

STATE OF ALASKA
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS AND LAND
SURVEYORS

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
August 13-14, 2020

By authority of AS 08.01.070(2), and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, a scheduled meeting of the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors was held virtually on August 13-14, 2020.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m.

Board members present, constituting a quorum:

Jennifer Anderson, PE, Civil Engineer, Environmental Engineer

Robert (Bob) Bell, PS, Land Surveyor, Civil Engineer

Catherine Fritz, Architect

Jeffrey Garness, PE Civil Engineer, Environmental Engineer

Elizabeth Johnston, PE, Electrical Engineer, Fire Protection Engineer (Vice Chair)

John Kerr, PS, Land Surveyor (Chair)

Jeff Koonce, Architect

Loren Leman, PE, Civil Engineer

Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect

Board members absent:

Eric Milliken, Public Member

Fred Wallis, PE, Mining Engineer

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

Rebecca Powers, Executive Administrator

Sara Neal, Licensing Examiner

Ryan Gill, Investigator

2. Mission Statement

The Chair, John Kerr, read the Board's mission statement into the record:

The Board adopts regulations to carry out its mission to protect the public health, safety, and welfare through the regulation of the practice of architecture, engineering, land surveying and landscape architecture by:

- *Ensuring that those entering these practices meet minimum standards of competency, and maintain such standards during their practice;*
- *Requiring licensure to practice in the State of Alaska;*

- *Enforcing both the licensure and competency requirements in a fair and uniform manner.*

3. Discussion of Virtual Meeting Protocol – Tips

Powers and Kerr began the discussion about meeting protocol and tips. The first tip is to make sure your microphones are muted when not speaking. If you forget to mute yourself, staff will mute for you. To keep the noise to a minimum, there is a function to raise your hand if you need to speak. If we are in a lively discussion and multiple people feel strongly about speaking about the same topic, it might be good to utilize that feature. If you need a bathroom break, turn off your video and mute yourself while away. Board members should take breaks when you need to, and we will have formal breaks. This will be our primary meeting room probably for a number of meetings and so we need to get reasonably comfortable and competent operating it, so I would say if anybody who has zoom questions or if you see someone struggling with something and you have a tip on how to resolve it, then let us pause the meeting for just a second, if we can, and learn how to overcome this technical hurdle; there will be technical problems. That is just the nature of zoom and computers and everyone has to be patient and wait a little longer for people to respond. Fritz asked if the chat function can be used. Powers let everyone know the chats are posted publicly. Johnston let the board know she utilizes hotkeys to toggle things on and off.

4. Review/Approve Agenda

The board reviewed the meeting agenda. Johnston noted lunch on day one is three hours long and needs to be corrected. She also noted the public comment time, which is set for 2:45 p.m. The agenda may flex quite a bit during the meeting due to running a full two-day meeting using new technologies for the board.

On a Motion duly made by Loren Leman, seconded by Bob Bell and approved unanimously, it was RESOLVED to table the agenda until everyone has a chance to review the updated version.

5. Review/Approve Minutes from February 12-13, 2020 Meeting

On a Motion duly made by Jeff Koonce, seconded by Elizabeth Johnston and approved unanimously, it was RESOLVED to approve the February 12-13, 2020 meeting minutes.

6. Review/Approve Minutes from Aug 15, 2020 Teleconference

Leman would like the opening statement to reflect the board meeting was “held virtually” rather than “virtually held.” The board member list needs to also reflect the discipline of engineering for the three new board members. The board members will provide Powers with the position or title they would like to have reflected in future agendas and minutes.

On a Motion duly made by Jeff Koonce, seconded by Elizabeth Johnston and approved unanimously, it was RESOLVED to approve the May 15, 2020 meeting minutes.

