless you are sitting there watching them build it or do a complete as-built yourself because you don't know if
23 the information the contractor sends you on his "redlines" are accurate. A. Jones requested clarification of when it would
24 be appropriate for a record drawing to be stamped based upon the wording currently in the Guidance Manual that states
25 "may or may not be stamped". Hanson provided an example of when you could have a record drawing that was stamp/
26 You could have a design drawing that was issued for construction and it has a stamp on it and a date and then it has a record
27 drawing title block that is added to it that says this is a record of what was constructed, signed, no stamp. It has an original
28 stamp on it and there is nothing wrong with leaving the original stamp on it. That is a way you could have a stamp on a
29 record drawing. Hanson added that to require a stamp on a record drawing though is not correct.

30
31 Hanson mentioned AWWU is another great example of ones that could have a stamp and the designer of record states it
32 appears to have been constructed in accordance with the original design.

33
34 Maynard stated the remove the old stamp when they put the design of record stamp. Fritz stated she appreciated the
35 examples to provide clarity.

36
37 Hanson said requiring a stamp on record drawings means you are taking responsibility for everything and that is against our
38 regulations. Hanson said this discussion has been ongoing for the past 8 years. Maynard stated that ADEC needs to change
39 their regulations. Hanson added that they are not taking responsibility for the work and that is what a stamp says.

40
41 TASK: Hanson will draft the letter and A.Jones will follow up with Sara Chambers to ensure the board works
42 appropriately with another State department.

43 44 45 46 **Agenda Item 8 - Executive Session**

47 **On a motion duly made by Maynard and seconded by Koonce, moved to go into Executive Session in**
48 **accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(3) to review disciplinary case numbers 2016-001056 and 2016-001097.**

49
50
51 The board came out of Executive Session at 12:05 p.m. and recessed for lunch.

52 53 **Agenda Item 9 - Reconvene meeting/Roll Call**

54 The board reconvened at 1:16p.m. Roll call, all present except for Richard Jones and Fred Wallis who were excused by the
55 Chair.

1
2 The following attended telephonically:
3 Elizabeth Johnston, board member

4
5 Peter Giessel, representing himself
6 Chris Miller, representing himself
7 Dana Nunn, representing American Society of Interior Designers – Alaska Chapter
8 Kelsey Davidson, representing American Association of Interior Designers – Alaska Chapter
9 Sara Manning, representing herself

10
11 **Agenda Item 10 - Public Comment**

Nov082017_3 – 00:19

12
13 The Chair invited Mr. Giessel to testify.

14
15 Giessel stated he submitted a letter on February 23 to the board for consideration at the April 2017 meeting and the board
16 said they would review the issue with Investigator John Savage and provide a letter of response. Giessel indicated that he
17 had not yet received a response from the board and requested a status update. Hanson stated it was on his list, apologized
18 for the delay and said he anticipated completing the letter next week.

19
20 *Nov082017_3 – 01:31*

21 The Chair invited Chris Miller to testify. Miller mentioned the agenda items that stood out to him were the continued
22 discussion of landscape architecture and stated there either needed to be hard boundaries or soft boundaries where each
23 registrant is then expected to work within their particular area of expertise. He also noted the stamping of record drawings
24 and use of drones for mapping are also of interest to him. Miller thanked the board for their work.

25
26 *Nov082017_3 – 04:58*

27 The Chair invited Nunn and Davidson to testify. Nunn introduced herself and stated she is representing the American Society
28 of Interior Designers – Alaska Chapter. Nunn also introduced Kelsey Davidson, the current Chapter President, who was in
29 attendance to answer any questions related to the society’s current strategic plan.

30
31 Nunn explained the society is interested pursuing professional registration for interior designers working in the commercial
32 sector and public facilities. Nunn stated the group has been meeting with FIA, fellow architects, and firms throughout the
33 state and wanted to meet with the AELS board to raise awareness of the society’s plans. Nunn also asked the board to raise
34 any questions they should research in preparation for meeting with legislators. Nunn defined the practice of interior design
35 and reiterated the license would be for those practicing in the public sector. Nunn reviewed the packet provided to the board
36 in the board packet addendum. Materials included an executive summary (reason for initiative, scope of initiative and
37 benefits to the public), interior designer registration map, graphic explaining how the practice of Interior Design protects
38 the public health, safety, and welfare, petition and summary of petition support.

39
40 Nunn explained the goal was to create a recognizable title for qualified interior designers, define the practice of interior
41 design, establish voluntary registration administered within the AELS board, develop continuing education requirements,
42 and provide plan approval authority for non-bearing interior construction or alteration to registered interior designers.

43
44 Nunn explained the NCIDQ (National Council for Interior Design Qualification) is a national benchmark exam for interior
45 designers and would be utilized as part of this initiative. Nunn noted currently only twenty-seven Alaska designers have
46 taken the NCIDQ and she anticipates seven to ten additional interior designers annually, either by taking the exam or coming
47 in from another state.

48
49 Koonce asked if there were model statutes that other states have adopted. Nunn said they are working with their Government
50 Affairs Committee to make sure they are utilizing the information that is currently available. Nunn added some states are
51 much more stringent than where Alaska wants to go and they are working with their committee to ensure they are not
52 overreaching their scope.

