

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

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
February 17-18, 2021

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 February 17-18, 2021.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 9:04 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- joined at 9:07)

John Kerr, PS, Land Surveyor (Chair)

Jeff Koonce, Architect

Loren Leman, PE, Civil Engineer

Bruce Magyar, Public Member

Luanne Urfer, PLA, Landscape Architect

Fred Wallis, PE, Mining Engineer

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

Rebecca Powers, Executive Administrator

Sara Neal, Licensing Examiner

Jared Famularo, Investigator III

Melissa Dumas, Administrative Officer

Sara Chambers, Division Director

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. Virtual Meeting Code of Conduct

The Chair reminded the board to be courteous and thanked everyone for always working well together.

4. Review/Amend/Approve Agenda

Leman would like to amend the day two agenda. He requested to be let out for lunch early so the board can watch the historic MARS Perseverance Rover landing.

On a Motion duly made by Loren Leman, seconded by Catherine Fritz and approved unanimously, it was RESOLVED to approve the agenda with the amendment.

5. Board Member Introductions

The board members introduced themselves to the new public member, Bruce Magyar, who then introduced himself to the Board.

6. Ethics Reporting

Fritz had a few meetings with the Alaska AIA chapter who oppose the interior design bill – HB61. Fritz is attending the meetings as an architect, not as a board member, and providing information to AIA members, including inviting them to attend the discussion concerning HB61 if they are interested. Bell met with Barbara Cash, who is advocating for HB61, as an individual, not as a representative of the board. Bell listened to her concerns and thanked her for the information. Garness asked for clarification as to what should be disclosed during ethics reporting. Johnston suggested reading AS 39.52.10 and stated that if financial interest is involved, or any possible representation of the board, it should be reported.

7. Board Elections

Kerr asked for nominations for the upcoming chair, vice-chair, and secretary vacancies, whose terms will start at the beginning of the next meeting. Fritz nominated Anderson for secretary. Koonce nominated Johnston for chair. Fritz nominated herself for vice-chair.

On a Motion duly made by Jeff Koonce, seconded by Luanne Urfer and approved unanimously, it was RESOLVED to elect Johnston as chair, Fritz as vice-chair, and Anderson as secretary.

8. Licensing Examiner's Report

Sara Neal gave the examiner's report noting that the renewal numbers have changed since the November 2020 meeting due to incorrect data being pulled from the database. The search criteria has been corrected which changed the numbers by deducting 300 which were the licensees who retired on their renewal forms. The report also shows the results from the October 2020 PE exam results. The AKLS is coming up in April with six applicants registered with several more applicants waiting for approval after being reviewed during this meeting. Kerr asked Neal if there was anything she was finding to be problematic with regards to the applications or renewals. Neal stated that the SE regulations were still problematic for applicants. Three applicants applied for an SE license with just the SE 16-hour exam. There are also issues with the qualifying degrees for TABLE B – ABET degree in a

different discipline requiring 5 years of experience. The board policy needs to be updated for degrees that are considered alternate.

9. Correspondence Received

- a. PE Exam Eligibility – The applicant, Katie Schumacher, is hoping to sit for the October 2021 PE exam and will have over four years of experience by then. Her manager, who is a PE, left the company last October and Schumacher wants to make sure she is on track to have an eligible person supervise and sign off on her experience, as she is still doing engineering work and managing several engineering projects around the site. Schumacher is asking the board to clarify what options she has to stay on track. Kerr stated that there is not enough information in the letter for him to comment on, but Schumacher needs to be aware of the mentor program; however, she cannot back date the mentor. Johnston explained that the statute says responsible charge has to be verified by a professional engineer registered in the United States in the branch of engineering. Kerr does not see where the PE has to be registered in the United States for mentoring. Johnston explained that, 12 AAC 36.063 (j) says to meet the mentoring requirements of this section, and applicant must complete four years of quarterly face-to-face meetings with a professional engineer registered in the United States and registered in the same discipline that the applicant is applying for. **Task:** Johnston will draft a letter.