7. Ethics Reporting

Fritz attended the annual meeting for NCARB, but it was virtual so there were no financial implications. Johnston attended all the virtual sessions for NCEES, which did not cost the state anything. Garness would like to be briefed on what should be brought up during ethics reporting. Kerr stated reporting should happen if there is any money provided to you from external entities in matters that relate to or influence board activity. Johnston stated that it could also be personal benefit, or the perception, anytime you are acting on behalf of the Board outside of a board meeting or representing yourself as a member of the board. It is typically disclosed during ethics reporting regardless of financial compensation because you are

holding the public's trust in that role at that time. Powers stated that information about ethics reporting for board members can be found in the resources folder in OnBoard.

8. Review/Approve Agenda

Neal and Powers noted that the agenda was tabled and needs to be voted on.

On a Motion duly made by Bob Bell, seconded by Loren Lemman and approved unanimously, it was RESOLVED to remove the agenda from the table.

On a Motion duly made by Bob Bell, seconded by Loren Lemman and approved unanimously, it was RESOLVED to approve the agenda as amended.

9. Licensing Examiner's Report

Neal walked through the Licensing Examiner's Report noting that there will be 56 applications by comity and 22 applications by exam reviewed during this meeting. Compared to the August 2019 meeting, the only big difference in the number of applications being reviewed were of civil and mechanical by exam applicants. Neal also noted that between April 1 and June 30 we had three architects and 33 engineers issued licenses. For firms, we had four corporations and five LLC's. 84 firms and 357 individuals renewed their licenses late. With the instatement of a \$50 late fee, we collected approximately \$22,050 for late fees. 182 licensees retired their licenses. The exam results are lower than last year due to the cancellation of exams, but since Pearson testing centers are beginning to open up, the numbers have started picking back up. Fritz asked if there was data in terms of many licensees retired their registrations, along with their discipline, compared to the last renewal cycle. Neal will have that information available for the November board meeting. Johnston stated that information would be helpful to use during public outreach events.

10. Correspondence Received

- a) Axsom - Waiver Request – Johnston informed the board that our statues do not allow the board to consider a waiver to the NCEES 16-hour exam if they are licensed in another state. There is an active project on this topic and the board encourages the applicant to apply again when the path becomes available. We cannot take exemption exceptions for special circumstances, but the board is trying to fix it. Kerr would like to speak with the regulations specialist to see where we are on current regulations project before drafting a response.

- b) Bishop - Progressive Structural Experience – Forest Bishop wrote the Board to ask if the 2 years of Progressive Structural Experience can be done through mentoring as his supervisor is not SE. Kerr explained that the mentoring program was designed for applicants by exam to have their experience reviewed by a PE when they do not have a supervising PE in the discipline for which they are applying at their place of employment. Kerr does not see why this person could not gain his experience under an SE. Johnston pointed out that mentorship is only designed for an initial application. Kerr said he would like to review the regulations and come back to this. Johnston said that (j) under 12 AAC 36.063 that talks about mentoring applies to the whole regulation as it would cover SE by exam as well. Bishop had also asked about whether two years under an SE would be accepted in which case the answer would be "Yes." Neal interjected with the fact that it was not an actual SE but a PE who had passed his PE- Civil/Structural exam. The question is now who gets to sign off on progressive structural experience which is not defined in statutes so it goes over to different documents to define it. Fritz said that if that is the case then no, this person cannot sign off on progressive structural experience as he is not a licensed SE to which Kerr agreed. Neal then asked if Bishop did not have the option of gaining progressive structural experience under a PE

Civil can he gain experience under the mentorship of a licensed SE who is not his supervisor. Kerr said that based on what Johnston stated about regulation 12 AAC 36.063 he can gain experience under the mentorship of a licensed SE. Johnston suggested putting this under FAQ's.

- c) Brodie - Chugach Electric – Johnston noted that this was discussed at the February 2020 meeting. To summarize, if you are having work done and you are an industrial exemption corporation or entities such as an electric utility, your employees doing work for you do not have to be licensed. But if you are doing work for the public, then you have to be licensed and if a consultant is doing work for you may have to be licensed. The fact that they are doing work for someone who has industrial exemption does not give the consultant an exemption. If they want to have some design work done by consultants, does it have to be stamped? Johnston will draft a response.