53
54 Fritz asked for clarification on the map of interior design registration provided in the addendum. Nunn explained the areas
55 that stated “Allows for Sign and/or Seal” and “Allows for Sign, Seal and Permitting” does not prevent an architect from

1 signing or sealing if that is within their area of practice. Nunn stated it is not intended to take away from what architects
2 currently do. Fritz asked how is interior design different or unique to the practice of architecture, noting that all the
3 information provided so far falls under the practice of architecture. Nunn responded interior designers practice within a
4 bubble as it is only the interior space and you may or may not have an interior designer on your project, but if it is a public
5 project and you have an interior designer doing the interiors, instead of an architect then we feel that individual should be
6 registered.

7
8 Nunn clarified the intent is not to change the stamp and seal requirements going forward, but to provide recognition to a
9 professional who understands and can apply building codes, accessibility requirements, and egress in a public environment
10 as opposed to the traditional view of someone who only picks paint colors.

11
12 Fritz noted the interior designers that she has worked with are very good and traditionally have worked for an architectural
13 firm and the responsibility falls on the architect. Fritz expressed she is still unclear of their intent based upon the current
14 requirements and responsibility of a registered architects.

15
16 Davidson stated she works for a stand-alone interior design firm and produce tenant improvement drawings that are
17 reviewed by an architect for compliance, but in many instances they are not stamped. Fritz stated if you are doing code
18 related improvements inside or outside, per our statutes and regulations you are required to be a licensed architect.

19
20 Koonce said any tenant improvement that is performed does not required to be stamped. Fritz argued that base on her
21 understanding if it is the practice of architecture it needs to be stamped by an architect. Koonce said tenant improvement is
22 not a practice of architecture. Nunn said there tends to be restrictions on size and dollar amount of projects, but that as an
23 interior designer she can design a tenant improvement that includes exiting, etc. and does not require an architect. Fritz said
24 this is not her understanding of our statutes and regulations. Hanson offered the example of putting up a cubicle farm. Fritz
25 stated given her current knowledge she is not in agreement with the previous statements and said she would be reviewing
26 the regulations for further clarification.

27
28 Urfer asked if they were successful in obtaining registration for interior designers, would they be required to obtain the same
29 number of continuing education requirements as other professions regulated. Nunn responded yes. Davidson asked what
30 the current requirement was. Several board members responded 24 professional development hours every two years. Nunn
31 added that she has been asked to teach the interior portion of the arctic course and interior designers would need to meet
32 that requirement as well as long as the content is relevant.

33
34 The Chair asked about the limits to practice. Davidson said the premise is not to threaten the livelihood of those who are
35 already practicing and calling themselves an interior designer, so the society would like to use the term Registered Interior
36 Designer” to differentiate them from those who are just interior designers. The Chair said there is a definition in our
37 regulations for each field of practice currently regulated by the board, and those who are not registered are not allowed to
38 use those titles. The Chair warned Davidson and Nunn that they may come up against that same requirement as it is a way
39 of protecting the public. Nunn said she is a registered interior designer in Texas, that term is defined in their regulations and
40 there is an understanding of what that title means.

41
42 Maynard stated that the effort appeared to be a lot of work for little to no change in current processes. Koonce encouraged
43 them to look at what other states have done.

44
45 Hanson encouraged Nunn and Davidson to develop a response to show how this change is not restricting free trade. Maynard
46 stated they may need to consider a grandfathering period for those currently practicing and what the requirements of that
47 would be. Maynard stated the reason to have licensure is to protect the public and encouraged Nunn and Davidson to develop
48 a strong justification for that if they wish to pursue this initiative.

49
50 Fritz recommended they provide a clear distinction between architecture and interior design and why it needs to be added
51 to what is already covered under the practice of architecture.

52
53 Maynard added that there might need to be a regulation similar to Sec. 08.48.281, which allows other registered
54 professionals to do the work of landscape architecture if it is within their scope of practice.

1
2 The Chair invited Sara Manning to speak.

3
4 Manning introduced herself and explained that she was testifying today to ask the board for an exemption related to the
5 date listed in 12 AAC 36.108. She said there was a conflict regarding the date in the regulation and what was printed on
6 the application form. Manning stated she applied by the July 31, 2017 deadline specified on the form and explained she
7 was told her application would not be reviewed by the board because she was not licensed in Alaska on 9/6/2016 listed in
8 the regulation. She added she is one of a few engineers that fall within the two dates and explained it has a huge negative
9 effect on her career and she will now be restricted from working on bridge design projects that had previously been
10 assigned to her as lead engineer. Manning asked the board to grant an exemption and review her application or if that is
11 not possible, consider changing the date in the regulation to make the application date. Manning asked how the September
12 date was chosen and if it effects the overall goal of what the board hoped to change. She thanked the board for their
13 consideration of her unique situation and offered to answer any questions.

14
15 Maynard responded to be grandfathered in you need to have been licensed in the state of Alaska at the time the regulation
16 went into effect. Maynard explained if we allow you to be grandfathered in we would never catch up, because it would
17 require allowing all those licensed between September 2016 and July 2017, which would then require an extension to the
18 application deadline, and then there is a potential for those licensed after July 2017 to make an argument similar to yours.
19 Maynard explained that in order for Manning to be a licensed structural engineer, she will need to take the SE exam.

20
21 Manning reiterated the form stated “Were you practicing structural engineering in Alaska as PE prior to July 31, 2017?
22 And she marked “yes” as she met that date. The Chair apologized for the typo on the form and added that the date listed
23 on the form does not trump the regulations. The Chair further stated we are bound as a board to the statutes and
24 regulations as well. Manning said it was her understanding that the board had the authority to grant exemptions. The Chair
25 clarified that we do have the authority within the confines of the statutes and regulations, but that if there are hard dates in
26 the regulations the board has to work within those in fairness to all. Manning asked how the September date was chosen.
27 Hanson explained it was the effective date of the regulation and is based upon the date the Lt. Governor signed it into law.

