

STATE OF ALASKA

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

**Minutes of Meeting
August 6-7, 2015**

By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors held a meeting May 7-8, 2015 in Fairbanks, AK.

Thursday August 6, 2015

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Roll Call

9:00 a.m. The Chair called the meeting to order. Roll call, all present except Dave Hale who was excused by the Chair.

Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board:

- Colin Maynard, Civil Engineer, Structural Engineer, Chair
- Keith Walters, Mining Engineer, vice-Chair
- Kathleen Schedler, Mechanical Engineer, Secretary
- Brian Hanson, Civil Engineer, Mining Engineer
- Eric Eriksen, Electrical Engineer
- Richard Rearick, Architect
- Jeffrey Koonce, Architect
- Luanne Urfer, Landscape Architect
- John Kerr, Land Surveyor
- Donald (John) Christensen, Public Member

Representing the Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing were:

- Martha Hewlett, Administrative Officer II (Via Telephone)
- Sara Chambers, Operations Manager (via Telephone)
- Janey Hovenden, Director CBPL (Via Telephone)
- Vernon Jones, Executive Administrator.
- Sarena Hackenmiller, Licensing Examiner.
- John Savage, Investigator

Members of the Public present for portions of the meeting:

August 6th

- Joseph Notkin, Architect, representing AIA Alaska
- Dale Nelson, PE, representing APDC
- Drew Ruderman, representing himself
- David Shuck, representing himself
- Ellery Gibbs, representing himself

August 7th

- Joseph Notkin, Architect, representing AIA Alaska
- Matt Haynes, representing himself
- Danielle Dance representing herself
- Tom Moll, representing himself

Agenda item 2 - review and approve agenda.

Chair: Asks if there are any additions to the agenda?

Note: Jones passed our several additions prior to the meeting including an updated copy of the agenda.

On a motion duly made by Schedler, seconded by Walters and passed unanimously it was RESOLVED to accept the agenda as revised.

Agenda item 3 - ethics reporting.

Chair: Going to ethics reporting.

Rearick, Koonce and Jones all report having attended the NCARB Annual at NCARB's expense.

Maynard, Kerr and Hanson report having attended the NCEES Western Zone meeting at NCEES's expense.

Agenda item 4 – review and approve the May 2015 minutes.

Chair: Asks if everyone read the minutes.

Note: There were several spelling and grammar corrections that will be forwarded to Jones.

On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Walters and passed unanimously it was RESOLVED to approve the May 2015 minutes as amended.

Agenda item 6 – Regulation update.

Note: items A and B have been forwarded for review by the DOL and if approved on to the Lt. Governor's office for filing.

A short discussion reveals that item C, which would require a registrant to put the business name, physical address, phone number, project name or identification, project address/location and Certificate of Authorization of the company on plans, needed a motion to be approved for public notice by the Board.

On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Koonce and passed unanimously it was RESOLVED to public notice changes to 12 AAC 36.185 Use of Seals by adding new subparagraphs (g) and (h).

Agenda item 7 – Financial Report.

Note: It was decided to discuss this prior to the teleconference with the Division.

Chair: Draws attention to item B, Fee setting. He was expecting a proposal to review and comment on but the spread sheet recommends the same as the last two years. He points out that we eliminated a \$260K deficit and they are estimating we now have a \$650K excess. We took in \$900K more than we spent as Brian predicted.

Jones: Points out that at the last meeting the Board indicated they wanted to wait one more cycle before they changed the fees.

Discussion revealed that the consensus was that the fees need to be reduced a little to keep the overage under control. After the discussion with Division the Board will put the spread sheet on the screen and play with it to decide on the amount of reduction needed.

Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report.

Savage: How is everyone doing today. I don't have a whole lot today but just a few points I'd like to go across. One of the issues I think you're going to talk about later on in your meeting here and I just want to kind of give you a heads up is stamps. I'm seeing more and more people with just having their stamps with just their number and not their identifier on there as far as, you know, land surveyor or mechanical engineer or whatever. I don't know why, I hadn't seen that in years and all of a sudden I've seen quite a few of them. I don't know if people are doing that because they don't want to have two stamps or whatever and think we won't look up the number to see if this is the civil or the structural because you get a lot of people that are using one or the other, they don't really care which one they use. I just thought I'd bring that up to you.

The other thing is the turn-over in our office. We have another three positions we are trying to hire for right now so I'm going to go back watching those other boards while they are doing the hiring. Hopefully that will happen real soon.

Jones: Brings up stamps that have a letter after the number such as E or S to indicate engineer or surveyor. Some of the older engineers have stamps like that.

Savage: Thinks that individual was a dual licensee and he reverted back to that so he wouldn't have to change stamps.

Chair: Adds that if you are doing mechanical you need to use your mechanical stamp instead of your electrical stamp. We are not a single license state.

Jones: Notes that he put that under new business so they could decide if they were going to let people continue to use those old stamps.

Savage: Suggests maybe a newsletter or put it on the webpage.

Chair: We can put it in the APDC newsletter she's always looking for things of interest to put in there.

Savage: The other thing is the upcoming NCEES Annual Conference I'll be going and there are quite a few people in here, if they don't stop it because of travel funds. I look forward to that one because of the contacts we make down there. The LE people in other jurisdictions have helped us immensely over the years. So any of you, I know there have been some e-mails going back and forth, but any of you that can go in there and get some face time with an of those guys, you know, it can't hurt so I just thought I'd throw that out there.

The other thing is, you guys can talk about it and I know Vern usually sends a boiler plate email but I'd like to do a specific invitation to the Fire Marshall's Office so everyone here, you know we've got a lot of new faces on the board, so everyone here can meet the players over there and see what they do for us. They are absolutely instrumental in a lot of our enforcement efforts especially with our limited resources having those eyes and ears out there with all their deferred jurisdictions they are coordinating with. A lot of times the deferred jurisdiction will call the Fire Marshal when they see that something isn't kosher and they will direct the people to me or they'll call me and say hey, we've got some one down in Valdez that's doing this with a set of drawings and you want to give them a call or whatever. Diana Parks is the supervisor there for the plan review area and I think it'd be good to get her in here again.

Does anyone have any questions of me?

Kerr: Asks if those cases of unlicensed practice on the report are mostly from out of state companies.

Savage: You know it all depends on the time. I'm going to revert back to what I've said the last few years. Our commercial side of the house is so much healthier than other states. There are a lot of individuals coming up here and they figure, let's see how long we can get away with it, oh I didn't know I need a whole other license, yeah sure you didn't. But it's about 50/50 you know you'll get people that let theirs lapse. We've come across some that have been lapsed for a couple of years. How that happens, I don't understand, both in and out of Alaska. The guys that are in Alaska that only work in Alaska they've got three licenses to worry about. Those guys that do come up here and seal the work, they're boiler plate type places. They're licensed in 50 states and you know they have a hard time keeping up with all those licenses and subsequently they are doing work and their stuff is lapsed or they've sealed it, a lot of these box stores, that's what we see a lot of too, the Box store will come up here and their work is coming from Louisiana, you know, their site plan is Shreveport Louisiana and here they are building it in Anchorage and none of the snow load and arctic type stuff has even been looked at. We are getting a lot of them but there's a lot more still out there and that's why places like the Fire Marshal's Office and the Department of Labor, those electrical inspectors and mechanical, plumbing inspectors, we have a really good rapport with them, if they're out there on a commercial job and they don't have any drawings or they have drawings that look suspect they'll pick up the phone and call us. That's another group of guys, their boss Al Nagel is in charge of all the mechanical inspections. He'd be another guy to have in here to get some face time with the Board and let you know how they go about turning over stuff to us. There's a lot of places out there who feel that that exemption change, that number 7 in our laws, there's still a lot, to include the Fire Marshal, you know well it wasn't a big job so we let them stamp it with the mechanical administrator's number or the electrical administrator's number we're always re-schooling these people especially in the outlying areas, the outlying jurisdictions. Under no circumstances can these guys seal their drawing with their EA and MA number that doesn't cut it. It has to be a licensed design professional in all the appropriate categories. So, with that change having not been that long ago some people realistically did realize the change took place but others are just continuing to do it because it's the cheaper way to do it.

Several board members suggested inviting the building officials to meetings at intervals when personnel changes happen.

The phone started alarming so the Chair indicated a short break.

9:40 – 9:50 Break for phone service.

Hanson: Asks if there is any increase in repeat offenders and are we actively searching for violations.

Mr. Notkin checks in via phone.

Savage: We're always active as far as hitting job sites and things like that and I need to get back on the rhythm I used to be on and hopefully we'll get to that point. As far as repeat offenders we do have a group of individuals that seem to be, you know, sometimes it's month after month, sometimes it's a couple of years and the same names and companies seem to be cropping up and that's something that the Board when it comes across will have to look at accordingly.

Hanson: But as an investigator you're not going out looking for people to bust, it's usually the Fire Marshall bringing stuff to you?

Savage: When you say go out and actively look. I still stop at job sites and pull the plans and look and I have found things that way. Unlicensed individual, a lot of it has to be checked once I get back to the office. Unlicensed individuals, not dating the stamp, corporate authorizations, and things like that. But no, I'm absolutely not going out targeting specific individuals and or firms at all.

Kerr: Asks if he has identified areas where we can proactively educate people stave off some common infractions.

Savage: You know because I don't really know the percentage of the number of violations I have, you don't actually ever know if these were individuals that were willing to take the risk of a fine and subsequently weren't licensed or weren't this or that. I think the newsletter and the web site are huge, I really do. You're going to capture a captive audience that's trying to find out what is expected of me, you know, legally what I have to do if I want to practice in Alaska. Those types of things, I think that's huge and we've done that over the years and it seems to help. You start seeing it subsiding and running cases on a specific offence we always seem to zero in on that and then it subsides dated stamp, that took forever for people to grab hold of that. And that being said I think in this, with the nature of things right with the price of oil and all that we're going to have to be looking at ways as a Board to handle these situations as opposed to AG's office or things like that, that are going to be spending monies that the State don't have.

Chair: Thanks John, keep up the good work.

Let's go to number 9A.

Hanson: Asks to talk about item 7 a bit more. He had been working on the numbers and thinks that a reduction to \$175 for a license fee would reduce it enough because we will end up 4 or 500K in the black this year.

Chair: Then after a while at \$175 maybe we would go down to \$150. We will talk about and set our recommendation after we hear the financial report.

Agenda item 9 – Board Correspondence received since May 2015.

Chair: Ok, CLARB:

Urfer: Explains that CLARB has been looking at the colleges to try to increase licensure. They found that a lot of the students didn't have any information on licensure or had incorrect information. They tried having a board meeting at the campus but few students attended however, holding a class produced good attendance. They found that that was also successful with engineers. They also found that a lot of times landscape architecture was coupled with architecture and the focus was on architecture and the LA students still didn't find out what they needed to do. They also track the number of students that get licensed and found that about 90% get licensed through CLARB and also get certified by CLARB. Only about 17% of the States had a requirement for experience prior to registration.

Rearick: Reported on the NCARB section. He points out that these are all the BOD and COA briefs and reports from NCARB. A lot of the information in them is repeated throughout the documents and some of it was discussed at the Annual Conference and he'll hold that stuff until tomorrow during Conference reports. There are a few things that he wanted to bring to the Board's attention.

As of July 21, 2015 the new IDP requirements came into play which required 3740 total hours in 17 experience areas which is a reduction in the total hours that was required. What they did was eliminate the elective hours.

The BOD of NCARB is in talks with the Architect Accreditation Council of Australia and the New Zealand Architect Registration Board regarding the feasibility of the mutual recognition of architects.

The Board also voted to propose modifications the NCARB Education Standard to align the Education Standard with the NAAB student performance criteria and is done on a regular basis.

