

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

MINUTES OF MEETING

November 14-15, 2002

*Draft*

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

By authority of AS 08.01.070 (2) and in compliance with the provision of AS 44.62, Article 6, the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors, (AELS) held a meeting at the Atwood Building, 550 W. 7<sup>th</sup> Ave., Conference Room 1270, Anchorage, AK 99502

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

Robert Miller, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:25 a.m.

Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

Robert Miller, Chairperson, Ph.D., Civil Engineer  
Daphne Brown, Architect  
Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member  
Kathleen Gardner, Vice-Chairperson, Mechanical Engineer  
Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer  
Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor  
Scott McLane, Land Surveyor  
Patricia Peirsol, Architect  
Ernie Siemoneit, Secretary, Mining Engineer

Absent were:

Marcia Davis, Public Member  
Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer, joined the meeting at 9:28 a.m.

Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator  
Julie Adamson, Licensing Examiner

Joining a portion of the meeting, in person, on November 15, 2002 were:

Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing  
David Brower, Assistant Attorney General  
John Clark, Investigator

Orson Smith, Ph.D., P.E.  
UAA Anchorage School of Engineering  
3211 Providence Drive  
Anchorage, AK 99501

Brown and Cyra-Korsgaard asked to be excused at 2:45 p.m.  
The Chair noted that Mearig would arrive on this morning's plane from Juneau.

**Agenda Item 2 – Review/Revise Agenda:**

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

Peirsol asked to have the Board Chairs meeting added to the Board member reports; and to review stamping requirements under Tab 17, Building Officials Manual.

The Chair indicated that the Director of the Division of Occupational Licensing, Catherine Reardon would not be available tomorrow and had therefore asked to speak to the Board at approximately 10:00 a.m. today.

**Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Report**

The Chair brought to the Board's attention that Orson Smith, Professor at the University of Alaska Anchorage has requested the Board consider adding a graduate level course to the Board-approved arctic courses. He reminded members that he teaches a short course for UAA-CTC in conjunction with William Nelson. He indicated he would abstain from voting and asked the Vice-Chair to take over as Chair when considering that item. There were no objections to his participation during that portion of the meeting.

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

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

The Chair asked for any corrections or additions to the August 2002 AELS draft minutes.

Kalen suggested on Page 31, Line 17, the following sentences be added, as follows:

Kalen noted that the psychometricians are not competent to select the subject matter experts. In his opinion, it would not work.

There was no object to the additional sentences being added to the draft minutes.

**On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Cyra-Korsgaard, and carried unanimously, it was**

1                   **RESOLVED to approve the August 22-23, 2002 AELS Board meeting**  
2                   **minutes as amended.**

3  
4       The Chair noted that there were no objections and the minutes were approved as corrected.

5  
6       **Agenda Item 5 – Correspondence**

7  
8       The Chair brought up the following correspondence:

9  
10      Other Correspondence: Letter from Peter Rasmussen, Region 6, WCARB.

11  
12      Brown mentioned that NCARB is interested in seamless reciprocity and wants to ensure that  
13      impediments are removed. The Alaska Board requirement for arctic engineering is not seen as  
14      an impediment.

15  
16      Brown stated that in addition to the Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) process, there is a task  
17      force to study development of a foreign BEA process. The BEA process was set up to allow  
18      those applicants not qualifying for a Blue Book Council Record to obtain one. Brown indicated  
19      that what has happened recently to the BEA was a change that would allow an architect  
20      registered in another jurisdiction to obtain licensure based on work experience performed in  
21      Alaska. The process is still a rigorous process that involves time and money but it is an  
22      alternative to the Council Record process.

23  
24      (a) Letter from Rep. Norm Rokeberg dated 9/25/02 (Added HB 227 to New Business).

25  
26      Kalen explained that Representative Harris introduced a bill to address an issue that arose with  
27      respect to mortgage surveys by establishing standards for land surveying . Currently we don't  
28      define land surveyor standards in our statutes (AS 08.48).

29  
30      McLane explained that Florida and some other states have created standards for mortgage  
31      surveys that may be used as a model. He went on to explain that the laws that differentiate  
32      mortgage and boundary surveys are found in different areas of the law. Mortgage surveys are  
33      not defined but would be covered in the Alaska Statutes in Title 38, not in Title 8.

34  
35      Peirsol did not think that defining land-surveying standards was within the purview of the AELS  
36      Board.

37  
38      Iverson suggested that the Board supports a statute change that would address mortgage surveys  
39      but the bill as currently drafted would not alleviate the problem.

40  
41      Discussion followed.

42  
43      The Chair suggested that the Legislature consider a solution by defining the requirements for  
44      mortgage surveys, perhaps in Title 38, and that the Board's investigator would investigate  
45      complaints against land surveyors with respect to any land surveying standards set by law.

46  
47      The Chair asked Kalen and McLane to draft a letter to respond to Representative Rokeberg.

48  
49      (b) Email from Orson Smith, Ph.D., PE (Added to New Business). The Chair indicated that Dr.  
50      Smith would be speaking to them tomorrow.

(c) Email from Kurt Stafford, IA program (Added to New Business). The Chair indicated that this was an informational item and that the Board would consider the work experience but would not count work experience and education concurrently.

Break: 10:08 a.m.

Reconvene: 10:20 a.m.

The Chair indicated that the Director of the Division of Occupational Licensing, Catherine Reardon, was present and moved to Tab 15, Meet with the Director.

### **Agenda Item 15 – Meet with the Director, Occupational Licensing.**

Reardon asked if there were any questions.

Brown asked if it was necessary to do travel authorizations when the trips were prepaid in the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) dues.

Reardon explained that there were several reasons why it was important to do the travel authorizations. The State likes to keep an arms length distance from organizations paying for the travel and also to ensure that Board members are covered under the State's umbrella insurance should any injury occur. It helps make it clear that the member was traveling on behalf of the State.

The Chair asked about legislative requests for statutory changes and referred to the FY 02 Annual report in which the Board requests statute changes in three areas.

Kalen stated that he spoke with Senator Therriault and believes that he would be willing to introduce the bills.

Reardon suggested that now is a good time to make requests because some legislators will prefile bills in late December.

Reardon discussed the Online Technology efforts. She stated that she met with the Executive Administrator and the Data Processing staff with respect to technology enhancements. As she envisions it, the Board would like online submittal of applications. Additionally, the Board would like applicants and staff to have access to checklists that would indicate the items received (transcripts, work experience verifications, and license verifications) so that applicants would not need to call or contact the agency directly to find out the status of an application.

At this time, she isn't convinced that we've surpassed the issue of the notary requirement although the State is working towards addressing this issue by next year's permanent fund dividend application deadline. The agency priority is nursing renewals but once that is completed she thought that the agency could commit to work on the phase of the project for online checklists. It is possible to have a separate signature page submitted by mail, accept applications online, and have the application considered completed once the signature page was received within the agency.

Reardon asked if the Board wanted Personal Identification Numbers (PIN) used and several members agreed that it would be preferable to use a PIN to access an account. Reardon agreed and said the PIN could always be removed but the system could be built with the PIN.

