

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

10
11 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING**
12 **February 1-2, 2018**

13 By authority of AS 08/01.070(2), and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, a scheduled meeting of
14 the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors was held on Thursday, February 1 and Friday,
15 February 2, 2018, at KPB Architects, Anchorage, Alaska.

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

18 The meeting was called to order at 9:05am by Chair Dave Hale.

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

21 Dave Hale PS, Surveyor
22 Brian Hanson, PE, Civil Engineer, Mining Engineer
23 Catherine Fritz, Architect
24 Richard "Vernon" Jones, Public Member
25 John Kerr, PS, Surveyor
26 Colin Maynard, PE, Civil Engineer, Structural Engineer
27 Bill Mott, PE, Chemical Engineer, Metallurgical and Materials Engineer
28 Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect
29 Fred Wallis, Mining Engineer

30
31 The following board member attended telephonically:

32 Elizabeth Johnston, PE Electrical Engineer, Fire Protection Engineer

33
34 The following board members were excused by the Chair:

35 Jeff Koonce, Architect

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

38 Alysia Jones, Executive Administrator
39 Heather Noe, Licensing Examiner
40 John Savage, Investigator

41
42 The following staff attended telephonically:

43 Janey McCullough, Division Director
44 Melissa Dumas, Administrative Officer

45
46 **Agenda Item 2 - Review/Amend Agenda**

47 The board reviewed the agenda.

48
49 Johnston requested items 21 and 22 be moved to this afternoon. The Chair explained guest speakers were coming in for
50 those presentations, so they could not be moved.

51
52 A. Jones noted a few grammatical revisions and the addition of agenda items 9.C. Letter requesting clarification of sealing
53 requirements and municipalities and 9.D. Letter regarding third party peer review service. The Chair confirmed that
54 everyone had a copy of the addendum.

1
2
3 **On a Motion duly made by John Kerr seconded by Colin Maynard, and approved unanimously, it was**
4 **RESOLVED to accept the updated agenda.**
5

6 **Agenda Item 3 - Ethics Reporting**

7 There were no ethic violations to report.

8
9 Urfer met with the interior design group.

10
11 Hanson stated that he attended the NCEES UPLG Committee meeting, an NCEES Education Committee meeting, Utah
12 board visit and is scheduled to do a board visit to San Jose while he is still on the AELS Board. All of these trips were
13 covered by NCEES.

14
15 Maynard stated that he also attended the UPLG Committee meeting in San Diego, paid for by NCEES.

16
17 Fritz stated she recently attended a WCARB Strategic Planning Meeting that WCARB paid for and had one phone call
18 with an interior designer.

19
20 Hale stated that he was attending a meeting at UAA with Geomatics students tonight to talk about licensure.

21
22 Maynard added that he will be talking to the mechanical engineering wrap up design class in a couple weeks, and did a
23 similar presentation last fall, for no compensation.

24
25 Kerr mentioned that agenda item 9.C. Jake Maxwell contacted him prior to writing the letter and explained his concerns.
26 Kerr had advised him to ask the Board.

27
28 Hanson added he had made a presentation to the UAA Electrical Engineers earlier this week and mentioned NCEES has
29 an outreach packet with handouts, pens, pencils, screen cleaners, etc. suitable for student level outreach. Hanson explained
30 boards can request a packet from NCEES.

31
32 **Agenda Item 4 - Review/Approve Minutes -Regular Meeting November 8-9, 2017**
33

34 R. Jones mentioned there was a statement regarding universities requiring “passing” the FE, and clarified that the
35 requirement is to “take” it rather than pass. R. Jones also requested review of information related to Certificate of
36 Authorizations (COA) to ensure it was correct and did not imply a COA was required for a sole proprietor.

37
38 Fritz noted a reference on page 6, that she received 3 phone calls to talk about an exemption for SE applications under 12
39 AAC 36.0208 and requested rephrasing to indicate the calls were from multiple callers.

40
41 J. Kerr said page 5 line 42 did not make sense to him and requested rephrasing.

42
43 Johnston stated her name was misspelled throughout the minutes. A. Jones apologized and indicated she would correct the
44 misspellings.

45
46 **On a Motion duly made by Colin Maynard, seconded by Catherine Fritz, and approved unanimously, it**
47 **was RESOLVED to approve the minutes with minor corrections.**
48

49 **Agenda Item 5 - Investigative Report**

Feb012018_11:28

50 Savage announced there is a new Chief Investigator, Greg Francois and said the Chair will be meeting with him in the
51 coming weeks. Savage said the section remains busy with regular workload which has increased with the recent renewal
52 season. Savage explained he still has multiple boards, but it is going in the right direction and cases are being transferred
53 to other staff. Savage explained, per the board’s request, he has made changes to the content provided in the board report
54 and noted this is the maximum amount of information he can provide on the investigative report. Savage asked the board
55 to provide feedback. R. Jones reminded the board not to be involved in complaints and to direct inquiries directly to John.

1 Savage said when a complaint is closed, everyone involved is made aware of the case, and warned the board about
2 defamation of character.

3
4 Savage said he would miss Hanson, as this is his last meeting and thanked him for his assistance with case reviews. He
5 requested the board confirm contact information and provide any updates to the A. Jones.

6
7 Chair asked if we can retain past board members for case review. Savage said we can and he has recruited some to be
8 expert witnesses over the years. Savage will see if Brian is interested in continuing to assist. Savage mentioned he would
9 be reaching out to several members regarding case reviews and explained the importance of their prompt response in
10 keeping cases moving forward.

11
12 The Chair thanked John for his report and all he does for the board and the public.

13
14 Maynard asked if the board could talk about HB90, which would lump all investigative costs together. Maynard said
15 Representative Kito would be speaking to APDC at noon today. The Chair asked Maynard to summarize the bill for the
16 board. Maynard explained the bill will take the total cost of investigations, regardless of the program and divide the cost
17 among all licensees. He explained the nurses have the highest costs, with doctors, guides, and then realtors. Maynard
18 added that midwives' fees went up severely due to the small number of licensees and high investigative costs. Maynard
19 suggested grouping a few of the related boards/programs to address the issue. Maynard stated we would end up paying
20 more (approximately \$50/ biennial). Maynard explained the policy of occupational licensing had historically been each
21 program was responsible for their own (direct) costs, and in the past three to four years indirect costs have also been
22 allocated to each program. Maynard stated the argument in support of the bill is that it is insurance, but Maynard
23 disagrees. Fritz asked why Kito is opposed to the idea of grouping similar programs to increase the licensee pool and
24 spread out the investigative cost between similar licensee groups.

25
26 Kerr commented the topic had been discussed at a previous meeting and recalled there was a motion to write a letter. The
27 Chair stated the bill had been put on hold and therefore the letter had not been written. Maynard recommend sending a
28 letter. Fritz suggested the letter articulate alternative options for addressing the issue. Maynard added that he was
29 concerned if investigative costs were lumped together that we would also lose our dedicated investigative staff member
30 that by statute should only be handling cases for AELS.

31
32 Kerr suggested the letter explain the time and effort that went into getting a dedicated investigator for the board. The
33 Chair clarified that losing our investigator is not what HB90 is about and is only an assumed effect if the bill passed.

34
35 Fritz said different professions have made different efforts, i.e. outreach and education to reduce the amount of
36 investigations and stated her concern that this would make it difficult to ensure which programs are continuing that effort.

37
38 Maynard explained there was a big back log of AELS cases because the priority was on medical cases. Maynard
39 expressed his concern of the priority shifting back to medical or another program if costs are lumped together again.

40
41 R. Jones stated at one time the board had two and a half investigators and now there is only one, but the workload has not
42 changed.

43
44 The Chair asked if Maynard would write the letter. Mott suggested relating the issue regarding John's position and time to
45 a public safety issue rather than a complaint of an increase in fees. The board agreed.

46
47 **On a Motion duly made by Colin Maynard, seconded by John Kerr, and approved unanimously, it was**
48 **RESOLVED to send a letter to the legislature expressing our opposition to HB90 and recommending a different**
49 **method of lowering the small boards' fees.**

50
51
52
53 **Agenda Item 6 - Financial Report**

Feb012018_34:44

54 Director McCullough and Administrative Officer Melissa Dumas joined the meeting telephonically. McCullough

1 mentioned she believed a letter had already been submitted. A. Jones will review correspondence to confirm whether or
2 not a letter was actually sent.

3
4 McCullough stated that the board had previously seen the year-end report for FY17 and explained the first quarter of
5 FY18 was available for the board to review. Dumas mentioned revenue from renewals will be reflected in the 2nd quarter,
6 which would be available in the coming weeks. Hanson stated the board had previously reviewed the 1st quarter report at
7 the November meeting. McCullough explained it was her understanding the board had reviewed FY17 information at the
8 last meeting. A. Jones explained the FY 18 report became available right before the November meeting, so it was
9 provided to the board in the November 2017 meeting addendum.

10
11 The Chair asked when the 2nd quarter report will be available and asked if the board can receive that information in
12 between board meetings. Dumas explained it would be available soon and offered to work with A. Jones to send it to the
13 board once it becomes available.

14
15 **TASK** – A. Jones will follow up with Dumas to get the 2nd quarter report.

16
17 Hanson asked if the continuing education audit letters had gone out. A. Jones responded that the letters had not been sent
18 yet. R. Jones offered to assist A. Jones with reviewing the audits to reduce the number that needs to be seen by the board.

19
20 **Agenda Item 7 - National Organization Correspondence & Meeting Reports**

Feb012018.1_43:58

21 7.A. *CLARB* – Urfer reported they are still concerned about all of the challenges to licensure and a lot of the
22 teleconferences are focused on those issues. Urfer said they are also recruiting for officers. Urfer said they recently sent
23 out a survey to evaluate perceived level of threat/ risk to licensure and to determine topics for the annual meeting.

Feb012018.2-_00:02

24
25
26 7.B. *NCARB* – A. Jones reported that during the Member Board Engagement call, both New Mexico and Utah mentioned
27 that interior designers are seeking registration, but their architectural boards are not being included in the conversations.

28
29 Fritz reported that we completed the history project and mentioned some interesting information came out of archives and
30 speaking with former board members.