9 b 4 the Board created a Task Force to basically look at the term Intern Architect and tried to decide if that should be used or another term should be used. They concluded that the term architect should be restricted to those who have obtained a license and recommended that the term intern and derivative terms be discontinued. They are going to remove the term intern out of all their Model Law and rename the Intern Development Program. Which is in line with our determination that intern architect does really exist although

we do have guidelines that allow use of the term so that's something we may want to revisit.

9 b 6 NCARB recently initiated a program to remind certificate holders that reminds them of upcoming license expiration dates. They caution that it's only as accurate as the information the certificate holder puts in.

9 b 8 concerns IDP experience that was obtained more than 5 years past. They are looking for Member Board recommendations. He will review the lengthy document that is attached in more detail and since we will not meet again within the time limit he will submit the recommendation he would have to the Chair and if no objection he would go ahead and respond. He doesn't disagree with finding a way to recognize past experience. The biggest problem he has is how to certify it.

He runs through several of the emails with just a brief one liner on what they are about.

9 b 13 He explains the broadly experienced intern proposal which would allow someone to get licensed upon graduation. They solicited all the universities to submit proposals. It would be an alternate path which he believes will be more difficult. He is generally in favor of this. They are again requesting Member Board input.

Those he skipped will be discussed under item 20.

Hanson: Highlights the NCEES correspondence. He asks who is going to the meeting in two weeks (Hanson, Maynard, Kerr, Jones, and Savage). This is from the February BOD meeting. The exam update on page two, surveying continues its downward trend. It's been 15% over the last couple of years. The projection for the FE for the end of the year is 40K vs 50K that's a 20% reduction. The PS exam in CBT is going to be \$300 instead of \$350.

He thumbs through the correspondence and just states what they covered. He announces that Marquette won the engineering award. Later in the correspondence there is a proposal for the surveyors to have an award.

He goes over the motions on the consent agenda. He isn't sure if we need a motion to support or not support anything. He asks everyone to read through all of them if they haven't and provide feedback tomorrow. He emphasizes the two motions on the future of surveying and states his support of them.

Kerr: Explains the motions on the future of surveying to the Board (he is on the Task Force).

There was a short discussion on NCEES financial reserves and the things they are spending it on such as funding the emerging engineers and surveyors group to the annual meeting.

This discussion was followed by a discussion on surveying programs in and out of Alaska. It was pointed out that there are fewer states that have a program than those that don't.

He talks briefly about a motion to require an active license to be appointed to an exam committee which would remove retired appointees.

10:25 – 1036 Break

Placed call to Sara's office for the Financial Report.

Chambers: We have some things we wanted to discuss with you. Are you ready for us to move ahead or are there things on your agenda to discuss with us first?

Chair: No, you can go ahead and we'll have questions I'm sure.

Chambers: Excellent, thank you, again for the record this is Sara Chambers, Operations Manager and with me is Janey Hovenden the Division Director and we have a couple of items that we want to cover and we'll try to keep them as efficient as possible the first being the fee analysis for the year. I want to make sure that each of you have in front of you a print out of the excel spread sheet that was sent to you, was it yesterday morning? There was a spread sheet that was sent to you by Vern and you should have a print out at the top left it says Board of AELS and it has the date and then fee type, current fee schedule as proposed by the board and so forth, does everybody have a copy of that?

Board: Yes we have.

Chambers: And did any of you have time to play with the excel document?

Chair: Sort of.

Chambers: Ok, we'll talk a little bit about that. I first want to go over the layout of this document and make sure that everybody is on the same page regarding what it means and what the data pertains to. It's fairly intuitive but we've done several of these using this new tool now and I don't want to take for granted that you all are as comfortable with it as I am. So, first we'll just go over what you're looking at. On the left hand side is a column that says fee types and there are about 15 different fees that are charged through the program that are listed there. Those are the fees that are in regulation. To the right is a section called current fee schedule. So under the current fee schedule you have information that is accurate as of today. So you have your current fees listed, this is what you charge right now. You have the projected units which are based on last year's statistical analysis. We're still closing up FY15 so this uses FY14 and projects it forward. And then what the revenue would be if those units, those numbers of applications fees, number of new architects, number of renewed architects and so forth all paid the fee analysis listed. On line 21 and 22 at the bottom of that fee type section there are two items that are not AELS specific necessarily that I want to make sure that you key on. The first is centralized fees, does everyone see that? The estimated centralized fees are the fees that are in regulation across all professional licensing programs. They are some of the nickel and dime fees for things like a wall certificate, a duplicate license, verification of licensure some of the \$5, \$25 fees that are common to everyone but those revenues do go back to your board. So we've done a rough estimate of 1% of your revenue is receipted by those fees so that's the \$22,984. And just under that is what I've termed the investigative offset. And that's sort of a fancy way of saying we are now able to receipt your fine revenue into your program and not have to forward them on to the general fund. So, thank you State Legislature this is a change for FY16 so starting July 1 fines that are part of your enforcement effort will be able to be receipted back to your program and based on the fines that were actually collected we're anticipating \$27,500. We want to be careful that we are not really calling it or becoming comfortable with fines as a revenue stream because that then creates an ethical problem for the Board and we want to make sure that we are above board in not viewing fines as a way to pad the coffers as it were. It's meant to offset some of the investigative costs of enforcement and also to have a punitive effect. So let me stop and see if there are any questions about centralized fees and investigative offset or that current fee schedule section.

Hanson: Asks if there will be a travel offset or is that already figured in the expenses for the 3rd party reimbursements.

Chambers: Thanks Brian that's a good question. It's not necessarily represented here because it is fairly minor and it does change from year to year. I think that's a really good piece to keep in mind though and we can, before finalizing fees we would do well to look back at the last two years, I think, that we've had that authority for reimbursement and just make sure that if there is a meaningful number that the program has been reimbursed. There is no need to account for any direct booking because it's not an expense. But the reimbursement would be a travel expense so that's a good point and Janey is making notes.

So the next two sections are very similar in fact. It's a copy and paste of the current fee schedule but it gives an opportunity too, in the blank column, click on the column and add in what that revenue would look like if you adjusted the fees up or down. So if you take, for instance, column E fee adjustments and row 7 application fees and you clicked your mouse there and say you put in \$50 then the fee with recommended

adjustment would become \$150 the projected revenue after adjustment would then look like \$379,500 and the percent change would look like 150%. So you could go up or down if you wanted to increase or decrease fees. Play with it and see what those fees would look like. The Division is the same way in the next section to the right so your printout has the same, no fee adjustments and this gives us a chance to look at for the record what does the Board propose and what does the Division propose and we can go back and forth and compare the two if there is a big difference between what the Board wants to see and what the Division wants to see we can illustrate how it impacts your bottom line in the section below and here's how we can accomplish the same overall revenue goal by putting different numbers in in different places and putting them in the most appropriate place for the reason that the fee would be charged. So if any of you were able to work with the excel document hopefully you were playing with that fee adjustment column and when we finish the overview we can start looking at some of the recommendations that some of you may have.

So to the right there is an adjustment column that may be where we want to put in a travel reimbursement section but we put in the prorated fees, the estimate for prorated fees because people who buy their first license within a year of renewal get a 50% discount on their renewal and so we have adjusted for that. So we're adding little opportunities to tweak and refine, and again this is a new tool we've only been using it since this summer so any of your suggestions for improving it are absolutely welcome.

Moving on to the right this is just a place holder so we can put in the FY14 specifics and once FY15 is out we can update those. At the bottom underneath the section we just went over is where the rubber meets the road so to speak. We got the section that links to the Board's proposal and a section that links to the Division's proposal and again we can reset the excel, where the excel points to whether it's the Division or Board and have a side by side comparison. Right now they should look exactly the same because we haven't given you a proposal to change and the Board hasn't settled on one. So as you can see here, let's just take, starting at B 30 calculation based on Board proposal based on FY12-13 actuals we have a spot just for trending visual purposes to see what was going on in 12 and 13 those are not linked to anything. FY14 and 15 take into consideration actual FY14 closed, reconciled numbers and then our best estimate on FY15 considering that those numbers will not be available, as you know, until October reconcile closeout of the fiscal year. We are still in re-appropriation so we are in that period of time I like to call radio silence like the space shuttle reentering, you don't hear for a while from them. You're just kind of hanging on to know that the astronauts are still alive and then everything crackles to life and everyone's excited and splash down and history is forever altered so we have that opportunity in October when we have all of those fiscal year numbers and you all will get your closed fiscal year. Shortly thereafter you'll get your first quarter, you'll have your very comprehensive six year reports. We are planning on publishing another report like we did last November that goes into indirect allocation methodology and so forth. So we will get there but right now we are in radio silence. So we've used FY15 we've used some projections, we looked back at FY13 and we've also looked at the 3rd quarter actuals for the program and we also have pulled a revenue report that looks at what your actual revenues were in the last quarter. Again they're not reconciled in the accounting system but if someone paid us something it's reflected there. So this is what our hypothesis is that you will end the biennium with the column in C and you see that we've also put in an expectation that things in life are not going to start costing less but may actually going to be costing more. So we factored in a 2% expense increase to be conservative and that's tied to the Anchorage Consumer Price Index. It's just a way to remind us that we need to be conservative in the analysis so the Board doesn't get underwater and you're certainly not in danger of that right now. So the projections are (unintelligible) there on this page. The projection is that although your expenses may go up slightly due to CPI if everything else stays the same that you will be looking at quite a bit of surplus over the next renewal cycles.

So one more point and then I'll turn it back over to questions. One more point is the law AS 08.01.065 the fee setting law that is centralized, all of our professional licensing programs requires us together as a Board and Division to consider fees that will result in revenue that is approximately what your expenditures are. The term approximate is a very subjective term, very loosely interpreted and what we've discussed, Janey and I together as well as I've been involved with over the last several legislative sessions and with the meeting with the Boards and Legislators and Legislative Budget and Audit is that there are many unknowns. We don't know what crazy investigation is going to happen, who's going to appeal a Board decision, whether

a Board decision will be appealed all the way to the State Supreme Court as we see sometimes, changes in law that may have unknown or unintended consequences on Licensing Examiner time. So there are a lot of things that we don't know when we are trying to use the past to predict the future. So we'd like to not approach this as a zero balance, but as a like a zero sum fiscal year but to look at keeping some surplus in you program for those unknowns. Much like a responsible business has a percentage set aside to make sure that they are covering all of their costs and unknowns. So again, you all are in a good position to do that and where you want to go this year, this analysis from here is the next phase in our discussion. We will be doing this fee analysis every year. We'll use this tool or a refined version of it and we will plan to have this conversation at some point every year to make sure that we are all on the same page with fees and that we are making adjustments appropriately. So with that let me ask again are there any questions at this point about the general document?

Chair: I don't see any. We'll play with this later in the meeting.

Chambers: Oh good, ok. Well Janey let me turn it over to you and see if there are any forecasts for a Division recommendation or what you're seeing as far as what you may want to propose for fees.

Hovenden: When I discussed this with Vern he indicated that the Board was not interested in entertaining changes the fees but in looking at this you may entertain that to reduce that surplus. You have room there and maybe come up with a comfortable surplus at the end of the 16-17 renewal cycle. We would be interested in whatever you would want to recommend. If you could do that in a formal motion and Vern could bring that back to us. It you would play with this a little bit later in the meeting and bring a decision to us in the morning.

Chair: I think the consensus of the Board is we don't want wildly changing fees that go way up, way down. So we want to kind of lower it gradually, I think that's the direction we're going to head, Brian you wanted to say something?

Hanson: We discussed this a little bit earlier and the Division actually set all of our fees last time and they were completely accepted across the board I believe, by the Board which has resulted in a \$700K surplus at the projected rate.

Jones: Actually the Board recommended an increase in the corporate fees.