1  
2 The Chair suggested that the Data Processing staff could designate someone to work with the  
3 Executive Administrator on Technology issues.  
4

5 Reardon reviewed the Board's budget and explained that it seemed likely that the Board would  
6 have a small surplus and that fees would likely be kept the same but that this would be revisited  
7 in July when the fiscal year is over. She reiterated her expectation that fees would likely stay the  
8 same for the next renewal cycle and that an increase would not likely happen until the 12/31/05-  
9 renewal cycle.  
10

11 Brown asked if there was going to be funding for hosting a reception at the Western Council of  
12 Architectural Registration Boards (WCARB) upcoming meeting to be held in late February and  
13 early March in Anchorage.  
14

15 Reardon responded that DCED does have a request form for such an event and that certain  
16 criteria would need to be met in order to do so for approval. She suggested that the Board make  
17 the request to the new Commissioner once appointed.  
18

19 The Chair thanked Reardon and members expressed their appreciation for the work she has done.  
20

21 The Chair resumed Agenda Item #5, Correspondence.  
22

23 (d) Email from Greg Hegge, re: Environmental Engineering dated 10/7/02  
24

25 The Chair noted that the Board continues its work on consideration of adding additional  
26 disciplines or non-discipline specific licensure. At this time, there is a provision in 12 AAC  
27 36.103 (d) that allows for licensure with 10 years post registration experience.  
28

29 (e) Letter from Michael Carlson rcvd. 10/7/02 re: land surveys.  
30

31 The Chair noted that the correspondence had been forwarded to John Clark, the investigator, and  
32 that no discussion would be held at this time.  
33

34 (f) Letter from Philip Kimbal dated 10/17/02 re: naval architects and marine engineers.  
35

36 The Chair noted that we do not license naval architects and marine engineers at this time nor do  
37 we have mandatory continuing education requirements so this is a moot point at this time.  
38

39 (g) Letter from Gary LoRusso, Keystone Surveying and mapping.  
40

41 The Chair noted that the Board is requesting continuing education statutory authority and plans  
42 to move forward with a program for land surveyors.  
43

44 The Board discussed the public packet of all correspondence and felt it was important to ensure  
45 any new Board members were added to mailing lists for the NCEES, NCARB, WCARB and  
46 CLARB so that they would be aware of the current happenings for the licensure boards.  
47

48 The Chair moved to Tab 6.  
49

50 **Agenda Item 6 – Executive Administrator's report.**

Page 5 of 33

Draft AELS Nov 02 minutes prepared by Nancy Hemenway

1  
2 The Executive Administrator introduced Julie Adamson, the new Licensing Examiner and stated  
3 she is in the process of hiring a second Licensing Examiner. The Landscape Architects  
4 Registration Examination (LARE) will be held next month and two candidates will test in  
5 Anchorage. She sent a letter to all licensees whose license will expire after being lapsed for five  
6 years on 12/31/02 and thus far about 15 reinstatement licenses have been processed. There is  
7 currently no backlog of applications.

8  
9 The Executive Administrator mentioned that we administered exams in Anchorage, Fairbanks  
10 and Juneau and that we had about 120 candidates total. There were a fair number of  
11 postponements and no shows for the exams.

12  
13 The Chair interjected that we used a new site for the Anchorage exams, the Grace Community  
14 Church, primarily because the rental was less and parking was ample. He indicated that it was  
15 nice to have both days of exams in the same location and that the site worked out well.

16  
17 The Chair moved to Tab 7.

18  
19 **Agenda Item 7 – Proposed Regulations Changes.**

20  
21 The Chair explained that item, (c) Draft Engineering Table correction to 12 AAC 36.063 was as  
22 a result of language that apparently was omitted during pagination. The Executive Administrator  
23 and the Chair made some small revisions for clarity. The Table in 12 AAC 36.063 (a) (3)(A)  
24 requires an ABET accredited B.S. degree in engineering in the branch of engineering applied for  
25 listed in 12 AAC 36.990, and a master's or doctorate in engineering acceptable to the Board.  
26 For this description of training and education, the equivalent education in years is 5 years, and  
27 the minimum experience required is 3 years for a total of 8 years of combined education and  
28 experience.

29  
30 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Gardner, and carried unanimously, it was**

31  
32 **RESOLVED to send forward for public noticing to interested parties the proposed**  
33 **regulation change to 12 AAC 36.063 (a)(3)(A).**

34  
35 The Chair noted that there were no objections and the motion was unanimously approved.

36  
37 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Peirsol, and carried unanimously, it was**

38  
39 **RESOLVED to send forward for public noticing to interested parties the proposed**  
40 **regulation change to 12 AAC 36.103, to reflect the current NCARB education**  
41 **standards publication.**

42  
43 Brown noted that this is an ongoing regulation project because the NCARB publications are  
44 updated annually and it requires that the Board update the specific regulation that references to  
45 the NCARB education standards.

46  
47 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Peirsol, and carried unanimously, it was**

48  
49 **RESOLVED to send forward for public noticing to interested parties the proposed**  
50 **regulation change to delete the provision in**

1           **12 AAC 36.103 (5) for architects by comity whose initial registration is after**  
2           **January 1, 1990 to prove IDP completion.**

3  
4 Brown explained that this requirement is seen as an impediment to reciprocity and is no longer  
5 necessary to ensure that comity applicants have met minimum requirements for training.  
6 Because the majority of states now require the Intern Development Program (IDP), and while  
7 some states do not require IDP, minimum levels of training have been evaluated by NCARB and  
8 must be met in order to obtain the “Blue Book” Council record. Jurisdictions are encouraged to  
9 accept the value that the council record offers and not look behind the “Blue Book” to determine  
10 minimum competency.

11  
12 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Kalen, and carried unanimously, it was**

13  
14           **RESOLVED to adopt the proposed regulation change to site adaptation under 12**  
15           **AAC 36.195 that went out for public notice in August 2002.**

16  
17 The Executive Administrator explained that while the Board adopted the change at its February  
18 2002 meeting, the agency did not have funds to public notice the project until after the fiscal year  
19 ended. That public notice period ended on September 20, 2002 and the agency received no  
20 comments per the Regulations Specialist .

21  
22 The Chair stated that the Board considered the cost to private individuals and did not find  
23 specific cost impacts.

24  
25 The Chair noted that there were no objections, the motion was unanimously approved, and he  
26 signed the adoption order and asked the Executive Administrator to forward this to the  
27 Department of Law.

28  
29 The Board discussed specific requirements of the changes to site adaptation.

30  
31 Iverson summarized the change as the architect or engineer assumes the responsibility of the  
32 drawings, either by reviewing them, recalculating or redrawing, whatever the professional deems  
33 is necessary to assume the responsibility for the drawings.

34  
35 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Siemoneit, and not passed, it was**

36  
37           **NOT RESOLVED to adopt the proposed regulation change to add environmental**  
38           **engineering as an engineering discipline listed in**  
39           **12 AAC 36.990 (17), and to send it out to interested parties for public comment.**

40  
41 The Executive Administrator explained that the Board had public noticed non discipline specific  
42 engineering licensure last November, and that at subsequent meetings had asked for specific  
43 language to be developed to define some disciplines. The proposed regulation changes were  
44 broad enough to allow the Board the flexibility to just add some disciplines or to add all 19  
45 disciplines that the National Council of Engineering Examiners offers.