31
32 7.C. *NCEES* – Hanson explained the Board of Directors report from Boston was included in the packet. Hanson
33 mentioned they made an additional donation to Without Borders. He explained NCEES is looking at a building expansion
34 or possibly moving due to a recent cost benefit analysis. Hanson announced the CEO Jerry Carter is retiring and plans to
35 depart the end of next year. Hanson said there was also a questionnaire on the land surveyor module and he encouraged
36 the Chair and Kerr to get involved in that process.

37
38 **On a Motion duly made by Colin Maynard, seconded by John Kerr, and approved unanimously, it was**
39 **RESOLVED to grant Brian Hanson Emeritus Status with NCEES.**

40
41 Hanson added that there is one candidate for Vice President - Brian Robertson, and one candidate for Assistant Vice
42 President – Scott Bishop, from Utah. The Chair asked about the South Dakota issue. Hanson stated it is related to
43 temporary licensure. Hanson said it is a model for what's going on in other states and added it is just a discussion at this
44 point.

45
46 The Chair explained that item 7.C.5., a questionnaire from South Korea regarding interest in a mutual recognition
47 agreement came to the board with a short response window, but that he felt the topic should be discussed by the board as a
48 whole. Maynard stated that we do not offer reciprocity with any other state let alone another country and noted we are not
49 able to do so because of the arctic requirement. The Chair noted the board has not vetted their institutions either.

50
51
52 R. Jones said we don't give straight reciprocity to anyone and asked why we would make an exception. The Chair agreed
53 and reiterated that he wanted it to be a board decision.

1 TASK: A. Jones will respond indicating the board is not interested in seeking reciprocity with South Korea due to arctic
2 course, and the need to vet education and licensure requirements, etc.
3

4 R. Jones mentioned he was disappointed in the presentations at the NCEES annual meeting, stating they were self-serving.
5 Hanson said the Board of Directors had discussed the relevance of some of the presentations and stated all comments are
6 reviewed and opinions are taken into consideration. Hanson added that he made a point of echoing the board's opinion of
7 the UAV presentation to the Board of Directors.
8

9 *7.D. Outreach Reports* – The Chair mentioned he would be talking to geomatics students tonight about licensure and what
10 the board does. Kerr and the Chair will also be talking at the Alaska Surveying and Mapping Conference about licensure
11 requirements, UAVs, etc. Kerr added it is a four day conference on surveying, mapping, GIS. The Chair said we are doing
12 a lot of outreach and believes it helps keep investigations down; keeps people aware of our regulations; and is worth the
13 effort. Kerr added that DNR informed him that the presentation he did last fall has generated a lot of discussion regarding
14 requirements for mappers. Mott asked if the presentation to DNR was specific to surveyors. Kerr responded it was on
15 licensing requirements related to mapping activities.
16

17 TASK: A. Jones asked the board to email her with any outreach activities, so she can better track the board's outreach
18 efforts and include it in the annual report.
19

20 The Chair asked if anyone else is doing outreach. Maynard said he's been talking to the civil engineering wrap up course
21 each semester for the past four years and is now being asked to speak during similar wrap up courses for other disciplines,
22 including mechanical. Hanson said the engineering society student chapter sent a request directly to NCEES and didn't
23 realize the board had been to the university in November.
24

Feb012018.2_21:05

25 Fritz requested that the board return to the discussion on HB90. She said she reviewed the minutes of the April meeting
26 and stated there was a motion that the Legislative Liaison Committee would draft a letter, but believed since the bill went
27 silent, the letter had not been drafted.
28
29

30 **Agenda Item 8 - Correspondence Sent**

31 *8.A. Response Letters RE: Deadline extension for SE application under 12 AAC 36.108.* – The Chair explained the board
32 had received several of requests to extend the deadline for application for structural engineer license by grandfathering.
33 Staff provided documentation showing all notification requirements were met, and mentioned in the response letters. The
34 Chair stated that in the letter he encouraged the registrants to sign up for the listserv to stay informed. He asked the board
35 how else we can notify people.
36

37 R. Jones said there is always ten percent of registrants that do not get the word and it is an ongoing issue. A. Jones asked
38 if there is a way to work more closely with the local chapters to help get the word out. Maynard said he mentioned it every
39 monthly meeting of the Anchorage chapter of the Structural Engineers of Alaska. Maynard added it was also in the APDC
40 newsletter. Fritz explained the three individuals she spoke with, were still expecting a hard copy in the mail and had not
41 transition fully to electronic communications. Fritz said encouraging the listserv and highlighting the listserv on the
42 website is sufficient.
43
44

Feb012018.2_25:19

45 *8.B. Response Letters RE: Playgrounds and Landscape Architects*

46 Chair asked if there had been any comments or responses from these letters. A. Jones indicated no response or additional
47 correspondence had been received regarding this issue.
48
49
50

51 *8.C. Response Letter to Jesse Engineering Co.*

52 The Chair explained the request to use engineering in the company's name was denied and the board's position had been
53 if you have been using it forever then we won't stop them from using it, however new corporations need to comply. The
54 Chair suggested everyone read the Oregon issue regarding an individual who did not have an engineering license, did a
55 traffic light study and claimed he was an engineer. The Oregon board took exception to that and the board was sued. The

1 courts claimed it was free speech. The board discussed the case and believed it would not have been something the AELS
2 board would have pursued.

3
4 **Agenda Item 9 - Correspondence Received**

Feb012018.2_29:56

5 *9.A. Relationship between responsible charge designee and company* – The question posed to the board was “Does the
6 responsible charge on the business license [Certificate of Authorization] have to be an employee of that company?” The
7 board began a long discussion on the topic.

8
9 Maynard commented that yes, a person in responsible charge should be an employee, if not an owner, in the company and
10 that if you are offering services and want a COA, you should have a qualified employee. Mott brought up sub-contracting
11 to the discussion and the board discussed the difference between being on a design team vs. what services a company
12 offers. R. Jones said he does not disagree that they should be an employee, but stated the regulations do not require it.
13 Savage asked about “direct knowledge and supervisory control”.

14
15 Hanson said he believed the intent of the regulation, was yes, you were going to be in that office, but added that the
16 regulation was created in a time when there were small companies, with everyone working in that same office and there
17 was no email, fax machines, etc. He explained people work all over the place now and supervise people remotely. Hanson
18 stated it is no different than hiring legal counsel for your corporation, which is not on their staff, but is hired to represent
19 the company.

20
21 Maynard said if a company is offering services, they should have someone on staff in responsible charge of that field of
22 practice, otherwise, they should hire the other company as a subcontractor to be part of their team and provide expertise in
23 another field of practice or discipline as required for a particular project.

24
25 R. Jones ask how someone can provide direct knowledge and supervisory control without ever visiting the site. Several
26 members indicated it was possible and explained the persons’ in responsible charge review all of the information,
27 numbers, etc. Hanson said the board regulates the individual and title, not the process and the responsibility is on the
28 professional to ensure the accuracy.

29
30 The board discussed how a company might turn that authority over to an individual that is not an employee or owner of a
31 company. Hanson posed the question of being on a company’s board of directors and the group discussed the use of the
32 term employee and the fact another term to define the relationship may be more appropriate.

33
34 The board then discussed a scenario involving a licensed professional getting a professional quality product from someone
35 else and taking responsibility for that work. Fritz stated that is legal, although it may not be advisable. Hanson said that it
36 is no less legal than a licensed professional sending an unlicensed crew out, creating a product and then the licensed
37 professional stamping it. Hanson added if they are doing work that *has* to be done by a licensed professional that is a
38 different issue.

39
40 The Chair stated the issue becomes grayer as to whether or not the registrant can actually take responsibility when he or
41 she is not part of the company. Kerr said the person in responsible charge needs to be able to demonstrate direct
42 knowledge and supervisory control whether they are in the office or remotely, and the responsibility remains with the
43 individual.

44
45 The board circled back to the original question and paused the discussion to prepare for the Office of Administrative
46 Hearings (OAH) training scheduled for 11:00a.m.

47
48
49 **Agenda Item 10 - OAH Training w/ Judge Christopher Kennedy**

Feb012018.3_01:43

50 Judge Kennedy introduced himself as the Deputy Chief at OAH and stated he was filling in for Judge Kathleen Frederick.
51 Kennedy explained one of his roles is speaking with clients such, as the AELS board, and ensuring boards understand the
52 role of OAH. Kennedy stated OAH was created in 2005 reaction to public perception of unfairness. Every agency had a
53 hearing officer buried in it and there were concerns regarding their objectivity. Other issues with the framework included
54 isolation from other professionals. In 2005, the hearing officers were put together in a separate independent office.
55 Kennedy said there are ten to eleven administrative law judges who hear cases from all different parts of state

1 government, some are generalists and others are specialists. Kennedy said they used to get quite a few cases from this
2 board, but they have not seen any from AELS in more recent years.

3
4 Kennedy described the process for getting cases, using the example of an application for licensure. Kennedy explained the
5 board may reject the application, the applicant is then given 30 days to appeal and then the case is referred to OAH. The
6 OAH then has 120 days to run a full appeal on their application. Kennedy explained OAH is required to start over in a
7 sense, reviewing all documentation the board reviewed, as well as any additional information the individual wants to
8 provide. He added often times the individual wishes to testify and provide a fuller picture of their story and/or situation,
9 which may involve a live hearing where witnesses are put up and cross-examined. Within the 120 days, the OAH is
10 supposed to issue a proposed decision to the board. Kennedy explained once a proposed decision has been made both the
11 applicant and the Attorney General's Office can comment on it by submitting a proposal for action. OAH then packages
12 the proposed decision and proposal for action and submits it to the board liaison, typically for inclusion on the next
13 quarterly meeting agenda. Kennedy stated at the next meeting the board will be in deliberative session and would invite
14 the administrative law judge to the session to discuss the matter. The board then has the option to accept, reject, modify,
15 (i.e. granting with conditions). Kennedy explained the AELS board has rejected the proposed decision and in another case
16 granted with different conditions than recommended. Kennedy explained the next steps would be to come out of executive
17 session and vote on the ultimate decision. Kennedy said if different than recommendation, then then board needs to
18 articulate why and the administrative law judge will work with the Chair to draft the explanation, which is then circulated
19 to the rest of the board and finally signed off on by the board.

20
21 Kennedy explained the intent of this process is to have a new set of eyes on the situation, give people due process, while
22 keeping the board at the top of pyramid regarding discipline, etc. Kennedy added it is also designed to spare the board
23 from having a hearing themselves.