Hanson: Yeah the corporate fees are actually \$60K a year. So a couple of the corporate licenses the Board proposed an increase. So we essentially followed the Division recommendation to arrive at where we are at, which is good, we're in a surplus situation.

Hovenden: It looks like there was a deficit leading up to this and this was probably the chance to get out of that deficit and that makes sense and now would be the time to really to analyze and decide where you want to go from here now that you are projected to be out of a deficit at the end of this period.

Hanson: So a couple comments on this spreadsheet if I might. The adjustments column has, you know, I believe all of those for the new architects should be split in half. Right now we have in that column 395 architects, we don't even license that many new, I'm sure a number just got plugged in but it would seem appropriate for each of the new architects, surveyors, landscape architects, all of the new should be half of the uh, the projected units should be half of the number because we're just assuming half of them so your revenue loss, negative number is going to change there. Maybe significantly but not that much so I think that's the first correction.

Chambers: So Brian if we could just, that is a cumulative, it's listed on the architects line but in order to keep Vern's sanity as he was heading into a Board meeting we did take all of the actual from the last two years of those who received a prorated benefit batched them all into one line according to what their fees that they paid was. It comes down to it should be labeled better corporate and not corporate. There's the corporate and then there's everybody who's not corporate so I think we've represented accurate numbers but we have

not represented it at that granular lever that would make it very intuitive and so you're not able to see it from the way it's printed on this page.

Hanson: Ok so when I added it up half it was like 600 vs 395 so it was a question for me as to whether it included all of those.

Chambers: It does and those are pulled from actual from the last renewal. So it's only an estimate of what will happen in the future but it's based on real numbers and incorporates all of those license types. We will work to refine that in the future so it is more intuitive and obvious.

Hanson: Secondly we've kind of discussed the fee setting as a Board and I'm not speaking on behalf of the Board right now but we're kind of looking at \$175 as a number to kind of start with for all of the \$250 fees as a starting point. So the fee adjustment would be a negative \$75 for new architects through renewed engineers. And none of us have our computers in front of us so I'm wondering if maybe could kind of punch those numbers in and maybe email us so we could look at those numbers and have a discussion about that and make a formal motion.

Chair: Suggests that they could take his laptop and put the spreadsheet on the screen and play with it tomorrow morning.

Chambers: I'm working on that right now plugging it in and making those changes. So we've got a reduction of \$75 in all of those individuals that are set at \$250 and then we've got, are you making any recommendations for corporate certification?

Hanson: Not at this point.

Chambers: So what we're seeing as we drop those down to \$175 is that your projected ending FY17 would be \$1.2M. Just over \$1.2M. and that would come up at that will be 39 instead of being 1.903 it would be 1.257.

Hanson: Which is still fairly significant.

Chair: Yeah, so we may want to tack a little more, but we'll play with that when we get to it and see what we come up with.

Chambers: Yes, that would be great and we will look at this again next year which is more aggressive of a review cycle than we've done in the past and so you could look at, and that would take into consideration a fee change for all new and renewed. So if you came out of the meeting with a recommendation then we would look at that again next year after you've gone through the renewal and see if there were any changes that maybe would necessitate further changes. And those fees could be adjusted again next year or we could hold that thought and see what the following year right before your next renewal looked like and then change them again. So you've plenty of time to fine tune it but you want to make sure that we are setting the renewal fee at the point that makes the most sense for this renewal.

Schedler: This is Kathleen and we really weren't in favor of changing it every year.

Chambers: Well that's certainly something that we do want to receive in the form of a motion before you adjourn this meeting at the end of your time together is to receive a recommendation by the Board in the form of a motion to say that the specific fees that you recommend being raised or lowered or that you wish to keep these the same to then we'll be able to take that feedback and plug in those numbers, take any other points into consideration and then go out to public comment next week with what the Divisions proposal is. If there are no changes recommended by the Board and if Director Hovenden determines that no changes are needed then there will be no changes proposed and we can go ahead and prepare to have renewal available in early October. If there is a regulations project needed it will be the highest priority to get that out but it will push the renewal availability out until the end of October which is still plenty of time they'll still have

two months to renew but we would have to have those fees changed and effective in order to receive the new fee.

Chair: My general impression is there will be a change from the \$250 to something, we're just not sure what it is yet. So when are you planning on sending that out for public comment, next week?

Chambers: We'd like to send it out as soon as possible. We'd like you to have as much opportunity to renew and that Vern and Sarena have as much opportunity to process those renewals as possible. So if we could get your motion when Vern comes back to the office on Monday then he can provide us with your written motion, Janey and I can talk about it and then advise our regulations specialist of what the recommendation is for public comment and get it out by the end of the week would be ideal.

Chair: That would be perfect, Brian you had something?

Hanson: Sara, another question on, I guess, the surplus. You said there's no hard and fast number for that. Right now we're going to end with \$600K give or take with surplus this year. Do you think the Division would continue to support a surplus to that magnitude or is it something they're going to want to see us eat up?

Chambers: Well it's been my experience working with 21 licensing boards for the last four years. Looking at this as a zero sum game is not at all advisable and having some sort of a cushion to accommodate any of those unknowns, I think, that neither the Board nor the Division can control. Whether it's an increase in expense, whether it's the Department of Law decides that they want to increase their rates, whether investigation costs increase. For this program size of revenues and expenses a \$650K surplus looks really comfortable and is a good thing in my mind. Pushing it toward \$2M is clearly going to be enough to weather any storm. I would say that would be quite a bit of a surplus. My rule of thumb is completely just my opinion is that a Board that has a lot of potential for unknown activity and especially a smaller Board which would be a Board with fewer licensees, not necessarily this program, should really look at having one year's expenses as a surplus if they're expecting a lot of changes and want to have a cushion in place. So you have a lot of room to play with but I wouldn't want to play with it too much because licensees typically don't want a yo-yo in their fees. If the fees increase too much this year then we get into a situation you had not too long ago where cut them to make them happy and then we had to increase to make up for an aggressive cut and then everyone's unhappy.

Chair: Yeah, I think we understand that part.

Hanson: We've made that comment before. That's where I was leaning, is a year's budget an appropriate level of cushion. It sounds like for the smaller board you are saying yes, I would argue that for the bigger boards it's a yes as well. Especially our Board there's a potential, uh, the unknown expenses out there if we ended up with something that did go all the way to the Supreme Court that's a half million dollar range of expense. And it wouldn't be unheard of for a \$200K expense on a legal action. So I don't see us as having \$750K to a million, that million might be on the high side but that sort of cushion I think would be appropriate for our Board especially what I know is happening right now in investigations side of things. So I guess we'll look at it.

Chambers: Well typically, I just pulled up the Annual Report that we provide to Boards and to the Legislature in November of every year. We have two reports and this is the one that really takes a seven year look back and include a breakout of investigation expenses. So looking at the last seven years the high annual investigative expense is about \$144K with a biennial expense being anywhere from \$100K to \$225K. So talking about a surplus of a few \$100K to weather an unanticipated or unknown investigative cost and that may be paying investigative time, paying legal expenses, paying attorney time, paying for administrative hearings, I'm in complete agreement with you that that's absolutely within the realm of possibility and would be an advisable amount of surplus to keep in hand. You know, you all understand very well, like we said a yo-yo is not appreciated by anyone. Maintaining artificially high license fees is not what licensees want and I don't think that is what the law provides. But treating this like a business, where we can, is advisable given what the market factors are that we can't control. So I know there's more thought you all need to give to it so

we're certainly available if you have further questions and we would appreciate that Board motion sometime before you adjourn and then Vern can bring that back on Monday so we can move quickly if there is a regulations project.

Hanson: Has the Division, I know in our spread sheet it's blank, but has the Division looked at numbers for our Board yet and kind of have a proposal?

Chambers: We've talked about it as Janey mentioned she and Vernon talked a little bit about and I think that with this program, it may be appropriate to recommend a modest reduction. It may also be appropriate if you want to go ahead and go into the renewal cycle as early as possible to have that available to keep fees the same and then look at them again next year. But it's really more of a preference than a requirement. These are hypotheses based on the information we have and certainly no increase is needed. You could either stay the same or we could modestly reduce fees. Your fees are not in the great scheme of what they could be at \$250 for two years license is not terrible. We have Midwives are paying \$2K for the privilege of being licensed two years. Some of this will be the Board's preference because you know your licensees and you know what level of risk you're willing to take. So that's kind of a long answer but those are some of the factors. Because you're in a deficit and will not be in a deficit given the information we know it really is more of a preference on how we want to manage the level of licensing fees and forecast for this conversation next year.

Hanson: My question though was have you guys come up with any numbers yet?

Chambers: We haven't, we're still wrestling with those topics and this is where your expertise will be very meaningful in order for us to make a final determination. We have no strong feelings either way other than fees should not be increased.

Hanson: Ok, thank you.

Chair: So, I guess we'll go on to the other issues. We've got five listed here, I guess. The third quarter report is the first one.

Chambers: My understanding is that you had already gone over your third quarter report.

Chair: Asks the Board if there are any questions. So then next is budget on travel.

Chambers: Well we are working through our FY16 budget as you all know it was quite delayed by the Legislators. We haven't had the same amount of time that we normally do to pick through the budget. What we are looking at is a decrease in spending authority by June of a couple hundred thousand dollars from the Legislature so we have less spending authority than we did last year. We are, our number one priority as you all well know from budget conversations in years past is to pay our debts. So we like to make payroll as our number one priority with everything else falling behind that. We have had to, because of the Legislature cutting some of our personal services authority we are looking at a tight year. We are not at this time forecasting any meaningful cuts to travel at this point. This Board in particular I well know and understand how important travel is to you especially because you have several different licensing types, different professions and different needs to attend more conferences engaged at a National level than perhaps some of our other programs do because of the nature of how you're structured statutorily. So we have no anticipated cuts although we are going to kind of keep the belt tight and as we see the budget playing out over the next couple of months we'll be articulating, communication with the Board Members of all boards if we see any changes that are needed. Fortunately the ability to have the reimbursement for travel expenses come back to the Board was a huge plus for many boards including your own and the ability for us to take advantage of direct booking that last summer Commissioner Bell gave permission for us to do that was another big win to make travel more reasonable, business wise, for our programs. So that's some of the color and context to our budget right now. The bottom line is that we have no proposed cuts to travel or reductions in travel and I'm going through, right now, all of the Annual Reports for travel requests that were submitted. So once we get all of those finalized from our boards then that'll give us a better sense of how

we need to help boards manage their travel. Again we have high expectations for a lot of travel from your program. Your associations do offset some of those costs and if there is anything that needs to change we will let you know about it and discuss it with you.

Jones: Asks if there is still a \$20K cap on how much can go back to the boards.

Chambers: Yes, the Legislature did not change that last year.

Hanson: This is Brian again, sorry, you know anything we can do to support the travel and keep that up so notice in your report you did a 10% travel reduction which resulted in a \$75K decrease in travel expenses yet they did a \$150K increase on personnel services so the end game was the budget went up to 12 and a half million. Coming from the business owner side of things the big expenses are not in travel, commodities, capital, they are in people and the only way for the Division to get their stuff under control is to cut people or reduce the hiring of additional people. That's your number one expense because you are an overhead type of organization. So, I just, if you need our support on travel we'll write whatever letters we can and I share the people concern there, it's overhead so we'll continue to pay our share I guess.