46  
47 Brown felt that the Board should slowly add disciplines and that environmental engineering was  
48 a specialty that made sense in Alaska.

1 Siemoneit thought that if someone wanted to work in the field of environmental engineering that  
2 they could get licensed as a civil engineer but develop their practice and specialty as  
3 environmental engineers just as they currently are doing in Alaska.

4  
5 Mearig thought that defining the disciplines in engineering was complicated because of the  
6 overlap.

7  
8 The Chair noted that the definition for environmental engineering was taken from the Academy  
9 of Environmental Engineers.

10  
11  
12 **On a motion by Kalen, seconded by Siemoneit, and passed unanimously, it was**

13  
14 **RESOLVED to table the motion on environmental engineering until the Board**  
15 **addressed the issue of non-discipline specific engineering.**

16  
17 The Chair noted there was no objection and the motion to table passed unanimously.

18  
19 **On a motion by Kalen, seconded by Brown, it was**

20  
21 **RESOLVED to serve notice of reconsideration on Kalen's vote on non-discipline**  
22 **specific engineering taken in August 2002, restated as follows:**

23  
24 *On a motion by Mearig, seconded by Brown, it was*  
25 *RESOLVED to approve the regulation change to*  
26 *non-discipline specific licensing as described in draft regulations under 12 AAC*  
27 *36.100(c), 12 AAC 180(b), and 12 AAC 36.990(17).*

28  
29  
30 The Chair noted that the motion taken at the August 2002 meeting had failed 3-5.

31  
32 The Chair asked if there was any objection to the motion for reconsideration and there was none.

33  
34 The Chair announced that it was time to break for lunch.

35  
36 Break for lunch: 11:50 a.m.

37  
38 Reconvene: 1:20 p.m.

39  
40 The Chair noted that Davis and Kalen were absent.

41  
42 **Agenda item 9, Public Comment**

43  
44 The Chair indicated there was no one present to come before the Board with public comment and  
45 that the Board would move forward with its work on the agenda but would return to take public  
46 comment if anyone joined the meeting.



1 The Chair moved to resume Agenda Item 7, Proposed Regulation Changes.

2 The Chair reminded the Board that the motion was back on the table to consider the non-  
3 discipline specific regulations.

4  
5 The Board held a lengthy discussion about adding engineering disciplines to the ones we  
6 currently license:

7  
8 Brown gave information she gathered from her NCARB Member Board Chairs meeting where  
9 some participants cautioned against the system because of overlap between disciplines causing  
10 enforcement difficulties.

11  
12 Mearig thought enforcement issues were less likely because of self-policing through liability of  
13 exposure. There would be consequences to work in fields not qualified by examination,  
14 experience, or education. He suggested the Board might want to strengthen its disciplinary codes  
15 and authority. He went on to provide information he found by reviewing Colorado and Nevada  
16 engineering licensure and stated that he favored the Colorado model as one to consider. The  
17 Nevada model does not define individual disciplines but leaves the field open to adding other  
18 disciplines its Board approves.

19  
20 Mearig suggested the Board remove its current definitions for disciplines it licenses.

21  
22 Kalen rejoined the meeting at 1:33 p.m.

23  
24 Iverson preferred adding all 19 disciplines and to develop definitions for them.

25  
26 Gardner thought providing definitions would assist the investigators.

27  
28 McLane thought that the current definitions assist the public in determining expectations of what  
29 the engineer can provide.

30  
31 Siemoneit expressed concern that the Board would provide licensure for disciplines without  
32 regard for what might be added, such as genetic engineering.

33 Kalen stated that other jurisdictions are not having enforcement issues with a non-discipline  
34 specific license.

35  
36 Peirsol stated she thought that the liability issue would stop most engineers from taking on jobs  
37 they were not qualified to perform.

38  
39 Iverson advised that the NCEES needs to have a sufficient pool of licensees in order to keep the  
40 discipline specific examination viable.

41  
42 The Chair noted that some disciplines have been removed, such as nuclear engineering for that  
43 reason.

44  
45 McLane indicated he would give this issue more credence if the request were coming from the  
46 public and not the engineers.

47  
48 Brown believes the Board should be ahead of the public perception and taking on a leadership  
49 role.

The Chair noted that the majority of the engineers requesting a change have been environmental engineers wanting to work within their specialty without having to take the civil engineering examination.

Mearig noted that currently the Board will accept candidates without a degree and that a stamped plan does not guarantee quality.

The Board held a discussion on minimum competency through experience and the requirement in Alaska regulation for 10 years post registration experience in a specialty; and the requirement to take the examination in the specialty.

Gardner was concerned about how the licensing system would be handled in proposals. Some engineers could be excluded from bidding because the proposal would specify someone licensed in the specific discipline, for example environmental engineering.

The Chair asked for a vote on the reconsideration of the motion for non-discipline specific licensure that was voted down 3-5 at its August 2002 meeting and restated Kalen's motion:

**On a motion by Kalen, seconded by Brown, it was**

**RESOLVED to serve notice of reconsideration on Kalen's vote on non-discipline specific engineering taken in August 2002, restated as follows:**

*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 regulations under 12 AAC  
36.100(c), 12 AAC 180(b), and 12 AAC 36.990(17)*

The Chair noted that the motion taken at the August 2002 meeting had failed 3-5.

The Board took a roll call vote on the reconsideration as follows:

Board Member	Yeas	Nays
Brown	X	
Davis	Absent	
Gardner		X
Iverson		X
Kalen	X	
McLane		X
Mearig	X	
Miller		X
Peirsol	X	
Siemoneit		X
Failed	4	5

**The Chair noted that the motion failed 4-5.**

**On a motion by Iverson, seconded by Brown, it was**

1 **RESOLVED to require that the applicant pass the examination in the discipline the**  
2 **applicant was applying for registration.**

3  
4 The Board held a short discussion and took a vote. The Chair noted that the vote failed 1-8, with  
5 Iverson the only yea.

6  
7 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, Application Reviews.

8  
9 **Agenda Item 10 – Application Reviews**

10  
11 **On a motion by Kalen, seconded by Gardner, and unanimously adopted, it was**

12  
13 **RESOLVED to go into executive session for the purposes of reviewing applicant**  
14 **files at 2:30 p.m.**

15  
16 The Board went into executive session at 2:30 p.m.

17  
18 The Board recessed at 4:45 p.m.

1 **Friday, November 15, 2002**

2  
3 **Agenda Item 11 – Convene/Roll Call**

4  
5  
6 Members present and constituting a quorum were:

7  
8 Robert Miller, Chairperson, Ph.D., Civil Engineer  
9 Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer  
10 Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor  
11 Scott McLane, Land Surveyor  
12 Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer  
13 Patricia Peirsol, Architect  
14 Ernie Siemoneit, Secretary, Mining Engineer  
15 Marcia Davis, Public Member  
16 Kathleen Gardner, Vice-Chairperson, Mechanical Engineer  
17 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect  
18

19  
20 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

21  
22 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator  
23 Julie Adamson, Licensing Examiner  
24

25 Joining a portion of the meeting, in person, on November 14-15, 2002 were:

26 John R. Clark, Investigator  
27 David Brower, Assistant Attorney General  
28

29 The Chair asked if there were any concerns about files that needed to be addressed.

30  
31 The Executive Administrator explained there were several files that needed additional  
32 information that she anticipated would be verified prior to the applications being read into the  
33 record.  
34

35 **Agenda Item 12– Investigator Report and Investigator Discussion Items**

36  
37 The Chair noted that John Clark was present.

