

1 **STATE OF ALASKA**
2 **DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**
3 **DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING**
4 **BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,**
5 **ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS**

6
7 **MINUTES OF MEETING**

8
9 **August 22-23, 2002**

Draft

10
11 ***These draft minutes were prepared by the staff of the***
12 ***Division of Occupational Licensing.***
13 ***They have not been reviewed or approved by the Board.***

14
15 By authority of AS 08.01.070 (2) and in compliance with the provision of AS
16 44.62, Article 6, the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land
17 Surveyors, (AELS) held a meeting at the Atwood Building, 550 W. 7th Ave.,
18 Conference Room 602, Anchorage, AK 99502
19

20 **Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Roll Call**

21
22 Robert Miller, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

23
24 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

25
26 Robert Miller, Chairperson, Ph.D., Civil Engineer
27 Daphne Brown, Architect
28 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member
29 Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer
30 Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor
31 Scott McLane, Land Surveyor
32 Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer
33 Ernie Siemoneit, Secretary, Mining Engineer
34

35 Absent were:

36 Marcia Davis, Public Member
37 Kathleen Gardner, Vice-Chairperson, Mechanical Engineer
38 Patricia Peirsol, Architect due to illness
39

40 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

41
42 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
43 Liz Long, Licensing Examiner
44

45 Joining a portion of the meeting, in person, on August 22, 2002 were:

46
47 Jim Steward
48 NANA Colt
49 700 G Street, 5th Floor

1 Anchorage, AK 99501

2
3 Craig Morrison
4 NANA Colt
5 700 G Street, 5th Floor
6 Anchorage, AK 99501
7

8 Bonnie Smith
9 19316 Trail Bay Drive
10 Eagle River, AK 99577
11

12 Darren Burks
13 7751 Lars Circle
14 Anchorage, AK 99518
15

16 Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing
17 David Brower, Assistant Attorney General
18

19 Daphne Brown was excused from 1:00 p.m. to approximately 2:00 p.m.
20

21 **Agenda Item 2 - Review/Revise Agenda:**

22 **TIME TOPIC LEAD PERSON**

24		
1. 9:00 a.m.	Call to Order/Roll Call	Chair
2. 9:05 a.m.	Review/Revise Agenda	Chair/Board
3. 9:15 a.m.	Ethics Report	Chair/Board
4. 9:30 a.m.	Review/Approve Minutes (Feb. 02 mtg)**corrected date	Chair/Board
5. 9:45 a.m.	Correspondence (a) Craig Morrison, letter of May 20, 2002, re: stamping (b) Todd Boucher, MBA Montana, letter of June 20, 2002 Proctor exams in Canada (c) Josef Silney & Assoc., letter of June 27, 2002, re: request to be added to foreign credential evaluation service list (d) Rodney Kinney email of July 8, 2002, re: similar business names (e) Darren Bucks email of 8/15/02, re industrial hygienist	Chair/Board
6. 10:00 a.m.	<u>Meet with Director, Catherine Reardon</u>	Chair/Director
7. 10:30 a.m.	Subgroup Breakout	Chair/Board
	a) Building Officials Handbook	
	b) Canadian Reciprocity	
	c) Work Experience Verifications Engineer; Land Surveyors; Other Verifications	
12:00 noon	Lunch	
8. 1:15 p.m.	Public Comment	Chair/Board
9. 3:00 p.m.	Application Reviews (Executive Session –until completed)	Chair/Board
4:00 p.m.	RECESS UNTIL 8:00 a.m. August 23, 2002	

2 **FRIDAY, August 23, 2002**

TIME	TOPIC	LEAD PERSON
10. 8:00 a.m.	Call to Order/Roll Call Executive Session to Complete Application Review -Continued, (if necessary)	Chair/Licensing Examiner/Board
11. 8:15 a.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigator's Report Discussion Items 	Investigator/Board John Clark
12. 9:00 a.m.	Budget Summary Report – Review Expenditures	Chair/Board
13. 10:00 a.m.	Meet with David Brower, Assistant Attorney General	Brower/Board
14. 11:00 a.m.	Executive Administrator Report	Exec. Adm./Board
15. 11:00 a.m.	Old Business:	Chair/Board
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outgoing Board member emeritus status 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encrypted Signatures Host Conference (WCARB) 	Peirsol/Board Chair/Board
12:00 noon	Lunch	
16. 1:00 p.m.	Old Business (Continued)	Chair/Board
17. 1:30p.m.	Goals and Objectives	Chair/Board
18. 2:15 p.m.	Proposed Regulation Changes	Chair/Board
	(a) Discussion and action on Engineering Disciplines (12 AAC 36.100) (b) Discussion on definition for "Environmental Engineering" (c) Draft Engineering Table correction-Engineering(12 AAC 36.063) Text dropped off during last revision in 1999 (d) Regulations public noticed 8/19/02 with comment period ending September 20, 2002.	Chair/Board
19. 3:15 p.m.	New Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Practice of Land Surveying – Boundary Surveys AKLS Contract E.I.T. Certificates (should we issue?) FY02 Annual Report Technology- Online Applications 	Chair/Board
20. 4:00 p.m.	Read Applications into Record	Licensing Examiner
21. 4:15 p.m.	Board Member Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subgroups NCARB Annual Conference (Boston) NCEES Annual Conference (LaJolla) AKLS workshop 	Chair/Board Brown McLane/Kalen McLane/Kalen
22. 4:30 p.m.	Review Calendar of Events/Confirm AELS Meeting Dates: (AELS: Nov. 14-15, 2002, Feb.25 -26, 2003; May 21-22, 2003, Aug. 21-22, 2003)	Chair/Board
23. 4:40 p.m.	Task List	Chair/Board

24. 4:45 p.m.	Housekeeping (Collect TA's and receipts, Sign Wall Certificates)	Board/Staff
---------------	---	-------------

1 Adjourn 5:00 p.m.

2
3 The Chair asked for revisions to the agenda, and revisions were made as
4 follows:

5
6 Items added under Subgroups:

7
8 Kalen asked to take up Land Surveyor Boundary during the Subgroup
9 breakout.

10 11 **Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Report**

12
13 The Chair noted there were no ethics reports or disclosures by Board members.

14 15 **Agenda Item 4 – Review/Approve Minutes**

16
17 The Chair asked for any corrections or additions to the May 2002 AELS draft
18 minutes.

19
20 Iverson noted that the agenda reflects approving February 2002 minutes and it
21 should be corrected to reflect May 2002 minutes.

22
23 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by McLane, and carried**
24 **unanimously, it was**

25
26 **RESOLVED to approve the May 16-17, 2002 AELS Board**
27 **meeting minutes with technical edits.**

28
29 The Chair noted that there were no objections and the minutes were approved
30 as corrected.

31 32 **Agenda Item 5 – Correspondence**

33
34 The Chair brought up the following correspondence:

35
36 (a) Craig Morrison, NANA Colt letter of May 20, 2002, re: stamping.

37
38 The Board held a lengthy discussion, during which Craig Morrison and Jim Steward joined the
39 meeting for a portion of the discussion. The Board discussed the letter at length.

40
41 The Chair will draft a letter of response, circulated to the Board answering the following
42 questions:

- 43
44 1. If the client does not require stamped drawings are we out of compliance with the law if we
45 do not stamp those drawings?

1 Response: Yes. The Board consensus was you would be out of compliance if you did not stamp
2 the drawing. AS 08.48.221 states that the parameters of the seal and final drawings require a
3 stamp.

4
5 Refer to AS 08.48.221, Seals that reads:

6
7 Each registrant may obtain a seal of the design authorized by the board, bearing the
8 registrant's name, registration number, and the legend, "Registered Professional
9 Architect," "Registered Professional Engineer," "Registered Professional Land
10 Surveyor," or "Registered Professional Landscape Architect," as appropriate. When a
11 registrant issues final drawings, specifications, surveys, plats, plates, reports, or similar
12 documents, the registrant shall sign the documents and stamp the documents with the
13 seal. The board shall adopt regulations governing the use of seals by the registrant. An
14 architect, engineer, land surveyor, or landscape architect may not affix
15 or permit a seal and signature to be affixed to an instrument after the expiration of a
16 certificate or for the purpose of aiding or abetting another person to evade or attempt to
17 evade a provision of this chapter. The registrant, by affixing the registrant's seal to final
18 drawings, specifications, surveys, plats, plates, reports, and other similar documents, and
19 signing them, certifies that these documents were prepared by or under the registrant's
20 direct supervision, unless the registrant certifies on the face of the document to the extent
21 of the registrant's responsibility.
22
23

24 2. Does the term "Public" include industrial facilities not normally accessible except by
25 employees and invited individuals?
26

27 The Chair noted the Board held a discussion of the "industrial exemption" under AS 08.48.241
28 (10), which reads:

29
30 10) an officer or employee of an individual, firm, partnership, association, utility,
31 corporation, limited liability company, or limited liability partnership, who practices
32 engineering involved in the operation of the employer's business only, and further
33 provided that neither the employee nor the employer offers engineering services to the
34 public; exclusions under this paragraph do not apply to buildings or structures whose
35 primary use is public occupancy;
36

37 Response: Yes.
38

39 The Board discussed the "public occupancy" exclusion from the industrial exemption of AS
40 08.48.241 (10), and decided that "public occupancy" includes employees if it is a shop that
41 conducts public business (for example, a muffler shop), and would include an oil company
42 administrative building that houses employees but would **not** include an outbuilding so long as
43 the building is not for use by the public.
44

45 The Chair recapped that the Board's interpretation was that an oil company employee would be
46 considered a direct employee. He noted that the "industrial exemption" could apply to the
47 employee of an oil company if the conditions of the exemption were met. The Board felt that
48 such a project would be considered an "in-house" project. In such cases the industrial exemption
49 would apply if the conditions in the statutory exemption were met (the employee practices
50 engineering involved in the operation of the employer's business only, and further provided that

1 neither the employee nor the employer offers engineering services to the public; exclusions
2 under this paragraph do not apply to buildings or structures whose primary use is public
3 occupancy). He reiterated that there seems to be some confusion about the “industrial
4 exemption”. The exemption does not extend to contractors, only to the company.