Chambers: Yes, absolutely, I think one of the pluses with some of the advances that we were able to make last year in travel, the two that I mentioned in particular. We have at least one board, the Board of Nursing, that probably is the only board that travels more than this one and their travel is almost all paid for by their National Association. So before we had the direct booking opportunity the Board of Nursing was really a major player in competing for the \$20K offset as well as travel dollars. But because their National Associations book all the travel for the people that they want to come, they submit a travel request, we look at it, we approve it then it's booked by their National Association so it's not an expense to their board and it's not a hit to that expenditure authority. So that helped you in that way because that expense went away. Because the budget is delivered to us at the component level and the component is the Division level not individual boards we do have to shift things around to make it work for all of our programs, all 43 programs and then also Business Licensing and Corporations. So we had three new licensing programs delivered to us last year by the Legislature, a substantial increase to one program where they added another license type essentially and they did not give us any additional personnel to either license or enforcement programs. So in order to maintain the statutory requirement to do what licensing and enforcement responsibilities that are in the Statute we had to get more creative in finding personnel to do those things and now we're looking for a way to pay them so there may not be personnel changes on the forecast for AELS but the overall budget is affected and your ability to recommend spending in certain areas is affected because the Legislature does not fund each of our boards separately, they fund the Division and we have to move those things around to make it all work. So there is a lot going on that the Board Members may not be fully aware of but we just came out of a meeting where we're looking at ways to address that. We're looking at whether we can pass the red faced test with a supplemental request in this budget climate where we did see certain reductions and where we also have had the need to add additional staff just to maintain reliability in several of our programs. And your offer to be an advocate is certainly not lost on me. I think you've been a strong advocate in the past which has been very successful in getting the ear of Legislators which was certainly informative in my seven meetings with Legislative Budget and Audit last summer and we continue to take those loud and clear messages from our boards and carry them forward to meetings with our Commissioner, our Deputy Commissioner and ultimately in our budget and with Legislators. So there's a little bit more color and context with the budget there and an appreciation for all the excellent communication that you've provided to us about your priorities so that we can try to make sure you get all the resources that you need.

Chair: Asks if there are any other questions and hearing none thanks Sara and Janey for their time.

Hovenden: I look forward to getting your recommendation on the fees so we can get those out.

Koonce: Asks about the \$20K maximum.

Jones: Explains that the Legislature has authorized up to \$20K to be returned to the Division for Board travel from third party reimbursements. That's \$20K for all the Boards not just us.

There was a short discussion and explanation of direct booking vs. third party reimbursement. If direct booked a traveler would use the National Organizations travel agent to book air fare and hotel and it would be direct billed to the National Organization the only cost to the State would be meals and incidentals not provided by the National Organization. Third party reimbursement on the other requires the traveler to pay for all expenses and then request reimbursement. What would happen is that the State would reimburse the traveler and the National Organization would reimburse the State.

Chair: Thinks the direct book process is strange in that when the traveler arrives NCEES gives them a check for meals and incidentals not provided by them and the traveler has to sign it over to the State and the State reimburses the traveler. He doesn't need the check from NCEES or the reimbursement from the State because it didn't cost him anything.

Hanson: Points out that there's parking expense and ground travel etc.

Hanson: Asks if we can discuss the fee structure before we move on.

There was a discussion on when and how to do this.

Hanson: Asks if everyone agrees that for a year maybe \$700K to \$800K is an acceptable surplus or if we go on a biennium right now we are at \$650K. We could build that up a little bit and try to maintain that.

Rearick: Would be more comfortable with closer to \$1M.

Kerr: Points out that NCEES has to cover the cost of a compromised exam and asks if we need anything like that.

Jones: No.

Chair: Right now we're looking at something like \$1.6M a year in expenses. I don't know if we want to get up that high. I don't think we can sell that to the licensees, charging a much of extra money so we can have it sitting here in the State coffers.

Jones: Had the impression listening to Sara that they were thinking about maybe changing in the middle of the cycle next year.

Discussion revealed that some were against having a fee change in the middle of the cycle some didn't care one way or the other.

Kerr: Feels that if we have money there are other things we should be doing to promote licensure regarding education and outreach or maybe funding building officials to the meeting.

Chair: Thinks that would be a hard sell to the Division. We have a hard enough getting ourselves to meetings.

Hanson: Reads from the regulations: The board may make expenditures from appropriated funds for any purpose that's reasonably necessary for proper performance of its mission.

Chair: What we think is appropriate and what the Division thinks is appropriate may be two different things.

Kerr: Before we set fees I wanted to throw that out for people to be thinking about. We may have the opportunity to support our professions a little more.

Eriksen: Thinks if we set our fees on something like that we would have to have a plan and a budget. It would be totally arbitrary without that.

Discussion continued for a little while on how much surplus we should have and speculation on expenses for the next cycle. On whether we should have a large enough surplus that one expensive case would not deplete it. Point was made that once a buffer was established we should try to maintain it. Not to factor in too many what ifs. Try to error on the side of registrants. Point was made that registrants would probably not say much about small (\$25) changes up or down but don't like the large swings. It was decided that Hanson would work on it over lunch.

Schedler: Asks to hear from Sarena.

Hackenmiller: Points out that once we stop requiring FE/FS applicants to apply to the Board our revenue will from that will be reduced.

Conversation continued for a little bit with no new points.

Chair: 9 d, email from Sara about 3rd party reimbursements. If you're traveling out of state and you're going to get reimbursed by NCARB let the travel office do it for you. It doesn't apply to NCEES because we don't do it that way.

Hanson: Notes that that is only if you're representing the Board. If you are on committee work you are representing yourself.

Chair: 9e. Email about FE exam verification. So Arizona doesn't do verification of FE?

Jones: No they will only verify an FE if the individual went ahead and got licensed in Arizona. If they didn't get licensed in Arizona they don't care about them. This, I think, is against NCEES policy. I know we're supposed to maintain those records indefinitely.

Chair: A comment from Peter Giessel that there are not thousands of bridges there are only 1196. That's according to AASHTO.

Chair: Email from Jerry Mastin re telephonic meetings.

Jones: Points out that there is a cost associated with teleconferencing that they should consider if they want to make all meetings available via phone.

Schedler: I thought we traveled from location to location to give people the opportunity to see us face to face. So now we also want to give them the opportunity to listen?

Hanson: It is a public meeting and the transcripts are available to the public at any time. It's just another avenue for folks to become engaged. I support it every time we've offered it we've had a couple of individuals.

Jones: So far I haven't advertised it. It was only made available to those who requested it.

Hanson: But my point is that even with not advertising, now we're advertising it, we've had a couple people that have shown an interest in all or part of the meeting. It's part of being transparent and allowing people to engage.

Chair: In the announcement of the meeting we can say there is a call in number. Call Vern for the number we don't have to publish the number.

Chair: ok, letter from Jerry Carter re the SCOTUS decision which doesn't really apply to us because we are under the control of the State Government.

I. Is an NCSEA letter about ACCA motion number one asking us to support it.

J. is an email from Colleen Kautz re online searches. I had a little bit of a problem on this when they changed the search trying to figure out.....

Jones: Ok, on that, they changed the online label on that to say last name or entity. He explains that we don't use the DBA, the license is issued to the Corporation, LLC or LLP. He adds that putting the owner of a LLC or Corp in the search criteria will not produce results because the business is a separate entity from the owner which is why we require them to get a COA.

Chair: Adds that you have to be searching in the correct area, i.e. business licensing, corporations or individual. If you mix the criteria you won't get results.

Hanson: Adds that it makes it difficult and refers to Savage's problem with trying to find people.

Kerr: Adds that in order to get a list of licensees, which is the only you can addresses. Which address is often the only way to distinguish between those with the same name, you have to download every licensee in every program. You cannot say give me the AELS Board licensees.

A couple Board Members disagreed and thought you could go with license type.

Hackenmiller: Confirms that there is no way to download an excel worksheet of just AELS. You can see it but you can't export to excel. On the left hand side of the search there is a yellow bar that is a professional license download and it's every single program and every single licensee.

Jones: Will look into it when he returns to the office.

Kerr: You need to have access to addresses. If you need to find out who a registrant is and it's a common name you have nothing.

Hackenmiller: If you can find it in the professional download list then you just have to do a control F and it's supposed to be very user friendly.

Kerr: Adds that he has downloaded it and there are something like 14,000 registrants. You just have to have a good internet connection which you may not have in Kotzebue but that's those folks problem I guess. But then you get everybody, I'm comfortable in excel, I don't have problems sorting people out and mining data but not everybody may be comfortable doing that and if you have an older version of excel it won't take all the registrants because it exceed the maximum number.

Hackenmiller: Each time you find a surveyor or any professional they do have the actual city and state but you do have to go into details to see that so are you thinking maybe that when you search Miller last name like this you'd like the city and state to show up?

Kerr: It's just a lot less functional than it used to be. He explains that he was trying to research whether a new surveying company was license and the search criteria he was used to doing was not working. He was trying to find out who the owners were and it was showing that they weren't licensed which he knew was not the case. And there's no help function which would tell you what you need for a valid search.

Chair: Why don't we break for lunch. Be back here at 1:00pm.

11:55am Break for Lunch

1:16pm Back on record.

Roll call all present except Hale.

Chair: Public testimony. Is Joe Notkin on the line? Dale you want to come up and talk to us?

Mr. Nelson: Addressed the Board as the Chair of the Alaska Professional Design Council Legislative Liaison Committee. He noted that they would continue their work on QBS in the upcoming session and asked if the Board had anything that would be coming before them.

Chair: Mr. Maynard advised him that the Board is seeking a sponsor for another attempt to make the landscape architect seat a permanent voting position. He added that the Board is presently working with the Legislative Regulatory Committee (Senator McGuire and Representative Colver) on the FE and FS exams and doesn't know if that will require a Statute change or not.

Chair: Next is Drew Ruderman.

Mr. Ruderman stated that he just wanted to introduce himself to the Board and advised that he will be seeking licensure using the Mentorship Program. He works for Engineering Equipment Company here in Anchorage which serves many industries in Alaska. He makes 6 to 8 trips a year to the North Slope visiting various facilities. He has a degree in Mechanical Engineering from Montana State University and has passed the FE exam and taken the Cold Regions Course at the University of Washington in Seattle. He wanted to outline his plan for the Mentorship Program and make sure he was doing the right thing. He stated his plan and that he planned to take the PE exam in April of 2018.

Hanson: Asked why he chose the mentorship path.

Mr. Ruderman responded that while they do have PE's in their office he doesn't work directly under them.

Hanson: Asks if they are in your discipline?

Mr. Ruderman responds that he's an electrical PE.

Hanson: Expresses his appreciation that he came in to talk to the Board and commends him on seeking licensure and going through all the steps and invites him to come back and update the Board if he wants.

Chair: Next is David Shuck.

Mr. Shuck: Advises that he applied before the change in regulations and is working on his 2 year degree in land surveying. He indicates he is having trouble getting a licensed surveyor to sign off on his work experience and asks if there is any process to make individuals complete the verification forms. He has requested they be filled out and sent in numerous times with no results.

Schedler: Advises that it is up to the applicant to provide verification of experience and notes that we have had situations where the verifier passed away and the applicant had to find other means to verify their work. She tells him that it is his responsibility and encourages him to continue pursuing that.

Mr. Shuck acknowledges the advice and asks when he might hear about his status for the 2 year degree.

Hackenmiller: Responds that he will hear through the application process.

Chair: Ok Ellery Gibbs.

Mr. Gibbs is here for the same reason Mr. Chuck is. They know each other and are having the same problem getting work verifications signed off. He states that it is the same person that is not signing off on the work. He gave the forms to him in person and they are still sitting on the corner of his desk a year later. He knows what he needs to do and will continue to pursue it.

Schedler: Suggests that maybe they should stand there and wait for him to sign it.

Mr. Gibbs Wants to know if after a number of times with no results if there is a moment where a body of professionals can step in and tell this person they have responsibilities. He provided the individual with copies of the verification form and stamped, self-addressed envelopes. He was told that the individual needed time to check his files and make sure it was there. He is concerned that pushing might get adverse results and that maybe another group of professionals could let this individual know that he has to do this.