24
25 Kennedy said the minute someone appeals and sends it to OAH, your AG turns into a representative or party in the case,
26 and your board liaison also becomes a party in the case. He added that board liaisons typically are aligned with
27 Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing (CBPL) staff and they get on one side and the appealing party gets on
28 the other side of the case and argue the case. OAH is in the middle, as is the Board, which can be considered the jury.
29 Kennedy explained the board cannot talk to the AG or CBPL staff about the case. Once the case is over, Kennedy
30 recommended discussing lessons learned and provide feedback for future consideration.

31
32 Kennedy mentioned the board can decide an item is too trivial and delegate the OAH to make the final decision. Kennedy
33 provided an example regarding a technical dispute about whether or not continuing education requirements were met and
34 stated the Chair would be able to decide. Kennedy said it is an option, but advised against delegating anything that is very
35 important to the board and/or related to policy.

36
37 Kerr asked for clarification about when the staff cannot be contacted. Kennedy explained that procedural questions are
38 allowed, however nothing regarding the content or substance of the case can be discussed.

39
40 The Chair asked if OAH would review the Guidance Manual and/or consider the board's history on a particular type of
41 ruling. Kennedy said OAH is supposed to apply the law which is your statutes and regulations, whereas a guidance
42 manual is controversial. He added they may look at it, but the information in the manual cannot be followed as the law.
43 Kennedy stated OAH has documentation of prior decisions and will review that information to see what the board did in
44 the past. The Chair asked if it was possible to get a copy of previous cases since the board is always looking for
45 precedence. The board discussed having A. Jones review the documentation of prior decisions as time allows and bringing
46 that information to the board.

47
48 TASK – A. Jones will contact OAH to schedule a time to review documentation of prior decisions.

49
50 Maynard asked if there was a transcript to see how the administrative law judge came to that decision or are we supposed
51 to just take the recommendation? Kennedy responded there typically is not a transcript, but that they would be able to play
52 specific pieces of the recording.

53
54 Kennedy mentioned a prior case with the AELS board where the board rejected the administrative law judge's decision,
55 and the case went up to superior court. He explained it came back to the board for reconsideration and the board then

1 granted the license with conditions that were different than what the judge recommended. Hanson said the board did not
2 realize there were options available to the board to consider. Kennedy said there are options for boards to ensure you are
3 getting the right assistance. Kennedy recommended someone review the decisions from the 80s and 90s and explained
4 that everything issued as a full decision since 2005 is available online, but the board does not have a lot of cases in recent
5 years. Kennedy offered to send over the three decisions of the Ward case, Fritz said she was able to pull them up online.

6
7 Kerr asked who follows up with stipulations of the board's ruling. Kennedy responded that the CBPL paralegal staff are
8 responsible for that work.

9
10 Maynard said there is a perception in our licensing community that we are involved in all of the investigations and it is
11 good awareness for us to know how it works. Kerr asked if there was an opportunity for consultation from the OAH for
12 advisement on a matter before it has the potential to reach an appeal. Kennedy indicated OAH can do information
13 gathering, but are not supposed to advise outside of a specific case and stated the AG's office is the more appropriate
14 contact for that service.

15
16 R. Jones requested Kennedy talk about ex parte communications. Kennedy explained that during investigations, you are
17 still a regulatory board, executive ethics does not prevent individuals from contacting individual board members about
18 their potential case, however as a good practice you may want to decline speaking with the individual. Kennedy stated
19 once the case is appealed, then it is against the law for you to talk with the individual. Kennedy explained people will try
20 to lobby board members and advised the board to shut those types of conversations down because board members are
21 supposed to act as the jury. Kennedy recommended board members notify the Chair if someone shares information. The
22 Chair can then talk with the administrative law judge to decide if they want to know that information. Kennedy added one
23 potential solution would be to circulate the information to all sides.

24
25 Board thanked Judge Kennedy for the training. Kerr suggested this training be provided every two years.

26
27 The board recessed for lunch at 12:05 p.m.

28
29 The board reconvened at 1:41 p.m.

30
31 **Agenda Item 15 – Public Comment**

Feb012018.04_00:03:34

32 Chris Miller of Fairbanks thanked the board for their outreach efforts. Miller agreed with industrial boundaries
33 information and point of view provided in the November meeting minutes. In regards to the interior designer initiative to
34 seek registration, Miller stated that in general he does not object to the idea, but mentioned based upon his brief review,
35 the interior designers do not appear to have the same bar that we do. Miller added if there were similar requirements - the
36 same three legs (education, experience and examination), and the definition specified the interior design work was related
37 to code work, then he would be open to it.

38
39 James Hall from Kenai called in to observe.

40
41 Hanson mentioned he had visited the Utah board and they are dealing with exemptions in general and how they were
42 unfairly applied to the profession of engineering within Utah. He stated they have a similar catch all phrase as Alaska
43 which states if it is within your expertise you can continue doing it, but they did not have that for surveying, and he
44 wanted to see that go in to their description. We had some items written into the regulations where land surveyors can do
45 some work that civil engineers do, but Utah does not have that. Hanson stated he just wanted to throw that out there for
46 consideration.

47
48 **Returned to discussing Agenda Item 9 A & B.** Chair asked the board members to reread the regulations and come back
49 with comments tomorrow to keep the discussion more focused. Johnston stated she would not be able to attend tomorrow
50 and asked to have the discussion now. The Chair invited Johnston to provide comments.

51
52 Johnston stated that she interprets 08.48.241 to read a company must have at least one person for each field, but that a
53 company can designate more than one. Johnston went on to explain that the board uses the term "responsible charge" in
54 several ways, including applicants who are not licensed by giving them credit for responsible charge and therefore
55 "responsible charge" doesn't just mean stamping each person's work. Johnston explained it is an unreasonable burden for

1 a company to have to update their COA every time it hires someone or someone leaves. Johnston said her interpretation of
2 the person in “responsible charge” is the individual making sure people are licensed and properly trained, and doing
3 quality control - not that you are stamping everything. Johnston explained that was her comments based upon the board’s
4 earlier discussion, but that if the discussion went deeper she would write a letter to the board on each of the points.
5

6 Maynard read 08.48.241(h) “Drawings, specifications, designs, and reports, when issued in connection with work
7 performed by a corporation, limited liability company, or limited liability partnership under its COA, shall be prepared by
8 or under the responsible charge of and shall be signed by and stamped with the official seal of a person holding a
9 certificate of registration under this chapter.” Maynard stated he was unsure if that means anybody who is registered or
10 not and said the board might want to consider changing the wording to “supervisory control” or some other term to
11 improve clarity. Maynard stated responsible control means you are overseeing the work, not just making sure that the
12 person doing the work is licensed.
13

14 Mott stated that was in conflict with Johnston’s point of giving people credit for responsible charge before they get their
15 professional license and the way Maynard was interpreting it would result in no one getting their professional license
16 unless they were designated in responsible charge.
17

18 Kerr re-read the last portion of 08.48.241(h) “shall be signed by and stamped with the official seal of a person holding a
19 certificate of registration under this chapter” and said his interpretation was any registrant rather than the person indicated
20 on the COA. Several other members agreed.
21

22 The Chair requested that the board consider the burden to the corporation. Maynard stated that he did not care whether or
23 not it was burdensome, the priority is public safety. Johnston argued that having the actual registrant stamp the drawings
24 vs. only the person designated in responsible charge protects the public even more, because then you know exactly who
25 did the work. Fritz and Hanson commented that their interpretation of the regulation was that the person stamping the
26 drawing did not have to be the person designated in responsible charge on the COA and looked at 08.48.241(3) which
27 specifies a company must designate a person in responsible charge for each major branch that can be held accountable,
28 but not that they are required to stamp all drawings.
29

30 Maynard said he still felt the person stamping the drawings should be listed as a person in responsible charge. Fritz
31 responded these were separate issues and explained the person listed on the COA provides a legitimate framework for the
32 corporation to offer those services, not necessarily for that individual to be for every drawing that comes out of that
33 organization.
34

35 The Chair read 08.48.241(1) which states the purpose of the COA is to determine if the corporation is qualified to offer
36 the practice. The Chair stated “responsible charge” is a separate issue.
37

38 Maynard read 08.48.241(b)(1) “the bylaws of the corporation, the articles of organization or operating agreement of the
39 limited liability company, or the partnership agreement of the limited liability partnership contain provisions that all
40 architectural, engineering, land surveying, or landscape architectural decisions pertaining to architectural, engineering,
41 land surveying, or landscape architectural activities in this state will be made by the specified architect, engineer, land
42 surveyor, or landscape architect in responsible charge, or other registered architects, engineers, land surveyors, or
43 landscape architects under the direction or supervision of the architect, engineer, land surveyor, or landscape architect in
44 responsible charge;” and stated that in his opinion they need to be under the direct supervision of the person in responsible
45 charge, not just work for corporation.
46

47 Kerr stated his interpretation of the statute was that the COA designates someone in responsible charge of the practice of a
48 particular field, which is different than responsible charge on a project. The responsible charge in 08.48.241(h) is to
49 ensure each project gets stamped, rather than “rubber stamped”. Kerr added his interpretation of (h) was that it did not
50 necessarily need to be the person that has the corporate authority. Maynard re-read portions of 08.48.241(b) (1) reiterating
51 the “under direction or supervision of...”
52

53 Mott pulled up information on several large companies on the Division’s Professional License Search database and noted
54 that the majority had a single person listed in responsible charge for a particular field of practice. Maynard stated that he
55 didn’t understand how someone could be making final decisions if they were not qualified/ authorized to do so. Mott said

1 if you interpret it to mean that only the person designated by the corporation on the COA can stamp, then why have
2 multiple PEs working for a company. He believed that would encourage a company to have one PE and hire lots of EITs.

3
4 Johnston stated she has full authority to make final decisions regarding electrical engineering, but explained it does not
5 mean she has to make *all* electrical engineering decisions. She has the authority to override decisions of other engineers
6 when a final decision needs to be made by the corporation.

7
8 Hanson said if you are in the corporation and are a principal, he believes you should be listed and that Maynard's model is
9 more appropriate, however he added that he personally doesn't believe that a person has to be listed on the COA in order
10 to stamp a project.