5
6 Response: The contractor for an oil company, such as NANA Colt, would be under contract and
7 consequently their employees would be contract employees. As a contract employee, the design
8 professional would have to stamp all of their work and the “industrial exemption” would not
9 apply.

10
11 3. Can any valid State (other than Alaska) PE be used on Federal Government projects (i.e. Fort
12 Richardson, Elmendorf AFB) without violating Alaska Law if designed in Alaska?

13
14 Response: Board will discuss this with David Brower, the assistant attorney general. Note: The
15 Board did discuss this with the attorney general and expects a response from him. The Board felt
16 that there is an exemption for federal employees under AS 08.48.331 (3), which reads:

17
18 3) an officer or employee of the United States government practicing architecture,
19 engineering, land surveying, or landscape architecture as required by the person's official
20 capacity;

21
22 Response: The Board would like clarification of their interpretation that the exemption does not
23 extend to contract employees of the federal government.

24
25 4. Is it necessary to have an Alaska PE stamp fire protection documents, if signed by a person
26 who holds an Alaska Division of Fire Prevention, Fire System Permit—Level ‘C’?

27
28 Response: The Board would refer applicants to the definitions of engineering under 12 AAC
29 36.990 for specific parameters. The Board felt that shop drawings don’t have to be stamped but
30 that a professional engineer must do the specifications and the review of any shop drawings.

31
32 5. I have enclosed a list of drawings that are in a typical design package. I respectfully ask for
33 clarification on which of these drawings and documents require the Alaska PE stamp.

34
35 Response: The Board prefers not to make blanket determinations regarding stamping because
36 there generally isn’t enough information provided and any omissions could result in
37 misinformation being provided.

38
39 Brown clarified that it is important to note that architectural work must be stamped and sealed by
40 an architect and not an engineer; and that typically construction documents are signed by a civil
41 engineer, structural engineering is stamped and sealed by a civil engineer.

42
43 The Chair indicated he would work on a response to Mr. Morrison, NANA Colt and would
44 circulate his response to the Board members prior to sending.

45
46
47 (b) Todd Boucher, MBA, Montana Member Board Administrator, letter of June 20, 2002,
48 re: Proctor exams in Canada
49

1 Iverson explained that the National Council of Examiners for Engineering Surveying (NCEES)
2 resolution to move forward to offer the NCEES exams through the professional associations in
3 Canada and passed at the August 2002 NCEES national conference.

4
5 (c) Josef Silney & Assoc., letter of June 27, 2002, re: request to be added to Foreign
6 credential evaluation service list

7
8 The Chair noted that Josef Silney & Associates, PO Box 248233, Coral Gables, FL 33124, is
9 on the University of Alaska list of International Transfer Credit Evaluation Information list.

10
11 The Chair explained that foreign degree evaluators were discussed at the NCEES annual
12 meeting. Some jurisdictions use Educational Credential Evaluators, Inc. (ECEI) exclusively
13 although the AELS Board has adopted the University of Alaska (UAA) listing of foreign
14 degree evaluators. Joseph Silney & Associates is currently on the UAA list.

15
16 Short discussion followed. Miller agreed to research with NCEES and the Accreditation Board
17 for Engineering and Technology, Inc. (ABET) to find out if they maintain a list of foreign degree
18 evaluators and have any preferences.

19
20 (d) Rodney Kinney email of July 8, 2002, re: similar business names.

21
22 The Board determined after a short discussion that this is a matter they do not have jurisdiction
23 over.

24
25 (e) Darren Bucks email of 8/15/02, re industrial hygienist

26
27 Cyra-Korsgaard explained that she was approached by a coworker who asked about the
28 definition of the draft “environmental engineering” definition that the Board was considering
29 because it included “industrial hygienist”. She stated that Darren Bucks responded with his
30 email question to the Board.

31
32 The Board held a short discussion and decided that industrial hygienists were not engineers and
33 that the definition for environmental engineering should not include them. The draft definition is
34 still currently under consideration.

35
36 Break: 10:05 a.m.

37
38 Reconvened: 10:15 a.m.

39
40 **Agenda Item 6 – Meet with Director**

41
42 The Chair announced that Catherine Reardon, Director, Occupational
43 Licensing, was next, and that the Board would move to Agenda Item 6.

44
45 Catherine Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing joined the meeting and
46 discussed continued Technology.

47
48 Reardon explained that she talked to data processing to discuss the possibility
49 of online enhancements. One phase could be a checklist to allow applicants
50 the ability to track the application and monitor the flow of documents in order
51 to assess the status of their application. Reardon envisioned that the applicant

1 would have a PIN to access their records. The data processing section felt this
2 could be accomplished in-house in their normal work, probably by next spring.
3 These enhancements would not require a special contract or additional funds.
4

5 Kalen rejoined the meeting at 10:10 a.m.

6
7 Discussion followed.
8

9 Reardon expressed concern about moving forward at this time with online
10 application using a digitized or electronic signature. Reardon felt that until the
11 State has dealt with this issue as a whole, and until the Board gets beyond the
12 need for a notarized signature it would likely be best to postpone this phase.
13 At that time, we could add the online submittal and scanning of documents.
14

15 Reardon indicated that legally digital signatures are acceptable but she isn't
16 aware that there is widespread use of this technology by agencies.
17

18 McLane suggested that once the digital signature issue is resolved, it could
19 extend to the work experience verifications as well.
20

21 Reardon noted that she communicated the Board's desire to have
22 reappointments done for the two outgoing members (after the May 2002
23 meeting). As far as Reardon knew no action had happened and it would be
24 pure conjecture to comment on what might happen on any reappointments
25 because of the impending election.
26

27 Brown asked if any funding would be available to host a reception at any of the
28 upcoming Host Meetings (WCARB 2003, Western Zone 2005 or NCEES meeting
29 2006).
30

31 Reardon indicated she would check with Economic Development Division. She
32 suggested the Board should develop the public policy statement to accompany
33 a request but she'd check to see if this would be feasible and what the process
34 would be to request the funds.
35

36 Reardon discussed the necessity for the emergency extension of the AKLS
37 workshop for the fall (October) AKLS examination. She indicated that after the
38 October AKLS workshop the next contract could not be sole-sourced again and
39 the AKLS contract would need to go out for a Request for Proposal (RFP) or
40 some type of competitive bidding. Generally there would be a 3-year contract
41 with the right to renew for two additional years. The Board would need to work
42 on the justification and what product would be advertised. She cautioned that
43 the Board must be careful not to have conversations that could taint the
44 process. Additionally, Reardon explained that the cost of the subject matter
45 experts' (SME) travel can be put into the contract and that would get the Board
46 past the constraints it has had with regard to the \$5,000 procurement cap that
47 has happened for SME travel for FY 01 and FY02. She noted that the cap
48 applies to the entire fiscal year.
49

1 Reardon clarified that specific provisions could be put in the contract that
2 could require that ten people selected by the Alaska Society of Professional
3 Land Surveyors (ASPLS), for example.

4
5 Reardon briefly discussed expert witness funds. She explained that that there
6 was a \$20,000 expert witness bill for the agency but it meant that it did limit
7 the spending for the end of FY 02.

8
9 Reardon indicated that the 2nd AELS licensing examiner position is unfilled
10 because of timing. It didn't make much sense to hire someone just before the
11 agency moved or when the training person would be on vacation but that the
12 Executive Administrator expected to hire in September.

13
14 Reardon discussed the AELS fees and her expectation that fees would likely
15 stay the same for the next renewal cycle but that would not happen until the
16 12/31/05-renewal cycle.

17
18 Reardon suggested that the Board work on Specialty Contractor specific
19 language by the November 2002 meeting so it could move forward when the
20 new administration comes in.

21
22 The Chair asked about additional travel for the Board. The Canadians have
23 invited the Board to send a representative to the British Columbia APEG-BC
24 meeting in October. Additionally, the NCARB Member Board Chairs' meeting
25 in Denver in September.

26
27 Reardon noted that she looks at the allocation of the \$106,000 increment. She
28 indicated there is \$35,000 allocated for computer funding and if the data
29 processing work is done in-house then that could provide some additional
30 funding for travel. Since there could be a new director for some of the FY03, it
31 may be helpful if the Board does document its travel needs.

32
33 Brown suggested that instead of 12 trips a year, the Board could consider
34 requesting an additional two or three trips to allow for ancillary trips that likely
35 would continue to arise.