- b. CE Exemption Request – Benjamin Clark Brown submitted a renewal application in January and is requesting an exemption to the CE requirements. The board has granted exemption requests in the past for extenuating circumstances. Fritz would like there to be a database created of decisions about leniency on continuing education. Neal explained that the only exemption she has a record of happened in February 2020. Fritz asked if the license has been renewed for this registrant. Powers stated that the license has not been renewed. Neal let the board know that a renewal application was submitted with the exemption request, but it was not processed until the board could review the request. Kerr stated that the registrant would need to get in compliance then reinstate his license. Johnston said if the intent is to practice before December 2021, he will need to complete the continuing education that corresponds to that renewal cycle prior to renewing his license. Powers explained that the board would need to make regulation changes in order to allow for exceptions. Fritz would like for a few members to review the expired license category to become clear in what the board has the authority to allow. Garness thinks the board could be flexible on something like this if they have the authority to within statutes and regulations. Kerr said the board needs to be sure they are consistent with their policies as part of the mission statement.

- c. Randlett-Design Limitations – Susan Randlett has a situation where she only has a general report about an old foundation, not the original design or record drawings. Placing new infrastructure on that foundation will require making assumptions without adequate data. Randlett is asking if the statute or regulation speaks to undertaking a design that might fail prematurely. Kerr asked if anyone could give input from an engineering perspective. Fritz said from the architectural perspective, she has a lot of questions. What kind of building are we talking about? An old foundation of what? The foundation can be verified for structural capacity, depending on the use and what they want to do with it. Fritz thinks a structural

engineer would need to investigate and determine if the foundation appears to have enough capacity for the new function. Kerr said it is a matter of does this work require a seal, if so, it is the professional's responsibility. **Task:** Bell will draft a response.

Kerr explained to the board that this section of the meeting is a highlight of things that need to be addressed. There is much more correspondence that comes in and gets dealt with by various board members and staff over time. If there is anything a board member was involved with that is not listed, but it merits discussion with the full board, please bring it up during this time.

10. Public Comment

Murphy Quinn, Roy Robertson, Eva Melancon, and Mark Lockwood were on the line but did not have a comment. Kerr thanked them for joining the meeting today and appreciates seeing people involved.

11. Correspondence Sent

a. Clarke – PE Stamping Requirements

Mike Clarke is unable to locate a definition that determines which specific drawings need to have a PE stamp. Kerr responded to Clarke and stated that the board does not define documents requiring stamping, but to err on the side of stamping.

b. Glashan – Practice Question

Stafford Glashan wants to know if the Board has an opinion on whether the design of construction dewatering is considered engineering. Garness stated that he does not have significant expertise in the area, but he did conduct brief research on some of the failures that are associated with the dewatering applications and impact on adjacent structures or temporary retaining walls for structures. Garness suggests erring on the side of what is engineering versus non-engineering. Anderson reviewed the letter and is hesitant to make a blanket statement that all dewatering systems need to be designed or stamped by an engineer specifically. Bell stated that if the water systems goal is to get water away from a lawn so it would not die, that is not an issue. However, if the goal is to get water away from the foundation of a building, which could cause it to fail, then it should be. Bell suggests the Board does not have enough information to make the determination. **Task:** Anderson will draft a response.

12. Investigative Report

The new board investigator, Jared Famularo, introduced himself. Famularo stated that he was recently transferred the case files and he is in the process of figuring out where they all stand. Leman told Famularo that he received his request to review a file and will respond this week. Magyar asked what type of screening is done on the applicants and files. Famularo said he has a system he uses for background checks, which will show any civil lawsuits, bankruptcies, and court filings that have been finalized. If there are questions about events in other states, we can reach out to those board investigators to request more information. Kerr stated that NCARB, NCEES, and CLARB often have an investigative component to the organization, whether it is a database of information about other licensees or information on tactics for investigations. There are currently nineteen open cases. Not all of them are currently Famularo's active cases, because of them of them are just getting finished or are being worked on by the investigator that worked on cases after Investigator Gill left the division. There are not a lot of changes since the last board meeting, but they were able to close ten cases. Fritz asked why there was a category of specialty contractor when it is not a profession the board regulates.