38  
39 Clark discussed the Investigator Report.  
40

41 Brown referred to an item on the list for unsigned plans and asked if the building official is  
42 notified when action is initiated.  
43

44 Clark discussed the frequency that he encounters unsigned plans and advised he does not send a  
45 letter to the Building Official but that a cease and desist order is the usual outcome.  
46

47 The Board held a discussion on the issue.  
48

49 Brown said the drawing must be signed and sealed or the building inspector is not exempt from  
50 the exemption under AS 08.48.331 (11) if they are accepting unsigned plans.

1  
2 **On a motion by Brown, seconded by Davis, and unanimously approved, it was**  
3 **RESOLVED to send a letter to the Fire Marshal and Building Officials to advise**  
4 **them they are liable if they accept unsigned plans.**

5  
6 Discussion followed.

7  
8 The Chair read a portion of the exemption under AS 08.48.331 (13): ... only applies if the plan  
9 reviewer is reviewing drawings and specifications for compliance with the building codes of the  
10 state or a municipality **if the drawings and specifications have been signed and sealed by a**  
11 **professional architect or professional engineer....**

12  
13 The Chair recapped the discussion that the Board was concerned that their investigator is  
14 routinely finding unstamped plans. Building officials must be registered unless they are  
15 reviewing plans stamped by an architect, engineer, landscape architect, or land surveyor. If plans  
16 are not stamped, the exemption under AS 08.48.331 (13) does not apply.

17  
18 The Chair asked for a voice vote and stated that the motion passed unanimously without  
19 objection.

20  
21 Iverson suggested that the Executive Administrator request the Department of Law review the  
22 draft letter prior to sending it to the Fire Marshal and Building Officials.

23  
24 Clark brought up instances where he is unable to prove a case because he cannot determine the  
25 specific date that plans were signed. It would be helpful if the requirement for sealing also  
26 include a provision for dating the plan.

27  
28 **On a motion by McLane, seconded by Brown, it was**  
29 **RESOLVED to public notice to interested parties a proposed regulation change to**  
30 **require that plans be dated when sealed.**

31  
32 The Board held a short discussion to determine if this would be cumbersome for those signing  
33 lengthy plans, and common practices for dating plans.

34  
35 Kalen asked that the motion be amended for clarification.

36  
37 **McLane amended his motion to read:**

38  
39 **On a motion by McLane, seconded by Brown, it was**  
40 **RESOLVED to public notice to interested parties a proposed regulation change to**  
41 **require that plans be dated within the seal, or in close proximity of the seal.**

42  
43 Discussion followed about the time it may take to add the date to the seal.

44  
45 Davis reminded members that Clark could not enforce undated plans that were undated  
46 deliberately to avoid compliance.

47  
48 **On an amendment by Davis, seconded by McLane, it was**

1 **RESOLVED to accept the date on the plans as the default date if no date was within**  
2 **the seal.**

Member	Yeas	Nays
Davis	X	
Gardner	X	
Iverson	X	
Kalen		X
McLane		X
Mearig		X
Miller	X	
Peirsol	X	
Siemoneit		X
Brown		X
Failed	5	5

3  
4  
5 The Chair stated that the motion failed 5-5.

6  
7 The Chair stated that the main motion was before them and the motion was read:

8  
9 **On a motion by McLane, seconded by Brown, and passed by roll call vote, it was**  
10 **RESOLVED to public notice to interested parties a proposed regulation change to**  
11 **require that plans be dated within the seal, or in close proximity of the seal.**  
12

13 The Chair noted that the effort it takes to date seals must be balanced by the benefits to the  
14 investigator to have a specific date that plans were sealed.  
15

Member	Yeas	Nays
Gardner	X	
Iverson		X
Kalen	X	
McLane	X	
Mearig		X
Miller	X	
Peirsol		X
Siemoneit	X	
Brown	X	
Davis	X	
Passed:	7	3

16  
17 The Chair indicated that the motion passed 7-3, and that it would be added to the project that  
18 would be sent out for public noticing to interested parties.  
19

20 Brown brought up an item that she wanted clarified by the members. If the NCARB revokes a  
21 council record, that revocation would not affect a registrant if they gained licensure in Alaska by  
22 comity on the basis of the council record. She went on to state that it is not a mandatory  
23 requirement for registrants to maintain a council record. So long as the applicant met the test at

1 the time of licensure, they are admitted for licensure and that license would not be revoked  
2 simply because they were no longer eligible to hold the record.

3  
4 The Board held a short discussion and agreed with Brown.

5  
6 Clark brought up the matter of joint ventures and asked the Board for clarification.

7  
8 Brown described situations where consultants are working for a firm and are paid a fee. She  
9 explained that typically design consultants will affiliate with a firm in Alaska, and the firm in  
10 Alaska accepts the responsibility for signing and sealing any plans.

11  
12 Clark indicated that by statute all members must be registered in a partnership. He has been  
13 treating joint ventures in much the same way as a partnership.

14  
15 Davis stated that 'joint venture' is a legal term which signifies a partnership for a particular  
16 purpose, and agreed with Clark that if a joint venture formed by two corporations is going to bid  
17 on a project, each member of the joint venture has to have a corporate registration. Alaska  
18 Statute 08.48.251 dictates that all members of the partnership (and joint venture) must  
19 independently be registered. She agreed that each member of the joint venture would have to  
20 have a business license, as well.

21  
22 Break: 9:20 a.m.

23 Reconvene: 9:35 a.m.

24  
25 Clark related fieldwork he has done where no signed plans were on site or in the professional's  
26 office. He asked for clarification of the requirements for signed plans on site.

27  
28 A lengthy discussion was held. The Board discussed common practices of putting a disclaimer  
29 on drawings sent electronically indicating the drawing is not final.

30  
31 Brown indicated that the final plan should be at the building site, otherwise the contractor could  
32 be building from preliminary drawings.

33  
34 Davis rejoined the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

35  
36 Davis suggested that so long as a design professional has complied with the requirement by  
37 having the final plans sealed and on file, that the design professional does not have control over  
38 the contractor. If a contractor is building from unsigned or altered plans, then the Board's  
39 investigator can take action for unlicensed or fraudulent activity.

40  
41 Brower joined the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

42  
43 The Chair asked Clark's view of non-discipline specific licensure and for any enforcement  
44 implications to changing our licensure methods.

45  
46 Clark responded that he encounters some issues now with design professionals working outside  
47 their area of expertise. In instances where someone has sealed plans obviously outside their  
48 practice, he is able to intervene and educate the professional.

**Agenda Item 12 – Budget Summary**

The Chair brought up the Budget Summary and indicated they had discussed this with the Director.