Kerr: Asks, how well do you know these Statutes and Regulations that you are getting ready to become licensed under? And if you know them well you know if that person is violating one of our Statutes or Regulations. And if you find that they are the board wants you to file a complaint if someone is violating our Statutes or Regulations. So you should know the Statutes and Regulations because that's where you're headed for work. So I think that you have the ability to get the answer to your own question.

Hanson: Advises that there are provisions within the Statutes that deal with ethics, ethical standards specifically that can be looked up. And just remembering that you're in control of your own destiny at that point and it's up to the individual to verify your work and determine what was professional, what was sub-professional and what's not professional at all. But there are provisions in the Statutes that you should probably review and take whatever action you feel is necessary to obtain certification.

Rearick: Adds that if there is another licensed professional that might be able to persuade him to submit your reference. The other thing is if they belong to a professional society the society may be able to make a suggestion to them. I see your situation and you don't want to be too forceful and force this guy to not want to do it at all. On the other hand if you can find some way to leverage the situation, have someone help you to move it along. We really don't have any authority to force them to do it. But there might be some ways to kind of nudge them.

Eriksen: Asks if they had any recent conversations, I mean has this person voiced any concerns or is it just a matter of priority?

Mr. Gibbs responds that it's almost a personality thing. Whether it's his personality or my personality, we work well together in ordinate subordinate position to a point but there was some clashing there. I did what I was supposed to do and I don't know that it's necessarily that there's something out against me. It's probably a matter of well it's not a critical thing, it's not important. So it just a matter of going back see what I should have done and then follow up with someone else that has his ear a little better. The attitude was that he's been busy and he knows that it's there he's got it on the corner of his desk he knows right where it's at and I know not only because of him saying so but others working with him have passed that on to me. If somebody says their busy and there's proper reasoning behind that but at the same time I don't believe that that is totally honest on his part. So from I'm hearing so far I know what needs to be done at this point.

Schedler: Asks if he has ever indicated that he wouldn't verify the responsible charge work and notes that that is his prerogative. That it's his decision.

Mr. Gibbs responds that he hasn't in so many words but he gets an attitude that it might be that way.

Jones: Points out that there is a box on the form that asks if this individual is recommended for licensure so you've got to be careful .

Hanson: Advises that there was another instance where an engineer refused to sign and the applicant was able to find another avenue so no complaint was filed but if a complaint might have gone further than "it's your decision to not fill this out" there is an ethical obligation promote the HSW of the public and that includes licensing individuals that should be licensed. If they have concerns they should put them on the form but just to out and out refuse isn't right.

Schedler: Shares a situation she was put in where she was told that she would fill out a verification for

someone who had not worked for her and that she wrote a letter saying that she had not seen this individuals work and could not complete the form. And that is where her feeling that it is the obligation of the engineer to fill out the form truthfully.

Mr. Gibbs thanks the Board for their information and candor and states that he does have other surveyors that would back him up on the work experience. He notes that this is well over 5 years of experience and that his application cannot go forward without this verification.

Chair: We don't have anyone else presently so let's go back to item 10. A. is a memo from him to the Legislative Regulation Review Committee that he hasn't been able to deliver yet since they postponed the meeting.

Phone rings and Joe Notkins is back in the meeting.

Chair: Welcomes Mr. Notkins and advises him he is next to testify.

Mr. Notkins: My name is Joseph Notkins and I'm an Alaska registered architect. He is chair of the Alaska chapter of the AIA. He acknowledges the Board for being proactive with Fire Marshall and Building Officials and the public on matters of Health Welfare and Life Safety in design and construction. He has fielded numerous calls from various Building Officials regarding advice on whether an architects stamp is needed and he always refers them to the Statutes and the ASLS Board.

These calls have yielded some interesting discoveries. First, there is a general understanding among the design professionals of the exceptions in AS 08.48.331. Second, some building officials are unaware of the existence of the Guidance Manual which is posted on the Board's webpage and available to the general public. Third, some Building Officials are unaware that it is within their authority to require additional design professionals under the IBC section 107, the Administrative Procedures. It gives authority to require all the necessary disciplines to provide design for life safety issues on any given project on a case by case basis. The public always asks where this is required and he believes that the IBC section 107 and AS 08.48.331 is the answer. The Fire Marshall is aware of point number three and is acting appropriately to require all the needed design professionals.

This leads me to my point in requesting that the AELS Board become more active in educating the public and contractors in particular. The public is not privy to the contents of the Guidance Manual, the exceptions in the Statute or section 107 of the IBC. He understands that ignorance of the law is not a legal defense but it's unfortunate when a home owner or business owner's plans are rejected when applying for plan review. Some people rely on a contractor's promise that they can get the work done for a certain price then encounter unexpected delays and higher costs to get their project permitted and constructed with respect to life safety building codes.

Under our current rules in Alaska many contractors take plans in for plan review that don't include the necessary design professionals preparing the construction documents and some of the drawings are prepared by unlicensed persons. He recently saw a good example when the Fire Marshall refused to review a set of plans until additional design documents were prepared by an architect in addition to the engineers drawings submitted by the contractor. This facility had significant life safety issues because the owner had relied on a design/build contractor to provide all design and construction services and has encountered costly delays. He asked why this is not clearly communicated to the public.

Given that Alaskans are generally not in favor of more regulation I would encourage the Board to seek ways to inform contractors and the general public that they should consult with the Fire Marshall or local Building Official before proceeding with planning or design on a project.

So this may be the start of a public information project by you folks. I'll take any questions that you have and leave this in your very capable hands.

Rearick: Notes that Mr. Notkin is very well represented and makes good points however it's sometimes very difficult to inform design professionals let alone the general public who don't even understand what architecture is but there is an awareness that needs to be communicated.

Mr. Notkin adds that in this case the individual was not a contractor or design professional and wanted to know why there wasn't any information at the counter. He doesn't know what the answer is but wants the Board to consider this a communications issue. He adds that it's really sad when someone has already done the construction and the gets in a world of hurt. He encourages the Board to do whatever is necessary to make the public, the contractors and Building Officials aware of the issues.

Chair: Thanks Mr. Notkin and returns to item 10. He goes through the sent correspondence with a brief description of each.

Agenda item 11 – Old Business

Item A was regarding the AKLS exam and Staff's desire to be able to administer the exam on demand instead of once a year. There is push-back from the surveyor community concerning whether or not defensibility of the exam would be compromised so this is on hold for the present.

Hanson: Suggests that we could administer the exam at any time at any place within the State but that it would only be scored once a year. He noted that presently the number of examinees barely cover the cost of the exam.

Note: We presently charge \$200 to take the exam and we pay Test, Inc. \$10K a year to hold an exam workshop once a year and to score the exam. Each additional administration would be an additional \$3500 to produce an exam and score it.

Maynard voiced concern that the questions could be remembered and compromise the exam if it was given multiple times.

Kerr: Noted that the reason for giving the exam more often benefited those companies from out of state more than those in state and questioned whether or not the public of Alaska is best served by providing the exam more often.

Hanson: Suggests that we use the same method that NCEES uses to determine if there are enough candidates to justify two exams a year.

Kerr: Thinks the scenario where it can be taken anytime but only scored once a year is feasible. He asks if anyone know of other states that offer it multiple times a year.

Maynard asks Jones to put that question to the other boards on Basecamp.

Item B is the Annual Report. Brought up a conversation on the roster and who is assigned to which seat.

Hanson: Mentions that before we move off the discussion on the roster we should remind those whose terms end in March that now is the time to request reappointment or if you are termed out, suggest a replacement. He suggests that if you are looking for reappointment to let the Chair know. It was noted that if you are ending your time on the Board you serve until someone is appointed to your seat.

Item C. Is the Western Zone meeting in Anchorage.

Hanson: Asks that we come back to this later.

Item D. is decoupling education and experience.

Maynard: Notes 7 states allow applicants to take the exam without any experience and another 8 are planning to make the change.

Item E. MRA between Canada and NCARB.

Rearick: Passes out a handout outlining the agreement that NCARB has already accepted (40 states have already signed on) and they are just trying to garner our support of the agreement. He goes on to explain the agreement. Short version is that the Canadian system of licensing architects while different than ours is similar enough to be acceptable for reciprocity. He would be comfortable signing on the agreement and would like to discuss it.

Chair: Asks for a motion.

On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Koonce and passed unanimously it was RESOLVED that the AELS Board would enter into the Mutual Recognition Agreement between the National Council of Architect Registration Boards and the Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities.

Koonce: Feels that it makes perfect sense. Even though on the engineering side there are many differences it should not keep the architectural side from working closely with the Canadians.

Kerr: Asks what the rationale is of those Boards who don't sign on.

Rearick: Some can't sign on because of their State Statutes, New York will never sign on just because they are ornery they review every single application regardless of whether or not the applicant has an NCARB Certificate for comity and they want to retain that privilege. We accept the NCARB Certificate and not only accepted it but it was the sole way to get licensed for a number of years. By accepting the NCARB Certificate it's much easier to license somebody knowing that they have met the standard. He emphasized that NCARB did not take signing this lightly, that they did a lot of research and there was a lot of discussion at Regional and National meetings as well as committee meetings.

Eriksen: Asks if there is any particular need for this.

Rearick: Doesn't see any at present it just facilitates licensure is all.

Maynard: Remarks on the issue of mobility of engineering licensure with Canada and that if the engineers in Canada came up with a proposal where while they're not exactly the same but they are equivalent if you're licensed here and haven't had any complaints you could get licensed there he would have a lot less reservations about doing it. But as it stands they want to get accepted off of their system but we have to take their test.

Eriksen: Sees value in this type of cooperation but so far we haven't been to make any headway with the engineers.

Rearick: Thinks the main difference is in the exams. A lot of Canadians choose to take the ARE so they can get licensed in any state. He notes that there are a lot fewer Canadian architects than American architects. He believes it's more beneficial to American architects than the Canadians.

Hanson: Asks if this only applies to comity applicants.

Rearick: Responds that it does only apply to comity applicant and that he forgot to mention that there is a requirement that a person be licensed in his home jurisdiction for one year prior to applying for comity.

Maynard: Notes that their exam is on the codes where the engineer's exam is on jurisprudence.

Hanson: Points out that we can already license Canadian architects with our present regulations.

Conversation continued for a few minutes on the criteria for licensure in Canada and Alaska.

Hanson: Believes that this should go into Board Policy as well as the minutes.

Chair: Asks for a motion to go into Executive Session.

On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it was RESOLVED to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(3) to review applicant files.

Staff (Hackenmiller and Jones) remained in the room.

2:05p.m. Off Record.

5:00p.m. Recessed for the day.

Friday May 8, 2015

9:00a.m. On Record, Roll Call, all present except Hale and Schedler who were both excused by the Chair. Schedler had to leave due to a family emergency.

Chair: We will start with item 11 C. Brian you want to give us a status report?

Hanson: Reports that planning for the 2016 Zone meeting in Anchorage has not started yet but will after the Annual conference. The Alaska Board will be expected to help with finding venues, gift bags, and guest speakers for luncheons, planning a dinner event that should be kind of a fun thing. In Scottsdale they had a casino night. We need to come up with ideas for those. NCEES does all the contract negotiations. The meeting will be at the Marriott so if we pick a place down town it should be walkable or we need to provide transportation. There is also a daytime event for guests that aren't attending the business meeting.

Discussion continued on possible excursions and entertainment events and the timing of the planning. Maynard will chair the committee. Hanson, Kerr and Hackenmiller will participate in the planning. The Western Zone will be the only participants.

Hanson explained that at the Scottsdale meeting the Arizona Board needed help so the Zone funded Sarena to help out because the next meeting would be in Anchorage and this would be good experience for her. He adds that everybody was extremely happy with Sarena. He got nothing but complements on her not only from the leadership but from individuals as well.

