

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 19-20, 2004
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 44.62,
16 Article 6, the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors,
17 (AELS) held a meeting at the Kenai River Center, 514 Funny River Road, Soldotna,
18 AK 99669.
19

20 **Thursday, August 19, 2004**
21

22 **Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Roll Call**
23

24 The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.
25

26 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

27 Donald Iverson, PE, Electrical Engineer, Chair
28 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Vice-Chair
29 Robert Gilfilian, PE, Civil Engineer, Secretary
30 Clifford Baker, PLS, Land Surveyor
31 Boyd Brownfield, PE, Civil Engineer
32 Craig Fredeen, PE, Mechanical Engineer
33 Richard Hughes, PE, Mining Engineer
34 Kenneth Maynard, FAIA, Architect
35 Scott McLane, PLS, Land Surveyor
36 Kimberly Mills, Public Member
37 Patricia Peirsol, Architect
38

39 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

40 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
41 Julie Adamson, Licensing Examiner
42

43 Joining a portion of the meeting, in person were:

44 John R. Clark, Occupational Licensing Investigator
45 Mike Tauriainen, 35186 Spur Hwy, Soldotna, AK 99669

Sam Best, P.O. Box 426, Soldotna, AK 99669
 Robert Springer, 210 Fidalgo Ave., Kenai, AK
 Ralph Linn, 177 N. Birch St., Soldotna, AK 99669
 Mary Gilfilian, 6521 Downey Finch Dr., Anchorage, AK 99516

Agenda Item 2 – Review/Revise Agenda:

**TENTATIVE AGENDA
 August 19-20, 2004
 Thursday, August 19, 2004**

TIME	TOPIC	LEAD PERSON
1. 9:00 a.m.	Call to Order/Roll Call	Chair/Examiner
2. 9:05 a.m.	Review/Revise Agenda	Chair/Board
3. 9:10 a.m.	Ethics Report	Chair/Board
4. 9:15 a.m.	Review/Approve Minutes Quarterly Board meeting (June 04 Qtr mtg)	Chair/Board
5. 9:30 a.m.	<i>Correspondence: Complete list/corr. in Public Packet</i> Email from Power Engineers dated 7/2/04 from Lynette Koenig, re: Elec. Seals.	Chair/Board
6. 9:45 a.m.	Investigator Report – John Clark a. MOA- Kenneth Butts, #7673, Case #10003002 b. Discuss Penalty for Non-Registered Corporations, LLCs, LLPs. c. Discuss Yellow Page Advertising d. Discuss Federal Lands	Board/Clark
7. 10:15 a.m.	Subgroups:	Chair/Board
	A. Engineering Disciplines (sub-disciplines) 1. Idaho/PNWER Resolution for Canadian applicants- follow-up 2. Control Systems Engineering- follow-up	Gilfilian/Board
	B. Incidental Practice: 1. Email of 4/28/04 from Elaine Nefzger, MOA requirement for site plans –PL 2. Email from Randy Johnson, Fbx North Star Borough, guidance on Eng/PLS 3. Email from Lance Duncan re: Land Surveyor Practice (references G&O #5) 4. Email from Tim Krug, regarding plantings required for subdivisions, requesting guidance with respect to landscape architecture	Maynard/Board
	C. Host Committee, Western Zone May 19-21, 2005	Mills/Board
8. 11:15 a.m.	Meet with Building Official- Bob Springer, Ralph Linn	Board/Springer
12:00 noon	Lunch	
9. 1:15 p.m.	Public Comment	Chair/Board
10. 2:15 p.m.	<u>Proposed Regulation changes</u> (a) Public noticing ended 5/12/04, adopted at June 04 meeting: 12 AAC 36.040, .061, .063 – Sent to Dept. of Law for review .040, .063 finalized, signed by Lt. Gov. June 22 and final July 22, 2004. (b) Part II- .061 architect education standards, needs re-adopted & resubmit to Dept. Law due to editing errors. <u>Held over from June 04 meeting:</u> (c) Specifications, 12 AAC 36.185 Sealing Specifications <u>New Draft (not public noticed) for discussion purposes:</u> (d) Canadian Reciprocity – (5 yr practice + PE Exam, + Arctic Engineering)	Chair/Board Ex. Adm/Bd. Gilfilian/Board Gilfilian/Board

11. 2:45 p.m.	Application Reviews (Executive Session –until completed)	Chair/Board
5:30 p.m.	RECESS UNTIL 8:00 a.m., Friday, August 20, 2004	

1

2

Friday, August 20, 2004

TIME	TOPIC	LEAD PERSON
12. 8:00 a.m.	Call to Order/Roll Call Executive Session to Complete Application Review –Continued, (if necessary)	Chair/Licensing Examiner/Board
13. 8:15 a.m.	Regulations (if needed)	Administrator/Board
14. 8:30 a.m.	<i>Administrator's Report</i>	Chair/Exec. Adm.
15. 9:30 a.m.	Meet with David Brower, Attorney (by teleconference) Discussion Items	Chair/Attorney
16. 10:15 a.m.	<i>Budget Summary Report</i>	Chair/Board
17. 10:30 a.m.	Old Business: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Surveyor Subdivision /Overlap w/Engineering (Randy Johnson, FNSB-carried forward 2/04- (Subgroup- #7B-2) Host Western Zone Meeting 2005- May 19-21, 2005 Emergency License- Report Model Law Land Surveyor- Report 	Chair/Board Mills/Chair Gilfilian/Peirsol McLane
18. 11:30 a.m.	Meet with Rick Urion, Director (by teleconference) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget, Legislative Report, Annual Report, Investigations 	Director/Board
12:00 noon	Lunch	
19. 1:15 p.m.	Legislation: HB 252/SB 207 Term Limits, CE (passed, signed by Gov. effective date 9/14/04.	Administrator/Board
20. 1:30 p.m.	New Business: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing Education Providers (Requested Cyra-Korsgaard) Continuing Education- Mandatory Program for renewal 2007 Annual Report- Mining Engineer Board Composition- Audit Question 	Chair/Board
21. 2:30 p.m.	Read Applications into Record	Chair/Licensing Examiner
22. 2:45 p.m.	Goals and Objectives	Chair/Board
23. 3:30 p.m.	Board Member Reports NCEES Annual Meeting- Cleveland	Chair/Board Gilfilian, Baker, Brownfield
24. 3:50 p.m.	Review Calendar of Events, Confirm AELS Meeting Dates: 2004 : Nov 18-19, 2004 Anchorage 2005 AELS Board meeting dates: Feb 17-18 Jnu; June 2-3 Fbx; Aug 18-19 & Nov 17-18 Anch Confirm CLARB attendee	Chair/Board
4:00 p. m.	Board Member Comments, Task List, and Housekeeping (Collect TA's and receipts, Sign Wall Certificates)	Chair/Board

3

4 The Chair asked if there were any revisions to the agenda.

5

6 Fredeen asked to have “Electronic Signatures” added to Old Business.

7

8 **On a motion duly made by Baker, seconded by Gilfilian, and unanimously**
9 **adopted, it was**

10

11 **RESOLVED to adopt the draft agenda.**

12

1 The Chair indicated there were no objections and the agenda was adopted.

2
3 **Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Report**

4
5 The Chair asked if there were any ethics disclosures by members.

6
7 The Chair noted there were no ethics disclosures to report.

8
9 **Agenda Item 4 – Review/Approve Minutes**

10
11 The Chair asked for any corrections or additions to the June 3-4, 2004 draft
12 minutes.

13
14 Mills noted a typographical error on page 12, line 11 delete, “giving,” and page 20,
15 line 32, remove “as well” and add “since there are so few mining engineers in the
16 state.”

17
18 **On a motion duly made by Mills, seconded by Baker, and unanimously**
19 **adopted, it was**

20
21 **RESOLVED to APPROVE the following motion: To adopt the**
22 **minutes from the June 3-4, 2004 meeting, as amended.**

23
24 The Chair indicated the draft June 3-4, 2004 minutes were adopted, as amended.

25
26 **Agenda Item 5 – Correspondence**

27
28 The Chair brought up correspondence:

29
30 Email from Power Engineers dated 7/2/04 from Lynettee Koenig, re: elec. Seals.

31
32 Fredeen asked if electronic seals on PDF files are allowed by regulation and
33 requested clarification of the Board’s policy on electronic seals.

34
35 The Chair responded one set of drawings must be wet sealed (hand signed by the
36 registrant within the seal) because anyone could execute an electronic signature.
37 The Board has previously discussed and has favored moving to accept encrypted
38 signatures as opposed to use of an electronic signature, but currently requires a wet
39 signature. The Board has allowed copies of plans with scanned in seals to be
40 distributed electronically, or copied with a copier and distributed, recognizing the
41 need for multiple sets of drawings. He indicated the U.S. Corps of Engineers uses a
42 method where they remove the seal and send the drawing electronically, along with
43 a “certification of drawings” cover letter from the registrant to indicate the attached
44 drawings were prepared by the registrant.

45
46 The Board held a discussion and some concern was expressed a PDF file could be
47 altered. The Board members discussed recent legislation would give the statutory

1 authority to electronically submit documents. The type of documents the Board
2 relies on are specific professional drawings, which are different than the types of
3 documents the legislation (HB 285) addressed. The Board felt it should clearly
4 address the matter of electronic seals, signatures, and electronic transmittal to give
5 guidance to its registrants.

6
7 **On a motion by Fredeen, seconded by Gilfilian, and unanimously adopted,**
8 **it was**

9
10 **RESOLVED to start a subgroup to study the matter and report back**
11 **to the Board.**

12
13 The Chair indicated Fredeen will chair the subgroup, Electronic Transmittals and
14 Signatures, and members would be Peirsol Gilifilian, and Maynard.

15
16 The Chair noted he would respond to Power Engineers, and indicate that there is a
17 difference between sending scanned documents, and attaching an electronic seal
18 and signature into a document is sent electronically. Scanned documents sent
19 electronically would be allowed by the Board, but sending an electronic seal with a
20 signature (encrypted or digital) would not be allowed at this time. He asked the
21 Executive Administrator to prepare a response and forward to him for review.

22
23 **Agenda Item 6 – Investigator’s Report**

24
25 The Board and Clark held a discussion about the investigator’s report and the
26 importance of site investigations as necessary to identify unlicensed activity.

27
28 Mr. Clark brought up three Memorandums of Agreement (MOA) for Board action.

29
30 Clark brought up the first MOA- Kenneth Butts, Alaska Architect license #7673,
31 Case No. 10003002 and he advised the Board the registrant was performing work
32 beyond the scope of his practice by performing mechanical and electrical
33 engineering services.