Kerr stated that he would like a binder/folder created that includes correspondence organized by topic.

- d) Churchill - AIA Provider – Mr. Churchill is an architect who took the arctic engineering course, which does not qualify for health, safety, and welfare continuing education credits. Fritz summarized the letter by stating that Mr. Churchill is asking that the course be qualified for HSW through the AIA continuing education system, however, there are a few problems with that. First, the arctic engineering courses are required for licensure. AIA has a counting system for its members that is a nice way to keep track of continuing education. You do not have to be an AIA member to be an architect licensed in Alaska, or most anywhere. Our regulations specifically allow a professional or a university level course to qualify for continuing education, so he's getting his CE credits for the state of Alaska. Further, he can submit the course himself that he took as a self-study to the AIA continuing education system for easy tracking. AIA will add it to his transcript for his own convenience at no cost. The question is, does the board want to require the University of Alaska and other providers to have control of our courses to be a registered provider with the AIA continuing education system. Fritz does not think that is the role of the board. There are a variety of ways to account for continuing education as the board will see when they start the discussions. Mr. Churchill could contact the three universities that offer the arctic engineering courses and encourage them to sign up for the AIA system. Basically, it is Mr. Churchill's responsibility to track his continuing education credits. Garness agreed that the board does not have any jurisdictional authority over this. Fritz stated that the board could request to become an AIA continuing education provider and sponsor courses, but that is not something the board wishes to pursue, as it is not something necessary for an architect to work. Fritz will draft a response.

- e) Glashan - Significant Structure - Glashan is simply commenting that the definition of significant structure does not address tall retaining walls, which is correct. Kerr states that we may need to contact someone and find out if there is a consensus that this is in fact an issue. Anderson stated that we probably do need to provide more specificity. It sounds like Glashan is uncomfortable dealing with structures that are tall or maybe those are the expectations clients have of him. The board should go back to the definition and make modifications. Leman, who is a civil engineer, could do that type of design, but he would not because he is not experienced in that sufficiently, so he would purposefully avoid it. There are civil engineers who are not structural engineers who Leman believes would be competent to do that type of design, so the board needs to be careful. The board should be careful not to disallow a civil engineer from being able to do that type of design if they are otherwise qualified. Kerr stated that he agrees, and Bell concurs as well. Bell stated that professional judgment comes into play, so if the engineer is looking at that wall and is unsure, then they need to get somebody that could be the structural engineer. If the engineer is

comfortable, then there's no reason why a civil engineer could not do it, which is currently the way it is now. Bell stated that he does not have any personal knowledge of those occasions where it went wrong when somebody designed a wall they were not capable of doing. Kerr stated that public outreach would be nice to reach out to licensees about this issue, reminding people that these are issues and not to practice outside of their area of expertise. Johnston stated that the definition of significant structure that the board adopted specifically came from the structural engineering licensure coalition. The board was trying to use the same language as others as much as possible. Kerr asked Anderson if she agreed that this can be handled through outreach without modifying the regulation language. Anderson feels like there is more to the story in the letter and the board is missing some details, but she does agree that everyone should be practicing in areas where they have experience and are comfortable to do so. Fritz stated there may be a situation where a retaining wall becomes a significant structure by nature of what it is doing or retaining, so it may not be in the board's best interest to actually define that as significant because in some ways, it may already be. Kerr will draft a response.

- f) Kurt - Arctic Engineering – The University of Washington would like to offer the Arctic Engineering course via zoom. Kerr stated the request was limited to the upcoming academic year, but ultimately this could be something that happens full time pending the trial run. Johnston says UAF offers the zoom option, so she does not see why the board should limit this method of delivery behind this year – it is the curriculum we care about. Powers will draft a response.
- g) Ulmgren - Five Year Limit for Exams – Kerr does not think this is currently an issue, as they have not reached the end of their exam period. When that time period comes up, it is reasonable to probably extend the period based on Pearson test centers. Johnston heard examinees have the opportunity to defer or refund and they could choose anytime within the next year for their deferment, but she did not hear anything specifically about the five-year completion period. Powers will respond.