36
37 Reardon suggested that there are many more trips available to the Board than
38 previously available and while she can't commit a future director she
39 understood the importance of attending the national and regional conferences.
40 Several members reiterated how important these trips have been to the Board
41 and the professions it serves and their appreciation for her support.

42
43 The Chair reverted back to Correspondence to a letter from Architectural
44 Engineering Institute (AEI) dated June 21, 2002 that requests us to offer the
45 NCEES architectural engineering (Group II) examinations. He noted that this
46 examination is a new examination being offered by NCEES and that that this
47 group could be attempting to market this examination so that sufficient
48 numbers of applicants take the examination to make it cost effective for NCEES
49 to continue offering the discipline.

1
2 **Agenda Item 7 – Subgroups**

3
4 The Board broke into subgroups at 11:05 a.m. as follows: Building Officials
5 Handbook (Cyra-Korsgaard, Brown); Work Experience and Canadian
6 Reciprocity would be combined (Miller, Iverson, Mearig,); and Land Surveyor
7 Model Law (McLane, Kalen, Siemoneit).

8
9 Break for lunch: 12:10 p.m.

10
11 Reconvene: 1:25 p.m.

12
13 The licensing examiner took the roll call.

14
15 The Chair noted that Brown was excused. Kalen was absent. Peirsol was
16 absent and advised that she was ill and would not be able to attend the
17 meeting this afternoon. Gardner and Davis were excused.

18
19 **Agenda Item 8 – Public Comment**

20
21 The Board took public comment from the following individuals:

22
23 The Chair recognized **Bonnie Smith**.

24
25 **Bonnie Smith** indicated that she is representing herself. She stated that she
26 is a registered engineer in Oklahoma with an environmental engineering
27 license. She has been attempting to get licensed as an environmental engineer
28 in Alaska. She has an environmental engineering degree and has been
29 previously denied by the Board. Her hearing was postponed awaiting Board
30 action on non-discipline specific engineering.

31
32 The Chair clarified that there is a proposal before the Board regarding non-
33 discipline specific engineering but even if the Board decided to approve that
34 method of licensing it would take time to implement it. Ms. Smith indicated
35 that she works in that field and is disappointed she cannot get licensed and
36 would like direction from the Board.

37
38 Iverson indicated that at this time taking the civil engineering examination
39 would be the only alternative although the Board would be looking at non-
40 discipline specific regulation change or to add environmental engineering.

41
42 The Chair added that the civil engineering examination has an afternoon
43 segment for environmental engineering. He indicated an applicant could
44 qualify with an additional year of experience if the engineering degree is in
45 environmental engineering, a discipline not currently recognized by the Board.

46
47 Mearig also indicated that the Board needed to hear from applicants in writing
48 requesting adding the discipline. The Board has not had enough interest

1 generated by applicants seeking registration in other disciplines such as
2 environmental engineering.

3
4 The Chair asked that she be added to the regulations specialist's interested
5 parties list for environmental engineering and asked the Executive
6 Administrator to forward her name to the regulations specialist to keep track of
7 when the regulation would be added.

8
9 Iverson reiterated that the Board is currently looking at changes in the
10 regulations, either for non-discipline specific or environmental engineering.

11
12 The Chair recognized **Darren Buck**.

13
14 **Darren Buck**, representing himself, indicated that he would like to know how
15 the proposed draft definition for "environmental engineering" would affect him
16 and if he would have to be licensed as a professional engineer.

17
18 Short discussion followed. The Board felt that the definition should be looked
19 at more carefully.

20
21 The Chair noted that there are overlaps between engineering and many other
22 professions and there certainly could be some elements of industrial hygiene
23 that could be considered engineering.

24
25 Buck explained that there are certifications for industrial hygienists and there
26 are some industrial hygienists that are engineers but in his particular field he
27 has not had engineering courses and does not practice engineering.

28
29 The Chair thanked him for bringing this to our attention.

30
31 At 1:35 p.m., Kalen re-joined the meeting.

32
33 The Chair moved to take up the reports for the **Subgroups** breakout groups:

34
35 Building Officials' Handbook

36
37 Cyra-Korsgaard referred to Tab 7 (a). She noted that Board members should send comments to
38 the Executive Administrator by September 15th and the revised version would go out to Building
39 Officials (list in Board packet under that Tab).

40
41 She referred to page 13, the list of standards, and asked if it would be appropriate for the Board
42 to suggest to the Building Officials a specific list of standards.

43
44 Iverson was concerned that inclusion of a specific list (p. 13) might have an unintended effect
45 and could become a checklist of requirements. Some items on the list may not be required for
46 each project.

47
48 Cyra-Korsgaard suggested that we provide guidance for Building Officials (so that when they
49 review drawings that include items contained in the reference list that the drawings are required
50 to be stamped and sealed.

Cyra-Korsgaard explained that the subgroup thought that some additional frequently asked questions (FAQ) could be developed, and gave an example:

FAQ- May an engineer whose experience is limited to roadway design stamp structural plans for a high-rise building?

No. Registrants may only practice within their area of expertise.

Iverson was concerned that engineers might have to provide proof to Building Official's of their specific expertise and that isn't the intent of the manual.

Cyra-Korsgaard thought, even without specific examples, it was important to identify that registrants are required to practice within their area of expertise.

The Board identified some corrections to the draft:

P. 14, item 2, FAQ. Add, Yes, if they follow the requirements under 12 AAC 36.195, for Site Adaptation.

P. 18, under **The Engineer**, add Petroleum.

The Chair asked Board members to thoroughly read the draft Building Officials' Manual and to give corrections to the Executive Administrator by September 15, 2002. A "tracked changes" document will be circulated prior to distributing to the Building Officials. The revised version will be on the November 14-15, 2002 Board meeting for final approval.

The Board held a discussion about property boundary lines and the role of the land surveyor and that only a professional land surveyor can identify and interpret the boundary lines. When the architect, engineer and landscape architect site are working on plans involving boundary lines, a land surveyor must stamp the plan.

Canadian Reciprocity and Work Experience Verifications

The Chair noted that Mearig would be representing the Board at the APEG-BC meeting in October in Victoria, B.C.

Mearig reported that items the subgroup felt should be discussed at the APEG-BC meeting in Victoria were:

- 1) The AELS Board desire to have an AELS Board member participate as an observer at an ABET accreditation visit to a Canadian university.
- 2) The Board will ask its attorney whether the language in 12 AAC 36.063 (c) (1) allows us to accept work experience and responsible charge work experience gained under a Canadian registered engineer. If not, we could consider a regulation change to allow partial credit for work experience, including responsible charge work experience gained under a Canadian registered engineer to count towards meeting the work experience requirement.
- 3) The Board also is considering some change to 12 AAC 36.090, Fundamentals of Engineering Waiver, perhaps reducing the requirement from 20 years of professional

work experience to 10 years of professional work experience for applicants holding a license in a foreign jurisdiction.

- 4) The Board strongly supports continuing the requirement that all registrants provide proof of passing the NCEES professional engineering examination. The subgroup felt the Board could not reduce the requirement for the PE examination, which is consistent with the NCEES policy on examinations.

Mearig would like to garner information on reciprocity requirements for U.S. engineers to practice in Canada. He further wanted to know if this is primarily a desire for Canadian engineers to practice in the U.S. or is there a mutual need for reciprocity.

Cyra-Korsgaard noted that there were cross border projects such as natural gas pipeline, railway, or highway projects that may be the impetus for the Canadian reciprocity.

Short discussion followed.

David Brower joined the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

Brown re-joined the meeting at 2:20 p.m.

Work Experience Form

Mearig referred to the Engineering Work Experience Verification Form, Tab 7 (c), Form A. He noted that the subgroup recommended that the Board adopt the work experience verification form for engineer replace the current work experience verification form for engineering applicants by comity or examination. The form would be part of the Engineering application form and would be used to document the required professional work experience with a couple of minor changes, as follows:

Add "applicant name" to page 2; and to number page 1 of 2, and page 2 of 2, respectively to clearly identify the form is a two-sided form, and to avoid any mix-up in work experience forms.

Mearig stated the subgroup looked at the land surveyor work experience form, Tab 7 (c) Land Surveyor (08-4412 a), and decided this form is more appropriate to use for land surveyor applicants.

Kalen noted that the work experience verification form (08-4412 a) was developed by the Alaska Society of Professional Land Surveyors (ASPLS).