34
35 **On a motion duly made by McLane, seconded by Maynard, and adopted, it**
36 **was**

37
38 **RESOLVED to accept the MOA proposed decision and order on Mr.**
39 **Butts.**

40
41 The Board held a brief discussion about the facts within the MOA and the proposed
42 decision. The summary of the proposed decision was discussed: Mr. Butts is
43 required to pay a \$5,000 fine within 120 days, with \$2,000 suspended; and to cease
44 and desist from working or offering to work as an engineer. The decision was
45 signed July 2, 2004 by Gary Veres, Chief Investigator, and Mr. Butts.

1 The Chair abstained from the vote because he reviewed the complaint with the
2 investigator.

3
4 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the motion and there were none.

5
6 Clark brought up the second MOA, Seth Yerrington, Alaska Architect license #2143,
7 Case #0100-02-994 and 0100-02-006. The Board held a brief discussion about the
8 facts within the MOA and the proposed decision. A summary of the proposed
9 decision was discussed: Mr. Yerrington's license to be on probation for 1 year, with
10 specific provisions for absences from the state; to submit to peer review and
11 reporting requirements, and to obey all laws pertaining to the practice of
12 architecture in this state or any other state. The proposed order was signed on
13 August 5th and 6th by Mr. Yerrington, and Gary Veres, Chief Investigator.

14
15 **On a motion duly made by McLane, seconded by Baker, and unanimously**
16 **adopted, it was**

17
18 **RESOLVED to accept the MOA proposed decision and order on Mr.**
19 **Yerrington.**

20
21 Board discussed the procedure of peer review with John Clark. The Board has the
22 authority to approve the architect and typically the investigator will advise the
23 Board Chair of the peer review architect.

24
25 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none and the motion
26 passed.

27
28 Mr. Clark brought up the next MOA, Albert Bianchi, Alaska Land Surveyor license
29 # 3141, Case No's: 0104-96-001, 0104-98-002. He gave a brief summary of the MOA:
30 Mr. Bianchi sealed plats were below the minimum professional standards.

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

34
35 **RESOLVED to adopt the MOA proposed decision and order on Mr.**
36 **Bianchi.**

37
38 The Board held a brief discussion about the facts within the MOA and the proposed
39 decision. A summary of the proposed decision was discussed: Mr. Bianchi is
40 required to voluntarily surrender his license to the Alaska Division of Occupational
41 Licensing on January 3, 2005. Mr. Bianchi will provide the agency a list of all land
42 surveying contracts by July 30, 2004 and he agrees to report subsequent new
43 contracts to the investigator. He also agreed he will not enter into any new
44 contracts for land surveying work involve the setting or recording of monuments
45 between July 15, 2004 and January 3, 2005, and he will never apply for a new land
46 surveying license in Alaska. Mr. Clark stated the provisions for compliance with
47 law and violation of agreement.

1 The proposed order was signed on August 17, 2004 by Mr. Bianchi.

2
3 The Board held a short discussion about the circumstances of the case and the
4 memorandum of agreement.
5

6 The Chair asked for a vote and there were no objections to adopting the proposed
7 memorandum of agreement.
8

9
10 Mike Tauriainen joined the meeting at 9:58 a.m.

11
12 Mr. Clark recommended a civil fine for a first offense for unlicensed practice for
13 non-Registered Corporations, limited liability companies (LLC) and Limited
14 Liability Partnerships (LLP) due to the number of unlicensed Corporate activities.
15

16 Brownfield asked for the investigator's recommendation for the initial fine.
17

18 Sam Best joined the meeting at 10:07 a.m.
19

20 Clark responded he recommends a \$2,000 initial fine for unlicensed practice by
21 corporations, LLCs, and LLPs on projects under \$100,000.
22

23 **On a motion by McLane, seconded by Baker, and adopted, it was**

24
25 **RESOLVED to set a minimum fine for first offense of \$1000 for**
26 **unlicensed practice by a corporation, LLC, or LLP.**
27

28 Gilfilian clarified the motion would refer to initial fines for unlicensed practice by
29 businesses, not individuals, and related his own experiences as a sole practitioner
30 he was unaware firm licensure was needed when he expanded his business.
31

32 The Board held a short discussion and the Chair asked for a roll call vote:
33

Board Member	Yea	Nay
Baker	x	
Brownfield	x	
Fredeen	x	
Gilfilian		x
Hughes	x	
Iverson		x
McLane	x	
Maynard	x	
Mills	x	
Peirsol		x
Total	7	3

1 The Licensing examiner called the roll and announced the motion passed by roll call
2 vote of 7 yeas, 3 nays.

3
4 Mr. Clark gave the three MOAs to the Board Chair, who signed them.

5
6 Mills asked if Bed and Breakfasts should be exempt under the exemption for a
7 single family dwelling is a 4-plex or less?

8
9 The Board held a short discussion about the size of the hotels and Peirsol advised
10 she would bring up B&Bs with the Fairbanks Building Official and bring back
11 information to the next meeting

12
13 Maynard advised some unlicensed architects are continuing to advertise design
14 services in the yellow page advertisements and his concern the public will not be
15 able to discern unlicensed practice.

16
17 Clark responded if the Board advises the Berry Company (who prepare the
18 telephone directories) someone is unlicensed, the Company will not accept them into
19 the next book, but at times they will do some free advertising. For example, GCI
20 might put someone into the engineer category without telling the client. In those
21 instances, the State has no case against the advertiser since the individual is
22 unaware of the action and cannot be held liable.

23
24 The Chair advised in the past, the Board had its own advertisement in the yellow
25 pages to remind public to check the on line database to be certain design
26 professionals are licensed. The funding for the yellow page ad was cut last year,
27 through new policies of the Governor regarding advertising.

28
29 The Chair asked Clark how he conducts investigations and if he was authorized to
30 do site inspections.

31
32 **On a motion by Gilfilian, seconded by Mills, and unanimously adopted, it**
33 **was**

34
35 **RESOLVED to go into Executive Session for the specific purpose of**
36 **discussing a case.**

37
38 The Board went into executive session at 10:25 a.m.

39 The Board came out of Executive Session at 10:30 a.m.

40
41 Break: 10:30 a.m.

42 Reconvene: 10:45 a.m.

43
44 The Chair introduced guests, Mike Tauriainen and Sam Best as former AELS
45 Board members.

1 The Chair moved to the next agenda item, Subgroups and asked the Board to
2 discuss Engineering Disciplines, Canadian Reciprocity, Incidental Practice, and
3 Host Committee 2005 Western Zone.

4
5 **Agenda Item 7 – Subgroups**

6
7 The Board broke into subgroups.

8
9 The Board reconvened at 11:25 a.m. and the Subgroup reports were held until
10 afternoon (taken up after Agenda item # 9 Public Comment)

11
12 **Agenda Item 8 – Meet with Building Officials**

13
14 The Chair introduced Robert Springer, Kenai Building Official, and Ralph Linn,
15 Soldotna Building Official, and the Board members and staff introduced
16 themselves.

17
18 Robert Springer began and addressed several issues of importance to him. He felt
19 the State Statutes regarding sealing plans should be more descriptive, as the
20 statutes leave room for interpretations when architects and engineers are required.
21 He recommended the statutes be tightened up in order to provide better guidance as
22 to the requirements. He mentioned small businesses are not able to afford the
23 design professionals for small jobs, such as a coffee kiosk.

24
25 The Board held a discussion about structures, if they were mobile or permanent
26 structures, the purpose of the structure, and if it were new construction versus
27 renovated structures and how may affect the need for design professional oversight.

28
29 Springer indicated Soldotna and Kenai are small communities with small
30 businesses without a lot of money to comply so he will require an architect or an
31 engineer on projects. The city has passed an ordinance to make the permitting
32 process cheaper and more simplified. He also mentioned the state inspectors do not
33 travel much any longer, and the result is compliance is going down.

34
35 Maynard stated the statutes and regulations are in place for public health and
36 safety issues, and economics should not play a role or overpower the building
37 official's requirement for licensed professionals.

38
39 The Chair indicated a mechanical engineer cannot provide civil engineering services
40 or architectural services and engineers and architects are required on public
41 projects.

42
43 Peirsol indicated many of her clients have found using an architect has actually
44 saved them in overall costs. Hiring a design professional who has familiarity with
45 the requirements rather than someone who must do the design work without the
46 education or experience can translate into more expensive overall project costs.

1 Often times the public thinks they will save costs but really, good design is more
2 efficient and money well spent.

3
4 Ralph Linn agreed but indicated hiring a design professional would be up to the
5 owner.

6
7 Mills asked if Springer was worried about personal liability when making these
8 judgement calls to allow a building permit without the design professional stamps.

9
10 Mr. Springer indicated he was confident in his judgment. He stated sometimes a
11 building is built as residential but is then renovated for public purposes without the
12 owner indicating the final purpose. For example, once the project is completed, the
13 building might then become a Bed and Breakfast (B&B) without the oversight of
14 design professionals.

15
16 The Board held a discussion about the practices and requirements for design
17 professional involvement.

18
19 Peirsol reiterated public safety is an ongoing mission of the Board and the Building
20 Officials. She said the Board is continually working on issues the two groups
21 disagree upon to provide a consensus for dealing with public safety. She asked both
22 Building Officials to review the Building Officials Manual, which is a document for
23 them as well as for the public to use as a reference, and to provide the Board with
24 any suggested changes.

25
26 Peirsol added while B&Bs are technically residential, they are still commercial
27 enterprises. Ralph mentioned the flaws in the home inspector law was just being
28 implemented.

29
30 Maynard asked if home inspectors have to be bonded and licensed.

31
32 Springer responded they must be bonded and licensed, although there is a provision
33 in the statutes for an exemption for design professionals to allow them to provide
34 home inspections.

35
36 Springer felt the Board's investigator should not be doing site inspections on
37 projects are nearly complete and then to demand plans for projects the fire marshal
38 has approved.

39
40 The Board discussed its efforts to develop a dialogue with the fire marshal and
41 building officials around the state to ensure the statutes are followed and to refine
42 the regulations so they are workable in the communities.

43
44 Linn indicated when the state fire marshal gives a permit, they are not reviewing
45 all the codes required and that structural codes are not adopted by the State, and
46 building officials do a more thorough code review.

1 The Board and Building Officials discussed the home inspection statutes.

2
3 The Chair and Board thanked the Building Officials for joining them.

4
5 The Chair announced the Board would break for a lunch at 12:25 p.m. and
6 reconvene for public comment at 1:15 p.m.

7
8 **Agenda Item 9 – Public Comment**

9
10 The Board returned from lunch at 1:10 p.m. and no members of the public were
11 present. The Board sat at ease and reconvened at 1:35 p.m. All members were
12 present except Peirsol.

13
14 The Chair reverted back to Agenda item # 7, Subgroups and asked the subgroup
15 Chairs to report.