Break at 10:45

Kerr let the board know if they come back from break early, there is a continuing education audit guidance document that can be reviewed before starting the audit portion of the meeting.

11. CE Audit Review - Process Review & Begin Audits

Kerr let the board know that 6% of the applicants are audited and they are required to reply. The last audit was waived, so this is the first one in four years. The purpose of the continuing education program is to maintain a continuing level of competency and standards for professional architects, engineers, land surveyors, and landscape architects to promote the public health, safety, and welfare within this state. The form is provided to document their continuing education if they have not met the requirements of course they are not eligible for licensure. While looking at a sample audit, Kerr noted the description of the activity tells the individual what they need or what is acceptable. Someone can be exempt from the CE requirements if they meet the criteria on the first page, which needs to be checked first to make sure they are not exempt. While looking at courses that seem suspect, the first thing Kerr would do before investigating the courses would be to look at the number of credits they have, with the requirement being 24. If the licensee is far in excess of that, then Kerr suggests subtracting the questionable courses right off the bat.

Johnston noted the first thing the regulations state about CE's is the subject matter must address the public health, safety and welfare, which automatically excludes a lot of non-technical content. The regulations also state that the CE's must be in the area of the registrant's registration or discipline. If it is

not in their discipline, then it has to be relevant to their practice of profession (architecture, engineering land surveying, or landscape architecture) and may include technical, ethical, or managerial content. Documentation also must state how the content is presented and who the sponsoring organization is.

The board reviewed the CE criteria, which can be found in Article 5 of the Statutes and Regulations. As long as the requirements are met, the audit can be approved.

Lunch

12. Continue Audit Review

Kerr appreciates everyone working through the audits. It is tedious, but it makes the board stronger to have a common understanding. Fritz recommends referring an audit to another board member for review if they know the registrant or have questionable topics. Kerr suggests board members communicate and work together, but as they become more comfortable they are more than welcome to work independently. The goal is to treat everyone fairly.

Due to the extensive number of audits reviewed, the division will follow-up with registrants as necessary.

13. Public Comment

Chris Miller, Mechanical Engineer and President of Design Alaska – Miller stated that he was not aware of today's meeting and that he is a faithful follower of the AELS board, as it impacts 50 people that work for him. He also did not see the minutes from the May meeting. He understands there have been some changes and things happen. He does not have a specific comment, other than he wants to be involved. Kerr appreciates Miller reaching out and affirms that there have been some changes to staff and work world. We have a number of new members, so we are not intentionally changing our processes to keep the public in the dark and we will strive to make those notifications more obvious and transparent. Miller noted that he did see the May minutes, but not much business transacted because it was mostly reviewing applications. He did not notice much discussion. Kerr noted the May meeting was abbreviated in light of COVID. Power stated that she does not post items to the website herself, that they go to the publications team and they post them as quickly as possible. There are some holes that will be worked through to ensure the proper documents are posted before board meetings. Miller stated that as a member of the of the constituency of this board the list served work just fine. Powers stated that she will learn how to utilize the listserv feature for future meetings. Miller would like to review content for this meeting to participate. Powers will email it to him. Kerr thanked Miller for his comment and appreciates feedback from the public. The board will add a public comment period to the agenda for 1:30 on August 14.