Famularo explained the issue is actually engineering, as the contractor was performing engineering duties as a contractor. The Chief Investigator decided it would be best to have the Board review that case to determine if it was actually an engineering issue instead of a contracting issue. Fritz asked if all of the audits are reported, and Famularo stated that they are only referred to Investigations if the Paralegal determines there was a violation. Leman has a few cases that were referred to him and he feels like the investigator could have worked on the less had they been reviewed by board members sooner. He would like to begin communication a little earlier to make everyone's job easier and invest less time into those cases. Kerr agrees the need for early communication with board members to help investigations stay focused on issues that have merit or potential is critical. Kerr also encourages Famularo to communicate with the board any trends that he may see if types of complaints. Kerr thanked Famularo and encouraged him to participate in the board meetings as much as he can to get an idea of who everyone is and the types of issues the board is working on.

13. Division Update

Melissa Dumas, Administrative Officer, joined the meeting to give the division update. Dumas presented the FY21 second quarter board report. Kerr asked what is considered a healthy but not excessive surplus to carry. Dumas stated that the legislature mandates that the board is supposed to maintain expenditures and revenue as equal, but because the board reviews on a biennium, it would be pretty impossible and the fees would have to change constantly to maintain that mandate. Dumas gave a quick review of general interest legislation that affects professional licensing, which could in turn affect the board **Lunch at 12:10.**

14. Application Review

The board began reviewing applications for registration.

15. HB61 Discussion with Representative Claman

Representative Matt Claman, House District 21 (West Anchorage), joined the meeting to discuss HB61. Interior designers in Anchorage approached Representative Claman expressing their interest in moving forward with the proposal that will make them a licensed profession. Prior to the meeting, the board presented Representative Claman with a list of questions and talking points (bold), which he proceeded to address (italics).

- 1. Why is this legislation needed? What is the current HSW hazard/harm that makes the licensing of Interior Designers necessary?** *I think it's just a part of becoming a more complicated world in terms of what are the right kind of coatings, what are the right kind of materials, just a lot of fire safety, energy codes, space planning, the kinds of things that interior designers tend to do more frequently than architects and because they're doing it more, they just tend to have more experience. I think some of that is driven by client needs. The architects tend to charge more per hour than the interior designers so a lot of the clients are actually interested in having some of that work performed by interior designers. As the buildings get larger, it becomes more important to have licensing in place.*
- 2. Only two other states (Louisiana and Nevada) and the District of Columbia have Interior Design practice acts.** *We actually went and looked through a number of other states that have different levels of regulation of interior design and there are 27-28 states that have some form of regulation, so it's just not one or two states from our perspective. What we tried to do is take an approach that was really consistent with how Alaska regulates other industries*

and rather than say, "They do it this way in Virginia or California," we actually wanted to tailor this to the practice in Alaska and make it so that it was creating the registration while not over-regulating the practice and providing standards.