16
17 **Agenda Item 7 – Subgroups**

18
19 Gilfilian, Subgroup Chair reported on Engineering Disciplines (sub-disciplines).
20 Iverson, Hughes, & McLane participated. He reported:

21
22 Idaho/PNWER Resolution for Canadian applicants- follow-up. The Canadian group
23 met and Senator Dyson signed the PNWER resolution without AELS Board input.
24 The resolution supports equality between engineers licensed in Canada and the
25 United States but does not prevent states from requiring examination. He
26 mentioned he found an article quoted Neil Windsor, APEGGA, as stating the
27 examinations would be waived, but may have been a misquote. While the
28 Canadians would prefer not to take the exams, the only examination has been
29 waived in jurisdictions is the fundamentals of engineering (FE) examination and
30 there are varying requirements among the U.S. jurisdictions. In Alaska, the FE
31 examination can be waived with 20 years of professional experience. He will
32 forward a proposal for a regulation change to be taken up under Agenda item # 10,
33 Proposed Regulation Changes.

34
35 Control Systems Engineering- follow-up. The Subgroup would continue work in this
36 area but focused on the Canadian Reciprocity issues first.

37
38 Peirsol rejoined the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

39
40 Maynard, Subgroup Chair, reported on the subgroup for group on incidental
41 practice:

42
43 Incidental practice and Board members Brownfield, Cyra-Korsgaard, Baker
44 participated in the subgroup discussion. He reiterated the subgroup plans to
45 review:

- 46 • Other state's information on what works and what does not work;
47 • Define areas of conflict between professions;

- Check professional college curriculums as they are not likely the same now as 20 years ago when the exemptions were adopted; and
- Define overlaps and give examples so people have an idea of the direction the Board is taking.

The group will develop a matrix of this information to help make decisions, not just incidental practice of minor importance, but for overlap of practices. The group did not answer emails listed but the Board may be able to work on responses tomorrow on some of the following:

1. Email of 4/28/04 from Elaine Nefzger, MOA requirement for site plans;
2. Email from Randy Johnson, Fbx North Star Borough, guidance on Eng/PLS;
3. Email from Lance Duncan re: Land Surveyor Practice (references G&O #5); and
4. Email from Tim Krug, regarding plantings required for subdivisions, requesting guidance with respect to landscape architecture.

Mills reported on the Host Committee Subgroup and Board member Peirsol participated.

Mills, Subgroup Chair, stated the subgroup discussed the Western Zone Meeting to be held May 19-21, 2005 and some of the options for participants including a dinner cruise and activities at the Alaska Native Heritage Center. Mills said NCEES Western Zone and the National Council of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors would give \$5,000 for a total budget of \$10,000.

Board members suggested some possible considerations such as Alyeska Resort, Hatcher's Pass, the Alaska Railroad, Wildlife Cruise from Whittier, and agreed participants enjoy getting out to see the Alaska scenery, not just a city. The subgroup will look at costs and potential sponsors for excursions, and items for gift packages for participants.

The Subgroup needs to prepare a budget for the incoming Western Zone Chair by October 2004.

Agenda Item 10 – Proposed Regulation Changes

The Executive Administrator explained item (a) regulations were adopted by the Board and sent to the Department of Law for review. Several portions of the project were approved and signed by the Lt. Governor and became final on July 22, 2004: Proposed changes adopted are to the following: 12 AAC 36.040, changes the due date for LARE applicants to allow staff to meet the exam ordering deadline date; and 12 AAC 36.063, an addition to the engineering table to add credit for an ABET accredited degree, not in the branch of engineering applied for, combined with an advanced degree to give 4 years of education credit total.

One proposed regulation for sealing specifications was previously held by the Board for further work. An annual technical regulation change to reference the current Architect Education Standard published each fall, was held for re-adoption (NCARB

1 Education Standards 2003-2004). Apparently, one of the prior attorney general's
2 edits referred only to a portion of the publication, but other prior and subsequent
3 projects have encompassed the entire booklet. The regulations attorney wanted to
4 be certain of the Board's intent to reference and adopt the standards contained
5 within the publication. The Executive Administrator indicated she spoke recently
6 to NCARB, who have published its annual draft education standards publication for
7 2004-2005, based on changes adopted at the NCARB annual meeting held in June
8 2004. A copy of the changes, which were technical, and not substantive are
9 contained in the AELS packet, along with the changes adopted at the June 2003
10 NCARB meeting. The changes to the 2003 NCARB Education Standards modified
11 the Broadly Experienced Architect process. The Board can now adopt the new
12 2004-2005 NCARB Education Standards, according to a recent discussion with
13 David Brower, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Law, instead of adopting
14 the 2003-2004 standards. The new version contains all of the same provisions and
15 has technical edits.

16
17 **On a motion by Maynard, seconded by Peirsol, and adopted unanimously,**
18 **it was**

19
20 **RESOLVED to adopt the NCARB Education Standards 2004-2005**
21 **version, currently in draft form but will be finalized this month.**
22

23 The Chair stated there were no objections, and the motion passed.
24

25 The Executive Administrator explained she and Gilfilian worked on revisions to the
26 Sealing Specifications proposed regulation change had been held over. A draft
27 proposed change in Tab 10 (c):
28

29 12 AAC 36.185 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:
30

31 ...

32 (e) The registrant, by sealing final plans, takes responsibility for [ALL
33 DOCUMENTS] any associated specifications included in the final plans,
34 unless pursuant to AS 08.48.221, the registrant certifies on the face of the
35 document the extent of the registrant's responsibility.

36 The Executive Administrator explained she circulated the proposed draft to the
37 Alaska Professional Design Council (APDC) for comments and those comments are
38 as follows:

39 Replace "any associated" with:

40 those pertinent

41 those relevant

42 those applicable

43 those related discipline specifications

44 the discipline specific technical specifications

45 the related discipline technical specifications
46

47 **On a motion by Gilfilian, seconded by Fredeen, it was**

1
2 **RESOLVED to adopt the draft proposed regulation for sealing**
3 **specifications.**

4
5 The board held a discussion.

6
7 **On an amendment by Peirsol, seconded by Gilfilian, it was**

8
9 **RESOLVED to amend the motion to change “any associated” to**
10 **“related discipline specifications.”**

11
12 **(e) The registrant, by sealing final plans, takes responsibility for [ANY**
13 **ASSOCIATED] related discipline specifications included in the final plans,**
14 **unless pursuant to AS 08.48.221, the registrant certifies on the face of the**
15 **document the extent of the registrant’s responsibility.**

16
17 The Board held a discussion.

18
19 **On a motion to amend the amendment, by Peirsol, seconded by Gilfilian,**
20 **and unanimously adopted, it was**

21
22 **RESOLVED to change the amendment by changing “final plans” to**
23 **“final drawings.”**

24
25 The Board held a short discussion.

26
27 **The Executive Administrator read the amended amendment:**

28
29 **(e) The registrant, by sealing final drawings, takes responsibility for**
30 **related discipline specifications included in the final drawings, unless**
31 **pursuant to AS 08.48.221, the registrant certifies on the face of the**
32 **document the extent of the registrant’s responsibility.**

33
34 **The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none so the**
35 **Board adopted the amendment to the amendment.**

36
37 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the change to the amendment and
38 there were none so the amendment was adopted.

39
40 **On an amendment by Gilfilian, seconded by Peirsol, and adopted, it was**

41
42 **RESOLVED to change “final plan or plans” to “final drawing or**
43 **drawings” in the four instances it appears in 12 AAC 36.185.**

44
45 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the amendment and there were
46 none so the amendment was adopted.

1 The Executive Administrator referenced 12 AAC 36.185 and read the final proposed
2 regulation change to sealing specifications under (e), as follows:

3
4 **12 AAC 36.185. Use of seals**

5
6 **(a) A registrant may**

7
8 **(1) not sign or seal a [PLAN] drawing or document dealing with**
9 **professional services in which the registrant is not qualified to sign or seal**
10 **by virtue of education, experience, and registration;**

11
12 **(2) approve and seal only design documents and surveys that are safe for**
13 **public health, property, and welfare in conformity with accepted**
14 **architecture, engineering, land surveying, and landscape architecture**
15 **standards in Alaska;**

16
17 **(3) seal only final [PLANS] drawings, surveys, reports, and required**
18 **construction documents for which the registrant is qualified to seal and**
19 **for which the registrant claims responsibility;**

20
21 **(4) not knowingly allow the use of his or her seal by another person on a**
22 **document that the registrant has neither prepared nor reviewed**
23 **personally;**

24
25 **(5) not use the seal or a reproduction of the seal of another registrant on a**
26 **document, regardless of the intended use of the document;**

27
28 **(6) not sign a name other than his or her own name over a seal, and may**
29 **not forge the signature of the individual to whom the seal was issued by**
30 **the board; and**

31
32 **(7) not sign or seal [PLANS] drawings, documents, or other professional**
33 **work for which he or she does not have direct professional knowledge and**
34 **direct supervisory control.**

35
36 **(b) If portions of [PLANS] drawings, documents, or other professional**
37 **work are prepared by other registered professionals, a registrant may seal**
38 **only that portion of the work for which he or she has direct professional**
39 **knowledge and direct supervisory control.**

40
41 **(c) Each office maintained for the preparation of drawings, specifications,**
42 **reports, or other professional work that will require a professional seal**
43 **must have a registrant assigned to and regularly employed in that office**
44 **who has direct knowledge and supervisory control of that work.**
45

(d) The registrant shall include the date each time the registrant signs and seals a document by inserting the date within the seal or in a close proximity to the seal.

(e) The registrant, by sealing final drawings, takes responsibility for related discipline specifications included in the final drawings, unless pursuant to AS 08.48.221, the registrant certifies on the face of the document the extent of the registrant's responsibility.

The Board held a brief discussion about public noticing the proposed changes to the Use of Seals.

Baker called for the question.

The Chair asked if there were any objections to adopting the main motion and to send to interested parties the draft proposed regulation.

There were no objections and the motion passed. The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to provide the Regulations Specialist with the proposed changes and to public notice the proposed regulations to the AELS interested parties list, along with a letter of explanation.

On a motion by Gilfilian, seconded by Brownfield, and unanimously adopted, it was

RESOLVED to adopt the proposed regulation changes listed in Tab 10 (d):

12 AAC 36.105 (c)(2) if the applicant has been practicing engineering as a registered engineer in the U.S. for five years or more, provide two current letters of reference from registered engineers practicing in the specific branch of engineering for which the applicant has applied [.]; or
(3) if the applicant has been practicing for five years or more as a professional engineer in Canada, with a license issued by a provincial or territorial engineering association recognized by the Canadian Council of Professional Engineering (CCPE), the applicant must
(A) provide two current letters of reference from U.S. or Canadian registered engineers, and
(B) successfully pass the examination listed in 12 AAC 36.100 (c) in the branch of engineering for which the applicant has applied.