14. Recess for the Day

15. Reconvene Meeting/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

Board members present, constituting a quorum:

Jennifer Anderson, PE, Civil Engineer, Environmental Engineer

Board members present, constituting a quorum:

Jennifer Anderson, PE, Civil Engineer, Environmental Engineer

Robert (Bob) Bell, PS, Land Surveyor, Civil Engineer

Catherine Fritz, Architect

Jeffrey Garness, PE Civil Engineer, Environmental Engineer
Elizabeth Johnston, PE, Electrical Engineer, Fire Protection Engineer (Vice Chair)
John Kerr, PS, Land Surveyor (Chair)
Jeff Koonce, Architect
Loren Leman, PE, Civil Engineer
Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect
Fred Wallis, PE, Mining Engineer

Board members absent:
Eric Milliken, Public Member

Attending from the Division of Corporations, Business, and Professional Licensing were:
Rebecca Powers, Executive Administrator
Sara Neal, Licensing Examiner
Ryan Gill, Investigator
Amber Whaley, Investigator

16. CE Audit Review Continued/Begin Application Review

AELS staff reviewed the application review process with the board members. The board began reviewing ninety-two applications for registration.

17. National Organization Reports & Updates

Due to time constraints, the board will review the national organization reports and updates located in the board packet on their own time.

Lunch -

18. Application Review Continued

The board returned to review applications for the remainder of the afternoon.

19. Public Comment

Chris Miller joined for public comment. Miller appreciated being given the opportunity to speak yesterday, as well as receiving the board packet for the meeting. There were 170 pages of material and he did not have much time to get through them. He had a very difficult time understanding what the topics were and would like to see more effort in organizing the board packet. Miller stated that he is very concerned about the lack of testing in Fairbanks. He is a major employer in the community and there needs to be a way to test people locally. If there is oversight on the part of going to computer based testing, it needs to be fixed. He understands with some specialty things that travel may be required for testing, but for the bread and butter of what builds Alaska. It needs to be more available than that. There is one place in Anchorage that can do it, and Miller would say that is true of Juneau as well; and that is how it has been for many years. Miller hopes to get a clear response at some point on the strategy to resolve this. As far as industrial exemption, there have been heated topics within his office regarding this. In general trends of professionals, they would not mind bringing the utility people into the fold so that they are part of the professional world. Miller does support the board's efforts to clean up the audit process, as it is very confusing. He has about 20 professionals in his office that all deal with the requirements and they understand that this is a people business and he understands some of the discussions that could be going around is the technical content. It needs to allow people the ability to educate them and meet their needs.

The board should be clear on what is acceptable. Miller stated that we are halfway to the next renewal already and he has already got quite a few credits logged, but he has four licenses to maintain so he has a bigger burden than most to manage his continuing education and choose wisely. Miller will be looking forward to being able to receive information in advance of board meetings so he can be prepared and contribute.

Kerr and Leman stated that the audits were not done in December, but rather in June. It is not the intention for that to be the schedule going forward. Miller stated that he does not understand the process, but when everyone turns their administrative responses in, he would think it would be a fairly fast thing to select the audience.