Iverson clarified the requirement for Engineers by Comity:

1. 48 months of professional work experience, of which 24 months is responsible charge work experience. The Board can generally obtain enough information provided in the work history on the application for the 48 months of work experience;
2. Verification of 24 months of responsible charge work experience, or two letters of reference if the applicant has been registered in their jurisdiction for five or more years;
3. Verification (from the jurisdiction) of current licensure which is based on meeting our minimum requirements (as established in 12 AAC 36.063;

- 1 4. Proof of completion of the arctic engineering course; and
2 5. Five references, of which 3 must be registered engineers having personal
3 knowledge of the applicant's education, training or experience.
4

5 Iverson explained that one state, California, has requirements that are different
6 than ours.
7

8 The Chair asked Kalen and McLane to provide any minor revisions to the Land
9 Surveyor work experience verification form (08-4412 a).
10

11 The Chair noted that David Brower, the Assistant Attorney General may not
12 know everyone and the Board introduced themselves.
13

14 Mearig asked for clarification of the requirement under 12 AAC 36.063 (c)(1)
15 and whether the Board had discretion to accept work experience under a
16 Canadian engineer.
17

18 The Chair noted that the regulation uses "full" and wondered if the Board had
19 the discretion to use a formula to give "partial" credit for work experience
20 under a Canadian registered engineer.
21

22 Brower suggested that the Board probably would want to revise the regulation
23 to make it broader and more clearly define the requirements although he did
24 not feel that he could give a definitive answer at this time.
25

26 Short discussion followed about differences between the Canadian and U.S.
27 requirements for engineering.
28

29 Land Surveying Boundary subgroup 30

31 Siemoneit reported it has come to the attention of some Board members that
32 there are instances where state engineers may be doing work that should be
33 done by professional land surveyors. He explained that during road projects
34 and during new construction that there is typically some right-of-way work to
35 incorporate private property into the project. When that happens the property
36 boundaries change, and during this process engineers have been laying out
37 monumentation for the centerline of the new construction. As property is
38 acquired and absorbed into the road project the monuments are supposed to
39 be re-established by a professional land surveyor and this is not being done.
40 Monuments might be reestablished off the new centerline and not be
41 established by a professional land surveyor.
42

43 Siemoneit went on to state that the subgroup agreed that it appears that the
44 department is internally debating this issue and the subgroup believes the
45 work is most definitely under the definition of land surveying.
46

47 Kalen agreed that there appears to be an in-house review of the process.
48

McLane doesn't disagree that an engineer can describe where the centerline of the roadway is located. But when the engineer dimensions it to the property boundary or the right-of-way line that work should be done under the purview of a professional land surveyor because when the engineer describes that dimension from the center line he is delineating the location of the property line.

On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by McLane, and unanimously adopted, it was RESOLVED to go into executive session for the purpose of reviewing land surveyor boundary issues as they relate to specific practices in state agencies.

The Board went into executive session at 2:50 p.m.

The Board came out of executive session at 3:08 p.m.
Brown asked that the Chair write a letter to the DOT/PF to indicate that any monumentation that is placed on the site, developed or designed must be done by a registered land surveyor.

On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Kalen, and unanimously adopted, it was RESOLVED that the Chair address a letter to the Alaska DOT/PF clarifying if any monumentations are designed or placed on a construction site that work must be undertaken by a registered land surveyor.

Brief discussion followed.

Discussion followed about ensuring the letter is sent to the appropriate person.

The Chair asked if there were any objections, and there were none. He reiterated that he would work with the land surveyors to craft an appropriate response to the state agency to Commissioner Perkins and the DOT/PF design based on a complaint to the Occupational Licensing investigator.

Agenda Item 9 – Application Reviews

The Board brought up the next item on the agenda, Application Reviews.

On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Iverson, and unanimously adopted, it was RESOLVED to go into executive session for the purpose of reviewing applicant files at 3:10 p.m.

The Board recessed at 6:00 p.m.

Friday, August 23, 2002

Agenda Item 10 – Convene/ Roll Call

Robert Miller, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

Robert Miller, Chairperson, Ph.D., Civil Engineer

Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member

Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer

Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor

Scott McLane, Land Surveyor

Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer

Ernie Siemoneit, Secretary, Mining Engineer

Excused were:

Marcia Davis, Public Member

Kathleen Gardner, Vice-Chairperson, Mechanical Engineer

Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator

Liz Long, Licensing Examiner

Joining a portion of the meeting, in person, on August 23, 2002 were:

John R. Clark, Investigator

David Brower, Assistant Attorney General

The Chair asked if there were any concerns about files that needed to be addressed and there were a number of files that still needed to be reviewed.

On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Iverson, and unanimously adopted, it was

RESOLVED to stay in executive session for the purpose of reviewing applicant files at 8:04 Am.

Brown joined the meeting at 8:06 a.m.

Peirsol joined the meeting at 8:10 a.m.

Clark joined the meeting at 8:10 a.m.

The Board came out of executive session at 8:32 a.m.

Agenda Items 11– Investigator Report and Investigator Discussion Items

The Chair noted that John Clark was present.

1
2 Clark discussed the Investigator Report.

3
4 Peirsol asked about:

5 Case # 101-02-5, Allegation that an architect provided false information on a
6 renewal application (Opened 06/07/02).

7
8 Clark indicated that he could not discuss that specific case today but hoped to
9 have the matter resolved by the next meeting.

10
11 Cyra-Korsgaard indicated that the Board had discussed during
12 correspondence information that some North Slope drawings were not
13 stamped and asked if there were any complaints.

14
15 Clark responded that he was not aware of any complaints of that nature.

16
17 The Chair explained that there might be some erroneous information relating
18 to the industrial exemption under AS 08.48.331 (10). Engineers who are
19 doing contract work for North Slope oil companies are not exempt from the
20 requirement for professional engineering and consequently they must stamp
21 their drawings.

22
23 Clark agreed that the exemption applies to the oil industry employees only and
24 not to contractors doing work for an oil company.

25
26 Clark indicated that the inspectors don't go on to the federal projects to do
27 enforcement work. Discussion followed.

28
29 Brower joined the meeting at 8:38 a.m. and the Chair asked him to join the
30 members at the table.

31
32 Clark asked for guidance from Board members to discuss any licensing
33 actions that occur in another jurisdiction and Alaska examines. Clark would
34 like the latitude to be able to contact the appropriate Board member to discuss
35 the particular disciplinary action.

36
37 There were no objections to his request.

38
39 Peirsol asked what actions the investigator takes with regard to unlicensed
40 activity.

41
42 Clark advised that for the first offense, although it depends on the nature of the case, how
43 egregious it may be, but typically he is advised he is in violation of Alaska statute. In some
44 instances there may be a fine imposed.

45
46 The Board discussed various cases generally. In some cases the case has become stale and the
47 investigator would need to review work that the land surveyor has done since the allegation to
48 determine if a pattern of incompetence has developed.

1 The Board discussed old versus new construction versus gutting a building and agreed that either
2 instance would require an electrical engineer to do the work.

3
4 Clark indicated that the investigators have been doing fieldwork in Kodiak, the Kenai Peninsula,
5 the Mat-Su Valley, and Fairbanks and the Board held discussions about the types of activity and
6 his interaction with the Building Officials.

7
8 Peirsol encouraged the investigator to continue to work on developing working relationships
9 with Building Officials.

10
11 Clark responded that there has been great improvement between the investigator, the Fire
12 Marshal, and Building Officials.

13
14 Clark left the meeting at 9:00 a.m.

15
16 Break: 9:00 a.m.

17 Reconvene: 9:15 a.m.

18
19 Cyra-Korsgaard asked that we invite the Fairbanks Building Official to our next
20 meeting in Fairbanks in order to foster better relations between the building
21 officials and the investigator.

22 23 **Agenda Item 12 - Budget Summary**

24
25 The Chair brought up the Budget Summary and asked if there were any
26 questions.

27
28 Brown would like to see additional travel covered but that could be taken up in
29 the Annual Report.

30
31 The Chair noted that the Occupational Licensing Director had indicated she
32 thought the fees would likely stay the same for the next renewal cycle.

33 34 **Agenda Item 13 - Meet with David Brower, Assistant Attorney General**

35
36 The Chair brought up questions for the Attorney General.

37
38 Mearig brought up the issue that was discussed the previous day and asked if
39 it was necessary to do a regulation change in order to accept work experience
40 done under a registered Canadian engineer or if the Board currently has the
41 flexibility to count the time as acceptable in meeting the experience
42 requirement.

43
44 Brower stated that the Board has the discretion in the Alaska Statutes to
45 decide what the requirements for engineers are and if the engineer is coming
46 into the system by comity, either from another U.S. jurisdiction or from
47 Canada. The Board can set the standards on a case-by-case basis. He
48 indicated that the regulations do not give the Board the flexibility or discretion
49 to accept the work experience but they could be broadened to give that specific
50 acceptance.

1
2 The Chair asked if the NCEES offered an engineering examination discipline
3 and the Board licenses the engineer and subsequently the NCEES eliminates
4 that specialty examination, what obligation would the Board have to other
5 clients who desire that specific licensure. An example would be if we licensed
6 two industrial engineers and then NCEES eliminated the examination because
7 sufficient numbers of applicants were not available, the examination was not
8 viable, and no other industrial engineers could get licensed in Alaska.

9
10 Brown appreciated that the attorney was present and hopes that he'll be able
11 to attend.

12
13 Peirsol asked if the Board has the ability to register an architect by comity with
14 the caveat that they complete a course and wondered if the Board could take
15 that action.

16
17 Brower responded that he felt that the Board could take that action. If someone
18 had been disciplined in another jurisdiction and wanted to get registered here
19 and happens to have registration in the other jurisdiction. The Board could
20 look to the statute, which requires "good character" and "reputation", and he
21 felt that past work would constitute reputation. The Board could make a
22 determination if they wanted to register that applicant and you can require the
23 same thing for a renewal.

24
25 Cyra-Korsgaard asked for clarification whether the Board had discretion to
26 discipline before or if they must license and then discipline the registrant.