11
12 The Chair said there may be some conflict between Maynard's interpretation and some of the regulations regarding
13 stamping and sealing drawings. The board discussed the multiple ways the term "responsible charge" is used in the statutes
14 and regulations and how the terminology is causing confusion.

15
16 Maynard shared a scenario in which a licensed individual who is not listed on the COA screws up and stamps a drawing
17 with an issue. Maynard stated not only would that individual lose his license, but the person on the COA could also lose
18 his license for not properly overseeing that person. Maynard added that in his corporation that would not happen, because
19 the person in responsible charge of the project is also in responsible charge for the corporation.

20
21 Hanson referred the board to (c) of the statute, which specifies the board's right to refuse to issue, suspend or revoke a
22 COA and noted that it did not say "employee". The Chair directed the board to 12 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals, which
23 indicated "direct professional knowledge" and "direct supervisory control" of the work. The Chair stated either the statute
24 and regulations are in conflict, or they go hand in hand with one related to the COA and the other relating to the
25 responsibility for a single product.

26
27 Fritz asked if it would be appropriate to contact the AG's office to get their interpretation. The board discussed the option,
28 but decided to continue the discussion. Fritz commented that there appears to be multiple levels of authority or
29 responsibility.

30
31 The Chair asked the board to step back and revisit the initial question, which asked if the person in responsible charge had
32 to be a full time employee of the company. The majority of the board felt it did not need to be an employee. Maynard
33 asked if a company would really want to give that authority to someone who didn't work for the company. Several said
34 that is up to the company. The board discussed registrants who are listed as the person in responsible charge for multiple
35 companies and insurance coverage.

36
37 The Chair requested that the board pause their discussion in order to return to public comment.

38
39
40
41 ***Returned to Public Comment***

Feb012018.4_00:52:21

42 Dale Nelson from APDC Legislative Committee arrived and requested the opportunity to testify. Nelson informed the
43 board, the group is preparing for Legislative Fly-in in Juneau next week. Nelson mentioned Sam Kito called in for HB 50
44 QBS and HB 90. Nelson reported there wouldn't be any further action on HB90. Nelson said they will be discussing HB
45 50 at tonight's teleconference and that they would not be doing anything further with HB 90.

46
47 Nelson reported 24 people, 19 professionals and 5 students (UAA and UAF) will attend the fly-in and have meetings
48 scheduled with their representatives. Nelson said they will be talking with representatives about capital funding for
49 deferred maintenance and repairs and University of Alaska funding for lab equipment. In regards to the UA funding,
50 Nelson said the group would stress the importance of education and students having the appropriate tools.

51
52 Hanson asked if APDC was aware of the State's travel restrictions. Hanson explained the AELS board is required to meet
53 in the most cost effective location and prohibited from traveling to Juneau and Fairbanks, unless there is a justifiable
54 reason for the meeting to be held in another location. Hanson mentioned the outreach the board conducted in Juneau with
55 the Chamber of Commerce and ASEA Infrastructure Report Card in February 2017 and at UAF in April 2017. Hanson

1 said as a long time board member, the travel restrictions were disappointing. The Chair said the board needs to justify
2 travel to hold the meeting in other locations, and need to consider other options for people to be involved.

3
4 Nelson stated APDC keeps moving their meetings around so younger professionals and students, who don't have the
5 money to travel are able to connect with the group.

6
7 R. Jones encouraged local chapters to voice their desire to have more AELS presence outside the Anchorage area.

8
9 Nelson asked if the board had a mission, the board members and staff showed him a hard copy of the mission statement
10 contained in the board packet and directed him to the AELS website.

11
12 The board thanked Nelson for his comments.

13
14 ***The board returned to Agenda Item 9 – Correspondence Received:***

Feb012018.4_01:07:00

15 **Agenda Item 9.C. Letter requesting clarification of sealing requirements and municipalities**

16 The Chair summarized the request indicating the individual was looking for clarification on stamping of legal descriptions
17 and requested a letter from the board.

18
19 Kerr and Hanson stated the answer to the first question “Does the creation of final legal descriptions and exhibits require a
20 professional seal?” is yes.

21
22 In regards to the second question regarding whether Municipality of Anchorage and private utility companies were
23 exempt from professional licensure requirements related to land surveying, Hanson stated exemption 10 does not apply
24 because they provide a service to the public. Kerr suggested the Chair write two letters – one that talks specifically about
25 land surveying and the other that addresses professional licensing for all disciplines.

26
27 TASK – The Chair will write two letters in response to Mr. Maxwell's questions.

Feb012018.4_01:13:19

28
29
30 **Agenda Item 9.D. Letter regarding 3rd party peer review service**

31 Maynard provided background on this item, stating someone directing initial work on a number of projects for local non-
32 profits, school districts, etc. recently retired and is interested in putting together a group of retired architects and engineers
33 to do work setting scope, design criteria, and/or review comments, but final design will be done by someone who is
34 licensed. Both Maynard and Hanson stated they had spoken with Mr. Fredeen regarding this matter. Hanson encouraged
35 the board to make a decision on whether this was acceptable or not, so future board members and investigative staff would
36 have that information.

37
38 Talking to the practice of architecture, Fritz felt it was okay to have someone help draft an RFP in terms of what the scope
39 should be. In regards to peer review, Fritz read AS 08.48.341 (12), which states:

40 “Practice of architecture” means professional service or creative work in the design of buildings, the teaching of
41 advanced architectural courses in institutions of higher learning, consultation, investigation, evaluation, planning,
42 design, and professional observation of construction of public or private buildings, works, or projects...”

43
44 Fritz stated when you are doing peer review you are evaluating, consulting, and providing your professional opinion
45 which falls under the practice of architecture. Mott agreed with Fritz's interpretation.

46
47 Maynard & Hanson said there are people who do reviews who are not licensed and discussed client/owner comments, and
48 comments provided by an engineer on areas that are not within their expertise. Hanson added there is a fine line between
49 the engineering aspect and the review aspect. Maynard added he did not believe the programming work would harm the
50 public. Fritz agreed, but reiterated her concern of peer review and promoting a capacity to work professionally. Hanson
51 said he did not realize they were doing RFPs, and said he had an issue if they get into the weeds. Maynard stated his
52 understanding was that the RFPs the group would be doing are not design-build RFPs, but rather RFPs to acquire design
53 services by licensed professionals. Fritz said she does not like the use of the word “planning” and Kerr added peer review
54 is a problematic term. The board discussed comments and reviews by unlicensed individuals and the responsibility of the

1 design professional to respond appropriately to those comments and whether any requested changes can or cannot be
2 done.

3
4 TASK: The Chair asked Maynard to write a letter responding to Mr. Fredeen.

5
6 **Agenda Item 16 - Application Review** *Feb012018.4_01:38:50*

7 The board began review of 101 applications. Applications included six architect registrations, eighty-nine engineer
8 registrations and six land surveyor registrations. There were forty comity applications, sixty exam applications and one by
9 grandfathering (12 AAC 36.108).

10
11 The board recessed for the day at 5:03 p.m. *Feb012018.4_03:22:25*

12
13

Agenda Item 18 – Reconvene meeting /Roll Call

Feb022018.1_00:00:01

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:19a.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
- Colin Maynard, PE, Civil Engineer, Structural Engineer
- Bill Mott, PE, Chemical Engineer, Metallurgical and Materials Engineer
- Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect

The following board members were excused by the Chair:

- Elizabeth Johnston, PE Electrical Engineer, Fire Protection Engineer
- Jeff Koonce, Architect

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

- Alysia Jones, Executive Administrator
- Heather Noe, Licensing Examiner
- John Savage, Investigator

Agenda Item 19. Application Review continued.

Agenda Item 21 - Discussion: Alaska Initiative for ID Registration

Feb022018.1_01:17:11

Barbara Cash, Dana Nunn, Cara Rude, Kelsey Davidson, and Mary Knopf joined the board to provide an update on the Alaska Initiative for Interior Design Registration. Cash thanked the board for their feedback following Nunn and Davidson’s presentation at the November meeting. Cash explained the information provided in the board packet had been updated from what was provided previously, noting the addition of supporter names and some additional bullet points regarding the petition. Cash explained the group followed up with supporters via email after meeting with the AELS board about the possibility of changing direction to a title act versus a voluntary title act. Ninety-eight percent of supporters agreed, so the group decided to pursue a practice act.

In response to some of the board’s previous questions, Cash provided information on the evolution of interior design. Cash stated from her perspective, the basis for university education and national examination has evolved over the past forty years based upon demand and need for education that directly focused on interior design.

Cash stated the NCIDQ exam is the benchmark covering basic requirements to practice interior design in code impacted environments. Cash explained code impacted environments broadly means environments within buildings that are designed to protect the public safety. The group discusses various elements including exiting/access within a tenant space. Nunn clarified they do not handle building system exiting, which would be within an architects purview, but non-loadbearing partitions, ADA accessibility, wayfinding (signage), flame spread are within the scope of interior design.

Cash acknowledged the board’s earlier questions concerning free trade, and asked Nunn to speak. Nunn stated the shift from a voluntary title act to practice act has an effect on free trade by limiting the potential pool of professionals the public can engage for services. Nunn explained the practice act would provide consumers with confidence and supports local business by providing a framework within which those working outside of Alaska must comply with before entering our marketplace. Nunn added that it supports small businesses and sole practitioners, enabling them to continue to do what they are doing within the law, without requiring over stamping by another professional.

Cash summarized the group’s interest in continuing the dialogue with the board and asked the board for a formal letter of support.