20. Investigative Report

Amber Whaley and Ryan Gill joined the meeting. Whaley introduced herself as the senior investigator. From this point on, however, Ryan Gill will serve as the assigned investigator for the AELS Board, as John Savage has retired. Gill went over the investigative report which outlines what investigations are open and closed from the last period. This report includes cases dating back to February and there are 21 open investigations. The report is broken down by discipline – architects, engineers, land surveyors, and then sub disciplines. 27 cases have been closed since the last board report, again, broken down into specialties. Many cases are unlicensed practice or violation of a likening regulation, which could be a broad spectrum of violations. Gill opened the floor for questions. Kerr appreciates the brief description of the violation of licensing regulation and unlicensed practice activity. Johnston has a question about the granularity of the categories. She would like clarification about how the engineers are listed on the report. Gill stated that some of the records are getting more and more specific and better maintained as we go, but some of them are generally categorized as engineer, where it could have been an electrical engineer or any type you can think of. As documentation and the database is fine-tuned, it's going to be more and more specific as the meetings go along. There will be different subcategories of engineers. Johnston stated that she would appreciate the breakdown to monitor large increases or patterns in certain professions, which could help determine which professions need more outreach. Gill stated that at the next meeting, the board will see more specifics and a better breakdown of exactly which professions are being affected. Johnston asked Gill how the workload is. Our board is one of those few that has a dedicated investigator, for which the board is grateful. She asked Gill if he feels like he has sufficient time to complete his caseload, and asked if there is anything he needs from the board. Gill stated that he does not need anything at this time. He is getting more and more familiar with the statutes and regulations as they apply to each profession, but he is also transitioning from his previous position, which was an investigator for managing probation, so he still has that workload as well. He estimates 85% to 90% of his day is attributed to the AELS board. Bell would like clarification about the difference between license application problem or violation of licensing regulations, as they are relatively generic. Gill stated that he is restricted to what the database drop down menu allows and those options can be adjusted as we go if it needs to be more specific. Gill stated that in the future, there will be a page dedicated to probation reports if there are any licensees that are on probation that are under the governance of this board. He also let the new board members know that when an investigation is ongoing, unless they are the reviewing board member, he will not disclose where the investigation is at. Kerr asked Gill if he knew approximately how many people are on probation that need to be monitoring. Gill stated that in the last 15 or so years, there has not been anybody placed on a consent agreement or probation of any kind in the AELS board. Leman expressed his concern that there should be punishments that are stronger than a letter. Johnston stated that the board has the power to revoke, suspend, or impose monetary fines that is within regulations. While disciplinary actions tend to be fairly benign, there are other options, they are just barely exercised. Whaley reminded the board that they have the authority to invoke disciplinary action against a licensee and that varies from several different things, from issuing probation, a civil fine, revocation, suspension, or anything like that. Fritz stated that

she recalls a few consent agreements over the years and how the board moves forward from here is important.

a) Executive Session

On a Motion duly made by Elizabeth Johnston and passed unanimously, it was RESOLVED to go into Executive Session for the purposes of investigator board member training, with Neal and Powers remaining in the session.

21. Continue Application Review

The board reviewed applications of special consideration.

22. New Business

a) Discussion on Lack of In-Person Testing Options for Fairbanks Test Takers (Johnston)

Johnston spoke of a past applicant, Blake Burley, who is a mechanical engineer and was under special consideration for his experience. After the mail ballot where he was approved, he went to sign up for his test and was informed by the test center that the PE exam will no longer be offered in Fairbanks because the exam is going to computer based testing. It is an issue with Pearson VUE who said that the computer based exam is not one that they can just offer and it was not their problem. Powers reached out to NCEES, who expressed that the Fairbanks test center has never offered the exams, so this is the first time we have heard of a problem. Johnston feels this is the first of a coming wave that will be complaining, especially in the era of COVID. It is being expected that all of our licensees will be traveling for testing. As a fellow licensee and an electrical engineer, Johnston does not feel this is acceptable. The state pays NCEES a great deal of money to administer the test, and if they are not able to rectify their relationship with Pearson VUE, and Pearson VUE is not willing to reach out to testing centers in Fairbanks, then we need to be informing them of our displeasure. Johnston thinks there should be an official letter to go to NCEES and Pearson VUE stating that there is a need for the Alaska licensees to have computer based testing available. They also need to be aware of the opening hours of the testing centers. If a testing center is only open for 6 hours, but a licensee is taking an 8-hour exam, then this is an issue. Powers stated that she reached out to NCEES and they agree that as computer based testing increases, it is something they may consider. Fritz stated that if we are going to be trying to get Pearson VUE to identify more sites, that it is across the State of Alaska rather than just Fairbanks. Johnston thinks it would be beneficial to include testing locations on our website.

b) Foreign Credential Evaluation Services (Johnston)