27
28 Brower responded that if people do certain things they don't automatically
29 become registered. If the Board thinks the applicant needs to take a course the
30 Board can do so.

31
32 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Iverson, and unanimously**
33 **adopted, it was**

34
35 **RESOLVED to stay in executive session for the purpose of reviewing**
36 **a specific applicant file at 9:49 a.m.**

37
38 **The Board came out of executive session at 10:10 a.m.**

39
40 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Iverson, and adopted by**
41 **roll call vote, it was**

42
43 **RESOLVED to approve Danny Graham, applicant for Civil engineer,**
44 **by Comity, with the stipulation that he successfully completes 15**
45 **hours of structural or structural design analysis continuing**
46 **education prior to the next renewal (12/31/05).**

47
48 **On a substitute motion duly made by Siemoneit, seconded by McLane, it**
49 **was**

RESOLVED to conditionally approve Danny Graham, applicant for professional engineer, Civil, by Comity, with the stipulation that he demonstrate 15 hours of successful completion of structural or structural design analysis continuing education prior to licensing.

Siemoneit clarified that under the substitute motion the applicant would not be licensed until he completed the continuing education, not college course work, prior to licensing.

Short discussion followed.

Peirsol asked if the applicant took a two-day course in ICBO would that satisfy the requirement.

Iverson thought that it would satisfy the requirement.

The Chair asked for a show of hands and the substitute motion failed 3-4 (Siemoneit, McLane, and Peirsol, yeas; Iverson, Brown, Kalen, and Miller as nays; Mearig abstained).

The Chair asked for a vote on the main motion. Kalen asked for a roll call vote. He restated the motion:

RESOLVED to approve Danny Graham, applicant for Civil engineer, by Comity, with the stipulation that he successfully completes 15 hours of structural or structural design analysis continuing education prior to the next renewal (12/31/05).

Board member	Yeas:	Nays:
Brown	x	
Davis	absent	
Gardner	absent	
Iverson	x	
Kalen		x
McLane		x
Mearig		x
Miller	x	
Peirsol	x	
Siemoneit	x	

The Chair stated that the motion passed 5-3.

The Chair asked if there were any objections, and there were none.

The Chair asked Brower to address the issue of two similar names reference the Kinney correspondence from yesterday.

1
2 Brower indicated that this is not a Board issue.

3
4 The Chair brought up the matter of an exemption for design professionals who
5 are working on federal land.

6
7 Brower responded that he did not see an exemption. There is an exemption for
8 an officer or an employee of the United States and it depends on how you
9 define employee but there is case law regarding this.

10
11 Iverson explained that the common practice for the military bases would be
12 that the military requires a professional engineer on projects but it doesn't
13 matter which state they are licensed in so long as they are licensed.

14
15 Brower responded that he will look into this and there might be federal statute
16 that preempts the state statute.

17
18 Brown asked if the Board could ask for travel for the attorney to attend the
19 NCEES annual meeting and explained that many states bring their attorney to
20 the meetings.

21
22 The Chair thanked the attorney and Brower left the meeting.

23
24 Break: 10:32 a.m.

25 Reconvened: 10:42 a.m.

26
27 **Agenda Item 14 – Administrator's Report**

28
29 The administrator gave a brief overview of the activities of the past quarter
30 including her annual vacation, the agency reconfiguration of office space,
31 training, and routine work.

32
33 She anticipates hiring a second licensing examiner next month. She attended
34 the NCARB annual meeting and will attend the CLARB meeting in September,
35 and the NCARB MBA workshop in November.

36
37 She explained that her goal is to provide as prompt, efficient, and courteous
38 service as possible to what staff views as the client.

39
40 **Agenda Item 15 and 16 – Old Business**

41
42 The Chair moved to the next item of business is the Emeritus Status. He
43 explained that NCEES has Mearig as both an active member and an emeritus
44 member. Mearig serves on the NCEES Examination Policy and Procedures
45 (EPP) committee.

46
47 Mearig explained that in order to get elected at the national office you must be
48 in active status but so long as you are in the elected position you can serve but
49 you can no longer serve on committees.

1
2 Executive Administrator will check to see if this is an annual requirement to
3 assign emeritus status.
4

5 Brown noted that there is not an emeritus status in the NCARB structure
6 although there are some restrictions for serving in the elected status.
7

8 The Chair moved to the next item on the agenda, Encrypted Signatures.
9 He explained that the director spoke to us yesterday with her concerns about
10 using encrypted signatures.
11

12 Peirsol indicated she would try to keep in touch with what is happening at the
13 state level but there did not seem to be much point in duplicating effort that
14 the agencies, such as the permanent fund, were already doing.
15

16 The Chair moved to the next item, Host Conferences, and indicated that the
17 WCARB meeting would be next spring.
18

19 Brown indicated that it would be nice to have the Board and the architectural
20 community involved. Alaska theme such as Iditarod and Skiing could be
21 enhanced.
22

23 Executive Administrator explained that Reardon indicated that there is a
24 process to request funds for receptions such as the WCARB but that there
25 must be a well-defined public policy reason to expend state funds. The DCED
26 could work with the Board to assist them in pursuing funds to supplement the
27 WCARB icebreaker.
28

29 The Board held an informal brainstorming of ideas for the Host Conference
30 activities.
31

32 The Chair asked for volunteers willing to serve on the Host Conference
33 committee and Cyra-Korsgaard, Miller, Brown, and Peirsol volunteered to serve
34 on the committee.
35

36 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda,
37

38 AKLS Workshop: 39

40 Kalen gave an overview of the AKLS workshop held in June 1-2, 2002. The workshop went
41 well although they barely had enough subject matter experts to participate.
42

43 Kalen explained that the workshop purpose is to evaluate the validity of the questions and set the
44 cut score, and to develop any additional questions needed for the next exam. Due to the
45 December 31, 2001 regulations that changed the minimum requirements for Land Surveyors,
46 Land Surveyors can no longer be approved to sit for the FLS or PLS examinations, or get
47 licensed by comity without a minimum of two years of land surveying course work.
48

49 Kalen added that as a result of this change, there has been an influx of land surveyor applicants
50 who came in under the old table and will need to take this exam in order to get licensed. The

Board discussed this matter in May 2002, and decided to offer the exam a second time in 2002, in October 2002 in order to provide adequate access for land surveyors desiring licensure.

Kalen indicated that there were 27 candidates that sat for the exam this time and he expects there will be quite a number for the October exam. He suggests that the Board consider moving towards a 2 day fall workshop and eliminate the Spring workshop because is difficult to get the subject matter experts in May or June and hotel rates are significantly lower in November.

McLane suggested that the logical source for the subject matter experts and to tie the workshop to the land surveying community is through the ASPLS.

Agenda Item 17- Goals and Objectives

The Chair moved the Board to Goals and Objectives and they held a lengthy discussion and revised their goals as follows:

Goal # 2, Item 2, change date to 2/2003.

Goal #2, Item 4, change date to 2/2003, and add, Land Surveyors, and Kalen.

Goal #4, Item 1, changes date to 5/2004.

Goal #4, Item 2, adds McLane.

Goal #4, add item 4, Update references to NCARB publications.

Goal #4, Item 3, change date to 2/2003.

Goal #4, Item 1, changes date to 2/2003.

Goal #6, item 1 (see Goal #1 & 4), and change date to 5/2003.

Goal #6, item 4, move experience worksheet to completed goals.

The revised goals are as follows:

Goal #1 - Increase Board's work efficiency.

Objectives		Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1)	Establish an orientation program for new Board members to assist in getting up to speed as quickly as possible. Provide Sample applicant files to new members.	Miller	Ongoing
2)	Update and maintain goals and objectives.	Davis & Exec. Adm.	Ongoing
3)	Update and maintain clear record of Board operating policies and procedures previously adopted by the Board. Date and track progress of all proposed changes to these policies and procedures.		
4)	Automate AELS application and licensing process by: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Distributing and receiving applications electronically• Structuring database so that it minimizes manual data entry• Structuring database so that it can answer queries easily.	Staff oversee and track	Ongoing
5)	Pursue training for Board and staff.	Board and Staff	Ongoing
6)	Pursue strategic planning.	Brown and Exec. Adm.	Ongoing
7)	Provide letter of Board's intent and understanding relating to any proposed legislative changes;	Board	Ongoing

develop procedures for doing the same.		
8) Establish subcommittee work at each meeting.	Chair	Ongoing

Goal #2- Increase Board's cost effectiveness.

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) All Board members or administrators who attend a regional or national professional function on behalf of Board shall submit a written report to rest of Board to share knowledge gained.	Attending Board member and/or Staff	Every Board meeting; ongoing
2) Examine financial feasibility of Board autonomy.	Gardner	2/2003
3) Obtain and analyze Board budget. annually and request audit of income or expenses as appropriate.	Mearig, & Exec. Administrator	Ongoing
4) Develop regulations that cover "minor importance" overlap between Architects, Engineers, and Land Surveyors' professional practice.	Davis, Miller, Kalen	Ongoing 2/2003

Goal #3 - Ensure that all individuals practicing within state are either registered or fall within appropriate exemptions to registration.

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Determine what action, if any is necessary to encourage registration of University of Alaska architects, landscape architects, land surveyors and engineering faculty.	Miller	Ongoing
2) Advertise AS 08.48.295 provision for civil penalty for unregistered and unauthorized practice.	Siemoneit ; Exec. Administrator	Ongoing

Goal #4 - Ensure all materials used to establish competency in the professions are appropriate for use within Alaska.