Gilfilian explained this allows seasoned Canadian engineers, "P-Eng's" to get licensed in Alaska so long as they pass the PE examination in the discipline applied for in Alaska. This would allow Canadian engineers to come into Alaska without having taken the Fundamentals of Engineering Examination, just as U.S. engineers by Comity currently are allowed. For Canadian engineers by Comity, the work experience under the Canadian engineer would suffice. Canadian examination

1 applicants would still use the same system currently in place, just as U.S.
2 engineering examination applicants use, the standard requires an ABET BS degree
3 (in the discipline) along with 48 months work experience, of which 2 years is
4 responsible charge work experience under a U.S. engineer. The tables allow
5 varying education credit and work experience credits for those not holding an ABET
6 accredited BS degree.

7
8 Peirsol related her experience in Edmonton, reviewing the Canadian educational
9 system, and she felt there should not need to be a requirement to take the PE
10 examination.

11
12 Brownfield disagreed and stated he felt the PE exam is needed so there are not two
13 standards, one that requires testing for Americans, and one that does not require
14 testing for Canadians.

15
16 Gilfilian agreed.

17
18 The Board held a short discussion.

19
20 Baker called for the vote.

21 The roll call vote was taken as follows

22

Board member	Yea	Nay
Baker	x	
Brownfield	x	
Fredeen	x	
Gilfilian	x	
Hughes	x	
Iverson	x	
Maynard	x	
McLane	x	
Mills	x	
Peirsol	x	
Total	10	0

23
24 The Licensing Examiner stated the vote was 10 yeas, zero nays.

25 The Chair noted the vote was unanimous and there were no exceptions. He asked
26 the Executive Administrator to add this to the regulations project to be public
27 noticed to AELS interested parties.

28
29 There were no objections and the Executive Administrator indicated she would do
30 so.

31
32 **Agenda Item 11 – Application Reviews**

33
34 **On a motion duly made by Gilfilian, seconded by Brownfield and, adopted**
35 **unanimously, it was**

1 **RESOLVED to go into executive session for the purpose of reviewing**
2 **applicant files.**

3
4 The Board went into executive session at 2:40 p.m.

5
6 The Licensing Examiner placed a sign on the door the Board was now in Executive
7 Session.

8
9 **The Board recessed at 6:10 p.m. until 8:00 a.m., Friday, August 20, 2004.**

1 **Friday, August 20, 2004**

2
3 **Agenda Item 12 – Call to Order/Roll Call**

4
5 The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. The Board came out of executive
6 session at 8:05 a.m. and the Licensing Examiner called the roll.

7
8 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

9 Donald J. Iverson, PE, Electrical Engineer, *Chair*
10 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member, Vice-Chair
11 Robert Gilfilian, PE, Civil Engineer, Secretary
12 Clifford Baker, PLS, Land surveyor
13 Boyd Brownfield, PE, Civil Engineer
14 Craig Fredeen, PE, Mechanical Engineer
15 Richard Hughes, PE, Mining Engineer
16 Ken Maynard, Architect
17 Scott McLane, PLS, Land Surveyor
18 Kimberly Mills, Public Member
19 Patricia Peirsol, Architect

20
21 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

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

24
25 Participating for a portion of the meeting by teleconference was:

26 David Brower, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Law
27 Rick Urion, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing

28
29 The Chair asked if there were any files that needed additional review and there
30 were none.

31
32 **Agenda Item 13 – Regulations (Continued)**

33
34 The Chair asked if there was further action to be taken.

35
36 **On a motion by Baker, seconded by Maynard, and adopted, it was**

37
38 **RESOLVED to have the Executive Administrator draft regulations to**
39 **allow staff to process applications for Architect by Comity**
40 **applications for applicants holding an NCARB “Blue Book” Council**
41 **Record that demonstrate the applicant has met the NCARB**
42 **Certification, has no disciplinary action, and has also met the**
43 **application and arctic engineering requirements; and to allow staff**
44 **to process applications for Engineer by Comity applications for**
45 **applicants holding an NCEES “Blue Book” Council Record stamped**
46 **“Model Law Engineer” that demonstrates the applicant has met the**

1 **NCEES certification for MLE, has no disciplinary action, and has**
2 **also met the application and arctic engineering requirements.**

3
4 The Board held a short discussion.

5
6 The Chair asked for a voice vote and indicated there were no objections to the
7 motion, and asked the Executive Administrator to bring back draft regulations to
8 the November 2004 AELS meeting.

9
10 **Agenda Item 14 – Administrator’s Report**

11
12 The Executive Administrator referred to the Administrator’s report and advised she
13 prepared a statistical report shows current licensees, as well as biennial license
14 renewals. About 44% renewed on-line as opposed to about 22% in the 12/31/01-
15 12/31/03 renewal.

16
17 The Board licensing examiners are currently Julie Adamson, with the alpha (A-K),
18 and Eleanor Vinson, with the alpha (L-Z) and both provide good service to our
19 applicants and registrants.

20
21 The Executive Administrator reviewed the Legislation from the last legislative
22 session. She explained HB 252 passed last legislative session with provisions for
23 statutory authority for a continuing education program, partially-exempt
24 administrator’s position, and authority for Board members serving partial terms of
25 less than two years of a Board term to not count the time period towards the two
26 term limit for AELS Board members. She explained the authority for the Board’s
27 investigator to halt commercial or public projects not having stamped drawings did
28 not get introduced.

29
30 Peirsol asked about the sunset bill and the Executive Administrator explained an
31 auditor has been in the agency reviewing files, board documents, public notices,
32 regulations, and policies and procedures. The starting point for a new report is
33 usually based on items the last audit recommended and any responses the Board
34 had to the questions posed.

35
36 Cyra-Korsgaard asked to have the Board composition and landscape architect
37 position put under New Business and the Chair agreed.

38
39 The Chair move to Agenda item # 21.

40
41 **Agenda Item 21 – Read Applications into the Record**

42
43 The Chair asked to move forward to read the applications into the record, Agenda
44 Item 21.

45
46 **On a motion duly made by Gilfilian, seconded by Mills, and unanimously**
47 **adopted, it was**

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

The Licensing Examiner, Julie Adamson, read the following applications into the record:

The following applicants are approved for professional exams, or for comity, as follows:

APPLICANT	DISCIPLINE	Exam/ Comity	BOARD ACTION
1. Arthur, Gregory	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
2. Bond Crowe, Melanie	PE-CHEMICAL	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending Verification Of Fe Exam
3. Brennan, Kyle	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
4. Broek, Sandon	PE-ELECTRICAL	Exam	Approved
5. Carlson, Steve	PE-CIVIL	Comity	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
6. Colville, Erik	PE-CIVIL	Comity	Approved
7. Craig, Pamela	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
8. Cross, Joshua	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
9. Davidson, Temple	ARCHITECT A.R.E.	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending Fees
10. Estabrook, Heather	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
11. Evans, Preston	PE-PETROLEUM	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
12. Fisher, Brandon	PE -CIVIL	Comity	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
13. Fisher, John	ARCHITECT	Comity	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
14. Francis-Chythlook, Oceana	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
15. Ganley, Francis	PE-CIVIL	Comity	Approved
16. Garner, Brendon	PE-ELECTRICAL	Exam	Approved
17. Gobeli, Jesse	PE- CIVIL	Comity	Approved
18. Gramann, Robert	ARCHITECT	Comity	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic

19. Grubesky, Gerald	PE-MECHANICAL	Comity	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
20. Hallinan, John	PE-ELECTRICAL	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
21. Hanson, Brian	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
22. Harrington, Michael	PE-CIVIL	Comity	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
23. Heal, Garold	PE-CIVIL	Comity	Approved
24. Hill, Jason	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
25. Hoffmann, Paulette	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course, Fees
26. Houtary, Leora	PE-MECHANICAL	Exam	Approved
27. Imlach, Thomas	ARCHITECT A.R.E	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
28. Johnson Iii, Benjamin	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
29. Kim, Chong	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
30. Knapp, Michael	PE-CIVIL	Comity	Approved
31. Limb, Johnathan	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
32. Luo, Kailong	PE-CIVIL	Comity	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
33. Martin, Nelson	PE-CHEMICAL	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending Transcript, Verification Of Fe Exam
34. Martinsen, Roger	PE-MECHANICAL	Comity	Approved
35. Mcloren, Heather	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending Fees
36. Mecham, Gary	MECHANICAL	Comity	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
37. Merrick, Keith	PE-ELECTRICAL	Exam	Approved
38. Merrill, Elizabeth	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
39. Mori, Ross	PE- CIVIL	Comity	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
40. Mormilo, Melissa	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
41. Morris, Sandra	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
42. Nakatani, Mark I.	ARCHITECT	Comity	Approved
43. Novak, Terry	ARCHITECT	Comity	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
44. Osburn, Jason	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved

45. Parrott, Mark	PE-MECHANICAL	Exam	Approved
46. Paulic, Kenneth	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
47. Pendergast, Rochelle	PE-MECHANICAL	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
48. Ramos, Charles	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
49. Renshaw, David	CIVIL	Comity	Approved
50. Rescober, John	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
51. Sampaga, Reynaldo	PE-CIVIL	Comity	Approved
52. Schmitt, Shelly R.	PE-ELECTRICAL	Exam	Approved
53. Shaw, Sheldon	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending Fees
54. Singson, Reynaldo	PE-ELECTRICAL	Exam	Approved
55. Sloan, Daniel	PE-MECHANICAL	Exam	Approved
56. Smith, Michael W.	ARCHITECT	Comity	Approved
57. Soltis, Michael	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
58. Solvason, John R.	MECHANICAL	Comity	Approved
59. Stierwalt, David	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
60. Sullivan, Anthony	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
61. Tassin, Daniel	PE-CIVIL	Comity	Approved
62. Terry, William	PE-MECHANICAL	Exam	Approved
63. Tinsley, Robert	MECHANICAL	Comity	Approved
64. Wagner, Charles	PE-CIVIL	Exam	Approved
65. Westgard, William	PE-ELECTRICAL	Comity	Conditionally Approved Pending Arctic Course
66. Wissman, Dan	PE-CIVIL	Comity	Approved
67. Adams, Eric	FE	Exam	Approved
68. Altiook, Ozgur	FE	Exam	Approved
69. Amsden Matthew	FE	Exam	Approved
70. Austin, Paul	FE	Exam	Approved
71. Beck, Albert	FE	Exam	Approved
72. Bingham, Mary	FE	Exam	Approved
73. Blakely, Vanessa	FE	Exam	Approved
74. Braham, Alicia	FE	Exam	Approved
75. Brownwood, Jamie	FE	Exam	Approved
76. Byers, Tyler	FE	Exam	Approved
77. Campi, Rosanna	FE	Exam	Approved
78. Changalvala, Raghavendar	FE	Exam	Approved
79. Dau, Wendy	FE	Exam	Approved