28
29 The Chair explained to change this would require a new regulation project and apologized for the effect the timing has on
30 her situation. The Chair thanked her for testifying.

31
32 The board returned to Agenda Item 7 – Correspondence.

Nov082017_3 – 44:25

33 *7. D. Questions about playgrounds and Landscape Architects* – Maynard explained when landscape architects were added
34 to the fields of practice regulated by the AELS board, the statute (Sec. 08.48.281) provided for engineers and architects to
35 continue to do the work that had been within their scope of practice. He added that if the City and Borough of Juneau
36 wished to require a landscape architect that they were within their rights to do so as it was above the minimum established
37 by the board’s statutes and regulations. Maynard added state law does not require a landscape architect be involved.

38
39 The Chair asked about the specific statement in the statute that lists outdoor play apparatus under the definition of
40 “practice of landscape architecture”. The board looked at Sec.08.48.281 and Sec. 08.48.341. Fritz asked for clarification
41 related to prohibited practice and the board discussed how other professionals can do that work. Urfer noted that it is
42 confusing with one statute saying “other professionals can do this work” and then the practice of landscape architecture
43 specifically lists what requires registration as a landscape architect. Urfer added this is the sixth time an issue like this has
44 come up. Hanson provided the example of a three-plex, which is not regulated by the board, but a four-plex is, however
45 the State Fire Marshall’s office says anything over three, we say anything over four, so there is a conflict there. Maynard
46 added that board previously tried to fix it, but was met with a lot of opposition. Hanson explained their requirement is
47 stricter than ours.

48
49 Urfer added that things have evolved in the past 20 years and landscape architects don’t have a set date like the
50 grandfathering period for structural engineers. Maynard said there is an expectation that the registrant is practicing within
51 their scope and areas of expertise and work within what they are qualified to do. Urfer said she reached out to three
52 municipalities and was able to speak with two about why they moved in the direction of requiring a landscape architect.
53 Urfer said the responses she received included “they were looking to improve quality and enhance their communities and
54 wanted to raise the standards”.

1 The Chair asked if it was worth adding something in the manual, several board members responded in favor of including
2 information in the guidance manual. Koonce asked about the RFP and A. Jones clarified that based upon the discussions
3 she had with the CBJ staff and the company, the RFP did not specifically state a landscape architect was required and
4 explained the RFP language is vague because it is used for multiple RFPs. Fritz added CBJ is trying to raise their
5 standards by requiring a registered professional. She noted the current regulations are confusing and they need clarity.
6 Urfer agreed and reiterated the evolution of the disciplines and confusion surrounding who is qualified to do certain types
7 of work. Urfer added that other jurisdictions do not have this problem because it has been clearly defined. Johnston voiced
8 her concern of trying to track what a certain profession did or did not do at a particular time and recommended the focus
9 be on professionals working within their areas of competency regardless of whether or not those competencies might
10 overlap with another profession.

11
12 Fritz stated the board consciously made a distinction for structural engineers and there is a definitive point based upon the
13 definition of a significant structure that requires a structural engineer versus a civil engineer. She did not propose that be
14 done for all the professions, but indicated it is difficult and causes confusion for individuals and groups that are not trying
15 to exclude a particular profession, but are trying to raise the bar.

16
17 TASK: The Chair asked Maynard and Urfer to draft a letter to send to the City and Borough of Juneau and one to the
18 company whose proposal was rejected.

19
20 *Nov082017_3 – 1:01:33*

21 *7. G. IACET Accredited Continuing Education Providers* – A. Jones asked the board for clarification on how best to respond
22 the letter. Maynard explained he had been involved in reviewing IACET through his work on an NCEES committee and it
23 was determined by the committee the additional 30 hours needed for a Bachelor’s plus thirty (credit hours) MLE need to be
24 IACET certified. Maynard noted IACET certified courses likely meet the board’s requirement, but was not in favor of
25 updating the regulations to specifically include IACET. Several other board members agreed based upon the current
26 regulations that state continuing education courses are not pre-approved.

27
28 TASK: A. Jones will draft a letter of response for the Chair’s review.

29
30 Hanson said NCEES has a free CPC registry through their E3 system that includes 45,000 account holders and 47,000
31 courses. Hanson explained there is also a way to transmit that information to your board.

32
33 *Nov082017_3 – 1:08:52*

34 *7. H. Alaska Initiative for Interior Design Registration* – The Chair asked if there was any additional comments. Several
35 board members stated it is an uphill battle. Fritz commented it is a threat to the practice of architecture and this board. She
36 said she did not understand the unique practice of interior design and does not feel there is any unique life safety component
37 that registered interior designers would address that is not already addressed by the professions currently registered by the
38 board. Fritz acknowledged interior designers are an important part of a team, but this initiative is problematic. Johnston
39 expressed her concern that the registration would be optional. Several members agreed that is not the appropriate approach.
40 Maynard reiterated we are not here to handle turf battles and stated if interior designers are qualified to do work on interiors
41 and protect public safety, then they should be allowed to do that work. He added currently we can argue whether or not they
42 should be going to building departments with unstamped drawings, but that that is a whole other issue. Maynard commented
43 if there is a public safety issue that requires them to be licensed then that is a reason to pursue the initiative, otherwise it is
44 a lot of effort to add registered to the front of their title. The board discussed the current revisions to the alternative path to
45 licensure for architects and how this might apply to the interior designers. Several board members compared the situation
46 to the various disciplines in engineering. The Chair said they have a challenge justifying it is a public safety issue that is not
47 already addressed by a different profession.