Agenda Item 17 – New Business

Item a. Stamping changes done by the original design professional.

Several Board Members explained how their company handles it. In an effort to make sure everyone was on the same page the Chair asks that Savage be asked to come down and participate in the discussion. He asked Savage what he wants to see and he replies that typically they re-stamp but he will enforce whatever the board decides they want to see. It was decided that it's the responsibility of the professional to maintain control of those changes and that they could reissue the sheet with a new stamp and the new date in the stamp or modify the sheet without changing the stamp but putting the date in the revision block.

Item b. Stamps that have a letter after the number.

The issue is that Savage is seeing stamps that have a letter after the number (example 3145 E). These are from some of the older professionals and Jones asks if they need to be told to bring their stamp up to the

present requirements. It was decided that Jones would put a notice on the webpage, Board list serve and ask APDC to put it in their newsletter that stamps should have the two letter branch designation and the number. They don't have to remove the E or S after the number but need to put the branch of engineering before the number. It was also clarified that an individual with two stamps such as a civil and structural could stamp drawings with his civil stamp if it contained both branches of engineering. The same would be true of controls done by an electrical or mechanical.

There was some discussion on a regulation project to change the picture in the regulations to more closely conform to what the Board intended. It was decided that the regulations said substantially similar and that they should just write in the two letter designation in front of the number and not have to remove the E.

Note: Joe Notkin called in to listen to the meeting.

Item c. Out of State Disaster Architects.

Koonce has been looking into disaster preparedness and within the Municipality of Anchorage there is no way to capture the expertise of the local expertise community to assess facilities in the event of a major event. The Department of Military and Veteran Affairs and Homeland Security would take over. He was looking at a class put on by the National Council of Structural Engineers and was looking to get in touch with Homeland Security to see if local expertise could be utilized.

Chair: Adds that the Department of Military and Veteran Affairs for the State have been doing training in this area and has for several years. He went through it about a year and a half ago. He had contacted the Muni Building Safety Department and they had planned to bring up some people from California but so far nothing has happened.

Koonce adds that his partner is on the transition team with the new mayor and they are working on moving this forward and he wonders if we should include something at the State level.

Maynard suggests that the Board could send the Building Safety Division a letter informing them that we understand that in the event of an emergency their plan is to bring a bunch of engineers and architects from out of State who may or may not be licensed in the State to do assessments of buildings. They cannot do that in the State unless they are licensed here.

Koonce pointed out that if they are brought in by FEMA and Homeland Security they wouldn't need a state license.

Discussion points out that with hurricane Katrina people are still dealing with shoddy architecture and there is story after story of that of what a disaster that was for New Orleans and that they are still suffering from the effects of the shoddy work. It was pointed out there is no emergency licensing statute in the Centralized Statutes but there probably should be something that includes all Boards. Discussion continued on who the letter should be sent to. Point was made that the State has its act together it's the City of Anchorage that doesn't. Maynard will write the letter. It was asked why we would want to try to force the City of Anchorage to have a plan.

Christensen points out that all cities have a FEMA plan and then reads verbiage from the State of Washington and suggests we use something similar.

Hanson agrees with the Muni that there are not enough people and they would have to bring in outside professionals. He likes having provisions for a disaster.

Chair asks Koonce to research the possibility of a regulation project to address this.

Item d. Arctic Engineering Requirement Evaluation.

Chair asked for this to be put on the agenda because several branches, naval architects and marine engineers, chemical and ceramic engineers, have pointed out that the courses have nothing to do with what they do. He asks if the Board thinks we should check with the societies of these branches and see if they want to come up with something that is more in line with what they do. Another issue is are the courses still the same, i.e. same professor, same syllabus. Do we want to have a review every 5 or 10 years or every time they change professors. He asks the Board if they think we need to do something or if it's fine the way it is.

Rearick brings up the naval architect that applied a few meetings ago who submitted some other studies that he did that was more in line with his profession and the Board accepted and suggests that maybe the way to go would be to have those branches bring some studies to the Board that they think are more appropriate for their discipline and comprehensive. It would be very difficult to broadly start approving courses specific to those disciplines. It would be too many for us to manage.

Hanson agrees and brings up a course that was presented to the Board for approval a few years ago that was not sufficient and was rejected. The Regulation says Board approved or equivalent so it's up to us to determine if it is equivalent. He thinks this would be a good time to review them. He doesn't know if they have ever been reviewed.

Chair explains that the Northern Design Course was temporarily approved for a couple of years and then went back for approval. This was over 10 years ago and all but one of the lectures is different. The syllabus has not changed significantly but he thinks that anytime the instructor or syllabus changes it should be reapproved by the Board.

Rearick thinks it's a good idea.

Chair: Asks how to go about this. Should we request a syllabus from all the courses and the instructors Bio?

Several members voiced agreement. Hanson pointed out that there are 8 courses and we should review all of them. And document it in the Board Policies and History.

Item e. Changes in the Licensing Program and Procedures.

Sarena and Vernon explain the good and the bad with the new system. They explain that the old licenses were moved over as AELR or X or C or whatever the one letter designation for that license was and there is no way we can change that. After a few weeks we decided to inactivate the AELR (old comity applicant) and AELX (old exam applicant) licenses and reenter with a new number. They explain that mail is now being scanned and delivered electronically. Eventually all the license files will be scanned and everything will be electronic. After scanning all the paper goes to archives. Presently Sarena is printing everything and making a file for board review and once approved that file will be destroyed. The Board is concerned about the quality of the scan (transcripts are really bad) and the number of steps in the whole process. Scanning the documents into an electronic file, printing the documents to take to the Board for review and then reentering the result of the review and destroying copy the board reviewed. The Board does 1250 reviews a year and feels they should voice their concerns and should have some say in the process. The Board agrees that we have to come into the 21st Century because everything is going electronic. But they should have the tools to do so whether it's a tablet or whatever. The Board is advised that in September the Division is undergoing

renovation and everyone will be in temporary spaces for a few weeks. Some of the functions like entering an exam are labor intensive.

Chair: Restates the process just explained and then asks how to find the original document if needed. Once told how it can be retrieved he adds that going into 45 boxes to get all the original documents for a specific file makes no sense at all.

Item f. Fee Changes.

Chair puts the spread sheet up on the screen. The Board feels that a reduction is called for because of the amount of surplus we now have. They discussed the amount of surplus desired and that litigation was the biggest threat to it. They discussed the fees one by one and decided on how much to reduce them. Some of the members felt that any reductions should benefit individuals and opposed reducing corporate fees. It was pointed out that the Board Review fee only applies to comity applications and examination files require more work than comity files, also that if an application is withdrawn everything except the application fee is refundable. The discussion resulted in the following motion.

On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it was RESOLVED to recommend the Division adopt the proposed Board licensing fees.

10:50 – 11:00 Break

Agenda item 18 – Special Committees

Licensure Implementation Committee.

Hanson passed out a proposed regulation change introducing structural engineering as a secondary license. This involves changes to several regulations and includes a grandfathering clause and a new stamp.

Maynard notes the removal of off shore facilities and suggests a change to bridges from total to clear span.

Hanson wants to change 12 AAC 36.185 to read drawings, surveys, reports and required construction documents.

It was brought up that we should have a motion on the floor prior to discussion. Chair pointed out that doing it that way would require an amendment to the motion every time a change was made. So this way we can work out the language and then make a motion. It was pointed out that we have a motion last meeting to create a regulation project so this is a follow-up to that.

It was decided to add the word engineering before surveys. Discussion went back to the span length and Hanson explained that with a clear span you could have a bridge that was a mile long with a pier every 199 feet and never have a structural engineer involved. It was decided to change span to total length. Pier's refers to docks and not bridges. This regulation is most closely aligned with the Washington model. It's a little different but not much. Koonce will look over the definition concerning hazardous materials and come up with language for that. Jones points out that on page 8 where you deleted activities that regulation was written to ensure that where a branch involves more than one discipline an individual can always practice what they have been practicing without getting an additional license. Law was afraid that when the Board brought in the additional branches that you were going to start excluding people where there was a dual practice like civil and environmental or civil and structural or whatever.

Hanson replies that that is the reason he put that in there so we could have the discussion. Because this is taking things away things from civil engineers that they have been able to do under 36.205.

Maynard suggests that we revise the definition of civil engineering to say structural other than significant structures.

Hanson reads the definition of design of minor importance in the Statute and explains that he chose design of minor importance because it allows you to do anything that is incidental to your discipline. It was a comment we received, I throw it out there for discussion. Maybe changing the definition of civil is the better way to go.

Maynard: Is hesitant to change 205 because environmental engineers could say civils can't do this because we have an environmental license now. Or control systems could say electricals can no longer do that.

It was decided to change the definition of civil engineering by changing it to read fixed works other than significant structures.

Koonce suggests that we use the Oregon verbiage regarding hazardous materials.

All of the stamps say Registered Professional Engineer. The proposed addition would be a stamp that says Registered Structural Engineer. Instead of putting No. in the stamp put SE (number).

They recap the changes on page 4 instead of "No." put "SE (number) on page 5 right after drawings it's going to be "drawings, engineering surveys, reports and required construction documents" and then see last page for changes to, those are gone we will not be making those. So on 43 a. it will be quantities of toxic or explosive. On page 7 f bridges having a total length of more than 200 feet. Then the definition of civil engineering we are going to add after construction of fixed works "other than significant structures".

The chair asks for a motion.

On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Eriksen and passed with Maynard abstaining it was RESOLVED to public notice changes to 12 AAC 36.063, 12 AAC 36.108, 12 AAC 36.180, 12 AAC 36.185 and 12 AAC 36.990 regarding structural engineering.

Chapter 36. State Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers, and Land Surveyors.

(Words in boldface and underlined indicate language being added; words [CAPITALIZED ANDBRACKETED] indicate language being deleted. Complete new sections are not underlined.)

The introductory language of 12 AAC 36.063(a) is amended to read:

(a) To be eligible for a professional engineering examination **other than the structural engineering examination**, an applicant must

12 AAC 36.063 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

(k) To be eligible for the structural engineering examination, an applicant must

(1) be currently licensed as a professional engineer in this state; and

(2) have at least two years of progressive structural experience, in addition to the eight years of education and work experience or both that are equivalent to the requirement's set out in the applicable table of education and work experience requirements for a professional engineering examination in this section. (Eff. 9/30/78, Register 67; am 6/12/80, Register 90; am 8/13/87, Register 103; am 6/3/89, Register 110; am 3/16/96, Register 137; am 7/26/97, Register 143; am 8/26/98, Register 147; am 1/20/99, Register 152; am 8/8/2001, Register 157; am 6/13/2003, Register 166; am 7/22/2004, Register 171; am 9/11/2004, Register 171; am

10/29/2009, Registered 192; am ___/___/_____, Register ___)

Authority: AS 08.48.101 AS 08.48.171 AS 08.48.181

12 AAC 36 is amended by adding a new section to read:

12 AAC 36.108. Application for registration as a structural engineer. (a) A person who holds a current certificate of registration as an engineer in the state on _____, l. ___ (fill in effective date of regulation) may apply under this section for a certificate of registration as a structural engineer by meeting the requirements of this section.

(b) An application for registration as a structural engineer under this section must be submitted on or before December 31, _____. (to be determined upon adoption)

(c) An applicant for structural engineering registration under this section must submit a

(1) typewritten application on a form prescribed by the board, including the references required under AS 08.48.201:

(2) the application and registration fees established in 12 AAC 02.110;

(3) verification that the applicant has, within the 120 months immediately before the date of the application, at least 24 months, of responsible charge experience in structural engineering;

(4) the plans or other documents required under (e) of this section; and

(5) the letters of reference required under (d) and (e) of this section.