3. Concerns about impacts to the AELS Board.

a) Sec. 5, AS 08.48.011 (b) in HB 61 is amended to add two additional members to the AELS Board. Please discuss your suggested revision to the engineering disciplines' board make-up. *The current language states the board should be comprised of either a mechanical engineer or an electrical engineer. Under the current version, we're proposing one mechanical engineer and one electrical engineer. The goal was to make sure both disciplines were included on the board. The second additional person would be a commercial interior designer. Rather than have the commercial interior designers regulated by its own independent board, we think it is important to have the regulation be by the kinds of professionals that would be working with commercial interior designers.*

b) The current workload of the AELS Board and its staff is significant. Please discuss how you envision the added responsibilities (administration, enforcement, increased Board member size, etc.) of a newly registered discipline to be addressed. *The goal would be that the fees associated with registration would cover the additional costs associated with having more folks regulated by the board.*

c) What is your anticipated schedule for HB 61? *For everything we introduce in a legislative session, our goal is to get it finished in this in this particular session, which is a two-year session. Of course, the realities of COVID-19 and budget challenges, whether we actually get it finished in two years, that remains to be seen, but I would I would certainly say right now, the lack of an emergency declaration for the COVID issues is a real concern.*

4. The AELS Board has not discussed the proposed bill. However, our Legislative Committee Chair, Catherine Fritz (architect) (SIC) has completed an initial review and raises the following concerns/issues of the current draft of HB61:

a) The use of the term, "Commercial." Merriam-webster.com defines commercial as:

"1. a. (1) occupied with or engaged in commerce or work intended for commerce

(2): of or relating to commerce

(3): characteristic of commerce

(4): suitable, adequate, or prepared for commerce

b) (1): being of an average or inferior quality

(2): producing artistic work of low standards for quick market success

2. a. viewed with regard to profit

b. designed for a large market

3. emphasizing skills and subjects useful in business

4. supported by advertisers"

Please explain the use of the work “Commercial” in HB 61, and why you believe it is important to distinguish commercial from non-commercial aspects of Interior Design practice, especially as it relates to HSW of the public? Non-commercial typically includes government agencies and non-profits, is it the intent of the bill to exclude the activities of these entities from the proposed Interior Design practice? *We looked back at other uses to come up with a definition. We are not totally wedded to the term commercial. We are trying to come up with a definition that reflects more typically commercial uses and non-residential uses so the scope of practice and folks that are practicing in that area where they have to register falls in that category. I recognize that almost any definition can be subject to some criticism and certainly if there's suggestions of something different we're certainly very open to those kinds of suggestions.*

b) Regarding proposed change Sec. 12. AS 08.48.201 (a), why are architects identified as references for interior designers? If Interior Design is a distinct profession from architecture, then architects would not be an appropriate discipline to provide references any more than other disciplines are allowed to do so. *The reason we have architects being allowed to make the recommendations, as well as interior designers, is that it is common to have more architects in an architecture firm than interior designers and if we actually want somebody that has worked with the interior designer to provide a reference, having that person who has worked with them will do a better job of giving the board that sound reference than somebody who has not actually worked with them.*

c) Regarding proposed change Sec. 24. AS 08.48.281, Is there any aspect of Interior Design practice that is not already part of the scope of practice of architecture? *I think, as a technical matter it's all included in architecture, but as a practice matter I think there's a lot of areas that interior designers work on that architects frequently are not as involved with particularly in some of the more detailed areas of what they're working on – some of the space planning, some of the coatings, different things that typically get done by interior designers.*

d) Regarding proposed change Sec. 29. AS 08.48.331 (a), item (8), Why is the new text necessary (this is not stated for any of the other registered disciplines)? This section is written as exceptions, so does this section mean that even if the scope of work to be done does not affect HSW, a registered Interior Designer must be hired? *The language in subsection eight are areas where the chapter does not apply, so this is where we get into the legislative drafting that is kind of dealing with double negatives. The reason to have the commercial interior design services listed is to make sure they are not exempted.*

e) Regarding proposed change Sec. 29. AS 08.48.331 (a), item (15), This section indicates that a person planning, designing, and implementing kitchen and bath projects are exempt from the chapter for some types of buildings (person's own use as a single family residence, and residential buildings not more than four families or two families that are more than three stories high). Why are these specific exemptions identified while other types of buildings in this section (farm buildings, private noncommercial garages and workshops less than 2,000 sf) are not called out