80. Eversman, Aaron	FE	Exam	Approved
81. Foster, James	FE	Exam	Approved
82. Gamage, Matthew	FE	Exam	Approved
83. Johnsen, Ruger	FE	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending \$75.00 Exam Fee, Transcript, and Original Application
84. Johnston, Christopher	FE	Exam	Approved
85. Karri, Naveen Kishore	FE	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending Receipt of 75% Letter From UAF
86. Kawka, Piotr	FE	Exam	Approved
87. Kemp, Joseph	FE	Exam	Approved
88. Kompella, Sitarama Sastry	FE	Exam	Approved
89. Korpelainen, Sami	FE	Exam	Approved
90. Kosmalski, Sharon	FE	Exam	Conditionally Approved, Pending Transcript
91. Langman, Craig	FE	Exam	Approved
92. Lombardo, James	FE	Exam	Approved
93. Meagher, Cormac	FE	Exam	Approved
94. Palokodety, Bhavani	FE	Exam	Approved
95. Paulic, Kenneth	FE	Exam	Fe Waiver Granted
96. Phillips, Kim	FE	Exam	Approved
97. Pulver, Joseph	FE	Exam	Approved
98. Roberts, Brian	FE	Exam	Approved
99. Satterfield, Jennifer	FE	Exam	Approved
100. Sayman, Irvin	FE	Exam	Approved
101. Scherbert, Laura	FE	Exam	Approved
102. Seelen, Sarah	FE	Exam	Approved
103. Staft, Lauren	FE	Exam	Approved
104. Stowe, Agnes	FE	Exam	Approved
105. Suravaram, Praveen	FE	Exam	Approved
106. Sylvestre, Jared	FE	Exam	Approved
107. Telang, Aseem	FE	Exam	Conditionally Approved Pending 75% Letter From UAF
108. Theur, Ryan	FE	Exam	Approved
109. Thrasher, Terry Sue	FE	Exam	Approved
110. Turenne, Cynthia	FE	Exam	Approved
111. Vadlamani, Srikar	FE	Exam	Approved
112. Vaughan Ii, Robert	FE	Exam	Approved
113. Vemula, Sreenivas	FE	Exam	Approved
114. Vickers Rippeto, Chrystal	FE	Exam	Approved
115. Vilchis, Pedro	FE	Exam	Approved
116. Woodrow, Martin	FE	Exam	Approved
117. Zinza, Timothy	FE	Exam	Approved

118.	Degraff, Paul	FLS	Exam	Approved
119.	Hughes, Kraig	FLS	Exam	Approved

On a motion by Gilfilian, seconded by Mills, and unanimously adopted, it was

RESOLVED to approve the following applicants for Fundamentals of Engineering Examination Waiver (FE Waiver):

1. Paulic, Kenneth	PE-Civil	EXAM	FE Waiver Approved
--------------------	----------	------	--------------------

On a motion by Gilfilian, seconded by Baker, and unanimously adopted, it was

RESOLVED to deny the following applicants for Fundamentals of Engineering Examination Waiver (FE Waiver):

1. Squires, John	PE Exam	FE WAIVER DENIED, FE EXAM APPROVED	
------------------	---------	------------------------------------	--

Gilfilian noted Mr. Squires application had verified work experience did not qualify as professional work experience and he did not feel the applicant had demonstrated 20 years of professional work experience and the work experience verifications were confusing to read.

On a motion by Gilfilian, seconded by Baker, and unanimously adopted, it was

RESOLVED to deny the following applicant for Professional Land Surveying:

1. Schillinger, Max	Land Surveyor	Comity	DENIED
---------------------	---------------	--------	--------

On a motion by Gilfilian, seconded by Mills, and unanimously adopted, it was

RESOLVED to find incomplete the following applicants for examination and comity:

1. Athanas, Aaron	PE-Mechanical	EXAM	INCOMPLETE needs additional 9 months of work verification
2. Donofrio, Gary	PE-Electrical	EXAM	INCOMPLETE needs additional 26 months of Work Experience
3. Stoll, Alan	FLS	EXAM	INCOMPLETE needs completion of B.S.Civil degree

1 Break: 8:55 a.m.

2 Reconvene: 9:12 a.m.

3
4 Baker asked to take up the Annual Report under New Business, prior to speaking
5 with the Director.

6
7 The Chair indicated there was still time before the teleconference and moved to the
8 Annual Report.

9
10 The Executive Administrator explained a draft was in the packet was submitted to
11 the Director, Rick Urion, on August 1st. The agency now requires submittal earlier
12 to ensure legislative requests are reviewed and considered for the next legislature.
13 The Board has not updated its Goals and Objectives for some time and she
14 recommended the Board update them, make any changes to the report, and she will
15 submit a revised version to the Director.

16
17 The Board held a short discussion about the mechanics of the Annual Report.

18
19 **On a motion by Cyra-Korsgaard, seconded by Baker, it was**

20
21 **RESOLVED to change the non-voting landscape architect member to**
22 **a voting member.**

23
24 Cyra-Korsgaard reviewed the history of the Landscape Architect member of the
25 Board for the new members, and the Board held a short discussion. She indicated
26 her position as temporary landscape architect, non-voting member expires with the
27 sunset date of the Board on June 30, 2005. She noted there are currently about 30
28 licensed landscape architects and she feels it is important to have this expertise on
29 the Board and the Board member should have a vote.

30
31 The Executive Administrator explained there were a number of bills before the
32 Legislature to add landscape architects as licensed design professionals, but in 1998
33 Senator Mackie introduced a bill, and one primary reason given was to allow
34 Alaskan landscape architects an opportunity to compete on public projects.
35 Requests for proposals were requiring professional registered landscape architects
36 on projects and Alaskans were not able to compete since there was no registration.

37
38 McLane referred to the current statistics for licensees under Tab 14, and felt the
39 Board composition should reflect the percentages of licensees served by the Board.
40 He suggested one of the Architect Board members could be a revolving position and
41 could change each four years to a Landscape Architect position.

42
43 The Board held a short discussion about the Board composition and changes to it
44 when the mining engineer was added.

1 The Chair asked to interrupt the discussion to take up the agenda item # 15, Meet
2 with David Brower, Assistant Attorney General, since it was now time to call Mr.
3 Brower.

4
5 The Licensing Examiner called Mr. Brower at 9:35 a.m. and he participated by
6 teleconference.

7
8 **Agenda Item 15 – Meet with David Brower, Attorney (by teleconference)**

9
10 Cyra-Korsgaard asked if passage of HB 252, which becomes effective on
11 September 14, 2004, providing statutory language which allows the Board to assign
12 its administrator duties, allows the Board to assign travel as a duty. She
13 mentioned participation at the regional and national level meetings is specifically
14 listed in the position description of the administrator.

15
16 Brower responded he thought the question was a fiscal question, not really a legal
17 question.

18
19 The Chair reiterated the Board wants authorization to assign travel for its
20 administrator and asked about the specific statutory authority going into effect in
21 September to allow the Board authority to assign duties.

22
23 Brower responded he would research the matter.

24
25 Gilfilian explained the Board is missing out on valuable information the
26 administrator would obtain from attending the meetings.

27
28 Cyra-Korsgaard asked about questions asked at the last meeting and if all the
29 questions were answered. The Board had asked if its members could contact each
30 other through email, and if several members could meet with the Fire Marshal
31 without having to public notice this as a meeting. The Fire Marshal has the specific
32 authority for plan reviews and the Board wants to meet regularly with the Fire
33 Marshal by sending individual board members to discuss issues with respect to the
34 statutory oversight of the Fire Marshal. No specific decisions would be made at
35 these meetings.

36
37 Brower responded he previously indicated if a subgroup meets and comes back to
38 the Board for consideration and action, and if each member does research but the
39 subgroup does not take action, the meetings do not require public notice. If, at some
40 point they are going to make recommendations, then the meeting falls under the
41 open meetings act. He felt a Board member could meet with the Fire Marshal but if
42 several members wanted to meet it would be best to do so at a public meeting.

43
44 The Board held a short discussion.

45
46 The Chair asked if there were any other questions and there were none. He
47 thanked Mr. Brower and the teleconference ended.

1
2 The Chair moved back to the discussion on the Annual Report.
3

4 Peirsol brought up the question on the Architect by Comity issue and commented
5 the requirement for an NCARB Council Record was onerous to applicants because
6 not all architects registered in other jurisdictions hold certificates. She noted the
7 Board recently denied an applicant for Comity because he did not hold an NCARB
8 Council Record. When the applicant applied in Alaska, the NCARB would only
9 provide the Blue Book Council Record if the applicant paid all the back annual fees
10 since the date of his first registration (approximately 20 years), which would have
11 been very costly. He asked to have the Board consider his application without the
12 certificate and was denied.
13

14 Cyra-Korsgaard felt the Council certification, which is documented in the “Blue
15 Book” Council record, should still be required, consistent with the education and
16 experience requirements required in Alaska since the 80s. She thought NCARB
17 should make the process easier for candidates who do not have the 5-year NAAB
18 accredited degree to qualify for the council record, but the certificate should still be
19 required as the minimum qualification. The current requirements for Architects by
20 Comity are in line with decisions the Board has made in the past, and are also
21 consistent with trends the national organizations have set for education and model
22 law requirements for land surveyors and engineers.
23

24 Baker thought the process should allow candidates not holding the NCARB Council
25 Record to gain access for licensure, just as the engineers can obtain licensure
26 without an NCEES Council Record.
27

28 The Chair asked to have the Architect by Comity issue on the next meeting agenda
29 in November 2004, to consider candidates who have met the 5 year NAAB
30 accredited degree and IDP for licensure without holding the “official NCARB “Blue
31 Book” Council record.
32

33 The Board held a short discussion.
34

35 Baker asked for point of order. He referred to the motion about the Landscape
36 Architect position has not yet been acted on.
37

38 The Chair affirmed there was a motion on the table needed action.
39

40 Brownfield felt he was too uninformed to decide on this matter and would have to
41 abstain from voting.
42

43 Gilfilian discussed his recollection about the addition of the Landscape Architect
44 position and his view there were compromises during the legislative process and the
45 non-voting member was a compromise.
46

1 Hughes agreed the Board composition would need more discussion before any
2 changes should be made.

3
4 **On a motion by Baker, seconded by Mills, and adopted unanimously, it was**

5
6 **RESOLVED to table the previous motion to change the Landscape**
7 **Architect position from non-voting Board member to a voting Board**
8 **member.**

9
10 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none. He noted the
11 motion was tabled.