48
49 *Nov082017_3 -1:14:58*

50 *7. I. CSA Foreign Professional Association Questionnaire* – A. Jones explained she received the survey and included in the
51 addendum what she submitted. Hanson provided the board with some background information on the survey explaining it
52 is related to publicly-traded mining companies. Hanson stated the Canadian Securities Administration (CSA) provides
53 reports to shareholders so they can make informed decisions about their investments and as part of the process to ensure
54 information provided is of good quality and truthful, the CSA includes information related to the standards of the individuals

1 signing off on these reports. Hanson stated in most cases these individuals are mining engineers and/or geologists and
2 indicated there may be additional certification requirements.

3
4 The Chair asked why we were spending our time on this. Kerr responded that it provides our mining engineers with
5 credibility. A. Jones added that it took approximately fifteen minutes to complete the survey. Hanson said there is only a
6 few professionals in Alaska that are qualified to do this work.

7
8
9 **Agenda Item 11 - Application Review**

Nov082017_3 – 1:21:17

10 The board began reviewing applications. The Chair excused Johnston from attending this portion of the meeting as she
11 was attending telephonically.

12
13
14 **Agenda Item 12 - Recess for the day**

Nov082017_3 – 3:48:04

15 The board recessed for the day at 5:00 p.m.

Agenda Item 13 - Reconvene meeting/Roll Call

Nov092017_1 – 00:05

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m.

Board members present, constituting a quorum:

Dave Hale PS, Surveyor
Brian Hanson, PE, Civil Engineer, Mining Engineer
Catherine Fritz, Architect
John Kerr, PS, Surveyor
Jeff Koonce, Architect
Colin Maynard, PE, Civil Engineer, Structural Engineer
Bill Mott, PE, Chemical Engineer, Metallurgical and Materials Engineer
Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect

The following board member attended telephonically:

Elizabeth Johnston, PE Electrical Engineer, Fire Protection Engineer

The following board members were excused by the Chair:

Fred Wallis, Mining Engineer
Richard “Vernon” Jones, Public Member

Attending from the Division of Corporations, Business, and Professional Licensing was:

Alysia Jones, Executive Administrator

The following staff attended telephonically:

Heather Noe, Licensing Examiner
John Savage, Investigator

Agenda Item 17 - Additional Application Review

Nov092017_1 – 00:40

The board resumed reviewing applications.

Investigator John Savage joined the meeting and the board shifted to item 15 and 16.A. on the agenda.

Agenda Item 15 - Investigative Report

Nov092017_1 – 14:10

Savage informed the board that their Chief Investigator quit and there is currently a search for a new Chief Investigator and anticipates there will be a replacement by the year’s end. Savage added that his office is still short staffed and they are trying to fill four to five vacancies. Savage said until the vacancies are filled, he is handling all contractor, mechanical administrator, electrical administrator, and underground storage tanks cases.

Kerr asked Savage for an estimate of how much time he was spending with these other boards and programs.

Savage responded that AELS matters constituted the majority of his workload and where his focus is. Savage explained he is just trying to keep the other areas assigned to him afloat and noted there will be a transition/ training period once additional staff are hired.

Maynard expressed his frustration with this news since the board went to the legislature to get the position to be solely an AELS position and it is stated as such in the AELS statutes. Maynard asked about the point of the statute if our investigator is assigned other programs when there is a shortage of staff. Savage agreed and recognized the board’s effort to get that accomplished. He stated he was hopeful that the new Chief Investigator would also be in agreement.

The Chair asked if there was someone the board could call or write a letter to remind them of the statute. Savage recommended either the acting Chief Investigator, Greg Francois or Al Kennedy, the Senior Investigator, who is more familiar with the AELS board’s situation. Hanson commented that it is up to the board and not Savage to handle the issue.
TASK: The Chair stated he would give Al Kennedy a call.

1
2 The board then proceeded to **Agenda Item 16 - New Business.**

Nov092017_1 – 20:18

3 *A. Organizational limits to responsible charge* – The Chair explained this item was added to the agenda because a
4 situation came up where a public entity, headed by a licensee, put out an RFP for a non-licensed individual to do the field
5 work, develop a final product for delivery, and then the licensee who issued the RFP is going to stamp it. The Chair asked
6 the board what are the organizational limits?
7

8 Hanson asked if the field data is required to be collected by a licensed individual. The Chair responded, typically yes and
9 explained it is basically collecting data for a final map. The Chair then explained the deliverable is a final deliverable but
10 the person is not licensed so they can't take responsibility for that work so the person issuing the RFP is allowing that
11 person to work under their license.
12

13 Fritz asked if it mattered how the person was hired and offered the example of an employee of the organization doing the
14 work. Fritz added if the person in responsible charge of the work is overseeing it, then there shouldn't be an issue.
15

16 Hanson said DOT, as a client, requires a licensed individual is in the field for any DOT survey as part of the contract.
17 Hanson said private clients do not require that and asked if surveying companies provide a licensed individual to perform
18 that task or do they send out a qualified unlicensed individual that brings it back to the office.
19