in the section? More generally, why is this item needed since the exemptions are already stated? *The way I understand it, many people that specifically do kitchen and bath only work and there was an interest in talking with folks that specifically wanted to be exempted. These were primarily residential design folks because the larger commercial buildings are typically not going to get kitchens put into them.*

f) Regarding proposed change Sec. 29. AS 08.48.341, item (24), there are terms used in subsection (A) that are not clear and/or relevant to the HSW mission of the AELS Board. For example, the terms analysis, enhancing, and administration are not used in the definition of other registered professions (items 12, 13, 14, and 15 of this section) and not understood as being applicable to HSW of the public. The phrase “nonstructural interior construction” is used in this section without definition. The definitions of structural and nonstructural are actual areas that there is a definition of Structural, nonstructural, and nonbearing that's provided in subsection 26 in section 32 of the bill, and as 08.48.341, so there actually is a definition of nonstructural and nonbearing. A lot of the questions relation to sections A, B, C, D, and E of Section 24 and Section 32 are related to industry terms that are used with frequency and they are well-known and understood by practitioners. The language many need further clarification or there may be some better choice of words. We are very receptive to suggestions and requests, because our interest is to make this a regulation that is relatively easy for the board to apply and does not create problems in the board doing its work.

5. What else would you like the AELS Board to know about this proposed bill and why it is important to you? *I think the main thing is that we see this as a business friendly and consumer friendly bill that is seeking to improve health, safety, and welfare work done by design professionals.*

16. Application Review

The board continued reviewing applications for registration.

Recess for the Day

17. Reconvene Meeting/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 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

Bruce Magyar, Public Member

Luanne Urfer, PLA, Landscape Architect

Fred Wallis, PE, Mining Engineer
Jake Maxwell, Land Surveyor

Attending from the Division of Corporations, Business, and Professional Licensing were:
Rebecca Powers, Executive Administrator
Sara Neal, Licensing Examiner
Sara Chambers, Division
Director

18. Review/Approve Updated Agenda

Powers updated the board on the last-minute changes made to the day two agenda.

On a Motion duly made by Catherine Fritz, seconded by Jeff Garness and approved unanimously, it was RESOLVED to approve the amended agenda.

19. Review/Approve November 12-13, 2020 Minutes

Garness noted two minor errors that need to be corrected. Leman found a few small edits that need to be made, but it is just a few spelling and word misuse errors that do not affect the outcome. Leman will email those changes to Powers after the meeting.

On a Motion duly made by Catherine Fritz, seconded by Bruce Magyar and approved unanimously, it was RESOLVED to approve the November 12-13, 2020 minutes.

21. Application Review – Special Requests

The board reviewed applications of special consideration.

On a Motion duly made by Elizabeth Johnston, seconded by Loren Leman and approved unanimously, it was RESOLVED to credit Matthew Blake with nine months of professional experience that was gained before he started school and that did not overlap with his education towards his requirements for sitting for the civil engineering exam, and that his application be considered conditionally approved pending receipt of verification of passage of PE exam.

22. Old Business

a. NTSB Safety Recommendations

There was a gas explosion in Massachusetts that killed a number of people. The gas company was under industrial exemption and the National Transportation Safety Board would like to make sure states are not exempting this type of work that needs to be prepared by a licensed professional engineer and co-signed on plans. The board wrote a letter to the governor after discussion in August 2019. At that time, the board agreed that the exemption was not appropriate. Maynard drafted a letter and sent it to the governor, handing the issue over to public policy of the legislature and to the Governor. Bell stated that he does not agree with the extension and lobbied hard, but the exemption was put back in at the encouragement of Representative Joe Green, an engineer who worked in the industry and was the advocate at the time – approximately 1990-1994. Leman thinks there is a place for an industrial exemption, but he also agrees that it should be limited, and there are times when it should not exist and this may be one. Fritz suggested this issue be assigned to the legislative committee.