Johnston stated that on the AELS website, there is a list of acceptable credential evaluation services, which includes the NCEES credential evaluation service. Before the November 2019 board meeting, the board looked at the list of services and asked each of them to confirm whether they reviewed foreign credentials against ABET education standards and did an equivalency comparison with varied results. Johnston said the board requested to move all that information from the website and have them go to NCEES for engineering credential evaluation, because that at least is evaluated against the NCEES model education standard, which is roughly in alignment with ABET. ABET itself no longer offers foreign credential evaluation services because they are trying to sell their own accreditation out for universities. They no longer help you convert – they want your University to go through a better accreditation process. The two points Johnston seeks to make are: 1. We still have not removed that information from our website and, 2. We have an applicant who turned in a foreign credential evaluation that was not from one of our official website sources, so she is having to reject them. Johnston thinks it is time to fix this by removing that

information from the website, referring them just to NCEES credential evaluation service. Johnston would like the board to make a motion to have all references removed from the AELS website.

On a Motion duly made by Elizabeth Johnston, seconded by Jeff Koonce and passed unanimously, it was RESOLVED to remove reference to foreign credential evaluation services for engineers other than the NCEES credential evaluation service.

23. Complete Application Review

The board continued reviewing applications.

The board scheduled the next board meeting for November 12-13, 2020, which will be held virtually.

24. Read Applications into the Record

On a motion duly made by Catherine Fritz, seconded by Bob Bell and passed unanimously, it was RESOLVED to approve the following list of applicants for registration by comity and by examination with the stipulation that the information in the applicants’ files will take precedence over the information in the minutes.

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	TYPE OF LICENSE	AUG DECISION
ROLF	ARMSTRONG	STRUCTURAL	Approved
DEBORAH	BACON	CIVIL	Approved
SHANE	BROWN	STRUCTURAL	Approved
JASON	CHANDLER	CIVIL	Approved
CARL	CHAPPELL	FIRE PROTECTION	Approved
LUKE	EDWARDS	ELECTRICAL	Approved
BRENDAN	ELKINS	CIVIL	Approved
DANIEL	FERRUFINO	CIVIL	Approved
DAVID	GOWERS	CIVIL	Approved
GERALD	HILL	ARCHITECTURE	Approved
ROBERT	HURTIG	ELECTRICAL	Approved
LEONARD	JOB	CIVIL	Approved
BRIAN	KERMODE	STRUCTURAL	Approved
Jashua	LEATHAM		Approved
TIMOTHY	LOUGHEED	ELECTRICAL	Approved
JOHNATHAN	MALLOY	CIVIL	Approved
GREGORY	MARTIN	MECHANICAL	Approved
RYAN	MOORE	CIVIL	Approved
THEODORE	MOWINSKI	MECHANICAL	Approved
MATTHEW	OTT	ELECTRICAL	Approved
NICHOLAS	PETRAGLIA	CHEMICAL	Approved
AIMEE	POSANKA	CIVIL	Approved
ADAM	RIDGE	CIVIL	Approved
DAVID	SAAREM	MECHANICAL	Approved
ROBERT	SCHEIBE	MECHANICAL	Approved

BENJAMIN	SCHLACHTER	CIVIL	Approved
WELLS	SQUIER	ARCHITECTURE	Approved
CHARLES	STEFFENSMEIER	CIVIL	Approved
STUART	STRINGER	STRUCTURAL	Approved
TIMOTHY	TENNIS	CIVIL	Approved
KHOI	TRAN	MECHANICAL	Approved
VINOD	VASUDEVAN	CIVIL	Approved
JOSHUA	WATSON	CIVIL	Approved
DANIEL	WORKMAN	ENVIRONMENTAL	Approved
SCOTT	WYSSLING	CIVIL	Approved

On a motion duly made by Catherine Fritz, seconded by Jeff Koonce and passed unanimously, it was RESOLVED to conditionally approve the following list of applicants for registration by comity and by examination with the stipulation that the information in the applicants' files will take precedence over the information in the minutes.