(d) An applicant applying for structural engineering registration under this section must

provide two letters of reference verifying the applicant's responsible charge experience required under (c)(3) of this section. The letters of reference must meet the requirement of (f) and (g) of this section.

(e) An applicant applying for structural engineering registration under this section must provide complete plans or other documents of at least two completed significant structures, as defined in 12 AAC 36.990, demonstrating the engineering abilities of the applicant in structural engineering. The plans or other documents must be signed, sealed, and dated, and must include necessary calculations and other applicable supporting documents. The plans or other documents must have been dated within the 120 months immediately before the date of application for structural engineering registration under this section. The plans or other documents submitted under this subsection must be on a disk or thumb drive accompanied by a letter of reference for each project, attesting to the applicant's competence on the project. The letters of reference must meet the requirements of (f) and (g) of this section.

(f) Except as provided in (g) of this section, the letters of reference required under (d) and (e) of this section must be signed and sealed by an engineer who was registered as a professional engineer in a state, territory, or

possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, or a foreign country at the time of the responsible charge experience or when the plans or other documents were signed and sealed, and either
(1) was registered as a structural engineer; or

(2) if the licensing jurisdiction did not register structural engineers during the period of the experience or when the plans or other documents were signed and sealed, designed significant structures under another professional engineering license.

(g) If an engineer provides a reference letter under (d) or (e) of this section without a seal, the applicant must provide a statement from the engineer certifying that the engineer held a current registration as an engineer during the period of experience or when the plans or other documents were signed and sealed, and the engineer's state of registration, registration number, and branch of engineering.

(h) If requested by the board, the applicant must be available for an interview with the board.

(i) The board may consult subject matter experts in the branch of engineering for which the applicant seeks registration to assist the board in evaluating the application.

G) Nothing in this section prevent a registrant from applying under this chapter for a certificate of registration by examination or comity in structural engineering.

(k) To remain current, an additional certificate of registration issued under this section must be renewed as provided in AS 08.48.231.

(Eff. ___/___/___, Register _____) Authority: AS 08.48.10 I AS
08.48.20 I AS 08.48.231

12 AAC 36.180(b) is amended to read:

SE-STRUCTURAL ENGINEER

12 AAC 36.180 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

- a. The seal authorized for use by structural engineers is of the following design or a substantially similar electronic or digital representation of the design:



The seal must reflect the branch identification authorized by the board. This identification is to be placed below the registrant's name and preceding the registrant's number on the seal. (Eff. 5/12/31 Register 50; am 9/30/178, Register 67; am 10/20/90, Register 116; nm 11/11.3/99, Register 152; am V20/2002, Register 161; am 3/1/2012, Register 201; am __/__/__ ,. Register _____)

Authority: AS 08.48.101 AS 08.48.221

12 AAC 36.185 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

(i) Drawings, engineering surveys, reports and construction documents

regarding the structural systems of a significant structure, as defined in 12 AAC 36.990, must be sealed by a registered structural engineer. (Eff. 5/30/82, Register 82; am 8/29/87, Register 103; am 1/13/99, Register 152; am 6/13/2003, Register 166; am 6/11/2005, Register 174; am

7/13/20 Register 199; am __/__, Register __ Authority: AS 08.48.101

AS 08.48.111 AS 08.48.221

12 AAC 36.990(a)(4) is amended to read:

“construction of fixed works **other than significant structures**, for”

and by adding a new paragraph to read:

(43) "significant structure" means:

(A) hazardous facilities, defined as: structures housing, supporting, or containing sufficient quantities of toxic or explosive substance to be of danger to the safety of the public if released;

(B) special occupancy structures, defined as:

(i) building and other structures whose primary occupancy is public assembly with an occupant load greater than 300;

(ii) buildings and other structures containing elementary school, secondary school, or day care facility with an occupant load greater than 250;

(iii) buildings and other structures containing adult education facilities, such as colleges and universities with an occupant load greater than 500;

(iv)) medical facilities with 50 or more resident, incapacitated patients;

(v) Jails and detention facilities and

(vi) all buildings or structures with an occupant load greater than 5,000:

(C) essential facilities that have a ground area of more than four thousand square feet and are more than twenty feet in mean roof height above average ground

level; essential facilities are defined as

(i) hospitals and other medical facilities having surgery and emergency treatment areas;

(ii) fire and police stations;

(iii) tanks or other structures containing, housing, or supporting water or fire suppression material or equipment required for the protection of essential or hazardous facilities or special occupancy structures;

(iv) emergency vehicle shelters and garages;

(v) structures and equipment in emergency preparedness centers;

(vi) stand by power generating equipment for essential facilities; (vii) structures and equipment in government communication centers and other facilities requiring emergency response;

(viii) aviation control towers, air traffic control centers, and emergency aircraft hangars; and

(ix) buildings and other structures having critical national defense functions :

(D) structures exceeding one hundred feet in height above average ground level;

(E) buildings that are customarily occupied by human beings and are four stories. or 45 feet or more above average ground level;

(F) bridges having a total length of more than two hundred feet and piers having a surface area greater than ten thousand square feet and

(Eff .512317.J., Register 50; am 9/30/78, Register 67; am 6/29/84, Register 90; am 8/29/87. Register

103; am 10/20/90, Register 116; am 3/16/96, Register 137; um 7/26/97, Register 143;

am 8/26/98, Register 147; um 11/13/99, Register 152; am 3/9/2001, Register 157; am 11/26/2012,

Register 201; am 3/11/2012, Register 201; am __/__/_____. Register __)

Authority: AS 08.48.101 AS 08.48.181 AS 08.48331

AS 08.48.171 AS 08.48.191

1 Registration and Practice Committee.
2
3 Maynard reports that the FE/FS issue is still pending and he will try to schedule a meeting with
4 the Legislative Regulatory Committee and find out what we need to do before January.
5
6 Licensure Mobility
7
8 Rearick reports on the MRA with Canada.
9
10 Investigative Advisory Committee.
11
12 Several members report calls from the investigator.
13
14 Guidance Manual Committee.
15
16 Urfer gives a brief explanation of what she changed and will email a pdf to all for review and
17 discussion at the next meeting.
18
19 Hanson asks to go back to the motion and if it will be public noticed over more than one
20 meeting. Jones advised that right now the regulations specialist priority is for the regulations that
21 need to be out before renewals so this one may be delayed for a while. It was decided to plan on
22 public notice until February 10th with written and verbal comments accepted. Maynard adds that
23 we will be working with APDC to get the landscape architect position permanent.
24
25 Emeritus Status Committee.
26
27 Jones advises that presently we have Bo, Heieren and Baker.
28
29 Budget Committee.
30
31 This was discussed earlier with the fee setting.
32
33 Continuing Education Committee.
34
35 Staff will be handing the audit except for any questionable submissions which will be brought to
36 the Board.
37
38 IDP Liaison Committee.
39
40 Koonce reports on changes NCARB is working on regarding the move away from the word
41 ‘intern’.
42
43 Back to CE: Jones asks if he should continue to be lenient granting extensions for response
44 times due to the fact that a lot of people take their vacations in the winter. The Board decided
45 that we should be consistent and continue as we have been for those who request an extension.
46 If we don’t get any response after the first letter I will send a certified letter and if no response I

1 will turn it over to the paralegal. Kerr recommends that we instruct them to respond via certified
2 letter since mail doesn't come directly to Vern.

3
4 **Agenda item 19 – Board Travel.**

5
6 NCEES Annual: Maynard, Hanson, Kerr, Savage and Jones will be attending in Williamsburg
7 VA. Funded delegates are Maynard and Kerr. Eriksen, Walters and Hale were approved but had
8 to cancel due to conflicts.

9
10 CLARB: Urfer, Christensen and Jones will attend.

11
12
13 **Agenda item 20 – National Meeting Reports.**

14
15 Rearick talked yesterday about some of the discussions and just wanted to cover some of the
16 resolutions that were voted on. He talked about the revisions to the Broadly Experienced
17 Architect program in an effort to streamline the process and make it a lot less expensive for
18 those using the program to get their NCARB Certificate. He noted that there were several
19 amendments to the proposal and it ultimately failed but he senses that it will resurface in the
20 future. There was a similar resolution to streamline the Foreign Broadly Experienced Architect
21 program. This one passed. The next one was regarding the public member on the BOD which
22 was modified to allow public members of Boards and other members of the design community at
23 large to apply, it passed.

24
25 Jones added that he has been pushing the regional officers to ask the BOD to start a law
26 enforcement forum at the National Conference like NCEES does to see if we can get John
27 involved in the world of architecture.

28
29 Koonce talks about a presentation by the Law Firm that does investigations for the Florida
30 Board.

31
32 Western Zone Report:

33
34 Hanson reports that they went over all the motions that were introduced to be voted on at the
35 Annual Conference. He covers the elections and notes that next year's meeting will be in Alaska
36 and that 2017 will be in Colorado. It goes alphabetically and he thinks Guam is being skipped
37 and will do a combined with Hawaii. That's not approved yet but it's kind of the idea. Law
38 Enforcement talked about outcomes, what constitutes a complaint and reciprocal actions which
39 carried over to the engineering forum. There was discussion where a small violation carried over
40 into 17 other jurisdictions. Reciprocal actions are not consistent, some jurisdictions say a
41 violation in your state is a violation in ours and some don't. MBA forum discussed CBT testing.
42 PE forum talked about structural engineering, title vs a practice act. There is a move to
43 standardize CPC throughout all the jurisdictions and NCEES will offer a National Registry. It
44 boils down to if you are acceptable in your home state you should be acceptable everywhere.
45 And their minimum standard is higher than Alaska's. He feels we should continue to track this.

1 There are still a couple states that don't require CPC. 15 hours annually as well as an ethics
2 requirement is the trend.

3
4 Maynard explains that the registry is just a data base where you enter your CE and then when
5 needed you print out a report that hopefully will be acceptable to all Boards.

6
7 Kerr reports on the surveyor forum. There was discussion about State specific exams and CBT.
8 Most don't have the number of applicant to make it cost effective to go to CBT. In Utah all the
9 state boards use CBT and are on the same contract which keeps the individual board costs down.

10
11 Hanson adds that the last paper and pencil NCEES PS exam will be this coming April. After that
12 the NCEES PS exam will be offered in CBT format only.

13
14 Maynard was appointed to the UPLG committee and Kerr is on the Future of Surveying Task
15 Force, Hanson is on the EPE Committee. Rearick is on NCARB's Education Committee and the
16 NAAB Accreditation Pool.

17
18 **Agenda item 22 – Licensing Examiner Report.**

19
20 Jones states that the Annual Report will suffice for the examiner report as it has all the statistics
21 for the year.

22
23 Hackenmiller goes over the report for the Board and explains that we do not presently have the
24 ability to pull data to differentiate comity and exam applicants electronically. We would have to
25 go through the continuum manually.

26
27 **Agenda item 23 – To Do List.**

28
29 Maynard has the FS and FE hearing request. And will work on the Western Zone meeting. And
30 request syllabus and professor Bios for the arctic courses.

31
32 Vern respond to Channing Lillo about stamping changes. Transmit fee recommendations to the
33 Division. Note about how registrants should put their number on their stamps.