23. National Organization Reports and Updates

a. CLARB

Urfer let the board know that CLARB cancelled their annual meeting in New York City, which should have been the 50th anniversary meeting. The meeting has been relocated to Phoenix. CLARB has been focusing on diversity/equity/inclusion. During the virtual meeting, Urfer found it interesting that CLARB tried doing online proctoring for exams in British Columbia. They found there was no increase in cheating and they did not lose any content from the exam. Everybody who took it thought it worked out really well. About 40% of the actual number of applicants that were being tested chose to be proctored online. CLARB is looking at regulation reform. They have been doing a proactive approach and it has been pretty positive. They are trying to find a uniform standard for both education and their application, which will likely impact the Board.

b. NCARB

Fritz stated that NCARB is getting ready for the next annual meeting in June, which will be a hybrid, meaning some people will be allowed to attend in person while others will attend virtually. Fritz has been very active in the examination committee and they rolled out the remote proctored exam in November. About 20% of the overall applicants chose the remote proxy during which they took the exam in their home and did not have to travel to a test center. There was a very high level of security and restrictive conditions that had to be approved to be able to take the exam in a remote setting, but so far, the outlook is very positive. It will really open up possibilities for places like Alaska with diverse locations of potential applicants. On the regional level, there will be a virtual conference in March. Fritz stated that they are actively implementing the strategic plan, which gives her personal satisfaction. She is also running for the position of Secretary on the board at the regional level.

c. NCEES

Johnston informed the board that the issue with the testing center issue with Fairbanks not being able to offer the PE exams through Pearson Vue has been resolved, which is excellent for our state. They can do both paper and computerized testing, but they have a limited number of seats, which brings our state up to thirteen seats. For electronic testing, the seats will be in high demand. The current recommendation is to schedule your exam four to six months before you want to take it. The Western Zone meeting will be virtual on May 13.

On a motion duly made by John Kerr, seconded by Elizabeth Johnston and passed unanimously, it was RESOLVED to appoint Jennifer Anderson as the voting delegate at the May 13 Western Zone meeting.

24. New Business

The board has expressed interest in increasing the pay range of the executive administrator, which will be discussed with Director Chambers after lunch. Johnston would like to create a board orientation video that new board members can watch on their own time.

Lunch at 11:30

25. New Business with Director Chambers

Director Chambers joined the meeting to discuss the process to add or share new staff, as well as the process for changing the salary for the executive administrator. She knows that AELS staff is very busy, but they are not behind and there has not been discussion that they are in need of a full additional staff member. Sharing staff is easier to do; however, the division currently had seven vacant examiner positions, so there is not extra staff to currently pull for additional help. Director Chambers explained the processes the division has to follow in order to hire staff, add new positions, and increase salaries. Commissioner Anderson is very concerned about the Division being able to meet our customer service needs with the staff that we have and she has provided a lot of tools to help. Johnston stated the board is thinking about streamlining and reducing time to licensure. One of the mechanisms and processes within the board to facilitate those goals would be to delegate some of the approval of applications to staff, which would increase their workload. Johnston would also like to see a monthly newsletter sent out to licensees, as well as board reports that summarized in layman's terms what the board did. Fritz asked what the plan is for projecting travel. Director Chambers explained that there is a status quo budget and the allocations have remained the same. However, just because there is a budget for travel does not believe there will be travel. It just means if there is travel, the legislature, or the Governor, has already allocated that amount. Magyar asked if there has been any cooperation with the universities, where the students may want to come in and work as a student to help them develop skills. Director Chambers stated there is the ability to set up an intern position, but they are usually more for engineering types of jobs rather than clerical. Johnston asked if there was something that can be done to increase the salary of the executive administrator. She also would like to know if current staff can be moved into an acting capacity while the division is recruiting for a new executive administrator. Director Chambers explained that not all executive administrator positions are created equal, and some are higher pay ranges due to the complexities and job requirements that come with their programs. In order to increase the pay range, there would need to be a class study and evaluate whether this position needs to be paid more, which takes time. Fritz expressed her interest in using surplus funds to have a database created so the board can easily access prior decisions. Director Chambers expressed interest in forming a workgroup to discuss the issues and make sure everyone is aligned on different pathways forward. The group will consist of Fritz, Johnston, and Magyar.