**Agenda Item 14– Goals and Objectives**

The Board did not discuss the Goals and Objectives but moved them to the February 2003 meeting.

The current Board 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"><li>• Distributing and receiving applications electronically</li><li>• Structuring database so that it minimizes manual data entry</li><li>• Structuring database so that it can answer queries easily.</li></ul>	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; develop procedures for doing the same.	Board	Ongoing
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 to National, and Zone meetings to ensure Alaska stays informed on national issues and can influence policy issues affecting their professions.	Board and Exec. Administrator	Ongoing
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
Issue Public Service Notice with contact information for complaints. 1)	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

The Chair welcomed Brower to the meeting.

**Agenda Item 16 – Meet with David Brower, Assistant Attorney General**

The Chair brought up questions for the Attorney General.

The Board held a lengthy discussion about non-discipline specific engineering and how such a system would work including the possibility of grandfathering the existing engineering practices such as civil engineers who have developed an environmental engineering practice. They discussed redefining existing definitions for disciplines, and possible sources of definitions, and if they should confine disciplines offered to those disciplines in which applicants can obtain degrees. They discussed ways that the system would keep engineers from practicing outside their area of expertise without overburdening our investigator.

Iverson brought up the provision under 12 AAC 36.105 (d) and asked Brower for an interpretation of this provision.

The Board held a discussion about whether this provision was written to allow a mechanism for applicants taking a non-NCEES examination a way to qualify for licensure. Currently, some Board members use this regulation as a means of allowing those applicants who have taken an NCEES examination not currently offered as a discipline in Alaska to qualify with an additional 10-years of post registration experience.

Iverson relies on the test as the measure of competency and if they have taken an examination outside our disciplines we license, the applicant should test in the discipline they will practice in such as the civil engineering examination.

A discussion followed regarding the interpretation of this regulation and how it applies to non-discipline specific applicants.

Brower explained that the Board has the authority to interpret the regulations and if they agreed to the interpretation of the 10 year post registration requirement that they can apply it in that way to applicants.

Davis felt that the Board should look at the original intent of the regulation and if the intent differs they could modify the regulation to make it clear how the new regulation would be applied.

The Chair called for a straw vote and asked if the board interprets 12 AAC 36.105 (d)(2) to adequately protect the public. Currently the Board interprets this regulation to allow comity applicants for engineering to take an NCEES professional engineering examination in any of the disciplines and, with 10 years of post-registration professional work experience, to qualify as a comity applicant. The vote was as follows:

Member	Yeas	Nays
Cyra-Korsgaard	X	
Iverson		X
Kalen	X	
McLane	X	
Mearig	X	
Miller	X	
Peirsol	X	
Siemoneit	X	
Brown	X	
Davis	X	
Gardner	X	
Passed:	10	1

The Chair noted that the straw vote indicated that the Board is comfortable with the public protection in their interpretation of the regulation. He asked the Executive Administrator to work with the Board's attorney to find out the original intent of this regulation.

Iverson asked if the Canadian engineers could come in by comity under this regulation.

Davis responded that if the engineers verifying the work did not have to be licensed in the United States they could come in under this regulation.

Break: 11:15 a.m.

Reconvene: 11:25 a.m.

The Chair brought up the discussion item, Renewal Fitness questions.

The Board held a discussion conceptually about a current registrant who is applying for registration as an engineer. This registrant did not have to answer questions about a felony sexual assault conviction because the fitness questions were changed to "related to practice" issues.

A discussion followed.

Brown felt that the fitness questions were deliberately changed because the Board shouldn't be concerned about matters that are not related to practice.

Once the person has completed their incarceration or other terms of the conviction, they are considered rehabilitated.

**On a motion by Kalen, seconded by Siemoneit, and unanimously approved, it was**

1           **RESOLVED to go into Executive Session at 11:42 a.m. to discuss a specific**  
2           **registrant.**

3  
4           **The Board came out of executive session at 12:00 p.m.**

5  
6           Break for lunch: 12:00 p.m.

7  
8           Reconvened: 1:15 p.m.

9  
10          Siemoneit and Kalen are absent.

11  
12          The Chair took up the next item on the agenda, Old Business.

13  
14          **Agenda Item 17– Old Business**

15  
16          The Chair indicated that (a) Land Surveyor Standards was discussed under correspondence; and  
17          that Land Surveyor Model Law would be discussed later by Kalen.

18  
19          The Chair took up the Building Official Manual (BOM). The Board packet has copies of the  
20          revised BOM and there are several emails from building officials with suggested changes.

21  
22          The Chair referred to Bob Springer, Building Official from Kenai and his comments.

23  
24          Brown responded to the first question by referencing the AS 08.48.341 (11), (12), (13), and (14)  
25          that define the practices of architecture, engineering, land surveying and landscape architecture.  
26          AS 08.48.221 sets up the requirements for registrants to seal final drawings, specifications,  
27          surveys, plats, plates, reports, or similar documents.

28  
29          Mearig explained that AS 08.48.331 specifies the exemptions to the practice of architecture,  
30          engineering, land surveying and landscape architecture.

31  
32          The Board discussed the general requirements in statute and that while the regulations do not  
33          explicitly outline these requirements in detail, the requirement for stamping is clear.

34  
35          Brown explained that the reference to the Uniform Building Code, page 9, paragraph 1, should  
36          be listed as the International Building Code as adopted by 13 AAC 50-55.

37  
38          Peirsol suggested that the Board respond and make it clear that all projects are required to be  
39          stamped and sealed unless exempted by statute.

40  
41          The Chair offered to write a letter to Mr. Springer referring to the specific statutes and more  
42          clearly outlining for him the need for drawings to be stamped and the exemptions to the practice,  
43          and referencing the seal requirements. He will work to develop a frequently asked question  
44          (FAQ) to put in the Building Officials' Manual. The Executive Administrator offered to assist,  
45          and McLane offered to deliver the letter.

46  
47          The Chair noted that the Board welcomed the questions and the opportunity to clarify the law.

48  
49          Siemoneit rejoined the meeting at 1:20 p.m.

1 Discussion continued.

2  
3 Kalen rejoined the meeting at 1:35 p.m.

4  
5 The Chair brought up the email from Kelly Nicoletto with the comments from the Assistant Fire  
6 Marshal.

7  
8 Brown suggests that the response to Page 9, third paragraph, regarding the notation requirement,  
9 that the Board encourages the Fire Marshal to require either the seal or notation and that it would  
10 be reckless or negligent if they do not.

11  
12 Davis suggested that FAQs be developed:

13  
14 “Am I doing anything wrong by reviewing plans that are not stamped by an architect or  
15 engineer? Yes.”

16  
17 “As a plan reviewer, do I need to be a professional architect, engineer, land surveyor, or  
18 landscape architect?”

19  
20 “Yes, you need to be registered unless you are exempt. Under AS 08.48.331 (13) you are  
21 exempt “when reviewing drawings and specifications for the compliance with the building codes  
22 of the state or a municipality if the drawings, have been signed and sealed by a professional  
23 architect or professional engineer or the preparation of the drawings and specifications is exempt  
24 under this section from the requirements of this chapter;”

25  
26 Iverson suggests a change to P. 11, #2. Can An Alaskan Registrant Overstamp Drawings  
27 Prepared And Stamped By An Out-Of-State Registrant not Registered in Alaska For Submittal  
28 In Alaska?