34
35 **Agenda item 24 – Read Applications into the Record.**

36
37 **On a motion duly made by Walters, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it was**
38 **RESOLVED to APPROVE the following list or applicants for registration by comity,**
39 **examination and in additional branches of engineering with the stipulation that the**
40 **information in the applicant's file will take precedence over the information in the**
41 **minutes:**

42
43 *The following subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*
44 *meanings:*

45 'FE': refers to the NCEES Fundamentals of Engineering Examination

46 'FS': refers to the Fundamentals of Surveying Examination

- 1 'PE': exam': refers to the NCEES Principals and Practice of Engineering Examination
- 2 'PS': exam: refers to the NCEES Principals and Practice of Surveying Examination
- 3 'AKLS': refers to the Alaska Land Surveyors Examination
- 4 The title of 'Professional' is understood to precede the designation of engineer,
- 5 surveyor, or architect.
- 6 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.
- 7 'Arctic course' denotes a Board-approved arctic engineering course
- 8

22-Jul	Booker, Aaron J.	Civil	Comity	Approved	APPROVED
31-Jul	Barnard, Geoffrey S.	Control Systems	Comity	Approved	APPROVED
29-Jul	Charpentier, Ethan A.	Structural	Comity	Approved	approved
22-Jul	Chiddix, Timothy L.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved	Approved
7-Jul	Fitzsimmons, Gavin	Structural	Comity	Approved	APPROVED
9-Jul	Garceau, Drew R.	Civil	Comity	Approved	approved
29-Jul	Gemmel, Michael	Civil	Comity	Approved	APPROVED
30-Jul	Haley, Byron	Civil	Comity	Approved	Approved
29-Jul	Hoffman, Jesse T.	Electrical	Comity	Approved	Approved
22-Jul	Jacobs, Christine S.	Civil	Comity	Approved	Approved
22-Jul	Kovalishyn, Valeriy	Mechanical	Comity	Approved	Approved
7-Jul	Mann, Jason Michael	Civil	Comity	Approved	APPROVED
23-Jun	Morgan, Michael	Mechanical	Comity	Approved	Approved
29-Jul	pardo, Carolina	Electrical	Comity	Incomplete	Approved
31-Jul	Parker, Marc	Civil	Comity	approved	APPROVED
30-Jul	Pierce, Linda M.	Civil	Comity	Approved	APPROVED
29-Jul	Pihlaja, Joseph A.	Civil	Comity	Approved	approved
7-Jul	Quissell, Brian A.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved	Approved
7-Jul	Reisdorff, Adrian D.	Environmental	Comity	Approved	approved
23-Jun	Rollins, Daniel	Mechanical	Comity	Approved	Approved
22-Jun	Sayed, Waleed	Civil	Comity	Approved	Approved
9-Jul	Scheffler, Ryan M.	Civil	Comity	Approved	Approved
9-Jul	Torre, Joelle Renee Perez	Civil	Comity	Approved	Approved
22-Jul	White, Carey H.	Structural	Comity	Approved	approved
31-Jul	Zhang, Yu	Civil	Comity	Approved	approved

The following applicants were approved for licensure pending completion of exams or other items.

31-Jul	Weiss, Andrew J.	Architect	ARE Exam	Approved	CA
31-Jul	Anderson, David L.	Architect	Comity	Approved	CA

		Landscape				CA
31-Jul	Baranko, Lucille	Architect	Exam	Approved		CA
31-Jul	Baril, Travis J.	Land Surveyor	Exam	Approved		CA
4-Aug	Barowsky, Jacob B.	Land Surveyor	Comity	Approved		CA
7-Jul	Bell, Ryan W.	Civil	Comity	Approved		CA
29-Jul	Bergeron, Alex John Paul	Mechanical	Exam	Approved		CA
22-Jul	Bergeron, Kali M.	Mechanical	Exam	Approved		CA
29-Jul	Betz, Joseph W.	Civil	Exam	Approved		CA
29-Jul	Bishop, Jerold A.	Civil	Comity	Approved		ca
22-Jul	Boardman, William	Mechanical	Exam	Approved		CA
23-Jun	Bonito, Douglas	Fire protection	Exam	Incomplete		CA
31-Jul	Boyer, Jessica	architect	comity	approved		CA
22-Jul	Bozek, Michael	Civil	Exam	Approved		CA
30-Jul	Bruns, Brendon John	Electrical	Exam	Incomplete		CA
30-Jul	Burdick, John Daniel	Petroleum	Exam	Approved		CA
29-Jul	Chan, Paul Myo Aung	Electrical	Comity	Approved		CA
4-Aug	Cullum, Stephen R.	Architect	Comity	Approved		CA
31-Jul	Ekstrand, Roland Nils	Civil	Comity	Approved		CA
31-Jul	Ernst, Louis L.	Architect	comity	Approved		CA
23-Jul	Fama, Nicholas P	Civil	Exam	Approved		CA
22-Jul	Fanning, Isadora L.	Civil	Comity	Approved		CA
31-Jul	Federle, Stephen N.	Electrical	Comity	Approved		CA
30-Jul	Gerges, Rafik	Structural	Comity	Approved		CA
22-Jul	Haakinson, David	Petroleum	Exam	Approved		CA
4-Aug	Haymes, Matthew	FE Exam	Exam	Approved		CA
30-Jul	Jones, Jeromy Jake	Civil	Exam	Approved		CA
30-Jul	Kerin, Elizabeth J.	Civil	Exam	Approved		CA
30-Jul	Klimas, David J.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved		CA
22-Jul	Kristanovich, Felix C.	Civil	Comity	Approved		CA
27-Jul	Labelle-Hamer, B. Tully	Electrical	Exam	Approved		CA
9-Jul	Lewis, Nathaniel B.	Mechanical	Exam	Approved		CA
	Limon, Anthony	Electrical	Exam	Approved		CA
23-Jul	Manuel, Michael H.	Civil	Exam	Approved		CA
31-Jul	McCourt, Ryan P.	Architect	ARE Exam	Approved		CA
9-Jul	Megee, Bradley W.	Electrical	Comity	Incomplete		CA
		Landscape				CA
31-Jul	Meyer, Dennis E.	Architect	Comity	Approved		CA
3-Aug	Moran, Nicholas J.	Civil	Exam	Approved		CA
30-Jul	Morris, Jessica Avalyn	Environmental	Exam	Approved		CA
29-Jul	Munisteri, Lucas	Petroleum	Comity	Approved		CA
21-Jul	Oldfield, John M.	Civil	Exam	Approved		CA
22-Jul	Packa, Benjamin J.	Mechanical	Exam	Approved		CA
30-Jul	Patil, Santosh	Petroleum	Exam	Approved		CA

29-Jul	Pause II, Stephen M.	Civil	Comity	Approved	CA
31-Jul	Plate, Stephanie Jo	Civil	Exam	Approved	CA
22-Jul	Rixse, Melvin G.	Petroleum	Exam	Approved	CA
3-Aug	Roth, Daniel K.	Civil	Comity	Approved	CA
30-Jul	Runa, Haley	Civil	Comity	Approved	CA
22-Jul	Ryder, Danielle L.	Civil	Exam	approved	CA
9-Jul	Schiller, Susan M.	Electrical	Comity	Approved	CA
9-Jul	Shaw, Justin M.	Civil	Comity	Approved	CA
30-Jul	Shippy, Joshua J.	Civil	Comity	Approved	CA
31-Jul	Sjostedt, Sean C.	Civil	Exam	Approved	CA
30-Jul	Smith, Dustin Leverett	Mechanical	Exam	Approved	CA
29-Jul	Sobolesky, Kevin W.	Electrical	Exam	Approved	CA
22-Jul	Suttie, Jamie Lee	Civil	Exam	Approved	CA
23-Jul	Tidd, Brent W.	Control Systems	Exam	Approved	CA
22-Jul	Titus, Matthew	Electrical	Exam	Approved	CA
	Tomlinson, Nels	Electrical	Exam	Approved	CA
30-Jul	Varney, Joshua William	Land Surveyor	Exams	Approved	CA
22-Jul	Weflen, Erik N.	Mechanical	Exam	Approved	CA
9-Jul	Williams, Heather R.	Civil	Exam	Approved	CA
29-Jul	Willis, Nolan J.	Electrical	Exam	Approved	CA
29-Jul	Zion, Brook Kay	Mechanical	Comity	Approved	CA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

On a motion duly made by Walters, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it was RESOLVED to find the following list of applicants for registration by comity, examination and in additional branches of engineering INCOMPLETE with the stipulation that the information in the applicant files will take precedence over the information in the minutes.

22-Jul	Barrett, Brian John	FS Exam	Exam	Approved	INCOMPLETE
31-Jul	Grey, Delenora May	Land Surveyor	Exam	Incomplete	INCOMPLETE
22-Jul	Kramer, Casey M.	Civil	Comity	Approved	INCOMPLETE
4-Aug	Shuck, David Brody	FS Exam	Exam	Incomplete	INCOMPLETE
30-Jul	Stepovich, Marko Xavier	Electrical	Exam	Approved	INCOMPLETE
31-Jul	Walsh, Donovan	Civil	Exam	Incomplete	INCOMPLETE

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

Agenda item 25 – Calendar of Events.

Chair: The next meeting is November 5-6, 2015 in Anchorage. February 10-11, 2016 in Juneau. May 5-6 or 12-13 in Fairbanks. After discussion it was decided to go with May 5-6, 2016 in Fairbanks. August 4-5 or 11-12 in Anchorage. After discussion August 4-5, 2016 was chosen. November 3-4, 2016 in Anchorage.

National meeting dates we have August 19-22 in Williamsburg and we have CLARB in New

1 Orleans in September.

2
3 **Agenda Item 26 – Board Member Comments.**

4
5
6 Eric thanked everyone for their professionalism and hard work.

7
8 Sarena voice her happiness at being with this Board and that it was a pleasure to help out
9 wherever she can. She is excited about the Western Zone meeting next year and hopes to very
10 involved.

11
12 Kerr is excited about the Western Zone meeting next year and hopes we can show those folks a
13 good time. He is distressed about our new document management system. There was a clear
14 lack of input by individuals that use the system.

15
16 Jones interjects that we were asked what we would like to see in the new system but didn't
17 realize that the good things from the old system would be dropped so we didn't ask for them.

18
19 Kerr adds that having been involved in a couple of document management system
20 developments it's clear to me that there were critical planning steps that were omitted.

21
22 Luann appreciates the input and asks everyone to take a look at the Guidance Manual and note
23 any changes that are needed.

24
25 Richard enjoyed being at the other end of the table. He is amazed at how we can discuss a
26 topic and come to different conclusions but at the end of the day we are still friends.

27
28 Jeff appreciates being on the Board and being to give back and thanks Sarena and Vern for
29 their efforts.

30
31 John enjoys working with the Board and the commonality in the professions.

32
33 Brian congratulates the new leadership, Colin, Keith and Kathleen. We have some exciting
34 changes coming and he hopes the regulations that were approved get signed soon. He looks
35 forward to some stimulating input on the structural regulations project. He notes that a lot of
36 people think we make decisions on 20 minutes of discussion but people put a lot of hours in
37 outside of the meeting preparing for it. He is excited for the Western Zone to be coming to
38 Alaska and states that Sarena has set the bar pretty darn high for folks helping out at meetings
39 and coordinating things and he appreciates those efforts. He appreciates that Vern was able to
40 push through her attendance at the Scottsdale meeting. He is glad to see the change in travel
41 approval from having to draw straws to see who gets to go to having most everyone who is able
42 to attend get approval. He is thinking of submitting a complaint with John Savage about our
43 new Chair's use of an architectural tie yesterday. (laughter).

44
45 Keith complements the Chair on a good job.

46
47 Vern explains that if travel was put in the Annual Report it most likely will be approved and for
48 those who are approved and have to cancel not to feel bad as that just saves a little money. He
49 asks those who don't want to save their board packets to leave them here and we can recycle
50 the binders.

1 Maynard comments on the improvements in travel and the way indirect expenses are done has
2 taken years but the results are good. He will try to get the Board Roster corrected so everyone
3 is in the proper seat.
4

5
6 Wall Certificates and the Minutes from the May meeting were signed and members were
7 instructed to email their receipts to Vern.
8

9 12:44 p.m. Meeting adjourned.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

Colin Maynard, PE, SE Chair
Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers and Land Surveyors

Date: _____