26. Regulations

The board discussed the following additions to the regulations package:

12 AAC 36.066. VERIFICATION OF LAND SURVEYOR WORK EXPERIENCE. (a) In support of an application for examination or registration as a land surveyor, an applicant shall arrange for verification of the work experience ~~required for eligibility for the fundamentals of land surveying examination and as~~ required in 12 AAC 36.065 to be submitted to the board. Verification of work experience must be on a form prescribed by the board and must be completed and submitted directly to the board by the **licensed** employer who is verifying the applicant's experience.

John Kerr submits the proposed regulation change:

Since the board no longer has any eligibility requirements for the FE Exam (12 AAC 36.062 repealed 5/2017) – EVERYBODY is eligible for the FE right now. Since 5/2017 there was no bar to clear and if challenged it's unlikely that the Board could assert those requirements prior to 5/2017.

That regulation needs to be revised to read:

12 AAC 36.063. ENGINEERING EDUCATION AND WORK EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS

(2) responsible charge experience or successful completion of four years of responsible charge obtained

within a mentoring system ~~will be considered for credit only if it is gained after~~ the applicant has completed education or work experience or both that are equivalent to the following:

(John Kerr Comment: The strikethrough above is my edit as it seems indirect and obscures intent. This language below is from the old 12 AAC 36.062 and needs to be numbered to match its new home and the references to other regulations needs to be checked. The requirements also need to be checked to ensure that they are in harmony with current regulations. It would be great if it could be reduced to a simpler form.)

On a motion duly made by Catherine Fritz, seconded by Jeff Garness and passed unanimously, it was RESOLVED to send the regulations as amended out for public comment.

27. Strategic Plan Overview

Fritz presented an overview of the Strategic Plan and the Board identified planned 2021 Actions for each Strategy to be accomplished between 3/1/2021 and 2/28/2022. The updated Strategic Plan document with Strategies and Actions is attached.

29. Read Applications into the Record

On a motion duly made by Catherine Fritz, seconded by Loren Leman 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	FEB DECISION
ALBERTO	PRIETO	CIVIL	Approved
ALEXANDER	ITSEKSON	CIVIL	Approved
ARIN	WOOSTER	MECHANICAL	Approved
BETHANY	BLACKBURN	CIVIL	Approved
CHRISTOPHER	COLEMAN	CIVIL	Approved
DARREN	NEFF	STRUCTURAL	Approved
DOUGLAS	SCHWARM	CIVIL	Approved
EDWARD	MACKOWIAK	ARCHITECT	Approved
EVA	MELANCON	CIVIL	Approved
GARY	YAMAGUCHI	MECHANICAL	Approved
GORDON	MACDONALD	CIVIL	Approved

JASON	BLASINGAME	MECHANICAL	Approved
JEFFREY	STAPLETON	CIVIL	Approved
JOSHUA	INMAN	ARCHITECT	Approved
LYNN	MERRILL	MECHANICAL	Approved
MICHELLE	YOKOTA	CIVIL	Approved
NANCY	LOKOCZ	ARCHITECT	Approved
RONALD	JOHNSON	ARCHITECT	Approved
SCOTT	MACK	MECHANICAL	Approved
SEAN	ELLENSON	MECHANICAL	Approved
SOLVEI	NEIGER	ARCHITECT	Approved
STACEY	LIN	MECHANICAL	Approved
SUNG	CHO	CIVIL	Approved
TIMOTHY	MALONEY	CIVIL	Approved
TRAVIS	BENEDICT	CIVIL	Approved
TYLER	DALLISON	ARCHITECT	Approved
VINCENT	FRATINARDO	CIVIL	Approved