12
13 The Executive Administrator explained the Board is up for a sunset review every
14 four years. During process, a bill is introduced by the Legislature to sunset the
15 Board. She has met with an auditor who has reviewed files, minutes, reports and
16 has asked questions. Usually the starting point in writing an Annual Report is a
17 review of the last legislative audit, and those questions and the Boards responses
18 are contained within the current report.

19
20 The Executive Administrator passed out the investigative report summary and the
21 Board briefly discussed the number of cases.

22
23 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda.

24
25 **Agenda Item 16 – Budget Summary Report**

26
27 The Board reviewed the Budget Summary Report.

28
29 The Chair brought up the Budget Summary Report. He reviewed for new members
30 a brief summary of direct and indirect costs, currently at 12.92% of the agency
31 indirect costs. He explained there is a 5-year comparison chart in the packet. The
32 Board discussed questions they had of the Director and the Administrative
33 Manager.

34
35 **Agenda Item 17 – Old Business**

36
37 The Chair moved to take up the first item, Land Surveyor Subdivision /Overlap
38 w/Engineering, (Randy Johnson, FNSB-carried forward 2/04- (Subgroup- #7B-
39 2)

40
41 Maynard distributed a report from the Tennessee Board titled “Delineation of
42 Engineering and Surveying.

43
44 Gilfilian spoke to the Tennessee Board at the recent NCEES meeting and the
45 Tennessee Board felt this was a compromise. In the Mat-Su Borough, there is not a
46 requirement for an engineer’s stamp on a subdivision. Engineers are required to

1 seal reports on soils and it was not clear from his discussions exactly when an
2 engineer would be required.

3
4 **On a motion duly made by Mills, seconded by Maynard, it was**

5
6 **RESOLVED to adopt the Delineation of Engineering and Surveying**
7 **definitions as a regulation project. (Failed unanimously).**

8
9 McLane felt it was too early to consider adopting a regulation.

10
11 Peirsol agreed the definitions should not go out as a regulation project

12
13 Brownfield stated he liked the Tennessee model but thought it was too soon, also.

14
15 Baker agreed the specific definitions appeared to be good.

16
17 The Board held a short discussion about the model, and if adopted, if it should be
18 placed in the Building Officials Manual, which is available on the website and
19 referred to by registrants seeking guidance.

20
21 **The Chair noted the motion failed; 10-nays, 0- yeas.**

22
23 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none.

24
25 **On a motion duly made by Mills, it was resolved to circulate the report to**
26 **design professionals.**

27
28 **The motion died for lack of a second.**

29
30 **The Chair suggested the Tennessee model be attached to the Board**
31 **minutes as a means of distributing the information to the public and there**
32 **was no objection.**

33
34 The Executive Administrator will do so, and will send a copy to Scott and Randy
35 Johnson, Fairbanks North Star Borough.

36
37 The Chair indicated the Board had discussed the next agenda item, the Host
38 Western Zone Meeting 2005- May 19-21, 2005 earlier.

39
40 The Chair brought up Emergency and Courtesy Licenses.

41
42 Gilfilian reported he spoke with Bob Stewart, Emergency Program manager for the
43 State of Alaska and did not get any specific information about how design
44 professionals would work during an emergency. He suggested the Board of Nursing
45 and Medical Board have procedures for Emergency Licenses and may provide a
46 good model for the Board.

1 Gilfilian suggested staff could contact Bob Stewart to obtain more information and
2 to speak with his contact, Dr. Bess Funk, to gain more information about their
3 processes. Stewart had also mentioned forensic engineering and that, when the
4 courts use expert witnesses, there may be a requirement for licensure in some
5 jurisdictions. This is a topic being discussed at the national level.

6
7 The Chair brought up Model Law Land Surveyor.

8
9 McLane explained photogrammetry would be included in the definition of
10 Professional Land Surveying and the Land Surveying Model Law is being revised at
11 the national level and the NCEES adopted a definition of land surveying to include
12 photogrammetrists. He proposed the Board circulate a copy of the Model Law Land
13 Surveyor standards.

14
15 McLane offered to work with the Executive Administrator to draft regulations to
16 allow staff to process comity applications of Land Surveyors who hold Model Law
17 Land Surveyor Council Records, and have passed the state specific AKLS
18 examination and to bring it back to the Board in November.

19
20 The Chair asked if it would be similar to the draft regulations for NCARB “Blue
21 Book” Council record holders, and NCEES Model Law Engineer record holders staff
22 could license once they met all the requirements.

23
24 McLane responded they would be similar, as the Model Law Land Surveyor
25 standards are greater than the current requirements in Alaska.

26
27 McLane suggested the Executive Administrator post the information in the draft
28 minutes and in the AELS Quarterly Board meeting summary, as well, as a means of
29 generating comments back.

30
31 The Executive Administrator inserted the following information taken from the
32 NCEES Model Rules:

33
34 The NCEES Model Law Surveyor (Model Rules, Revised August 2003) is as follows:
35 210.20 Definitions

36
37 A. The NCEES *Model Law*, Section 110.20, Definitions, provides definitions of the
38 following terms:

39 2. Model Law Surveyor – The term “Model Law Surveyor” refers to a person who:

40
41 a. Is a graduate of an EAC/ABET-accredited Surveying Engineering Group
42 program, a Surveying and Mapping Group program accredited by the Applied
43 Science Accreditation Commission of ABET (ASAC/ABET)

44
45 b. Has passed the eight-hour NCEES Fundamentals of Surveying (FLS) exam and a
46 six-hour NCEES Principles and Practice of Land Surveying exam using the NCEES
47 cut score

c. Has completed four years of acceptable surveying experience after confirmation of a Bachelor of Science degree in a surveying/geomatics program, which may include up to one year of experience for a graduate surveying/geomatics degree

e. Has a record clear of disciplinary action

The jurisdiction may require a Model Law Surveyor to pass its state-specific exam for surveyors.

210.25 Inclusions and Exclusions of Surveying Practice

A. Activities Included within Surveying Practice

Activities that must be accomplished under the responsible charge of a professional surveyor (unless specifically exempted in Section B below) include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. The creation of maps and georeferenced databases representing authoritative locations for boundaries, the location of fixed works, or topography. This includes maps and georeferenced databases prepared by any person, firm, or government agency where that data is provided to the public as a survey product.

2. Original data acquisition, or the resolution of conflicts between multiple data sources, when used for the authoritative location of features within the following data themes: geodetic control, orthoimagery, elevation and hydrographic, fixed works, private and public boundaries, and cadastral information.

3. Certification of positional accuracy of maps or measured survey data.

4. Adjustment or authoritative interpretation of raw survey data.

5. Geographic Information System- (GIS) based parcel or cadastral mapping used for authoritative boundary definition purposes wherein land title or development rights for individual parcels are, or may be, affected.

6. Authoritative interpretation of maps, deeds, or other land title documents to resolve conflicting data elements.

7. Acquisition of field data required to authoritatively position fixed works or cadastral data relative to geodetic control.

8. Analysis, adjustment, or transformation of cadastral data of the parcel layer(s) with respect to the geodetic control layer within a GIS resulting in the affirmation of positional accuracy.

B. Activities Excluded from Surveying Practice

A distinction must be made in the use of electronic systems between making or documenting

original measurements in the creation of survey products, versus the copying, interpretation, or representation of those measurements in such systems. Further, a distinction must be made according to the intent, use, or purpose of measurement products in electronic systems to determine a definitive location versus the use of those products as a locational reference for planning, infrastructure management, and general information. The following items are not to be included as activities within the definition of surveying:

1. The creation of general maps:
 - a. Prepared by private firms or government agencies for use as guides to motorists, boaters, aviators or pedestrians;
 - b. Prepared for publication in a gazetteer or atlas as an educational tool or reference publication;
 - c. Prepared for or by education institutions for use in the curriculum of any course of study;
 - d. Produced by any electronic or print media firm as an illustrative guide to the geographic location of any event;
 - e. Prepared by laypersons for conversational or illustrative purposes. This includes advertising material and users guides.
2. The transcription of previously georeferenced data into a GIS or LIS by manual or electronic means, and the maintenance thereof, provided the data are clearly not intended to indicate the authoritative location of property boundaries, the precise definition of the shape or contour of the earth, and/or the precise location of fixed works of humans.
3. The transcription of public record data, without modification except for graphical purposes, into a GIS- or LIS-based cadastre (tax maps and associated records) by manual or electronic means, and the maintenance of that cadastre, provided the data are clearly not intended to authoritatively represent property boundaries. This includes tax maps and zoning maps.
4. The preparation of any document by any federal government agency that does not define real property boundaries. This includes civilian and military versions of quadrangle topographic maps, military maps, satellite imagery, and other such documents.
5. The incorporation or use of documents or databases prepared by any federal agency into a GIS/LIS, including but not limited to, federal census and demographic data, quadrangle topographic maps, and military maps.

- 1 6. Inventory maps and databases created by any organization, in either hard-copy
2 or electronic form, of physical features, facilities, or infrastructure that are
3 wholly contained within properties to which they have rights or for which they
4 have management responsibility. The distribution of these maps and/or
5 databases outside the organization must contain appropriate metadata
6 describing, at a minimum, the accuracy, method of compilation, data source(s)
7 and date(s), and disclaimers of use clearly indicating that the data are not
8 intended to be used as a survey product.
9
- 10 7. Maps and databases depicting the distribution of natural resources or
11 phenomena prepared by foresters, geologists, soil scientists, geophysicists,
12 biologists, archeologists, historians, or other persons qualified to document such
13 data.
14
- 15 8. Maps and georeferenced databases depicting physical features and events
16 prepared by any government agency where the access to that data is restricted
17 by statute. This includes georeferenced data generated by law enforcement
18 agencies involving crime statistics and criminal activities.
19

20 The Board held a discussion.

21
22 Cyra-Korsgaard asked if the Board would adopt new minimum standards outlined
23 in the Model Law Surveyor.
24

25 McLane said not at this time but the direction would be to move towards a 4-year
26 degree as a minimum educational standard for surveyors.
27

28 Brownfield indicated the Model Laws are intended as a means of identifying a
29 uniform set of guidelines, and to keep Member Boards moving in the same direction
30 by providing general guidelines for the Member Boards as they go through the
31 process of revising their statutes and regulations.
32

33 The Chair agreed with the purpose of the model laws and noted Alaska did not
34 adopt the Model Law in its entirety for engineering.
35

36 The Chair moved to the next item on the agenda:
37

1 **Agenda Item 18 – Meet with Rick Urion, Director (by teleconference)**

2
3 The Director, Rick Urion joined the meeting at 11:20 a.m. by teleconference. He
4 advised the Board his Administrative Manager, Jenny Strickler, was present to
5 answer any questions about the Budget.