1 The Chair asked if the group had had discussions with the legislature. Cash responded the group has not had any direct
2 conversations with legislators yet and are waiting until it is launched to begin discussions. Cash added the group is
3 working with Dave Parrish and finding a sponsor. Davidson added that the group is also working on draft language.
4

5 Hanson asked if the group was interested in pursuing their own board. Cash replied their petition indicated they would fall
6 under the AELS board similar to landscape architects.
7

8 Mott asked how many states currently licensure interior designers. Cash directed the board to the map provided in the
9 packet, which indicated 27 states as having some type of recognition for interior designers. Fritz asked how many have a
10 practice act. Cash believed at least twelve states have a practice act, but mentioned variations between the states. The
11 board reviewed the graphic provided in the packet. Kerr asked if there was a particular state, the group was trying to
12 emulate. Cash said they looked at language from several states including Massachusetts and North Carolina, and trying to
13 take what is applicable. Kerr asked if there were any states the group would direct the board to look at as a good example.
14 Cash responded there are elements from some states that are a good basis and Nunn added they have not found a
15 jurisdiction that operates exactly how they would envision operating within the AELS board. Nunn said the closest would
16 probably be Texas, but reiterated key differences between Alaska and Texas.
17

18 Urfer asked how many of the states that are gray (currently do not have licensure) are pursuing registration for interior
19 designers. The group indicated several states are in a similar process. Cash explained ASID has a national campaign to
20 provide additional support to states over a five year plan, and Alaska is currently in the second year of that support from
21 ASID.
22

23 In terms of board make-up, Cash said the group wants to be regulated by the AELS board and is not interested in creating
24 its own board. She added several states have architecture and interior design combined, but few encompass additional
25 design professions. Nunn explained the group is only interested in having code-impacted interior designers regulated and
26 would want to have a seat on the board. Nunn said prior to the board's November meeting, they had been looking at states
27 with title acts and now that the group is pursuing a practice act, they are looking at states that have practice acts.
28

29 Fritz asked what was unique to interior design that is not already covered in the practice of architecture. She explained her
30 issue with the initiative is that a practice act stems from the need to address a problem with current practices not fulfilling
31 a public safety need. Cash explained she sees interior design as dovetailing and having developed as a specialty practice,
32 similar to landscape architecture, which has a focus that is unique to that education, exam, and practice. Cash stated the
33 initiative is not in response to something the scope of architecture is not already addressing, but is a supplemental,
34 emerging profession that is ready to be regulated because it involves protecting the public. Fritz indicated she had thought
35 a lot about this topic and had a long conversation with Knopf. Fritz said, in her opinion, the unique difference with
36 landscape architecture for the State of Alaska was that it was crossing between two disciplines – architecture and civil
37 engineering in an area of work that wasn't clearly done by either group, in addition to the points made related to it being
38 an emerging profession. Fritz encouraged the group to define uniqueness of the practice to show a public safety need that
39 is not being met.
40

41 Cash said the group sees a value in having a close eye on public safety issues at the tactile level. Knopf said several
42 interior designers work in architectural firms, but have other stand-alone projects as well. She added the architectural
43 community has embraced interior design as its own entity. Nunn said interior designers are part of a project team on a
44 daily basis and are constantly working to elevate the level of design and service to the public, and call on specialties to
45 accomplish that. Rude added there are emerging specialties and explained more and more firms are relying on interior
46 designers for their expertise in material health/ material chemistry, which could be practiced by an architect, but are
47 predominantly done by interior designers.
48

49 Mott asked what the current requirements are for interior designers. Cash responded currently there is no requirement to
50 take the NCIDQ exam and it is entirely voluntary.
51

52 Maynard stated there is no problem with architecture, but there is a group of professionals doing work that do not have the
53 background to pass an architectural exam and likened it to someone doing control work who does not have the
54 background to take the electrical engineering exam, and so they become control system engineers. Maynard explained
55 there was nothing wrong with electrical engineers and the work they were doing, but there was a subdivision and now

1 there are control system engineers. Maynard encouraged the group to develop a clear definition of the practice of interior
2 design because we are a discipline-specific state. Several board members also commented on the importance of having it
3 be well-defined to aid investigative staff should an issue arise.
4

5 Dunn stated at the previous board meeting Koonce provided an interesting perspective regarding the scope of architecture
6 including interior design, but the scope of interior design not including the scope of architecture. Dunn added where there
7 is overlap, there is quite a bit of impact on public safety. Dunn expressed her concern that people who do not have the
8 education, experience, or credentials are practicing in that overlap and there is nothing preventing an interior decorator
9 from making that transition.
10

11 Kerr asked if interior designers work with lighting. Cash explained interior designers work closely with an electrical
12 engineer on lighting, and are involved in selecting fixtures based on requirements, location of switches, etc. Davidson
13 clarified lighting is within the space they are working and would not be for exiting a building or parking lots.
14

15 Kerr asked how many people have NCIDQ certifications. Davidson said there are 50 individuals in Alaska who passed the
16 NCIDQ, but not all are affiliated with ASID Alaska Chapter.
17

18 In regards to registration numbers, Davidson anticipates twenty-five individuals would pursue registration and noted there
19 thirteen are in the queue, but are not yet eligible to take the exam. The group and board discussed the education and
20 experience requirements (education and experience) to be eligible to take the NCIDQ.
21

22 Hanson asked if their national organization had model law or rules that could be adopted or evaluated. Cash responded the
23 national organizations model law is what the group is using as a basis. Kerr asked is they would develop a state-specific
24 exam to address Alaska's uniqueness. Cash clarified the uniqueness she previously referred to was in regards to the make-
25 up of the board and not the practice. The group discussed the possibility of requiring interior designers to take an arctic
26 engineering course and whether the course is relevant to the practice of interior design.
27

28 Hanson explained adding a discipline is a statute change and then regulations would need to be developed. The board
29 encouraged the group to work on defining interior design and code-impacted environment. Hanson recommended the
30 group provide more tangible benefits so the board can write a letter that includes specific benefits and distinguishable
31 points versus a generic statement of support.
32

33 Task – A. Jones will provide CBPL's regulation checklist to Davidson.
34

35 The group thanked the board for the discussion.
36

37 **Agenda Item 22 - Discussion: DOT Standard Drawings – Sealing Requirements** *Feb022018.1_02:05:28*

38 Mark Neidhold, DOT Chief Design and Construction Standards introduced himself and thanked the board for the
39 opportunity to speak. Neidhold explained utilizing standard drawings is a common practice in Alaska and the United
40 States, and DOT's practice of incorporating the use of sealed standard drawings in their construction documents is critical
41 to their process, as it is for other organizations providing engineering and construction services throughout Alaska. He
42 stated DOT has over 35 years of history with this process and have not had any previous issues with this process.
43 Neidhold stated the standard drawings are based on science and engineering and unless there is a change to a design
44 standard, to engineering principles, or a determined need to revise a design, the department feels there is no need to
45 change the original registrants seal. Neidhold explained, the Chief Engineer requested the Alaska Department of Law
46 (LAW) review the current practice of DOT's use of standard drawings and LAW came back with the determination that
47 DOT's practice of using sealed standard drawings is consistent with Alaska statutes and regulations. Neidhold respectfully
48 requested the board take no further action on this item as DOT's current practice effectively addressed public safety; is
49 consistent with Alaska's statutes and regulations; and allows DOT to effectively manage the public funds for which the
50 department are fiduciary responsible.
51

52 The Chair asked if the board had any comments. Hanson asked for a copy of LAW's determination. Neidhold replied the
53 determination was provided via a phone conversation, but indicated he would request a written statement. The board
54 requested a copy of the rationale and regulations the lawyer looked at to be included as well. The Chair explained the

1 board is bound by the statutes and regulations and need to consider them if LAW is interpreting them differently than we
2 are.

3
4 Hanson asked if there were examples from other states or entities that are stamped to help justify DOT's position.
5 Neidhold reminded the board he had surveyed several states and mentioned that at the November meeting, Neidhold
6 offered to pass along those communications to the board. Hanson recalled that of those that testified during the November
7 meeting, only DOT stamps their standard drawings, other entities indicated they have standard drawings, but that they are
8 not physically stamped by an engineer.

9
10 TASK – Neidhold will request a written statement from LAW that includes rationale and references the statutes and
11 regulations reviewed and submit it to the board. Neidhold also agreed to provide data from other states regarding the use
12 of stamped standard drawings to further support DOT's position.

13
14 Fritz asked for clarification on why DOT wants a stamp on the standard detail as opposed to the plan set being stamped
15 with reference to those details. Neidhold explained it is based in the responsible charge criteria and there are elements that
16 get incorporated into a project and are outside an engineers areas of expertise, so the engineer does not have the expertise
17 to stamp or seal those elements. The elements are stamped by a registered engineer that meets the board's expectations
18 and has the required expertise. Neidhold added that if he is required to go through the exercise of having it re-verified for
19 each project, it is an expensive exercise that provides no additional value. Mott asked if you are using a component that
20 you don't have the expertise to verify, how you would verify it is applicable for that particular instance. Mott stated
21 someone with those expertise has to verify the applicability. Neidhold stated the expectation of everyone who sealed a
22 standard drawing intended it would be used verbatim/ standard throughout Alaska and if there were restrictions, those are
23 noted on the drawings.

24
25 Maynard explained that the person who references the standard detail is taking responsibility for that by referencing it, not
26 the person who stamped the detail, because that person may be deceased, retired, or unaware it is being used. Neidhold
27 said the State of Alaska ultimately assumes that responsibility and understands the board's concern. Neidhold explained
28 DOT believed they were in compliance and that is why they went to LAW. Neidhold said they explained what DOT's
29 process was to LAW, as well as the reasoning behind their process.

30
31 Hanson said he understands Neidhold's point, but offered the example of light control, which a civil engineer can specify,
32 but said he personally would never stamp a sheet calling out a traffic control device, even though it is a standard detail
33 that is used throughout Alaska. Hanson said he would rely on an electrical engineer or civil engineer who has that
34 expertise to know if that is the right application of that standard drawing or not. In response to Neidhold's comment on re-
35 engineering, Hanson said there are multiple entities throughout Alaska that do not have stamped drawings that consultants
36 happily use on their projects. Neidhold said responsible charge occurred when that document was sealed with the intent of
37 standard application.

38
39 The board discussed due diligence and an engineer's responsibility to ensure all the components meet codes and project
40 requirements. Maynard suggested having the person reviewing stamp a cover letter, instead of putting a stamp on a detail
41 you expect someone else to incorporate, so there is a record of who was responsible.

42
43 Fritz commented the discussion is analogous to discussions with the Department of Education (EED) and prototype
44 buildings. She explained EED wanted to establish a prototype for a school of a particular size and stick it in various
45 locations throughout the state, have a design team hired to design that prototype, stamp them, and prepare for bid. Fritz
46 stated that is not appropriate, even if the sites are similar. Fritz said if a prototype is going to be used, it has no stamps on
47 it and the firm that accepts it as a basis for the design, reviews it and stamps all the sheets as necessary to send out to bid.

48
49 Hanson offered the example of pre-manufactured buildings. Regulations say you must hire an Alaska-registered engineer.
50 Hanson stated it does add cost, but it also puts someone registered in Alaska in responsible charge and ensuring it is
51 appropriate. The Chair, Fritz, and Maynard discussed taking responsibility for the specific application, but that the intent
52 was not to reinvent the wheel.