20 Kerr stated in our organization, we understand each individual's capabilities, training, and we have control over how they
21 respond to a difficult situation (i.e. contact office or just push through the issue). Kerr said he would never send someone
22 out to do generically what is in a contract just because they were an employee, but rather look at the characteristics of the
23 employee to ensure is appropriate matched the task at hand and I am fully aware of what they are or aren't capable of that.
24 Kerr said the RFP does not do that. Kerr continued that he will not certify what someone has done unless I have direct
25 knowledge of their work habits, skills, behaviors, training, etc.
26

27 The Chair responded to Hanson example, clarifying that on DOT projects that require a PLS, that PLS stamps it, not DOT.
28

29 Kerr said there is no way for someone in an external organization to ensure the work is being done properly and that a
30 contract or RFP does not provide adequate information for someone to certify it was done to the appropriate standards. Kerr
31 stated in order to stamp work, you need to understand it to the level you can go to court and/or defend what happened.
32

33 Fritz said it appears to be a potential problem for the individual in responsible charge. The contract or RFP could contain
34 certain qualifications and if the person in responsible charge feels comfortable taking on that responsibility then that is their
35 decision. Fritz added it seems problematic and she would not want to be put in that position, but it could be appropriate in
36 some applications.
37

38 Hanson said you could hire a drafting company to design everything and they send it to an engineer or architect for review
39 and to get through the permitting process.
40

41 The Chair provided an example of a recent project he did a hydro project on a sub where he worked with a hydro-graphic
42 surveyor. Where they both stamped it for the portions they were responsible for. The Chair said he believes an employee/
43 employer relationship is different than a client/ contractor relationship. Hanson stated there is nothing to preclude the
44 Chair from hiring the other company to do their portion of the work, but overseeing the entire project and stamping the
45 entire project.
46

47 Maynard said he did not see any difference between the situation being discussed and BP with all of their contractors in
48 various locations. The board discussed whether it is providing data collection or a professional service. Hanson provided
49 an example where data was collected by an unlicensed individual and the company requesting it had nothing to do with
50 the work would appear to be in violation of our regulations, because it is a licensed activity.
51

52 Johnston provided an example involving RFPs soliciting unlicensed individuals, typically suppliers or vendors providing
53 lighting recommendations for a company.

1 Koonce asked Savage what the original question was. Kerr said “if you are in responsible charge of professional work you
2 need to be able to direct the work, know what happened, what didn’t happen, why that happened or didn’t happen, be able
3 to defend that work whether the person you send out in the field is licensed or not.” The board agreed.
4

5 Savage explained in most instances it is clear they are “rubber stamping” but he appreciated the board’s discussion and
6 understanding their point of view.
7

8 Hanson summarized the discussion stating if you are requesting an unlicensed individual to do something in order to get
9 around the system, that’s when it becomes an issue. Hiring temporary, contract, or unlicensed employees is not the issue if
10 the person in responsible charge is able to successfully do what Kerr stated earlier.
11

12 The Chair circled back to the original discussion of final products being delivered by an unlicensed individual. The board
13 concurred this was illegal practice. The Chair stated he would follow up with Savage when he was back in the office.
14

15 *Nov092017_1 – 44:24*

16 Koonce asked Savage about the possibility of a more descriptive explanation of the cases, so the board is better informed
17 of what types of cases Savage is encountering. Savage said he can add that information in the next report. Maynard asked
18 if cease and desist orders can be included in the board version of the board packet or if they are confidential. Savage
19 explained they are not confidential and added the board will be made aware before the order is sent. Savage explained
20 these are very cumbersome for the Division and often times other avenues are used and can be effective without needing
21 to reach the level of a C&D. Kerr explained individuals come to him about an issue and he immediately directs them to
22 Savage, and then someone else brings up the same or similar issue and he is not sure if he is directing multiple people to
23 Savage to file the same complaint and it has getting dismissed and asked Savage for guidance on what gets brought
24 forward and what is not a violation. Savage warned the board to step lightly and said all cases are looked into, but if it did
25 not rise to a level requiring a license action then information cannot be shared.
26

27 Hanson distinguished “case closed/ no licensing action” does not necessarily mean that there was not a violation. It may
28 mean the violation did not rise to taking licensing action. Savage indicated they may have gotten an advisory letter. Kerr
29 added that we want people to comply not suffer.
30

31 The Board thanked John for his report.
32

33 The board returned to reviewing applications.
34

Nov092017_1 – 56:11

Nov092017_1 – 2:13:00

36 Following the completion of application review, the Chair reminded the board motions related to discussions held in
37 Executive Session needed to be made.
38

39 **On a motion duly made by Fritz and passed unanimously, [the Alaska Board of Registration for Architects,
40 Engineers and Land Surveyors] having examined the Consent Agreement and Proposed Decision and Order in
41 Case No. 2016-001056, Timothy Ingraham, Professional Land Surveyor Registration Number 7340, hereby
42 ADOPTS the Consent Agreement and Decision and Order in this matter.**
43
44

45 **On a motion duly made by Fritz, and passed unanimously, [the Alaska Board of Registration for Architects,
46 Engineers and Land Surveyors] hereby ORDERED that default is entered against Douglas A. Comstock and that
47 Comstock’s professional architect registration number AELA10886 is revoked.**
48
49