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Review Arctic Course.	Miller	5/2004
2) Update AKLS Exam.	Kalen, McLane	Ongoing
3) Audit National Standards for exams and certification.	Board and Exec. Administrator	Ongoing
4) Update references for NCARB publications in regulations.	Board and Exec. Administrator	Annually

Goal #5 - Ensure that Alaska standards stay within the national norms, and its licensing systems are fair and applied uniformly.

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Monitor and review latest federal regulations, state Board decisions, and national organization policies relating to NAFTA.	Board and Exec. Administrator	Each Board meeting; ongoing
2) Obtain adequate funding to send "discipline specific" Board members/ licensing examiner	Board and Exec. Administrator	Ongoing

	to National, and Zone meetings to ensure Alaska stays informed on national issues and can influence policy issues affecting their professions.		
3)	Investigate drainage, soils analysis, and hydrographic surveying under the definition of land surveying.	Kalen and McLane	2/2003
4)	Investigate GIS and photogrammetry.	Kalen and McLane	2/2003
5)	Research CLARB council record.	Exec. Administrator, Mearig, Cyra-Korsgaard	Ongoing
6)	Stay current on all competency and regulatory issues of other jurisdictions	Board and Exec. Administrator	Ongoing

Goal #6 – Improve communications with applicants and licensed professionals.

	Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1)	Structure databases so that applicants can access application via internet and answer queries easily (for application checklist) (See Goal #1, and #4).	Cyra-Korsgaard and staff	5/2003
2)	Update AELS Web Page, including postings of commonly asked questions (FAQs).	Licensing Examiner	Ongoing
3)	Update Goals and Objectives.	Davis	Ongoing

Goal #7 – Improve communication with public about Licensing Benefit and Problem Resolution Process

	Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1)	Issue Public Service Notice with contact information for complaints.	Executive Administrator	Ongoing/Website
2)	Letter to BBB/Ombudsman re: contact for complaints.	Executive Administrator	11/2003
3)	Educate Public about Benefit of using Licensed Professionals (in Public Service Notices).	Mearig & Executive Administrator	Ongoing/Website

Break for lunch at 12:09 p.m.

Reconvened at 1:21 p.m.

Kalen, Gardner, and, Davis absent.

Agenda Item 18 – Proposed Regulation Changes

The Chair took up the next agenda item, Proposed Regulation Changes.

The Executive Administrator explained Tab 18 materials. There were four items public noticed January 17, 2002 and public comment ended on February 21, 2002.

1. The regulation specialist broadly amended 12 AAC 36.100 to allow for altering the examination requirements for engineers. The specific proposed regulation change listed offering Group I and Group II, NCEES examinations, which would include 18 specialty disciplines.
2. 12 AAC 36.103 was voted down 5-4 in February 2002.
3. 12 AAC 36.180, is a technical change to implement item #1, non-discipline specific regulations;
4. 12 AAC 36.990 was adopted for (35) aspect of landscape architecture definition, and held over (11), which was a technical change to implement non-discipline specific licensure.

The Executive Administrator explained that Tab 18 (b) is the draft definition of “environmental engineering” that was developed as an alternative solution to expand the specialty disciplines that the Board currently offers. Instead of broadening the disciplines to 18 (now 19 since architectural engineering examination will be offered in October 2002), the Board could consider adding only one or more disciplines where enough interest has been generated to warrant it.

The Executive Administrator explained that Tab 18 (c) is draft language she worked with the Chair to insert. When the regulation table was revised in 1999 it should have included changes. More specifically, to add: the specific language of “in the branch of engineering applied for listed in 12 AAC 36.990 (17); and that the master’s or doctorate in engineering be “acceptable to the Board” to ensure that applicants meet the minimum qualifications. This change would need to be public noticed.

Kalen joined the meeting at 1:37 p.m.

The Board held a lengthy discussion of the non-discipline specific licensing, potential enforcement issues and that a change could be made to rely on professional ethics to keep practitioners working within their area of expertise.

Iverson thought that the Board was interested in adding environmental engineering but that there wasn’t support to revise the entire system.

Brown explained that Gardner would be back for the next meeting and that the matter can be moved forward and discussed at the November meeting.

The Board took a straw poll to show level of interest to move forward with non-discipline specific engineering.

Board Member	Supports	Does not support
Brown	X	
Iverson	Neutral	

Kalen	Neutral	
McLane		X
Mearig	X	
Miller		X
Peirsol	X	
Siemoneit		X
Cyra-Korsgaard	X	

On a motion duly made by Mearig, seconded by Brown, and defeated by roll call vote, it was

RESOLVED to move ahead with non-discipline specific licensure regulations project.

The Executive Administrator suggested that the current draft language identifying Group I and Group II exams was not clear and the attorney advised that the examination disciplines offered would have to be listed or the public isn't adequately noticed about the additions and deletions of specialties.

Iverson suggested that Mearig provide the background information to accompany the project, the letter explaining the purpose of the change.

Siemoneit expressed concern that the Board is moving forward on a project without clear support for this project.

Peirsol expressed her concern that the public doesn't understand what the Board's proposed changes are and she thought that the Board was going to post this on the website and prepare letters to accompany regulations projects.

Cyra-Korsgaard explained that the Board has a meeting summary prepared for each meeting that is posted to our website and distributed to the Alaska Professional Design Council. She added that anyone interested in following what the Board's actions have been can read the meeting summary or look at the minutes.

Mearig restated the motion:

On a motion by Mearig, seconded by Brown, it was

RESOLVED to approve the regulation change to non-discipline specific licensing as described in draft regulation under 12 AAC 36.100 (c), 12 AAC 180 (b), and 12 AAC.36 990 (17)

Roll Call Vote

Board Member	Yeas	Nays
Brown	X	
Iverson		X
Kalen		X

McLane		X
Mearig	X	
Miller		X
Peirsol	X	
Siemoneit		X

The Chair noted that the motion failed 3-5.

Mearig stated that he thought the vote indicates this must be a dead issue. Short discussion followed.

Iverson stated that he did not think it was dead but that there is a parallel consideration, whether the Board would move forward on environmental engineering or the non-discipline specific.

Kalen indicated he would be willing to reconsider his vote at the November meeting. Chair asked that this be put on the November agenda for reconsideration.

Environmental Engineering

The Chair brought up adding one engineering discipline, "environmental engineering" to those disciplines we offer for registration. He mentioned that he and the Executive Administrator developed a draft definition for discussion purposes.

**On a motion duly made by Brown, and not seconded
it was
RESOLVED to move ahead with the environmental engineering
regulation change.**

The Chair noted there was no second and the motion died.

Short discussion followed. Mearig asked to have this held until after the non-discipline specific regulation was dealt with since that issue is still unresolved.

The Chair asked to have it on the agenda next time.

The Chair explained when the regulation table was revised in 1999 it should have included the language but somehow it inadvertently was dropped and the Board could add this to their next regulation project to be public noticed. At this time it isn't cost effective to move forward on this but should be holdover.

The Chair asked to have this on the November agenda and there were no objections.

The Chair brought up (d) site adaptation and noted that that regulation was public noticed and the public comment period closes on September 20, 2002. He asked to have this on the November agenda to consider adopting and to review any public comments.

1
2 Break: 2:35 p.m.
3 Reconvene: 2:45 p.m.
4

5 **Agenda Item 19- New Business**

6 The Chair moved to the first item under New Business.
7

8 The Chair brought up the AKLS Contract and recapped that the Director
9 previously discussed the necessity for the emergency extension of the AKLS
10 workshop for the fall (October) AKLS examination. She indicated that the
11 future AKLS workshop contract could not be sole-sourced again and the AKLS
12 contract would need to go out for a Request for Proposal (RFP) or some type of
13 competitive bidding. The Chair indicated the Director recommended the bid
14 include the cost of the subject matter experts' (SME) travel to avoid the
15 problems the Board has had with regard to the \$5,000 procurement cap for FY
16 01 and FY02, and that the SMEs could be tied to a provision that they must be
17 selected by the Alaska Society of Professional Land Surveyors (ASPLS).
18

19 The Executive Administrator further explained that the AKLS exam contract expired in June
20 2002 and the only way it could be renewed is to do an emergency extension of the current
21 contract as the Director mentioned. The Director stated that without the emergency extension
22 the October exam could not be given.
23

24 The Chair reiterated the Board's support for the AKLS exam to be offered in October 2002 and
25 to move forward with the extension of the current contract.
26

27 Kalen noted that he would prepare a spreadsheet that will come under the \$5,000 limit and his
28 willingness to work on the terms of a bid proposal for the November meeting since the
29 examination is in April 2003 and the workshop would be in May or June 2003.
30

31 EIT Certificates:
32

33 The Executive Administrator explained that many states issue a specific
34 certificate but Alaska does not. Staff frequently have received requests for E.I.T.
35 certificates but we steer applicants to the verification process when another
36 jurisdiction needs the examination verification.
37

38 Mearig explained that the title is generally the issue and the Board hasn't
39 supported engineer-in-training as being particularly useful so he is inclined to
40 not issue specific certificates.
41

42 Short discussion.
43

44 The Chair recapped that there seems to be a general consensus to continue the
45 process as it currently is and that while it might help to highlight the
46 registration process for some individuals it might not warrant the effort
47 involved in issuing another type of certificate.
48

49 AELS Annual Report FY02

The Chair explained that there is a draft report under Tab 18, and that Brown has reviewed it and made some excellent edits that will be incorporated into the report. Short discussion followed.