53
54 Neidhold assured the board there are elements he is very much in alignment with the board on and others where his
55 position differs. Neidhold again requested the board take no action and asked the board to look at the issue historically.

1 Neidhold explained this change of a brand new responsible charge each time has a monetary cost that will result in less
2 safety improvements.

3
4 Kerr said that he personally would feel better if they were stamped by someone who was alive, employed, and accessible
5 to contact if there is a question concerning whether or not it is appropriate for a particular application.

6
7 Hanson said AELS does not seek out issues, but would like to continue the dialogue, get the opinion of the lawyer DOT
8 consulted and keep the lines of communication open. Neidhold confirmed the board's requests of him, which included a
9 written statement from LAW regarding their determination and the specific statutes and regulations reviewed, and a list of
10 states/ entities that use sealed standard drawings.

11
12 Neidhold requested the board consider cost as it relates to public welfare. Neidhold said safety of our public is his top
13 priority and reiterated a change in DOT's process would have a negative impact on public safety. The Chair explained if
14 there is a difference in opinion regarding a statute or regulation we are bound to change it, rather than just go with it just
15 because it has a detrimental economic effect downstream. The Chair stated if we need to change a regulation, then we
16 need to change it.

17
18 Fritz said if the economic impact has not been determined, there is no basis for Neidhold's concern. Neidhold said DOT
19 has looked at the economic impact. He explained DOT incorporates 1,000 standard details each year. Neidhold said they
20 looked at their in-house costs to develop cost estimates and numbers.

21
22 Neidhold thanked the board again for the opportunity and reiterated the importance of this discussion to DOT. The board
23 thanked Neidhold for speaking with them.

24
25 The board returned to **Agenda Item 19. Application Review continued.**

Feb022018.1_02:41:04

26
27 **The board returned to discussions on 9.A. and 9.B.**

Feb022018.1_03:01:05

28 The Chair said he re-reviewed Sec. 08.48.241, and directed the boards attention to Sec. 08.48.241(b)(1) which specifically
29 references professionals under the "direction or supervision" of the person in responsible charge.

30
31 Maynard posed the scenario of a person in responsible charge for the corporation assigning a project to a registrant, the
32 registrant does his design, and then during review, the person in responsible charge tells the registrant to make changes.
33 Maynard asked if that registrant doesn't want to make those changes do they have to, or can they just stamp it? And if
34 they do have to make changes based upon what the person in responsible charge for the corporation is telling him to do,
35 who is really in responsible charge of that project? Maynard stated his point was the person in responsible charge for the
36 corporation is the one that makes the final decisions on what is going out from that corporation, so they are in responsible
37 charge. Hanson stated the person in responsible charge can also make the decision to allow another registrant to stamp a
38 particular project, even though they are the one in responsible charge. R. Jones mentioned in our ethics there is a
39 statement that if you are required to do something by a higher authority that you don't feel comfortable with then you are
40 supposed to report it.

41
42 The Chair asked the board if they felt Sec. 08.48.241(b)(1) gave people the authorization to have people under them
43 stamp. Fritz stated she believe it does and believes it is an important clause. Hanson said it is up to the corporation to
44 decide who they want to have stamping drawings. The board discussed various scenarios regarding who stamps drawings
45 for a corporation, if that person needs to be listed on the Certificate of Authorization (COA), and the purpose of the
46 requirement to designate a person in responsible charge in order to offer and practice within a particular field. Several
47 members felt the cleanest way was to have everyone who is stamping drawings listed on the COA, others argued that
48 approach may not be practical for all corporations and referenced Sec. 08.48.241(b)(1) as allowing registrants under the
49 direction or supervision of the person designated in responsible charge to stamp drawings even though that person may
50 not be listed on the COA. Fritz directed the board to consider Sec. 08.48.241(h), which also contains language that
51 suggests drawings may be stamped by a registrant that is not the person designated on the COA.

52
53 *Feb022018.1_03:23:59*

1 **On a Motion duly made by Brian Hanson, seconded by Bill Mott, and approved by a majority, it was**
2 **RESOLVED that in response to Item 9.B., an Alaska licensed design professional may stamp documents**
3 **even if they are not on the Certificate of Authorization.**
4

5 Board members Fritz, Hale, Hanson, Jones, Kerr, and Mott voted in favor of the motion. Maynard, Urfer and Wallis voted
6 against the motion. Johnston and Koonce were not in attendance.
7

8 *Feb022018.1_03:24:46*

9 The board returned to Item 9.A., an email asking if the responsible in charge on the COA has to be an employee of that
10 company. The board discussed various relationships with a company including employee, owner, stockholder, and
11 member. Mott stated that in his opinion the person in responsible charge should be associated with the firm as an
12 employee, owner, or otherwise. Fritz restated the question presented to the board and they discussed “offering of service”.
13 Referencing 12 AAC 36.185(c), Hanson explained, if we apply similar logic as discussed for Item 9.B. the person should
14 be regularly employed by the corporation. Maynard stated you could have somebody who is not an employee be listed in
15 responsible charge, but you would still need to have a registrant in every office who is under the direction of that person.
16 Jones referenced a previous discussion regarding satellite offices and said as long as there was a registrant in that office,
17 other people could do work under him. Kerr said whoever is designated in responsible charge needs to be able to
18 demonstrate sufficient control over the scope, schedule, budget, and staff, but that it does not necessarily need to be an
19 employee. The Chair asked the board if, in the context of the question, it would be adequate to respond that it is possible
20 to incorporate with a person who is not an employee although you have to adhere to the regulations 12 AAC 36.185(c).
21 Maynard said there is nothing in regulations that requires the person in responsible charge to be a full-time employee of
22 the corporation, however, the corporation must have a registrant regularly employed in each office that is producing
23 drawings and they would need to be under the direction of the person designated in responsible charge on the COA. Mott
24 stated he agreed, but asked how that gets rolled out if it is not clearly stated in the statutes and regulations. The Chair said
25 they can incorporate, but they may not be able to practice unless they can adhere to the regulations. Hanson provided a
26 scenario where one office may have a CE, while another has an SE and we do not require each office have one of each,
27 only that a registrant is in each office. The Chair said he would draft something and run it by Maynard. Kerr asked that it
28 be sent to all board members, so we all know what is being said. The Chair stated he would work with the A. Jones to run
29 it by the board before responding.
30

31 *Feb022018.1_03:46:21*

32 In coming board member Jennifer Anderson stopped by the meeting to introduce herself. The board took a brief recess to
33 speak with Anderson.
34

35 **Agenda Item 25. Executive Session**

36
37 **On a Motion duly made by Brian Hanson, seconded by John Kerr, and passed unanimously, it was**
38 **RESOLVED to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310 (c)(3) to review four requests for**
39 **exemption from continuing education per 12 ACC 36.530. We invite Heather Noe and Alysia Jones to join.**
40
41

42 The board came out of executive session at 1:42 p.m.

Feb022018.2_00:01:32

43
44
45
46 **On a Motion duly made by Colin Maynard, seconded by Fred Wallis, and passed unanimously, it was**
47 **RESOLVED to deny the exemption request by Terrance Cheatham (AELM9168) and grant him 90 days to**
48 **provide documentation of 24 hours of continuing education. Any continuing education used may not also**
49 **be used for the 2019 renewal.**
50

51 **On a Motion duly made by Colin Maynard, seconded by Richard V. Jones, and passed unanimously, it was**
52 **RESOLVED to deny the exemption request by Larry R. McGinnis (AELM1861) and grant him 90 days to**
53 **provide documentation of 24 hours of continuing education. Any continuing education used may not also**
54 **be used for the 2019 renewal.**
55

1 **On a Motion duly made by Colin Maynard, seconded by Fred Wallis, and passed unanimously, it was**
2 **RESOLVED to deny the exemption request by Tumen Badarch (AELN14689) and grant him 90 days to**
3 **provide documentation of 24 hours of continuing education. Any continuing education used may not also**
4 **be used for the 2019 renewal.**

5
6 The board requested staff follow up with Hancock and request additional supporting documentation be provided for the
7 board to consider his request for exemption from continuing education requirements.
8

9
10 **Agenda Item 26 - Old Business**

Feb022018.2_00:03:42

11 26. A. Review November 2017 To Do List - The Chair asked everyone to provide more timely responses to questions
12 following board meetings. The board reviewed outstanding items and discussed progress on tasks.

- 13 • Kerr and A. Jones are still working on a brochure regarding UAVs.
- 14 • Maynard will write a letter to the UAA regarding taking the FE exam and indicated he would request information
15 from NCEES.
- 16 • Urfer and A. Jones said they had done a lot of clean up on the Guidance Manual and encouraged everyone to
17 review and comment on the updates.
- 18 • Hanson stated he had forgotten about the letter to DEC and agreed to draft a response next week.
- 19 • Fritz and Hanson clarified the intent of the To Do item referring to education and work experience. Fritz stated
20 Hanson was interested in viewing how the NCARB record is used to satisfy requirements and determining if there
21 was language that would be appropriate to add on the engineer/ land surveyor side.
- 22 • The Chair will make an appointment with the Chief Investigator next week to discuss John's assignments.
- 23 • Maynard said he had not received any input regarding his proposed updates to regulations 12 AAC 36.185(c).
- 24 • Hanson said he met with the investigator regarding the letter of response to Mr. Giessel and agreed to draft the
25 letter.
- 26 • In response to laptop issues, A. Jones announced the Division recently purchased a web-based software
27 specifically designed for board meetings. She said would provide additional information and training as the board
28 transitions to using the software.
- 29 • Guidance manual updates are on-going.
- 30 • A. Jones will draft a response to IACET stating the board does not pre-approve courses.
- 31 • The Chair asked everyone to review Kerr's UAV presentation.