50 **Agenda Item 18 - Old Business**

Nov092017_1 – 2:15:33

51 *A. Regulation Project Updates - 1. Updates to 12 AAC 36.061, .103 & .110:*

52 Fritz explained there was a motion at the last meeting to look at regulations that dealt with architectural registration by
53 Comity. Regarding 12 AAC 36.103 Architect Registration by Comity. R. Jones and Fritz looked at education
54 requirements for applicants who don’t hold an NAAB accredited degree. She added the reason for reviewing the
55 regulation was because on an inequity within the regulations that requires a higher standard for initial registration (by

1 exam) than registration by comity. Fritz explained what would be involved if the board chose to evaluate the architectural
2 experience (AXP), including the six areas versus having NCARB evaluating. Koonce said this is part of NCARB's
3 process and felt the board should not be the ones evaluating the experience.
4

5 The board reviewed the options Fritz and R. Jones provided. Currently an NCARB Certificate is required for initial
6 registration in Alaska. The board discussed standards of licensure. Maynard argued that people licensed 20-30 years ago,
7 were licensed under different regulations and will likely not meet today's standards. Fritz said the initial application
8 standards are more robust and argued for more equality between the requirements. Maynard disagreed, saying we need to
9 evaluate based upon when you were licensed. Several members indicated saying "shall" requires NCARB Certificate may
10 not be appropriate. Koonce and Hanson recommended including a date after which an NCARB Certificate will be
11 required going forward. For those licensed before that date, the board would evaluate their experience on a case by case
12 basis.
13

14 Fritz confirmed the board prefers the second option provided with the addition of a date. Fritz stated she would take it
15 back and bring back an updated option 2 at the February meeting.
16

17 Fritz suggested a revision of 12 AAC 36.061(2) to update the publication "NCARB Education Standard, 2010" to the
18 current title "NCARB Education Guidelines". Members agreed it was a simple clean-up.
19

20 The board discussed proposed updates to 12 AAC 36.110(b). Koonce said he reviewed several states for any seismic
21 requirement and recommends striking (b).
22

23 The Chair asked Fritz to provide an updated version of 12 AAC 36.063, .103 and .10
24

25 *18. A.2. Use of NCEES Record in Applications*

26 Hanson reported he was waiting to see what the board decided regarding the architectural application requirements,
27 adding it is a similar issue of "may" vs. "shall". Hanson said he wants to clean up 36.105 and asked the board whether or
28 not we should require the NCEES record for comity applicants rather than getting transcripts, work experience and other
29 information piecemeal. Hanson noted it is an electronic system and the work is evaluated by at least one PE and the
30 content is much more descriptive than what is currently provided on our work experience verification forms. Hanson
31 explained there is no cost for establishing/maintaining an NCEES record, however there are fees associated with
32 transmitting the record.
33

34 Hanson provided additional detail regarding what information is contained in the NCEES record. Hanson said they do not
35 evaluate whether they meet our criteria, however they do evaluate the work experience to confirm it is descriptive and is
36 engineering. Hanson explained there are several states that have an expedited process for applicants with the NCEES
37 model law designation, where staff approve those applications and board review is not required.
38

39 The Chair asked about how this would affect older applicants that do not have an NCEES record. Hanson stated he is
40 leaning towards "shall" vs. "may". Maynard said that would be nearly impossible for him and other registrants who have
41 been working in the field for 40+ years. The board discussed today's process vs. transmitting the record. Kerr suggested
42 educating new applicants about the option to create and maintain a record.
43

44 Fritz stated anything we can do to build on national standards would be of benefit to the board.
45

46 The Chair asked what the advantages would be to requiring the NCEES record. Hanson responded the documentation is
47 much cleaner, the work experience are more descriptive. The Chair said the disadvantage to applicants is having to pay
48 more money. Maynard reiterated it is a lot of work for those who have been practicing for a long time to set up an NCEES
49 record. Fritz said she wouldn't be afraid of having "shall" if there was an effective date in the regulation, similar to the
50 discussion with architects.
51

52 Hanson said he would coordinate with Fritz to have similar language for both professions.
53

54 *18. B. Status Update on Guidance Manual*

Nov092017_1 – 3:16:33

1 A.Jones and Urfer stated there has been a lot of clean up to get it into a workable document and the format has been
2 updated. Urfer said she hoped to get the updated version out for comment in the next two weeks.

3
4 *D. Continued discussion on Photogrammetry* – Kerr stated there is information on photogrammetry for the guidance
5 manual. A.Jones added that the information was provided as an example following discussion at the April meeting.
6 Hanson asked if we intended to put together a pamphlet. The Chair expressed concern discussing the tools. Kerr and
7 Hanson recommended compiling information related to “if you are using a drone this is what you need to know....” in
8 layman’s terms.

9
10 The Chair said this could be a helpful tool when they are not able to provide presentations. Kerr and A. Jones discussed
11 working on compiling an informational handout.

12
13 *E. Update on Use of Seals 12 AAC 36.185(c)* – Maynard explained we need some language that allows to the use of
14 regional or satellite offices on occasion, as long as they are controlled by the person in responsible charge of the project.
15 Maynard researched various national organizations for language. Several members liked the terminology used in NCEES
16 model law (managing agent and resident professional). Maynard asked the board to consider whether or not we wanted to
17 update the Certificate of Authorization regulations as well, which would affect all firms, not just corporations. The board
18 discussed partnerships and sole proprietorships, which currently are not required to have a Certificate of Authorization.
19 Maynard asked the board to review and send comments directly to him for compilation for the February meeting.