The Chair recapped the discussion and indicated that he and the Executive Administrator would work to reorganize the report and circulate the edited report to Board members, who should send any additional corrections to the Executive Administrator. The goal is to finalize the report the next couple of weeks and the target date is September 15, 2002 for a finished report to submit to the Director.

The Chair noted that there were no objections to this process and moved to the next agenda item, on-line applications.

The Chair indicated that this has been previously discussed with the Director and she'll move forward with data processing to do the in-house checklist.

Agenda Item 20 – Read Applications into Record

On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Peirsol, it was

RESOLVED to approve the following list of applications for comity and examination as read, with the stipulation that the information in the applicant's file will take precedence over the information in the minutes:

NAME	DISCIPLINE	EXAM/ COMITY	BOARD ACTION
1. Adcock, Bradley	PE Electrical	CO	Approved
2. Alexander, William	PE Civil	CO	Approved
3. Amiri, Babrak	PE Civil	CO	Conditional, needs current verification of registration & needs completion of Arctic Engineering Course prior to licensing
4. Andraschko, Kenneth	PE Civil	EX	Approved
5. Andrew, Jan	PE Civil	EX	Approved
6. Armstrong, Rolf	PE Civil	CO	Approved
7. Aubert, Winton	PE Petroleum	EX	Approved
8. Blei, Jeremy	PE Civil	EX	Approved
9. Bonney, Matthew	PE Mechanical	EX	Conditional needs transcripts & \$20.00 for wall certificate
10. Bough, James	PE Electrical	CO	Approved
11. Brandewie, Mark	PE Mechanical	CO	Approved
12. Brenner, Marta	PE Civil	EX	Approved exam; needs completion of arctic engineering course before licensing.

13. Breslawec, Oleksa P.	PE Mechanical	CO	Approved pending completion of arctic engineering course.
14. Brice, Bradley	PE Petroleum	EX	Approved pending completion of arctic engineering course.
15. Browning, Gregory	PE Civil	EX	Approved for FE & PE. 26 months short for FE waiver 12 AAC 36.090. Needs Arctic
16. Caffee, Christopher	PE Mechanical	CO	Approved
17. Campbell, Jesse	PE Mechanical	EX	Approved
18. Chavalitlekha, Aott	FE	EX	Approved for Fundamentals of Engineering examination.
19. Chavalitlekha, Aott	PE Electrical	EX	Approved FE & PE exam. Require both exams for licensing or 17 months more of approved experience.
20. Cismoski, Douglas	PE Petroleum	EX	Approved
21. Clyde, Cynthia	PE Chemical	EX	Approved pending completion of arctic engineering course.
22. Cox, Patrick	PE Civil	EX	Approved
23. Davis, Christopher	PE Electrical	CO	Approved
24. Deerkop, John	PE Electrical	CO	Approved
25. Dias, Clifford	PE Mechanical	CO	Approved
26. Doniere, Kevin	Landscape	CO	Approved
27. Dougherty, Timothy	PE Civil	CO	Approved
28. Dunn, James	PE Civil	EX	Approved
29. Eby, Carl	PE Electrical	EX	Approved
30. Foldenuaer, Carl	PE Electrical	EX	Approved pending transcript
31. Graham, Danny	PE Civil	CO	Approved on condition prior to next renewal have 15 hours continuing education in structural or design analysis.
32. Grigg, Charles	PE Civil	CO	Approved pending proof of current license.
33. Grzybowski,Michelle	PE Chemical	EX	Approved pending completion of Arctic engineering course
34. Hamann, Thomas	Architecture	CO	Approved
35. Heron, Hollis	PE Electrical	CO	Approved
36. Hodges, Christopher	PE Electrical	EX	Approved
37. Jarrett, Jimmy	PE Civil	CO	Approved

38. Jorgensen, Bryan	PE Mechanical	CO	Approved
39. Kimbrell, Dmitri	PLS/AKLS	EX	Approved
40. Koenig, Matthew	PE Mechanical	CO	Approved
41. LaPierre, Curtis	Landscape	CO	Approved
42. Lawler, Monty	PE Electrical	EX	Approved. Needs completion of arctic engineering course prior to licensing
43. Machen, Andrew	PE Civil	CO	Approved
44. McMillen, Brian	Architecture	EX	Approved
45. Nguyen, Binh	PE Electrical	CO	Approved
46. Nichols, John	PE Civil	EX	Approved
47. Noel, Brian	PE Petroleum	EX	Approved
48. Oydna, Arne	PE Civil	EX	Approved
49. Perry, Anne	Architecture	CO	Approved
50. Rennie, Scott	PE Petroleum	EX	Approved
51. Riedel, Daniel	PE Petroleum	EX	Approved
52. Scholten, Tamara	PE Civil	CO	Approved
53. Sherer, David R.	PE Mechanical	CO	Approved
54. Simpson, Barbara	Landscape	CO	Approved
55. Soule, Gregory	PE Civil	EX	Approved pending completion of Arctic engineering course
56. Stewart, James	PE Civil	EX	Approved for exam pending completion of Arctic engineering course prior to licensing
57. Strupulis, Anthony	PE Civil	EX	Approved
58. Tanner, Barbara	PE Civil	EX	Approved
59. Toney, John	PE Mechanical	CO	Approved
60. Van Blankenstein, Ian	PE Civil	CO	Approved
61. Walsh, Chantal	PE Petroleum	EX	Approved. Needs to pass FE & PE for licensing
62. Welsh, Gerald	PE Civil	CO	Approved
63. Woods, Karl	FLS	EX	Approved

64. Mukherjee, Sanjay	FE	EX	Conditional pending proof of foreign degree evaluation showing degree is equivalent to ABET accredited BS degree
65. Carey, Bryan E.	FE	EX	Approved
66. Dinsmore, Rae	FE	EX	Approved
67. Flora, Jacob M.	FE	EX	Approved
68. Groves, Jason O.	FE	EX	Approved
69. Huey, Aaron Douglas	FE	EX	Approved
70. Lu, Guibin	FE	EX	Approved
71. Malo, Adriana	FE	EX	Approved
72. Menendez, Oscar A.	FE	EX	Approved
73. Muench, Wilhelm E.	FE	EX	Approved
74. Pace, Roy N.	FE	EX	Approved
75. Ponchione, Arjuna B.	FE	EX	Approved
76. Puustinen, Kevin	FE	EX	Approved
78. Rasmussen, James Matthew	FE	EX	Approved
79. Riddle, Sarah E.	FE	EX	Approved
80. Schuyler, Sherwood R.	FE	EX	Approved
81. Seamount, Jessica A.	FE	EX	Approved
82. Singson, Reynaldo A.	FE	EX	Approved
83. Stoll, Alan W.	FE	EX	Approved
84. Teoh, Adly	FE	EX	Approved
85. Thomson, William R.	FE	EX	Approved
86. Thorum, Elliot M.	FE	EX	Approved
87. Vaughan, Nathaniel	FE	EX	Approved
88. Walsh, Chantal R.	FE	EX	Approved
89. Weaver, Peter T	FE	EX	Approved

90. Wilson, Mary T.	FE	EX	Approved
---------------------	----	----	----------

Mearig objected to the initial list and stated that anyone who requires additional experience should come back to the Board for review, and if there is an FE waiver they are approved for the examination but the Board should review any additional work experience.

The Licensing Examiner read the names of the two files under consideration as Courtney Gibbs and Eli Lehrmann should be moved to the incomplete list.

On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Peirsol, and unanimously approved, it was

RESOLVED to go move two files, Courtney Gibbs and Eli Lehrman from the approved applicant file list to the incomplete applicant file list.

The Chair asked for approval for the adjusted approved list. There were no objections and the motion for approved files passed.

On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Peirsol, and unanimously approved, it was

RESOLVED to go into Executive Session for the purpose of reviewing two applicant files.

The Board went into executive session at 3:15 p.m.

The Board came out of executive session at 3:27 p.m.

On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Peirsol, and unanimously approved, it was

RESOLVED to approve Courtney Gibbs application for comity as read, with the stipulation that the information in the applicant's file will take precedence over the information in the minutes:

91. Gibbs, Courtney	PE Civil	CO	Approved
---------------------	----------	----	----------

The Chair noted that there were no objections and the file was approved.

On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Peirsol, and unanimously approved, it was

RESOLVED to hold as incomplete the following list of applications for comity and examination as read with the stipulation that the

information in the applicant's file will take precedence over the information in the minutes:

1. Jackson, Jennifer	PE Petroleum	EX	Incomplete. Needs to document 15 months professional experience after 10/02 and needs verification of FE examination.
2. Coghill, William	PE Civil	EX	Incomplete. Needs 5 additional months work experience.
3. Lehrmann, Eli	PE Civil	EX	Incomplete. Needs 13 months additional work experience beyond 10/02.
4. Schlomer, John	PE Civil	EX	Incomplete. Cannot determine adequate professional experience without transcript. Appears applicant needs 8 months professional experience after 10/02.
5. Wilmot, Brett	FLS	EX	Incomplete. Needs one year of additional surveying education.
6. Wyborn, Glen	PE Mechanical	CO	Incomplete. Needs 24 months additional professional experience under U.S. registered engineer, mechanical for responsible charge.
7. Grahn, Karin	FE	EX	Incomplete. Needs foreign degree evaluation & documentation of engineering work experience.