29  
30 The Board held a discussion and reworded the question as follows:

31 “Can An Alaska Registrant Take Responsibility For A Design Done By An Out-Of-State  
32 Registrant In Alaska?”

33  
34 “Yes, if they follow the requirements under 12 AAC 36.195, for Site Adaptation.”

35  
36 **On a motion by McLane, seconded by Peirsol, it was**

37  
38 **RESOLVED to table the Building Officials’ Manual until the February AELS**  
39 **meeting.**

40  
41 The Chair indicated that the Executive Administrator and Cyra-Korsgaard would continue to  
42 revise and complete the document and could circulate it to Board members for their review.

43  
44 The Chair brought up the land surveyor Model Law and wants to work towards adoption of the  
45 Model Law.

46  
47 **On a motion by Kalen, seconded by McLane, and unanimously adopted, it was**

**RESOLVED to pursue the adaptation of the Model Law and Rules on Surveying, with particular regard to licensing photogrammetrists and GIS Specialists. A working draft is to be prepared in time to start a statute and regulations project at the February 25-26, 2002 Board meeting.**

The Board held a discussion.

McLane explained that the model law is well written and allows photogrammetrists and GIS specialists to work under one title as land surveyors.

Kalen explained that there is a window of opportunity for photogrammetrists and GIS specialists to get licensed without a degree. These professionals would be prohibited from doing certain kinds of boundary surveys through civil penalties.

The Chair noted that the motion passed with no objections. McLane agreed to work on the meeting summary paragraph describing these proposed regulations changes.

The Chair moved to Agenda item #17 – Old Business.

#### Canadian Reciprocity

Mearig discussed his visit to Victoria, British Columbia, to attend an APEG-BC meeting in October 2002. He referred to his report in Tab 21, and discussed the requirements for engineers. ABET does not visit Canadian Universities. About 60 Canadians took the NCEES professional engineering examination, offered by the State of Washington in Vancouver. A summary of comments with respect to the subgroup questions are recapped as follows:

Mearig met with Gillian Pichler (APEGBC Director of Registration) to get a response to the questions that came out of our last subgroup meeting in August 2002:

- *Inquire into the possibility of an Alaska AELS engineer member attending an ABET visit to a western Canada university.* There was considerable interest in having us attend the Canadian accreditation board visit to UBC this fall, although the timeframe was too short for the Executive Administrator to get approval.
- *Do we need an alternative to responsible charge experience under U.S. registered engineers? Consider something less than 1:1 credit?* Since APEGBC gives full credit to references by U.S. PE's, Pichler thinks we should reciprocate by giving full credit for responsible charge experience under a P.Eng. During the roundtable discussion, the Washington board chair mentioned that they give full credit to P.Eng. responsible charge.
- *We are open to using discretion in applying our FE requirements - particularly the waiver. Any suggestions?* Pichler thinks that a P.Eng. should not have to show successful completion of the FE – similar to how we treat comity applicants. The Washington representative thought that Canadian graduates should take the FE and that a P.Eng. should not get special treatment. He says that all comity applicants in Washington must show successful completion of the FE.
- *Is the PE exam non-negotiable? In our subgroup, Iverson mentioned that he thinks it is since most U.S. jurisdictions are headed in that direction.* APEGBC would like to think

1 we could come up with an alternative path for experienced P.Eng. holders (similar to  
2 B.C.'s requirements for U.S. engineers (see below).

- 3  
4 • *Get a firm definition and description of actual practice for Alaska-licensed engineers*  
5 *obtaining a license in BC.* Following is APEGBC's policy for Non-resident License  
6 evaluation. It cuts about two months out of the process, as applications go directly to the  
7 registration committee. Approved candidates then need to write the Professional Practice  
8 Examination (Law & Ethics - 3 hour multiple choice and essay), offered quarterly.

9  
10 Applications for non-resident license from applicants who have a CEAB/MRA (likely  
11 ABET)-accredited degree, are licensed in their state of residence and have more than  
12 five years of experience since licensure, supported by good documentation of  
13 experience and good references, are forwarded directly to the Registration Committee  
14 for approval. If there is a dissenting opinion, the application will be sent to the  
15 Applications Committee for further review.

16  
17 APEGBC licenses about 16,000 resident engineers and 120 non-resident engineers. To  
18 qualify for initial licensure, the applicant must state the work or project in BC. Renewing  
19 non-resident license holders need not declare the work or project. Non-resident fees are  
20 double the resident fees. APEGBC likes to see an NCEES council record, but this is not  
21 required. Gill suggested we look at the Texas NAFTA/MRD model that waives exams for  
22 applicants licensed in Canada or Mexico who can show 12 years experience, an  
23 accredited degree, and knowledge of local conditions and codes.

24  
25  
26 Mearig explained the reciprocity for U.S. engineers to practice in British Columbia. Canada does  
27 not consider U.S. engineers to be foreigners. U.S. engineering degrees are accepted but there is a  
28 residency requirement and engineers must show a project. For renewals, fees are twice the  
29 amount but there is not a requirement to show a project.

30  
31 A discussion followed about equality, how Washington and Oregon are handling work  
32 experience, and our examinations.

33  
34 The Chair indicated that the stumbling block to reciprocity seems to be the professional  
35 engineering examination and the concern that if we waive any examinations how that affects our  
36 U.S. registered engineers.

37  
38 Peirsol indicated that the Canadians take stringent exams throughout their education and which  
39 could be considered equivalent.

40  
41 The Chair noted that the pass rate by Canadian engineers taking the PE examination is about the  
42 same.

43  
44 The Chair commented that the Board should continue to be open to Canadian Reciprocity.

45  
46 Break: 2:50 p.m.

47 Reconvene: 3:00 p.m.

48  
49 The Chair brought up the next item under Old Business, Specialty Contractor.

1 He read the draft language that the Board developed at its November 2001 meeting that had not  
2 been forwarded to the Legislature, and mentioned that the Governor chose not to address that  
3 statute change last legislature.

4  
5 AS 08.48.331 (7) a specialty contractor licensed under AS 08.18 while engaged in the business  
6 of construction contracting or a person preparing shop or field drawings for work designed by a  
7 professional architect, engineer, or landscape architect.

8  
9 The Board held a discussion about the purpose of the original statutory exemption for specialty  
10 contractors; the need to ensure that licensed architects and engineers prepare the drawing; final  
11 suggested changes to the proposed statute change; and the importance of creating the appropriate  
12 intent letter to accompany this statute change so that the legislature and the public are well  
13 informed.

14  
15 The Chair read the revised language change:

16  
17 AS 08.48.331(7) a specialty contractor licensed under AS 08.18 preparing shop or field drawings  
18 for work designed by a professional architect, engineer, or landscape architect.

19  
20 The Chair noted that Kalen had offered to forward the proposed statutory changes to Senator  
21 Therriault's office.

22  
23 **Agenda Item 19– New Business**

24  
25 The Chair moved to the first item under New Business.