On a motion duly made by Catherine Fritz, seconded by Loren Lemman 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	FEB DECISION
ALEX	LEGRISMITH	CIVIL	Conditional
AMMON	GROESBECK	CIVIL	Conditional
ANDRES	OSPINA	CIVIL	Conditional
ANDREW	REP KING	MECHANICAL	Conditional
ANTONIO	LIMON	ELECTRICAL	Conditional
BENJAMIN	STILL	CIVIL	Conditional
BOGDAN	PODGORNIAK	CIVIL	Conditional
BRANDON	RUHL	ARCHITECT	Conditional
BRIAN	CHASE	CIVIL	Conditional
CECIL	DYER	CIVIL	Conditional
CORRINE	MARZULLO	CIVIL	Conditional
DANA	POTTER	ARCHITECT	Conditional
DANIEL	HJORTSTORP	CIVIL	Conditional
DAVID	SHAMRELL	MECHANICAL	Conditional
DAVID	SMITH	MECHANICAL	Conditional
DOUGLAS	GELINEAU	CIVIL	Conditional
DOUGLAS	MULLINER	CIVIL	Conditional
DREW	VANDERMEER	CIVIL	Conditional

Matthew DUNCAN	KEITH	MECHANICAL	Conditional
DYLAN	HICKEY	LAND SURVEYOR	Conditional
EDWIN	HIGGINBOTHAM	CIVIL	Conditional
EMILY	MESKER	CIVIL	Conditional
FRANK	JORDANO	CIVIL	Conditional
FRANK	YOUNG	ELECTRICAL	Conditional
JESSICA	GUZAUSKAS	CIVIL	Conditional
JOHN	ANDRZECZAK	MECHANICAL	Conditional
JOSEPH	LUJAN	LAND SURVEYOR	Conditional
JOSHUA	KNUTSON	CIVIL	Conditional
KALIE	RUBALCAVA	CIVIL	Conditional
KANGVAL	JUMPAWONG	STRUCTURAL	Conditional
KRISTOFFER	NYSTROM	CIVIL	Conditional
KYLE	MCDONOUGH	CIVIL	Conditional
MARK	FONDREN II	CIVIL	Conditional
MATTHEW	ISKRA	CIVIL	Conditional
MATTHEW	EPP	CIVIL	Conditional
MATTHEW	CASH	ELECTRICAL	Conditional
MATTHEW	BLAKE	CIVIL	Conditional
MITCH	LOEWEN	MECHANICAL	Conditional
MURPHY	QUINN	LAND SURVEYOR	Conditional
OLIVER	LOFTUS	LAND SURVEYOR	Conditional
OLIVIA	JOBIN	CIVIL	Conditional
PAUL	DUTTON	CIVIL	Conditional
PEYTON	BRIGGS	CIVIL	Conditional
RILEY	BRONGA	CIVIL	Conditional
SHAWN	WOOTEN	MECHANICAL	Conditional
SOPHIA	TIDLER	CIVIL	Conditional
TAYLOR	HANLEY	MECHANICAL	Conditional
TODD	LINDLEY	MECHANICAL	Conditional
WILLIAM	RUTHERFORD	ARCHITECT	Conditional
XINLEI	NA	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	FEB DECISION
Chad	Walsh	Land Surveyor	Incomplete
Gabriel	Thomas	Civil	Incomplete

30. 2021 Board Meeting Dates

Board meetings for 2021 will be held on May 19-20, August 25-26, and November 9-10.

31. Adjourn Meeting

The AELS February 2021 board meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Rebecca Powers, Executive Administrator

Approved:



Elizabeth T. Johnston, PE Chair
Alaska Board of Registration for

Architects, Engineers, and Land Surveyors

Date: 06/18/2021