6
7 Mary Gilfilian joined the meeting at 11:30 a.m.

8
9 The Chair asked Strickler to give an overview of the budget process for the new
10 Board members.

11
12 Strickler explained the Board is self-sufficient. She explained funding was in the
13 general fund but in about FY 2001, the Legislature moved from Program Receipts to
14 accounting for the agency's self supported programs in Receipt Supported Services.
15 This provided a means of identifying the specific method of accounting as a way the
16 Legislature can identify the programs are self-supporting and separate from the
17 General Fund. Budget expenditures and revenues are calculated and since the
18 Board is on a biennial cycle, fees are set on odd years and there is a roll forward to
19 represent revenues not used in a prior year. Revenues are received and accounted
20 for by program, and expenditures and projected expenditures for individual
21 programs are assessed. Any AELS funds received but not used are accounted for
22 but are not available for other programs within the agency.

23
24 Strickler explained each program within the agency is not unique, in that a specific
25 budget is not prepared for each Board, nor is expenditure authority granted by
26 program. Instead, a lump sum of expenditure authority is granted. Unless there
27 are new line items requested in the Board's Annual Report, the Director makes an
28 assumption the expenditures will remain about the same and this becomes the
29 basis for the budget request submitted to the Commissioner, and to the Governor.
30 The Division has direct expenses, for example, AELS staff salaries and printing
31 costs, and indirect expenses such as the purchase of a new Division copier, or the
32 Division receptionist costs. Currently the indirect expenses are set at 12.92% and
33 the amount is based on the total number of licensees in the program.

34
35 Ms. Strickler added contractual costs reflect items such as litigation and attorney
36 general time.

37
38 The Board had a short discussion about the budget process.

39
40 Baker indicated the Executive Administrator travel has been denied and requested
41 travel for the administrator.

42
43 Rick Urion, Director, advised the Executive Administrator's travel request to
44 Philadelphia, to attend a conference was recently denied. He views the travel
45 requests on a case-by-case basis and approves travel he believes is beneficial to the
46 agency.

1 The Board generally discussed the importance of sending its administrator to the
2 regional and national conferences and Board members beliefs that the participation
3 allows the Executive Administrator opportunities to engage in discussions with her
4 peers, as well as keep abreast of national trends and for Alaska to have a voice.
5 Several Board members attended the NCEES meeting in Cleveland and expressed
6 disappointment the administrator was not there to attend the administrator's
7 forum. Since they were attending engineer and land surveyor forums held at the
8 same time, there was not coverage at the meeting and the Board members
9 expressed disappointment and encouraged the Director to approve future travel.

10
11 The Chair asked about travel for its investigator for site investigations.

12
13 The Director responded he approved travel for investigator John Clark to attend
14 this Board meeting and specifically for site investigations on the Kenai Peninsula.

15
16 The Board held a brief discussion about old cases.

17
18 The Chair thanked the Director for his time.

19
20 The Chair asked the Board if they would like to break for lunch and they
21 collectively agreed to continue with the agenda after a short break instead of taking
22 an hour lunch break.

23
24 Break: 12:05 p.m.

25 Reconvene: 12:20 p.m.

26
27 The Chair moved to the next agenda item.

28
29 **Agenda Item 19 – Legislation**

30
31 The Executive Administrator explained HB 252 contained three provisions: term
32 limit changes, authority to create a mandatory continuing education program, and
33 partially exempt position for the Executive Administrator and she previously
34 discussed the bill under the Administrator's Report.

35
36 **Agenda Item 20 – New Business**

37
38 The Board held a discussion about continuing education with some members
39 believing registrants already participate in continuing education and a mandatory
40 program creates an unnecessary governmental layer. Other members believed it
41 was necessary to support continuing education as a requirement of license renewal
42 because it provides for public safety by ensuring its registrants are keeping up with
43 trends and keeping active through ongoing professional learning.

44
45 Gilfilian thought in the last year alone, the Board had seen growing support from
46 the engineering community for continuing education (CE).

The Executive Administrator advised 24 of 55 jurisdictions require continuing education as a condition of license renewal and another 8 or so jurisdictions are studying continuing education. She stated the board has statutory authority to require mandatory continuing education requirements.

The Board Chair asked for the subgroup on Continuing Education to make recommendations to the Board. Brownfield is Chair, and Fredeen, Maynard, and McLane are subgroup members.

The Board held a discussion about the trends, personal experiences with other jurisdiction's continuing education programs, and the prior public comments the Board has received. Some Board members felt as other jurisdictions have imposed requirements, the process and availability of courses for CE have also increased.

The Executive Administrator urged the Board to consider a system that does not require individually approving continuing education courses and instead to accept courses provided by national and regional organizations, and those courses offered by professional societies or approved by them as meeting the minimum criteria for continuing education. She cautioned the Board to avoid approval of all course providers which can be a labor intensive process for staff and the Board, and recommended retaining the right to approve but to use courses others have determined acceptable to meet the requirement.

The Chair noted Agenda Item 21, Read Applications into the Record was already completed and he moved to the next agenda item.

Agenda Item 22 – Goals and Objectives

The Chair moved to review the current Goals and Objectives at this meeting and to include the revised version in the Annual Report.

The Board reviewed its Goals and Objectives, and made revisions to them:

Goal #1 – Increase Board's work efficiency.

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
a) 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.	Chair	Ongoing
b) Update and maintain goals and objectives.	Chair & Exec. Adm.	Ongoing
c) 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.	Chair & Exec. Adm.	Ongoing

d) 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
e) Pursue training for Board and staff.	Board and Staff	Ongoing
f) Pursue strategic planning.	Chair and Exec. Adm.	Ongoing
g) Provide letter of Board's intent and understanding relating to any proposed legislative changes; develop procedures for doing the same.	Board	Ongoing
h) Establish subcommittee work at each meeting.	Chair	Ongoing
i) Increase dedicated attorney time.	Chair	Ongoing

Goal #2 – Increase Board's cost effectiveness.

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
a) All Board members and the executive administrator who attend regional and national professional functions on behalf of Board shall submit a written report to rest of Board to share knowledge gained.	Attending Board member and Executive Administrator	Every Board meeting; ongoing
b) Examine feasibility of Board autonomy.	Brownfield, Gilfilian	Ongoing
c) Obtain and analyze Board budget annually and request audit of income or expenses as appropriate.	Chair & Exec. Administrator	Ongoing

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

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
a) Determine what action, if any is necessary to encourage registration of University of Alaska architects, landscape architects, land surveyors and engineering faculty, state and federal design professionals.	Chair	Ongoing
b) Advertise AS 08.48.295 provision for civil penalty for unregistered and unauthorized practice.	Chair; Exec. Administrator	Ongoing

c) Review “minor importance” overlap between professions (Incidental Practice Subgroup)	Subgroup: Maynard (Ch), Baker, Brownfield, and Cyra-Korsgaard	Ongoing
d) Send letter to general contractors, electrical and mechanical administrators annually.	Chair, Executive Administrator	Ongoing
e) Adequately fund investigators to pursue unlicensed activity, including site investigation	Chair/Board	Ongoing
f) Seek additional dedicated attorney time for prosecution of unlicensed practice	Chair/Board	Ongoing
g) Review Possible Engineering Disciplines (Engineering Discipline Subgroup)	Gilfilian (Ch), Iverson, Hughes, Fredeen, & McLane	
h) Research Implementing issuance of courtesy or emergency license (for disasters), and for use by forensic engineers	Gilfilian, Peirsol	Ongoing

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

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
a) Review Arctic Course.	Board and Ex. Admin.	5/2006
b) Update AKLS Exam.	McLane, Baker	Ongoing
c) Update educational standard references for NCARB publications in regulations.	Board and Exec. Administrator	Annually (November)

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
a) Monitor and review latest federal regulations, state Board decisions, and national organization policies relating to NAFTA.	Board and Exec. Administrator	Each Board meeting; ongoing
b) Obtain adequate funding to send “discipline specific” Board members/ Executive Administrator 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

c) Develop regulations to implement model law surveying.	McLane	Ongoing
d) Research CLARB council record.	Exec. Administrator, Cyra-Korsgaard	Ongoing
e) Stay current on all competency and regulatory issues of other jurisdictions	Board and Exec. Administrator	Ongoing
f) Research implementation and support for CE program	Brownfield (Ch), Maynard, and McLane	Feb. 2005
g) Establish Checklist for staff to approve license for those holding council certification (Architect NCARB Blue Book, Engineer MLE)	Maynard, Peirsol	Feb. 2005

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

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
a) Update AELS Web Page, including postings of commonly asked questions (FAQs).	Licensing Examiner	Ongoing
b) Develop outreach program for educational institutes using the NCEES “Speakers Kit”	Gilfilian	Ongoing

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

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
a) Issue Public Service Notice with contact information for complaints.	Executive Administrator	Ongoing/Web site
b) Educate Public about Benefit of using Licensed Professionals (in Public Service Notices).	Mills & Executive Administrator	Ongoing/Web site

Break: 1:40 p.m.

Reconvene: 2:00 p.m.

On a motion duly made by Cyra-Korsgaard, seconded by Peirsol, and unanimously adopted, it was

RESOLVED to adopt the Goals and Objectives, as amended.

Cyra-Korsgaard asked to have an addition to the Annual Report Legislative Request to ask for continuation of the landscape architect position on the Board.

1
2 **On a motion by Cyra-Korsgaard, seconded by Peirsol, it was**

3
4 **RESOLVED to adopt the Annual Report, as revised, with the**
5 **inclusion the Board wishes to continue the Landscape Architect**
6 **member term to coincide with the Board Sunset date of June 2009.**
7

8 The Chair noted there were no objections and the motion passed.
9

10 **Agenda Item 23 – Board Member Reports**
11

12 Gilfilian gave a report on the NCEES Annual meeting, on workshops attended and
13 on the NCEES policy for Fire protection and Design-Build. NCEES recommends
14 jurisdictions strongly enforce supervision of the fire protection system. NCEES
15 does not support project delivery that compromises the role of design professionals
16 in maintaining responsible charge of projects.
17

18 He mentioned NCEES will submit a list of approved calculators in November for
19 use at the April exams. NCEES recommends limiting test takers to three attempts
20 only, and then they must take additional educational courses before attempting the
21 test again.
22

23 Gilfilian asked to have the Fire Marshal attend the next meeting.
24

25 Brownfield reported he attended new member orientation, ABET training, Cut
26 Scores, and it was all helpful. He will provide a written report.
27

28 Baker reported the FLS and PLS exams were statistically analyzed regarding the
29 education component and those candidates with an ABET 4 year accredited degree
30 had the highest percentage of applicants pass the exam. He reported the
31 Professional Activity and Knowledge Study (PAKS) has been completed. He noted
32 NCEES recommends guidelines and provides a Speakers kit for presenting
33 surveying to elementary and to middle school students.
34

35 Mills offered, as the public member, to take up presentations for the Board to
36 promote licensure.
37

38 Peirsol reported on the NCARB Annual meeting held in Portland, OR. About 60
39 percent of the administrators attended the meeting. At times, the Northern
40 Marianas Island and Puerto Rico do not send its administrators but many
41 jurisdictions are represented at the regional and annual meetings, and she
42 reiterated the importance for Alaska to participate. She participated in workshops
43 on impediments to licensure, strategic planning and professional ethics.
44 Resolutions were discussed on prototypical buildings, rolling 5-year clock for
45 examinations, and use of the title “architect” after retirement. She also
46 participated in the national town meeting, regional meetings and discussions of
47 international reciprocity and the Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect program.