20
21 **Agenda Item 16 - New Business**

Nov092017_1 – 3:40:00

22 *B. Review of Statutes and Regulations related to Landscape Architects* – Urfer explained she is working with an ASLA
23 sub-committee reviewed definition of landscape architect in relation to CLARBs and now that CLARB has settled on a
24 definition, Urfer wants to potentially broaden and/or clarify the definition of practice of landscape architecture. The Chair
25 asked if any action was required. Urfer responded no specific action, but more of an awareness.

26
27 *C. Potential updates to 12 AAC 36.105 Engineer Registration by Comity* – A. Jones explained with the passing of the
28 structural engineer by grandfathering (12 AAC 36.108), the board may want to review and potentially update 12 AAC
29 36.105. A. Jones added that 12 AAC 36.063 regarding registration by exam, specifically addresses structural engineering
30 applications. Hanson argued that an SE comity applicant needs to meet the requirements listed in .063. The board reviewed
31 the regulations.

32
33 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Kerr, and unanimously approved, the board RESOLVED to start
34 a regulation project to add structural engineering comity language to 12 AAC 36.105.**

35
36 Johnston requested Maynard re-read the motion and stated she approved.

37
38 *D. Industrial Exemption Wording for Guidance Manual* –

Nov092017_1 – 3:56:55

39 The Chair passed out draft language regarding industrial exemption for boundary surveys for the board to consider for
40 inclusion in the Guidance Manual. The Chair explained the industrial exemption cannot be used for boundary surveys. The
41 Chair stated properties are bundles of rights, and a lot of times those rights are fixed to the boundaries so that even when
42 multiple adjoining properties are owned by the same company, the rights are connected to the land. The board discussed
43 easements, set-backs and where potential harm could arise.

44
45 The Chair explained you can’t do whatever you want because it is your property. The rights go with the land and ownership
46 is not in perpetuity. The Chair asked the board to send comments to him and Kerr for updates.

47
48 **Agenda Item 18 - Committee Updates**

Nov092017_1 – 4:08:45

- 49 • Licensure Implementation – Koonce reported there were no updates.
- 50 • Land Surveying Outreach – The Chair said we met with DNR and gave another presentation and will continue to
51 offer to present.

52
53
54 **Standing Committees**

- 55 • Investigative Advisory Committee – This topic was covered during Investigator Savage’s report.

- 1 • Licensure Mobility – Koonce reiterated the rewrites discussed earlier to update the regulations
- 2 • Guidance Manual – Urfer noted there was nothing further to add.
- 3 • Legislative Liaison – Maynard stated the sunset passed and there are no plans to meet with legislators in conjunction
- 4 with the February meeting.

5 The Chair asked if there was a reason to have the meeting in Juneau or if Anchorage would be more
6 appropriate. The board decided to revise the travel request for Anchorage. Hanson requested that the new
7 licensing examiner, Heather Noe be included on the request so she can meet the board members and to
8 assist with the anticipated high volume of applications to be reviewed.

- 9
- 10 • Emeritus Status – The Chair asked about emeritus status for Hanson.
- 11 • Budget Committee – Koonce stated he liked the reporting.
- 12 • Continuing Education – A. Jones mentioned per the board’s approval, that the January 1, 2018 to December 31,
13 2019 renewal form was updated to include the carry forward option for initial renewals, which are exempt from
14 reporting for this renewal period only.
- 15

16 **Agenda Item 19 - Licensing Examiner Report**

Nov092017_1 - 4:14:27

17 A.Jones directed the board to the updated report provided in the addendum. H. Noe stated there were 73 applications for
18 the November meeting rather than the 72 noted on the report. A. Jones asked the board to contact her if there is any
19 additional information they would like to see on the licensing examiner report.

20

21 **Agenda Item 20 - Read Applications into Record**

Nov092017_1_4:15:45

1
2
3
4
5

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

On a Motion duly made by Kerr, seconded by Maynard and approved unanimously, it was RESOLVED to APPROVE the following list of applicants for registration by comity, examination, and in additional branches of engineering with the stipulation that the information in the applicants' files will take precedence over the information in the minutes.

APPROVED APPLICANTS	
ROGER	ALWORTH
ERIC	ANTRIM
BRADLEY	BONNETTE
KELDEN	BOREN
TERRENCE	BRAXMEIER
CHARLES	COURTRIGHT
TRAVIS	DAHL
JANAK	DHUNGANA
AARON	DOTSON
BEJAMIN	FOLEY
JEFFREY	GRASSMAN
AMY	HERBST
JOHN	HUTCHINS
JUSTIN	LANDOWSKI
J.WALT	LEWIS
TOBY	LOVELACE
DOUGLAS	MELTZER
MICHAEL	MIOTKE
JOHN	OLDFIELD
JEFFREY	PALMER
WAYANDA	PARKES
JONATHAN	PHILLIPS
RICHARD	PRATT
ZACHARY	RINKER
COREY	ROCHE
ARMANDO	SAPIN
JASON	SOUTH
AARON	SZALAJ
ZACHARY	VICK
THOMAS	WALLACE
THOMAS	WALLER
GRADY	WEISZ
LEON	WILLIAMS

On a Motion duly made by Kerr, seconded by Maynard and approved unanimously, it was

1 **RESOLVED to CONDITIONALLY APPROVE the following list of applicants for registration by comity,**
2 **examination, and in additional branches of engineering with the stipulation that the information in the**
3 **applicants' files will take precedence over the information in the minutes.**
4