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	TYPE OF LICENSE	AUG DECISION
DOUGLAS	BONITO	FIRE PROTECTION	CONDITIONAL
ALAN	BROWN	ELECTRICAL	CONDITIONAL
Alan	Brown	Electrical	CONDITIONAL
CLAUDIA	CASTREJON	ELECTRICAL	CONDITIONAL
Claudia	Castrejon	Electrical	CONDITIONAL
A. PHILIP	CLARK	MECHANICAL	CONDITIONAL
P Amos	Clark	Mechanical	CONDITIONAL
ERIC	FROELICH	ARCHITECTURE	CONDITIONAL
Eric	Froelich	Architect	CONDITIONAL
BENJAMIN	GIBSON	CIVIL	CONDITIONAL
NATHAN	GREENE	ELECTRICAL	CONDITIONAL
CHAD	GRISMER	CIVIL	CONDITIONAL
SCOTT	HARDY	ELECTRICAL	CONDITIONAL
Scott	Hardy	Electrical	CONDITIONAL
RICHARD	HARVEY	FIRE PROTECTION	CONDITIONAL
ADAM	JENKINS	ELECTRICAL	CONDITIONAL
Adam	Jenkins	Electrical	CONDITIONAL
BREANNA	LAMBERT	CIVIL	CONDITIONAL
BRIAN	LINCOLN	CIVIL	CONDITIONAL
MATTHEW	LONGSINE	MECHANICAL	CONDITIONAL
Matthew	Longsine	Mechanical	CONDITIONAL
JOHN	MCDONALD	MECHANICAL	CONDITIONAL
John	McDonald	Mechanical	CONDITIONAL
JAMES	NEELEY	FIRE PROTECTION	CONDITIONAL
GARRETT	PROKOSCH	MECHANICAL	CONDITIONAL
JOSHUA	REISER	MECHANICAL	CONDITIONAL

Joshua	Reiser	Mechanical	CONDITIONAL
JARED	RIEDEL	MECHANICAL	CONDITIONAL
CHASS	RISING	ARCHITECTURE	CONDITIONAL
Chass	Rising	Architect	CONDITIONAL
DEVON	ROE	CIVIL	CONDITIONAL
ERIC	ROSENDALE	CIVIL	CONDITIONAL
AHARON	SHERRILL	CONTROL SYSTEMS	CONDITIONAL
ANDREW	SMITH	ARCHITECTURE	CONDITIONAL
Andrew	Smith	Architect	CONDITIONAL
ADAM	WYBORNY	ENVIRONMENTAL	CONDITIONAL
ADDISON	YANG	CIVIL	CONDITIONAL

On a motion duly made by Catherine Fritz, seconded by Jeff Koonce and passed unanimously, it was RESOLVED to find the following list of applicants for registration by comity and by examination incomplete with the stipulation that the information in the applicants' files will take precedence over the information in the minutes.

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	TYPE OF LICENSE	AUG DECISION
FARSHAD	Ebadi	Electrical	Incomplete

25. Board Member Comments

Kerr appreciates everyone grinding through this challenging meeting. There was a lot of material covered and it was a new format and had new members. Leman said he was happy to work with everyone and will give the meeting some thought and provide feedback later. Anderson thanked everybody for participating the last two days. She feels like a lot was accomplished and it is really nice to get the new board up to speed on things. Koonce thanked Neal and Powers for their help in putting the meeting together, albeit tough trying to go from meeting in person to electronically, especially with the breakout rooms and other technology. Neal and Powers thanked the board for their grace and patience through this meeting. Fritz thanked everyone for a great meeting, and while it was difficult in many ways with the virtual format, she appreciated Neal and Powers for the preparation. She misses everyone and wishes the meeting was in person. Kerr thanked the new board members for their patience, as well as Neal and Powers for their efforts in putting the meeting together.

26. Adjourn Meeting

The AELS August 2020 board meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:



Rebecca Powers, Executive Administrator

Approved:

Elizabeth Johnston

Elizabeth T. Johnston, PE Chair
Alaska Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers, and Land Surveyors

Date: 02/23/2021