32
33 *Feb022018.2_00:15:23*

34 26. B. Regulation Project Updates: B.1. Updates to 12 AAC 36.061, .103 & .110 –Fritz explained this was the
35 continuation of the discussion about modifying the architect registration by comity regulations to close a loop hole that
36 makes comity easier to obtain than initial licensure in the State of Alaska. Fritz reminded the board she had previously
37 provided two options, one which required the NCARB certificate or use the NCARB criteria, and the board determined
38 using the NCARB standard was a better use NCARB's expertise and the board's time. Fritz stated that we need to build in
39 an effective date, so older applicants would not get stuck in new requirements they could not reasonably attain. The board
40 reviewed the proposed revisions. R. Jones explained when regulation updates were made in 2011, the board decided to
41 keep the NCARB record requirement for initial applicants, because eventually everyone would have an NCARB record.
42 Maynard expressed his concern with requiring applicants to go through their system. Fritz said NCARB sets a standard
43 and it is a lot of information for a board to manage, and encouraged the board to consider taking advantage of their
44 comprehensive program and expertise. Fritz noted a previous concern had been that the process was onerous for older
45 applicants, however she explained NCARB now has a reasonable alternative path so the board does not have the
46 responsibility or liability of trying to assess differences between older applicants and newer applicants. R. Jones said he
47 could accept this compromise, but agrees with Maynard that we should not require applicants to pay another entity money
48 to do our job. Urfer asked if applicants are required to go through NCARB to take the exam. Fritz responded yes. The
49 board debated requiring applicants to go through a third party. Fritz stated she thought the board had determined a
50 direction at the last (November) meeting and were just discussing an effective date at this point. Mott said, having gone
51 through the process with NCEES, he is a huge fan of establishing a record. Maynard responded that it is great for those
52 who want to, but felt the board should not be forcing people to do so. Fritz reiterated her main concern is an inequity
53 between initial and comity licensure. Fritz said we are trying to grow the profession in our state and we should be

1 supporting initial licensure. Fritz commented that it should be equal if not harder to get in by comity. R. Jones pointed out
2 that comity applicants have already been vetted by another jurisdiction.

3
4 Fritz explained the required resources to determine an equivalent to the NCARB standard for initial licensure is extensive
5 and did not believe the board was interested in pursuing that option. R. Jones stated the only reason we should be
6 questioning a comity applicant that has been vetted by another jurisdiction is if they have marks against their license. Kerr
7 added that standards in some jurisdictions are not equivalent to ours. Several other members agreed with Kerr's comment.
8

9 The Chair asked A. Jones to read the minutes from the November meeting regarding this topic. A. Jones read:

10
11 The board reviewed the options Fritz and R. Jones provided. Currently an NCARB Certificate is required for
12 initial registration in Alaska. The board discussed standards of licensure. Maynard argued that people licensed 20-
13 30 years ago, were licensed under different regulations and will likely not meet today's standards. Fritz said the
14 initial application standards are more robust and argued for more equality between the requirements. Maynard
15 disagreed, saying we need to evaluate based upon when you were licensed. Several members indicated saying
16 "shall" requires NCARB Certificate may not be appropriate. Koonce and Hanson recommended including a date
17 after which an NCARB Certificate will be required going forward. For those licensed before that date, the board
18 would evaluate their experience on a case by case basis.
19

20 Fritz confirmed the board prefers the second option provided with the addition of a date. Fritz stated she would
21 revise and bring back an updated option 2 at the February meeting.
22

23 The Chair then asked the board what's changed and asked for a reason why we were re-hashing the issue. A. Jones read
24 an additional excerpt from the November meeting minutes:

25
26 Fritz explained what would be involved if the board chose to evaluate the architectural experience (AXP),
27 including the six areas versus having NCARB evaluating. Koonce said this is part of NCARB's process and felt
28 the board should not be the ones evaluating the experience.
29

30 Maynard stated that we don't do that for engineers, we check that they have a degree; that they have passed their exams;
31 are licensed in another state; have two letters of recommendation or verification forms; and review any disciplinary
32 actions. The Chair asked if the architects needed to follow that model. Maynard responded, no, but that he believes it
33 works well us and did not feel that we need to go back in and check all the experience (architectural experience including
34 the six areas) if they are already licensed in another state. Maynard continued, we can accept that, check the three legs of
35 the stool and if appropriate, approve them. Fritz stated she can see the desire for consistency, particularly as we are a
36 combined board, but noted there are distinctions and there are different education, experience, and examination
37 requirements.
38

39 Kerr asked if one of the concerns was that an applicant would seek initial licensure in another state and then apply by
40 comity to Alaska. Fritz said she has signed off on two such applications. The board returned to the discussion of the
41 proposed effective date. Fritz explained she selected the date because it was the date the board began requiring the
42 NCARB certificates.
43

44 The Chair expressed his concern around circular conversations when work is being done in between meetings.
45

46 TASK: The Chair asked Fritz and Koonce to present on this topic at the next meeting so all board members can have a
47 better understanding of the information and feel comfortable to make an informed decision. Fritz agreed to work with
48 Koonce and asked the board to send any specific questions to her so she can address them in the presentation.
49

50 *Feb022018.2_00:56:53*
51

52 *26. B. Regulation Project Updates: B.2. Updates to 12 AAC 36.105* – Maynard stated that he had not gotten to this item
53 and would have an update at the next meeting.
54

1 26. B. Regulation Project Updates: B.3. Updates tp12 AAC 36.185(c) – Maynard said (c) needs to be moved and that the
2 board needs to make sure its interpretation is clear. Maynard explained there were several issues that needed to be
3 addressed including: requiring a licensee in each office, ability to manage projects remotely, and how to deal with branch
4 offices that don't have a licensee.

5
6 TASK: The board was asked to provide comments to Maynard by next Friday (2/9/2018) and Mott will work with
7 Maynard to provide proposed language by the next meeting.

8
9 26. C. Update on Guidance Manual – A. Jones explained Urfer and her had completed their first round of reorganization
10 and clean up. Kerr said he had added language for the definition of surveying and sent it to Alaska Society of Land
11 Surveyors as well as URISUS and GIS user groups for comments. He urged board members to provide feedback so that it
12 comes from the whole board. Kerr expressed his frustration at not being able to move forward with the updates. Urfer
13 recommended accepting all changes in the Guidance Manual and moving forward with a clean version.

14
15 TASK: A. Jones requested board members provide comments within two weeks (2/16/2018).

16
17 TASK: Kerr will email the information to A. Jones for distribution to the board for comments.

18
19 *Feb022018.2_01:04:12*

20 Fritz interjected, asking if she could provide an update on HB 90. Fritz said she participated in the APDC call last night
21 and noted that Representative Kito is upset with the AELS Board and the decision to write a letter in opposition of the bill.
22 Fritz said we were out of order yesterday as it was not on our agenda to discuss. Fritz said we did make motion in April
23 and yesterday's discussion was consistent with that motion, but stressed the importance of not alienating our legislators,
24 and giving legislators an opportunity to provide more information on what they are doing and why.

25
26 The Chair said we should all be working together in a friendly manner, even if our positions differ.

27
28 Maynard said he personally sent a letter to the Senate Finance Committee outlining possible alternative approaches
29 without increasing our fees. Fritz said she personally plans to talk with Rep. Kito about keeping the lines of
30 communication open and feels very badly that he feels "stabbed in the back" by this board.

31
32 **Agenda Item 27. New Business**

33 27.A. Regulatory Outreach – Mott stated the Fire Marshall attended our August meeting and said there were several
34 comments regarding the fact that a lot of the investigations stem from the Fire Marshall's feedback. Mott said there are a
35 lot of other regulatory bodies that review design data and may not be aware of the AELS Board or that there is a point of
36 contact for looking into issues related to unethical or incorrect work. Mott provided FIMS as an example of an entity that
37 reviews engineering data including stability, erosion control, NFPA compliance issues, control issues, pipeline hydraulic
38 studies, corrosion studies, etc. and mentioned they are not aware they can file a complaint when they see engineering that
39 is being done in a sub-standard way, or by non-licensed companies. Mott also suggested we improve communications
40 with the U.S. Coast Guard and help them understand what it is that we do. Mott said there are smaller companies that are
41 doing some significant work and don't believe they need to have licensed professional to do the work. Mott asked the
42 board how we raise our visibility both to the regulatory agencies and incoming companies.

43
44 The Chair stated it is an ongoing process and said he looks for opportunities to do outreach at conferences and working it
45 into conversations with clients.

46
47 Fritz asked if it truly is a case of not knowing or is it that they don't want to bother. Mott said in some instances he
48 believes it is a lack of awareness. Mott also expressed concerns with other State agencies not being aware of our
49 requirements. Maynard commented that if we see something in writing, then the board could respond and explain the
50 requirements. Mott agreed that would work on a case-by-case basis, but asked about raising the visibility in general. Mott
51 asked if there were fliers or other educational materials board members can handout or forward. The Chair said he has
52 found the most effective tool to be a board member showing up at a seminar or meeting and giving a short spiel about the
53 board. The Chair cautioned everyone to make sure what they are saying is coming from the board and our regulations
54 rather than an individual member's personal opinion.

1 Fritz said we have a modest budget for outreach and if the board feels developing a brochure would be beneficial we can
2 pursue that, and/or we can identify something that may require a larger effort and put that in our next budget year. Mott
3 suggested a handout that could be transmitted electronically as well. He mentioned the Resource Development Council
4 Annual Conference and AGC conference as potential opportunities to reach large audiences and asked the board to
5 consider giving a seminar or hosting a booth.

6
7 The Chair said he is presenting with Kerr at the Survey and Mapping conference. Maynard suggested offering a one-hour
8 seminar on when is licensing required, what is the industrial exemption, or other topics. The Chair stated the more
9 outreach we do and the more educated people are the easier our job as a board becomes because they understand the
10 regulations and compliance goes up.

11
12 Fritz suggested creating a general outreach committee to consider the issue. Kerr recommended we compile a list of
13 meetings we'd like to participate in. Fritz asked about staff resources to help develop a handout or short PowerPoint
14 presentation on what is licensing in Alaska. Kerr believed the presentations needed to be tailored. Fritz agreed, but
15 suggested a base presentation that could be modified depending upon the audience.

16
17 TASK: A. Jones said she would ask staff for other licensing programs if they have anything to use as a template and is
18 also checking with the Division on the possibility of purchasing software to develop outreach materials.

19
20 A. Jones suggested having a dedicated page on the website where educational materials could be housed and accessible.
21 The board discussed providing a letter of support to use outreach funds to purchase Adobe InDesign or other appropriate
22 software for staff to be able to develop education materials. A. Jones stated the board used approximately \$400 of their
23 outreach budget to cover Kerr's trip to Fairbanks to present at the UAV conference.