CONDITIONALLY APPROVED APPLICANTS	
DEBBIE	ANCHETA
CHRISTOPHER	BEZA
JON	BROOKS
JIMMY	CHURCH
WILLIAM	COLEMAN
ANN	DANIELSON
ANNA	FERNTHEIL
JARED	FREEMAN
PHILIP	HAYES-VALILIEVA
ARIEL	HIPPE
DAVID	HOISINGTON
WILLIAM	KLATT
JAY	LEMS
QI (LINDA)	LIU
MATTHEW	MANSKE
JAMES	MOLER
ANDREW	PEAK
DARREN	PETERSON
BRANDEN	POULSEN
SAMSON	SHEPHER
MARC	SHIELDS
ROBERT	SIEDMAN
ROBERT	SMITH
JAMES	SWENSON
SAMUEL	TYLER

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

INCOMPLETE APPLICANTS	
CARRIE	JOHNSTON
CLIFTON	HYDER
DAVID	WILLIAMS
ISAAC	BRONNIMAN
JEFFREY	BUCHOLC
JEREMIAH	DOBBERPUHL
JOSHUA	CROWE
MARK	SAMS
PAUL	FRENCH
SAMUEL	WOOLFOLK
WEIFENG	DAI
WILLIAM	CULVER
WILLIAM	WEAVER
TADEUSZ	TOMASIC

6
7 **Agenda Item 21 - Review Calendar of Events/ Board Travel**

8 A. Board Meeting Dates:

- 9
- 10 • February 1-2, 2018 - location changed to Anchorage.
 - 11 • May 3-4, 2018 Fairbanks, pending approval. A. Jones explained we will need to provide justification and
12 explained last year the board scheduled an outreach event at UAF. Johnston encouraged the board to consider an
13 outreach event in conjunction with the local chapters. Maynard suggested alternating between students and
14 current professionals. Hanson said the Fairbanks meeting historically were 3 ½ days.

15 The board agreed scheduling an outreach event is good as the members are not always able to conduct outreach
16 on their own.

- 17
- 18 • August 2-3, 2018 Anchorage
 - 19
 - 20 • November to be determined at February 2018 meeting.
 - 21

22 B. National Organization Meetings

23 1. NCARB/CLARB New Member Orientation, February 8-10, Washington, D.C. – A. Jones announced NCARB and
24 CLARB is doing an orientation for new members and staff. Johnston, Mott and A. Jones qualify. The board agreed it would
25 be worthwhile for the new AELS board members and staff to attend.

26

27 2. NCARB Regional Summit, March TBD, Wichita – Fritz will attend. The Chair will attend in Koonce's place, and A.
28 Jones plans to attend.

29

30 3. NCEES WZone April 5-7, Honolulu – Hale, Maynard, and Kerr will attend. Initially Johnston and Mott were also
31 interested, however first-time attendee funding is not available for Zone meetings.

32

33 4. NCARB Annual Meeting, June 28-30, Detroit – Fritz, Koonce and A. Jones will attend.

34

35

36 5. NCEES Annual Meeting, August 15-17, Scottsdale – A. Jones mentioned Investigator Savage would be interested in
37 attending. Johnston and Mott are interested in attending as first time attendees.

1
2 6. CLARB Annual Meeting, September 27-29, Toronto – Urfer plans to go to Toronto pending approval.
3

4 **Agenda Item 22 - Board Tasks - To Do List**

5 Board discussed tasks. The Chair asked A. Jones to compile the list of to do items and email it to the board.
6

BOARD MEMBER TASKS
Catherine, Jeff and Vern will work with Alysia on NCARB History (A16.B.2.j)
John will work with Alysia on UAV info./ brochure for website (A114.D.)
Colin will write a letter to UAA regarding passing of FE exam
Dave will write a response letter to Jesse Engineering Co. (A17.B.)
Colin and Luanne will draft response letter re: playgrounds & Landscape Architects (A17.D.)
Colin and Luanne will draft verbiage for the guidance manual to clarify (A17.D.)
Brian will write a letter to DEC regarding their regulations (A17.E.)
Catherine and Brian will coordinate on education and work experience req. (A114.A.1&2)
Dave will call chief investigator regarding John's time and our statutes
Input regarding proposed updates to seal regulations (A114.E.)
Brian will write a response letter to Peter Giessel (April 2017 Meeting - A17.F.)
STAFF TASKS
Alysia will schedule OAH training for board
Alysia will work w/ Sara on laptop issues/ policies & procedures so that board members have access to marked up versions of board packets at meetings
Alysia will compile required notices for SE by Grandfathering regulation update (A17.C.)
Alysia will work with board members as needed to produce an updated version of the Guidance Manual by February
Alysia will draft a response letter regarding IACET (A17.G)
Alysia will disseminate John Kerr's UAV presentation
John Savage will include sanitized explanation of cases in future investigative reports

7
8
9 **The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.**

10
11 **Outreach at UAA College of Engineering**

12 Board members Hanson, Maynard, Fritz, Mott and Kerr met with approximately 25 students and 6 faculty in the UAA
13 School of Engineering, which includes Geomatics. Hanson facilitated the discussion and the students asked a lot of
14 questions. The main topics included: the FS exam, responsible charge, and education vs. experience time. The board
15 members also explained the relationship between the AK Board and NCEES.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3

Respectfully submitted:



Alysia D. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:



Dave Hale, PLS, Chair
Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers
and Land Surveyors