The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none.

On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Peirsol, and unanimously approved, it was

RESOLVED to deny the following list of applications for comity and examination as read, with the stipulation that the information in the applicant's file will take precedence over the information in the minutes:

1. Biggs, Thomas	FLS	EX	Denied; 12 AAC 36.064 requires total of 8 years experience-lacking 24 months.
2. Bosse', Scott	PLS/AKLS	EX	Denied. 12 AAC 36.065 requires 2 years of course work in survey education.
3. LeMay, Patrick	PE Civil	EX	Denied. 12 AAC 36.063 requires a combined total of 8 years experience & education. Needs 24 months additional experience.

On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Peirsol, and unanimously approved, it was

RESOLVED to go into Executive Session for the purpose of reviewing three applicant files.

The Board went into executive session at 3:41 p.m.

The Board came out of executive session at 3:48 p.m.

1 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the motion to deny and there
2 were none.

3
4 The Chair referred back to the Annual Report under New Business and asked
5 to approve the Annual Report with the technical revisions and edits.

6
7 The Executive Administrator advised the Board that she consulted with the
8 Director to find out if the Board could postpone adopting the Annual Report
9 until November. She indicated that it is helpful to have the report sent to the
10 Director timely although the Board could approve the statistical reports and
11 then approve the report in November.

12
13 **On a motion by Brown, seconded by Kalen, and unanimously approved, it**
14 **was**

15
16 **RESOLVED to approve the FY 02 AELS Annual Report in its final form.**

17
18 The Chair noted that there were no objections and the Annual Report will be
19 reorganized, circulated to the Board for any technical edits and submitted to
20 the Director.

21
22 **Agenda Item 21 – Board Member Reports**

23
24 The Chair noted that there were written reports that covered the meetings
25 members had attended.

26
27 Cyra-Korsgaard spoke about the CLARB Resolutions that were handed out
28 previously and indicated these resolutions would be voted on at the CLARB
29 annual meeting in September. She mentioned that they would be voting on the
30 adoption of the Model Law Proposing that Landscape Architects have 36 PDH,
31 of which 24 PDHs should be should be earned by completing structures and
32 educational activities that directly relate to health and safety issues.

33
34 The Chair suggested that Cyra-Korsgaard be the delegate to the CLARB
35 Conference.

36
37 The Chair noted that there were no objections and Cyra-Korsgaard would be
38 the delegate to the CLARB Conference.

39
40 The Chair brought up the Specialty Contractor statute language and the Chair
41 would draft something to circulate or have before the Board in November and
42 would add this to the November agenda.

43
44 Brown discussed the NCARB Annual meeting and highlighted the hot issue
45 was a resolution that would require delegates be Architect Board members and
46 it was voted down for the second year in a row. Facilitating mobility has been a
47 focal point and the NCARB has been facilitating agreements with other
48 countries for international practice. The architect would collaborate with the
49 host architect who then stamps the drawings.

Brown discussed the Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) process and that there still is discussion at the officer level and there are still states who are in similar positions to us. Some states, like Nebraska require that the architect practice for 10 years but the experience must be in their state.

The Chair noted that the WCARB Director sent an email that explains about 38 people have gone through the process of applying for the BEA, and of those, 20 have gone through the entire process.

The Chair indicated that the NCARB dues will be increasing but will be phased in over time from 2004 - 2009.

The Chair noted that there are written reports from those attending but that Examination Security issues were discussed. Some people are using scanners, which led the NCEES to provide pencils. There has been concern expressed about the types of calculators that can allow word processing capabilities.

Kalen reported on the NCEES Annual meeting in San Diego and the Western Zone portion of the meeting and the Land Surveyors Forum. He anticipates having a proposal on the November meeting agenda to adopt the Land Surveyor model law.

Agenda Item 22 - Review Calendar of Events/Confirm Meeting Dates

The Chair reviewed travel for the next year:

September 12-14, 2002	CLARB Annual Meeting	New Orleans, LA	Cyra-Korsgaard, Miller and Executive Administrator
September 19-20	NCARB MB Chairs Conf.	Denver, CO	Miller
October 23-25, 2002	APEG-BC	Victoria, BC	Mearig
November 8-9, 2002	Washington DC	MBA Conference	Executive Administrator
Feb 13-15, 2003	Presidents Assembly/MBA Forum	Girdwood, AK	Miller, Executive Administrator
Feb 27-Mar 1, 2003	WCARB Region 6	Anchorage	Brown, Peirsol, and Board (as permitted)
May 15-17, 2003	Western Zone meeting	Red Lodge, MT	Miller, McLane, Exec. Adm.
June 25-28, 2003	NCARB, Annual meeting	San Antonio, TX, Hilton Palacio del Rio	Peirsol; Brown, Exec. Adm.

The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, the tentative schedule for the quarterly AELS 2002/2003 Board Meetings and noted location change for February 2003, and August 2003 meetings:

November 14-15, 2002 - Anchorage

February 26-27, 2003 - Anchorage
May 21-22, 2003 - Fairbanks* tentative date (Wed/Thurs)
August 21-22, 2003 - Juneau
November 13-14, 2003 - Anchorage

Brown noted that the WCARB meeting will be held at the Captain Cook Hotel Feb 27th through March 1st. The Board has asked the Director for an additional night hotel in conjunction with this meeting. Brief discussion followed.

Agenda Item 23 and 24- Housekeeping, Board Member Comments, Review Task List

Board Member Comments

The Chair asked for Board member comments:

Brown thought the meeting went well and staff did a good job.

Mearig would like to have the Board consider following the Idaho model for a take home examination for the AKLS and arctic engineering.

Brown asked to have the item put on the November item for subgroups.

Siemoneit thanked staff.

McLane agreed that once we've adopted the model law we could move forward on a take home examination.

Cyra-Korsgaard mentioned that in some jurisdictions Landscape Architects are allowed to take the examination at the same time they are acquiring experience.

Iverson thought the meeting went well.

Peirsol was sorry she missed the first day of the AELS meeting.

Kalen mentioned that if Alaska the AKLS examination done in a similar method as Idaho it would completely change the examination.

The Board members signed wall certificates and submitted travel reports as required.

The Executive Administrator will compile task list from the minutes and send around to all Board Members.

Task List:

Brown	Check with WCARB director to find out specific dates and length of the WCARB meeting in Anchorage in 2003.
	Serve on Host Conference (WCARB) Committee.

Cyra-Korsgaard	Revise Building Officials' Manual so that when B.O. review drawings that include items contained in the reference list on p.13 that the drawings are required to be stamped and sealed.
	Serve on Host Conference (WCARB) Committee.
Miller (Chair)	Circulate "environmental engineering" definition to professional societies and Dr. Perkins (May 02)
	Work with Kalen on Specialty Contractor language for insertion in the Annual Report (May02)
	Invite Dean of Engineering to our meetings and consider holding a meeting at the University.
	Research number of schools offering environmental engineering degrees.
	Serve on Host Conference (WCARB) Committee.
	Find out what the Board involvement will be for the NCEES Presidents' Assembly in 2003.
Kalen	Work with Miller on Specialty Contractor language for insertion in the Annual Report, and on legislative request for term limits and continuing education statutory changes (May02)
	Work with McLane on GIS/Photogrammetry Report for August 2002.
	Work on the terms of a bid proposal for the next AKLS examination workshop for the November meeting.
	Prepare a spreadsheet for the AKLS workshop
McLane	Work with Kalen to provide any minor revisions to the Land Surveyor work experience verification form (08-4412 a).
	Work with Kalen on GIS/Photogrammetry Report for August 2002.
	Serve on Host Conference as an alternate.
Peirsol	Continue to monitor "encrypted signatures".
	Serve on Host Conference (WCARB) Committee.
Siemoneit	Check on yellow page and ACS advertising on website.
Executive Administrator	Check with NCEES on emeritus status, permanent or periodic status? done: Permanent emeritus status, acted on by the NCEES Board of Directors.
	Work with Chair to draft letters thanking employers. Done: Draft completed.
	Copy new model law definition for engineer & distribute to Board members (May 02)
	Post LARE site as Anchorage, and to contact staff for information on exam site location.
	Invite Fairbanks building officials to the May 2003 meeting.
	Update references for NCARB publications

Catherine Reardon, O.L. Director	Check to see if Board members costs could be removed from the overall costs of the AKLS workshop (May02)
Licensing Examiner	Revise the Examination scheduling letter to include a statement that calculators with word processing capabilities are not permitted, including cards that are made for calculators.

On a motion duly made by Kalen and seconded by Peirsol and unanimously approved, it was

RESOLVED to adjourn the meeting at 4:55 p.m.

There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

Nancy Hemenway, Executive
Administrator

Approved:

Robert Miller, Chair, Ph.D., P.E.
Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers, and Land Surveyors

Date: _____