24
25 TASK: MOTT will compile a list of meetings we'd like to attend.

26
27 The Chair said it is up to board members to follow up and request to be on the agenda, and added that meeting organizers
28 are usually very receptive. A. Jones offered to assist with coordinating presentations.

29
30 Maynard reminded the board to pass along any issues to A. Jones, or to Investigator Savage so they can be addressed
31 properly. R. Jones explained that if they select certain NAICS codes when applying for their business license, it alerts
32 staff that a professional license is required, however some companies select a generic code that does not raise flags and
33 can skirt the system.

34
35 *Feb022018_2_01:27:14*

36 27.B. Discussion of 08.48.241(3) – A. Jones explained with the recent renewal cycle ninety percent of the corporations
37 submitting amendments were well outside of the required 30 days from the effective date. A. Jones asked the board's
38 opinion on how best to address the issue and whether or not a letter of advisement was needed.

39
40 Maynard recommended submitted an article to the APDC newsletter, several other members agreed the newsletter would
41 be a good delivery method, and much more cost-effective than a letter. The Chair and Fritz suggested utilizing the AELS
42 listserv and website as well.

43
44 Maynard asked about elections. The board agreed to do elections at the April meeting as it was not included on the
45 February agenda.

46
47 **Agenda Item 28 - Committee Updates**

Feb022018_2_01:32:08

- 48 • Licensure Implementation – Maynard stated there were no updates.
- 49 • Land Surveying Outreach – The Chair stated this had been covered previously. Other members of the committee
50 did not have anything further to add.
- 51 • Investigative Advisory Committee – This topic was covered during Investigator Savage's report.
- 52 • Licensure Mobility – No update to report.
- 53 • Guidance Manual – Urfer stated this was previously covered.

- Legislative Liaison – Kerr asked for clarification based upon earlier discussions regarding a letter. The Chair said the board would hold off on the letter at this point. Fritz stated she would personally reach out to Representative Kito.
- Emeritus Status – The Board approved Brian Hanson for Emeritus Status.
- Budget Committee – No update to report.
- Continuing Education – No update to report.

Agenda Item 29 - Licensing Examiner Report

Feb022018_2_01:35:16

Noe read through the Licensing Examiner report, stating there were a total of 101 applications reviewed at the February 2018 meeting, including 59 exam and 41 comity.

Agenda Item 30 - Read Applications into Record

Feb022018_2_01:39:52

On a Motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Fritz 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.

STEVE	BERRY	RANJAN	SATYAMURTHY
KERRY	BRUGGEMANN	GARY	SOMMERFELD
JEFFREY	BUCHOLC	COLIN	WAGONER
RYAN	ELLIOT	COURTNEY	WASSOM
CRAIG	HANSON	DAVID	WILLIAMS
ANDREW	JOCA	CLIFTON	HYDER
MARION "KEITH"	KAUFMAN	ERIK	MARTIN
KEVIN	MATAKIS	GARY	CONNER
ERIK	MOORE	GARY	STOWE
AARON	MORRISON	SANJAY	MEHTA
GARY	OLSEN	WILLIAM	WEAVER

On a Motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Wallis and approved unanimously, it was RESOLVED to CONDITIONALLY 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.

RUSTY	ALLEN	REBECCA	FLYNN OLIVER
JUDY	ANUNCIACION	LESLIE	GALBRAITH
ANDREA	AXMANN	ANDREW	GALLAGHER
RICHARD	BAILEY	THOMAS	GILL
CHARLES	BANG	ANDREW	GRAY
BRITTANY	BARKSHIRE	JAMES	HALL
ISAAC	BRONNIMAN	HEIDI	HALVERSON
SARAH	BUTTERER	PALOMA	HAWN
JAIME	CATHCART	KAGEN	HEWITT
SITHA	CHHUM	TRAVIS	HOGINS

ELIZA	CINK	CURTIS	HUFFMAN
IAN	CLARKE	ANDREW	HUMPHREY
CURTIS	CLUTE	JOEL	IMMARAJ
ANDREW	CONRAD	ANDREW	IVY
AUSTIN	DANIELSON	JENNIFER	JONES
LANCE	PARADIS	THOMAS	JOSEPHSON
JUSTIN	PENFIELD	JUSTIN	KANOUSE
WILLIAM	PRICE	GATES	KESLER
JOSH	RIPPLINGER	NOAH	KING
FRANK	ROBERTS	JACOB	KOPLOW
HEIDI	ROBUCK	SUSAN	KOUGIAS
JONATHAN	RODER	DANIEL	LAMBSON
MATTHEW	RYANS	DENNIS	LONG
ZAQUEO	SALAZAR	JONATHAN	LUND
TIMOTHY	SAMUELSON	LAURA	LUPARDUS
MELODY	SHANGIN	BRYCE	MAHN
RYAN	SMILEY	FRANK	MCGUIRE
MICHAEL	SMITH	SAMUEL	MCINTOSH
ERIC	SOUDERS	JESSE	MOE
NATHAN	STEPHAN	REED	PAITICH
TADEUSZ	TOMASIC		
JONATHAN	TYMICK		
COREY	WARDROPE		
MATTHEW	WUESTENFELD		

1
2
3
4
5 **On a Motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Wallis and approved unanimously, it was RESOLVED**
6 **to find the following list of applicants for registration by comity, examination, and in additional branches**
7 **of engineering INCOMPLETE with the stipulation that the information in the applicants' files will take**
8 **precedence over the information in the minutes.**
9
10

KEVIN	ALLEN
FRANK	ATAIYAN
SETH	BURWASH
THARETH	CASEY
WILLIAM	CULVER
THOMAS	DAVIDSON
MARK	EVANS
JAMES	FORTNER III
JEFFREY	HEBERT
ADAM	LEITH
BRYCE	MYERS
SPENCER	NEWINS

JOHN	REGO
ANTHONY	ROOS
MATTHEW	WOODS

1
2
3 **Agenda Item 31 - Review Calendar of Events/ Board Travel**

4 The board discussed dates of upcoming board meetings. The Chair asked if there was a reason to go to Fairbanks. Several
5 members indicated they would do outreach again. A. Jones reminded the board had previously discussed coordinating
6 outreach with local chapters since May 3-4 is finals week at UAF, and students would not be available. Kerr suggested
7 researching other events to determine potential opportunities to coordinate. Fritz recommended engaging architects and
8 landscape architects since we don't have schools in Alaska. Maynard asked about working with one of the societies to
9 host a luncheon similar to what APDC has done in Juneau.

10
11 TASK: A. Jones will work with Johnston for determining appropriate contacts.

12
13 The board tentatively agreed the next two board meetings will be held in Anchorage on the following dates:

- 14
- 15 • August 2-3, 2018
 - 16 • November 1-2, 2018

17 The board reviewed the following upcoming national organization meetings:

- 18
- 19 • NCARB/CLARB New Member Orientation, February 8-10, Washington, D.C. – B. Mott, E. Johnston and A. Jones will be attending.
 - 20 • NCARB Regional Summit, March 8-10, Wichita – A. Jones reported the travel was approved as of today, February 2, 2018. D. Hale, C. Fritz, R. Jones and A. Jones will be attending.
 - 21 • NCEES Western Zone April 5-7, Honolulu – A. Jones reported the travel was approved as of today, February 2, 2018. D. Hale, J. Kerr, and C. Maynard will be attending.
 - 22 • NCARB Annual Meeting, June 28-30, Detroit – C. Fritz, J. Koonce, R. Jones and A. Jones tentatively plan to attend.
- 23
24
25
26

27 Fritz asked about submitting all travel requests for the year to make the process more efficient. A. Jones explained the
28 process and that a travel request cannot be submitted until the official invitation, tentative agenda, etc. from the national
29 organization is provided.

30
31 **31. Board Tasks - To Do List**

32 The board reviewed tasks from the February meeting. A. Jones will compile and send out a To Do List reminder next
33 week.
34

BOARD MEMBER TASKS

- ALL - notify Alysia when you conduct any outreach
- ALL - provide input to Colin regarding proposed updates to seal regulations. Bill to assist. *(Feb AI 26.B.3)*
- ALL - review guidance manual and provide comments to Alysia *(Feb AI 26.C.)*
- Bill will compile a list of potential meetings/ outreach opportunities
- Brian will write a letter to DEC regarding their regulations *(Nov AI 7.E.)*
- Brian will write a response letter to Peter Giessel *(Apr - AI 7.F)*
- Catherine and Brian will coordinate on language *(Nov AI 14.A.1&2 / Feb AI 26.B.)*
- Catherine and Jeff will make a presentation related to regulation project 12 AAC 36.103 *(Feb AI 26.B.1)*
- Catherine will follow up with Rep. Kito RE: HB90
- Colin will write a letter to UAA regarding **taking** of FE exam
- Colin will write a response to C. Fredeen *(Feb AI 9.D)*
- Dave will call chief investigator regarding John’s time and our statutes
- Dave will complete Update Traveler Info. form
- Dave will write a reponse to question regarding who may stamp for a company *(Feb AI 9.B)*
- Dave will write a response to J. Maxwell *(Feb AI 9.C)*
- Dave will write a response to question regarding RC and company *(Feb AI 9.A)*
- Elizabeth and Alysia will work on obtaining support of local chapters for an outreach event in Fairbanks
- Fred will complete Updated Traveler Info. form
- John will work with Alysia on UAV info./ brochure for website *(Nov AI 14.D)*
- Luanne will complete Update Traveler Info. form

STAFF TASKS

- Alysia will draft a response letter regarding IACET (AI7.G)
- Alysia will respond re: MRA w/ South Korea *(Feb AI 7.C.5)*
- Alysia will send regulation checklist to Kelsey Davidson / Interior Designers
- Alysia will check with legal department regarding changing renewal status for those requesting CEU exemptions
- Alysia will work with board members to produce an updated version of the Guidance Manual for May meeting
- Alysia will work w/ Sara on laptop issues
- Alysia will review Office of Administrative Hearing documentation of prior decisions

32. Board Member Comments

The board thanked Hanson for his service on the board and wished him well. Several members commented on the robust discussions and thanked each other for the providing different perspectives.

The meeting adjourned at 3:44 p.m. *Feb022018_2_02:03:10*


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

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

Respectfully submitted:



Alysia D. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved: 

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

Date: 5/3/18