1 NCARB celebrated a 10 year anniversary of its International Recognition
2 Agreement with Canada's CCAC.

3
4 The Chair referred to an email from Andrew Schultz that was received by licensing
5 staff just prior to the June meeting. Staff responded but wanted to have the Board
6 review the email for confirmation of staff determination on educational
7 requirements for engineering. The engineering degree held is an ABET accredited
8 degree in Geological Engineering, but is not one of the six disciplines the Board
9 licenses. Staff advised Mr. Schultz he would be allowed 3 years of education credit,
10 and would need five years of work experience, of which 2 years need to be
11 responsible charge work experience under a U.S. registered engineer.

12
13 The Board discussed the email and the Chair noted staff replied appropriately. The
14 Chair mentioned the University of Alaska has a degree program in geology under
15 consideration that is anticipated to be an ABET accredited B.S. degree in
16 Engineering and the Board would count the degree in the same way and only allow
17 3 years of education credit.

18
19 Hughes added the Geological Engineers have initiated discussions requesting
20 consideration of Geological Engineering being added as a discipline.

21
22 Gilfilian asked to bring up unfinished correspondence that has been carried forward
23 as part of the Subgroup work. Some issues have not been resolved, but he would
24 like to answer the emails and address whatever issues they can address:

25
26 Randy Johnson, North Star Borough:

27
28 Gilfilian agreed there are conflicts between surveyor and engineering functions.
29 There is the letter from the Tennessee Board with the delineation between the
30 professions that can be sent to Mr. Johnson, but the Subgroup needs to do more
31 work on this.

32
33 Elaine Netzger:

34
35 The Board held a short discussion. The Chair noted the Municipality of Anchorage
36 is correct in its guidelines and McLane will work with the Executive Administrator
37 on a response.

38
39 Tim Krug:

40
41 The Board held a short discussion.

42
43 Maynard felt the Board could respond that there is a difference between the
44 conceptual drawings and an architect is well qualified to draw trees and shrubs on a
45 subdivision plan.

1 Cyra-Korsgaard reiterated the regulations that by virtue of education, experience,
2 and examination, any design professional who feels they have met those
3 qualifications could draw trees and shrubs on drawings.

4
5 The Board held a short discussion about overlaps between professions and the
6 practice of landscape architecture.

7
8 The Chair noted the Board has ongoing work to better define the overlap between
9 professions.

10
11 **Agenda Item 24 – Review Calendar of Events, Confirm AELS Meeting Dates**

12
13 The Chair confirmed the AELS Meeting Dates, after the Board held a discussion:

14
15 **2004:** November 18-19 – Anchorage.

16
17 **2005 AELS Tentative Board Meeting Dates:**

18
19 February 17-18 – Juneau

20 June 2-3 – Fairbanks

21 Aug 18-19– Anchorage

22 Nov 17-18 – Anchorage

23
24 Cyra-Korsgaard will attend as delegate to the CLARB annual meeting to be held in
25 Philadelphia on September 23-25, 2004. The Chair asked for confirmation and
26 noted there were no objections to sending the delegate.

27
28 The Executive Administrator recapped regulations projects and noted she would
29 public notice to interested parties the Architect Education Standards 2004-2005;
30 Sealing Specifications, and Canadian Reciprocity proposed regulation changes. She
31 will bring back to the November meeting regulations proposals for staff approval of
32 Architect by Comity NCARB Council record holders and Engineer by Comity
33 NCEES Council MLE record holders.

34
35 **Agenda Item 25 – Board Member Comments.**

36
37 The Chair brought up the next agenda item, Board Member Comments, Task List,
38 and Housekeeping:

39
40 McLane thanked the Board for coming to Soldotna and meeting with Building
41 Officials.

42
43 Baker asked to invite the Fire Marshal and Building Officials to the next meeting.
44 He thought the Board should re-visit the penalty of \$1,000 fine for first offenders of
45 unlicensed corporate practice.

46
47 Cyra-Korsgaard welcomed new members.

1
2 Maynard advised the Northern Design Course is being considered to be added back
3 into the UAA Department under Dean Robert Lang and may be developed as a web-
4 based course.

5
6 Brownfield agreed it was good to be at the meeting.

7
8 Fredeen felt the meeting was a good meeting, and invited Board members to
9 participate in the upcoming ASHRAE meeting. Details: There will be an AELS
10 Forum at the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning
11 Engineers (ASHRAE) meeting on September 16, 2004, at 5:30 p.m.- 8 p.m., to be
12 held at the Sourdough Mining Company, at 5200 Juneau St., Anchorage, AK
13 (reception 5:30 to 6:00 p.m., followed by the dinner and program). Cost of the
14 dinner is \$20. The purpose of the forum is to discuss issues informally. For more
15 information contact Craig Fredeen at 339-5325; or RSVP to cfredeen@ascg.com by
16 9/14/04. The meeting was public noticed by the Division.

17
18 Gilfilian is looking forward to the November meeting and reiterated support to have
19 the Fire Marshal attend the meeting and for the Board Chair to meet with the Fire
20 Marshal.

21
22 Mills felt the Board was re-energized with its new members and thanked staff for
23 the good job and the continuity they provide.

24
25 Peirsol felt it was good to see everyone in Soldotna and encourages the Board to
26 meet in one new location each year in order to meet with local professionals, code
27 officials and the general public.

28
29 Hughes agreed meeting in Soldotna was a good idea. He would like the Board to
30 work on its relationships with building officials.

31
32 Hughes thought that as a multi-disciplinary engineering state, as in many states
33 recognizing the more complex specialized nature of our professions, the Board might
34 want to consider other engineering disciplines to the list of disciplines we license,
35 albeit recognizing that doing so would have restrictions on existing disciplines. For
36 example, the Board may wish to consider adding Controls Engineering and
37 Geological Engineering as two possible engineering disciplines to add for licensure.
38 Additionally, since there is a small pool of Mining Engineers currently licensed in
39 Alaska, the Board may also wish to consider recommending the Legislature
40 consider other disciplines to fill the Mining Engineering board member position,
41 including Geological Engineers.

42
43 Maynard enjoyed the meeting and requested a note be put on the website stating
44 the Northern Design Course is a full semester course and not a short course.

45
46 The Chair agreed the Board should travel to other locations for perspective and to
47 meet the local officials.

Subgroup Assignments:

Continuing Education to make recommendations to the Board. Brownfield, Chair, and Fredeen, Maynard, and McLane are subgroup members.

Electronic Transmittals and Signatures, Fredeen (Chair) Peirsol, Gilfilian, and Maynard are subgroup members.

Incidental Practice Subgroup: Maynard (Chair) and Baker, Brownfield, and Cyra-Korsgaard are subgroup members.

Engineering Discipline Subgroup: Gilfilian (Chair) and Iverson, Hughes, Fredeen, and McLane.

Host Committee Subgroup: Mills, (Chair) Iverson, Brownfield, Cyra-Korsgaard, Peirsol.

Task List:

Iverson (Chair)	Correspondence.
	Serve on Engineering Discipline, and Host Committee Subgroups.
	Meet with Fire Marshal.
Baker	Continue work on Model Law Land Surveyor.
	Serve on Incidental Practices, and Host Committee Subgroup.
Brownfield	Review travel and budget for the Board.
	Chair, Continuing Education Subgroup, Serve on Host Committee Subgroup.
Cyra-Korsgaard	Serve on Host Committee, Incidental Practice Subgroups.
Fredeen	Serve on Subgroup for Continuing Education.
	Chair, Electronic Transmittals and Signatures Subgroup.
	Coordinate ASHRAE /Eng. Forum September 16, 2004.
Gilfilian	Serve on Subgroups: Engineering Disciplines (Chair), Incidental Practice, Electronic Submittals and Signatures.
Hughes	Serve on Engineering Discipline Subgroup.
McLane	Continue work on Model Law Land Surveyor with Executive Administrator and bring draft to circulate for Nov. mtg.
	Serve on Subgroups: Incidental Practice, and Engineering Disciplines.
Maynard	Chair, Subgroup on Incidental Practice. Serve on Continuing Education Subgroup.
Mills	Chair the Western Zone Host Subgroup.

Peirsol	Serve on Electronic Submittals and Signatures Subgroup.
	Bring up B&Bs with the Fairbanks Building Official and bring back information to the next meeting.
Executive Administrator	Assist the Chair with general correspondence.
	Move regulation project forward to public notice to interested parties: Sealing specifications, Canadian Comity, and Architect Education Standard
	Develop draft regulations for staff approval for Architect by Comity holding NCARB “Blue Book” Council Record; and NCEES Council Record stamped “MLE”.
	Agenda items to add: Continuing Education (Old Business) Architect by Comity (Old Business) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Host Western Zone Meeting 2005 (Old Business) • Mining Engineering Board member (New Business) • Temporary License for Emergencies (Old Business).
	Invite the Fire Marshal to the November 2004 Board meeting in Anchorage.
	Find model laws and legislation from other jurisdictions in order to provide guidance to the subgroup.
	Work on revisions Annual Report FY 04.
	Research emergency license procedures. Contact Dr. Bess Funk to gain more information about the emergency license processes.
	Post the information <u>NCEES Model Law Surveyor</u> in the draft minutes and in the AELS Quarterly Board meeting summary.
	Attach the Tennessee model be to the Board minutes as a means of distributing the information to the public and to obtain feedback.
	Provide Board members with a recap of the Architect by Comity issue and the 5-year NAAB Accredited degree plus IDP requirement.

1
2 **On a motion by McLane, seconded by Mills, and unanimously adopted, it**
3 **was**

4
5 **RESOLVED to adjourn the meeting at 3:33p.m.**

6
7 There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned.

8
9
10 Respectfully submitted:

11
12
13
14 _____
15 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator

16
17 Approved:

18
19
20 _____
21 Donald J. Iverson, P.E., Chair
22 Board of Registration for Architects,
23 Engineers, and Land Surveyors

24
25
26 Date: _____
27