26  
27 The Chair brought up item (a) UAA Course, 1 credit graduate course and introduced Orson  
28 Smith, Ph.D., P.E.

29  
30 Dr. Smith referred to the handout in the Board's packet and explained he has developed a web  
31 based graduate level course that he would like the Board to consider adding to its list of Board  
32 approved arctic courses. The proposed course is a 1-credit course that would take approximately  
33 2 weeks to complete, and consists of power point presentations presented in 10 daily increments.  
34 The total time to review the presentations would be 15 hours. He envisions that students would  
35 watch some segments more than once, and will be assigned additional reading. Instructional  
36 goals, measurable guidelines for evaluation, and the course outline are all in the packet. The  
37 course cost is \$995.

38  
39 **On a motion by Mearig, seconded by Kalen, it was**

40  
41 **RESOLVED to include the Arctic 680 A course to the Board approved list of arctic**  
42 **courses.**

43  
44 Cyra-Korsgaard felt that this course was a step in the right direction in cutting down barriers to  
45 licensure and giving applicants additional opportunities and choices to meet the requirement.  
46 She wondered if the course could be expanded from 10 days to perhaps 15 days.

47  
48 Iverson was concerned that a 1-credit course might not be in depth enough to cover the  
49 complexity of the material.



The Chair agreed that it could be expanded and suggested it be made a 2-credit course.

Mearig felt that the course as described meets the requirements for the arctic course. The course would prepare architects and engineers so they would know where to look and what to consider in arctic conditions.

Member	Yeas	Nays
Iverson	X	
Kalen	X	
McLane	X	
Mearig	X	
Miller	Abstained	
Peirsol	X	
Siemoneit		X
Brown	X	
Davis		X
Gardner	X	
Passed:	7	2

The Chair indicated that the motion passed 7-2, and thanked Dr. Smith for his participation.

Davis left the meeting.

The Chair moved back to Agenda item, #20.

**Agenda Item 20 – Read Applications into Record**

**On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Iverson, 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
<b>1. Arndt, Travis</b>	<b>PE Civil</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>APPROVED PE CIVIL EXAM</b>
<b>2. Conner, Ronald D.</b>	<b>PE Mechanical</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
<b>3. Cobb, Richard S.</b>	<b>PE Civil</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>APPROVED PE CIVIL EXAM</b>
<b>4. Curtain, Brian E.</b>	<b>PE</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

	<b>Mechanical</b>		<b>(PENDING ARTIC AND FE))</b>
<b>5. Degerlund, Nils</b>	<b>AKLS</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>APPROVED AKLS EXAM</b>
<b>6. Dover, Randall</b>	<b>Architect</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL (PENDING ARTIC)</b>
<b>7. Ferrari, Cynthia</b>	<b>PE Civil</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL (PENDING ARCTIC)</b>
<b>8. Grahn, Karin</b>	<b>FE</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>APPROVED FE EXAM</b>
<b>9. Griswold, Glen</b>	<b>PE Engineering</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL (PENDING ARCTIC)</b>
<b>10. Harnisch, Lynn</b>	<b>PE Civil</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL (PENDING OR LIC. VERIFICATION</b>
<b>11. Heesch, Jack T.</b>	<b>PE Mechanical</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>APPROVED PE MECHANICAL EXAM</b>
<b>12. Heiss, Eric</b>	<b>PE Civil</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL (PENDING TRANSCRIPT AND ARCTIC)</b>
<b>13. Hill, Todd</b>	<b>PE Civil</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>DENIED COMITY APPROVED PE CIVIL EXAM</b>
<b>14. Hutchison, John</b>	<b>PE Mechanical</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL (PENDING CO VERIFICATION</b>
<b>15. Jackson, Jennifer</b>	<b>PE Chemical</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL- PE CHEMICAL EXAM (PENDING FE VERIFICATION)</b>
<b>16. Johnson, David</b>	<b>Architect</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL (PENDING ARCTIC)</b>
<b>17. Kendrick, William</b>	<b>PE Civil</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
<b>18. Larsen, James</b>	<b>PE Mechanical</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APROVAL (PENDING ARCTIC)</b>
<b>19. McDonald, Michael</b>	<b>PE Civil</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL (PENDING TRANSCRIPT,LIC. AND EXAM VERIFICATION AND ARTIC)</b>
<b>20. Michaelson, Cindy</b>	<b>PE Electrical</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>

<b>21. Mueller, Heinz</b>	<b>PE Civil</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL (PENDING TRANSCRIPT, LIC &amp; EXAM VERIFICATION AND ARTIC)</b>
<b>22. Mukherjee, Sanjay</b>	<b>FE</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>APPROVED FE EXAM</b>
<b>23. O’Hanley, Leonard J.</b>	<b>PLS/AKLS</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>APPROVED PLS/AKLS/EXAM</b>
<b>24. Owens, Larry</b>	<b>PE Civil</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
<b>25. Playter, Douglas</b>	<b>PE Civil</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
<b>26. Robertson, Jeffrey S.</b>	<b>PE Civil</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL (PENDING LIC. VERIFICATION AND ARCTIC)</b>
<b>27. Samuels, Clive</b>	<b>PE Mechanical</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL (PENDING ARCTIC)</b>
<b>28. Schulte, Bruce</b>	<b>Architect</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL (PENDING COMPLETED APPLICATION)</b>
<b>29. Wagner, Barbara</b>	<b>Architect</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
<b>30. Witzmann, Stephen</b>	<b>PE Civil</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>

**On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Iverson, it was**

**RESOLVED to find 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:**

<b>1) Fleming, Michael</b>	<b>Architect</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>INCOMPLETE (IDP requirement not met)</b>
----------------------------	------------------	-----------	---

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

**On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Iverson, 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) Hill, Todd	PE Civil	CO	DENIED COMITY, APPROVED PE CIVIL EXAM
2) Sparks, Richard	PLS/AKLS	EX	DENIED

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

The Chair resumed action on Agenda item, #7, Proposed Regulation Changes.

The Executive Administrator explained that the Board public noticed a series of proposed regulations. The Board has a year to act on those proposed regulations. Several items have not been finalized due to discussion and requests by the public to continue discussion on the way the Board licenses engineers.

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

**RESOLVED to add all disciplines that NCEES offers exams, except architectural engineering, to the list of disciplines that Alaska offers registration, and to remove the definitions for the six disciplines listed in 12 AAC 990 (17).**

Discussion followed.

**On an amendment by Iverson, seconded by Siemoneit, it was**

**RESOLVED to add only environmental engineering to the list of disciplines that Alaska offers in 12 AAC 36.990 (17).**

The Chair asked for a vote on the amendment and it failed 2-6. Siemoneit and Iverson as yeas; Miller, Gardner, Kalen, McLane, Mearig and Peirsol as Nays.

The Chair noted that the amendment failed.

**On an amendment by Peirsol, seconded by Iverson, it was**

**RESOLVED to add architectural engineering to the list of disciplines that Alaska offers in 12 AAC 36.990 (17).**

The Chair asked for a vote on the amendment and it passed, 7-1, with Brown as the Nay vote.

**On an amendment by Mearig, seconded by Kalen, it was**

**RESOLVED to combine Structural I and II disciplines.**

The Chair asked for a vote on the amendment and it failed, 4-5, with Kalen, Mearig, McLane, and Brown as yeas, and Miller, Gardner, Siemoneit, Peirsol, and Iverson as Nays.

The Chair reread the main motion as amended:

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

**RESOLVED to add all disciplines that NCEES offers exams to the list of disciplines that Alaska offers registration, and to remove the definitions for the six disciplines listed in 12 AAC 990 (17).**

Iverson said he intended to vote against the motion because due diligence is missing. There is no emergency. It is a good idea to add disciplines but the Board can proceed slowly.

Member	Yeas	Nays
Iverson		X
Kalen	X	
McLane	X	
Mearig	X	
Miller		X
Peirsol		X
Siemoneit		X
Brown	X	
Davis	Absent	
Gardner		X
Failed	4	5

The Chair noted that the motion failed, 4-5.

**On a motion by Brown, seconded by Iverson, and unanimously supported, it was**

**RESOLVED to create a subcommittee to review the Nevada statutes and regulations for discipline specific licensure, and to develop language for definitions.**

The Chair asked for volunteers and assigned Gardner as Chair, with Mearig to serve, and the Executive Administrator to assist the subcommittee.

Brown asked the subcommittee to make a formal presentation at the February meeting.

Cyra-Korsgaard indicated she had prepared a power point presentation from the CLARB meeting presentation but due to time constraints would not present it at this time.

Brown indicated she would like to do an outreach program to high school students about the requirements for becoming an architect or engineer, and to encourage students to attend accredited schools.

The Chair moved to the next item on the agenda.

**Agenda item 21- Board member reports.**

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

**Agenda item 22- Review Calendar of Events.**

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:

February 25-26, 2003 - Anchorage\* date change due to MBA mtg.  
May 21-22, 2003 - Fairbanks\* tentative date (Wed/Thurs)  
August 21-22, 2003 - Juneau  
November 13-14, 2003 - Anchorage

Feb 13-15, 2003	Presidents Assembly/MBA Forum	Girdwood, AK	Miller, Executive Administrator
Feb 27-Mar 1, 2003	WCARB Region 6	Anchorage	Brown, Peirsol, Gardner, Kalen and Miller
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.

Brown noted that the WCARB meeting will be held at the Captain Cook Hotel from Feb 27<sup>th</sup> through March 1<sup>st</sup>. The Chair asked Peirsol to be the delegate at WCARB. Other members who plan on attending the February meeting are Gardner, Kalen, Brown, and Miller.

The Chair offered to be the delegate for the NCEES assembly in February and there was no objection.

Cyra-Korsgaard indicated that she has volunteered to work on cut scores with CLARB.

Brown indicated she is working on the Foreign Architect and Canada architectural licensure with NCARB.

The Chair moved back to New Business, Agenda item # 19, to discuss LLC fees.

The Executive Administrator explained that several Limited Liability Companies complained during the last renewal cycle about the fees for LLCs. The LLCs were sole practitioners but felt that they paid individual fees and LLC fees and it seemed onerous to them. The fees for individual professional licenses were \$195 and LLC renewal fees were \$235.

The Board held a short discussion and concluded that the sole practitioner has a choice to act as a sole practitioner and only pay individual renewal fees, or to establish an LLC.. The decision to become an LLC presumably offers its own benefits and the choice is up to the individual. The Board did not think that its fees for individual corporate, LLC or Limited liability partnerships were onerous.

#### **Agenda Item 23 and 24– Housekeeping, Board Member Comments, Review Task List**

Gardner asked to continue work via email on the Building Officials Manual (BOM) so that the manual could be finalized.

Cyra-Korsgaard agreed with Gardner and suggested that edits to the BOM could be incorporated and Board members can comment back to Executive Administrator if there are any concerns with the edits.

Peirsol suggested that attendance by Board members at the February WCARB meeting in Anchorage would be valuable and she hoped that everyone would consider attending.

Siemoneit thanked staff and asked to continue work on the BOM.

Mearig said goodbye to the Board in anticipation that the newly elected Governor would appoint a new Board member prior to the February meeting. He thought the discussions were excellent.

The Chair commented that he thought the discussions were good.

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

**Task List:**

Brown	Serve on Host Conference (WCARB) Committee.
	Draft letter to Commissioner regarding funding for WCARB reception.
Cyra-Korsgaard	Continue work on revisions to the Building Officials' Manual
	Serve on Host Conference (WCARB) Committee.
Miller (Chair)	Serve on Host Conference (WCARB) Committee.
	Find out what the Board involvement will be for the NCEES Presidents' Assembly in 2003.
	Write a letter to Fire Marshal to discuss the exemption for building officials (exemption does not apply unless plans are signed by an architect or engineer).
	Respond to Michaela A. Martin, Oak Ridge Laboratory, regarding the IAC Program.
Kalen	Forward to the Legislature the Board's request for statutory changes for Specialty Contractor, term limit, and continuing education.
	Prepare a spreadsheet for the AKLS workshop and participants for the next AKLS examination workshop for Dec. 2002 and pass on to the Executive Administrator.
	Draft response to Rep. Rokeberg on HB 227, Land Surveying Standards (with McLane and Executive Administrator )
	Assist Executive Administrator in preparing draft regulations for Model Law Land Surveyor.
McLane	Serve on WCARB Host Conference as an alternate.
	Draft response to Rep. Rokeberg on HB 227, Land Surveying Standards (with Kalen and Executive Administrator )

	Review draft response to Bob Springer, and personally deliver letter responding to his BOM comments.
	Assist Executive Administrator in preparing draft regulations for Model Law Land Surveyor.
Mearig	Serve on Subcommittee for Proposal for Nevada model licensing structure and to develop definitions for disciplines.
Gardner	Serve as Chair of Subcommittee for Proposal for Nevada model licensing structure and to develop definitions for disciplines.
Peirsol	Serve on Host Conference (WCARB) Committee.
Siemoneit	Check on yellow page and ACS advertising on website.

1

Executive Administrator	Update engineering and land surveying work experience forms.
	Update arctic engineering course list (add graduate level course) to the Board approved list.
	Assist Chair in writing letter to Fire Marshal to discuss the exemption for building officials (exemption does not apply unless plans are signed by an architect or engineer).
	Draft response to Rep. Rokeberg on HB 227, Land Surveying Standards (with Kalen and McLane)
	Draft response to Greg Hegge regarding environmental engineering.
	Work with the attorney to research the legislative intent of 12 AAC 36.105 (d)(2).
	Put fitness questions for renewal on Feb 03 agenda.
	Assist Kalen and McLane in responding to Rep. Rokeberg.
	Invite Fairbanks building officials to the May 2003 meeting.
	Assist subcommittee to prepare draft proposal on discipline specific registration per the Nevada model.
	Prepare forms for participants for Dec. AKLS workshop.
	Assist the Subcommittee on draft proposal for Nevada model of licensing structure and develop definitions for disciplines.
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.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

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

**RESOLVED to adjourn the meeting at 5:05 p.m.**

There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

Approved:

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

Date: \_\_\_\_\_