

1 Division of Occupational Licensing:

2
3 John Clark, Investigator
4 George Weaver, Investigator
5

6 UAA Anchorage School of Engineering
7 3211 Providence Drive
8 Anchorage, AK 99501:
9

10 Orson Smith, Ph.D., P.E.
11 Bart Quimby, Ph.D., P.E.
12 Rob Lang, Ph.D., P.E., Dean of Engineering
13 Hannele Zubeck, Ph.D., P.E.
14

15 Jon Zufelt, Ph.D., P.E.
16 US Army CRREL
17 P.O. Box 5646
18 Ft. Richardson, AK 99505
19

20 William G. Nelson, Ph.D., P.E.
21 P.O. Box 110489
22 Anchorage, AK 99541
23

24 Bob Carlson, Ph.D., P.E.
25 UAA Fairbanks
26 P.O. Box 755900
27 Fairbanks, AK 99775
28

29 Scott Sandlin
30 P.O. Box 103563
31 Anchorage, AK 99510-3563
32

33 The Chair welcomed new Board member Kimberly Mills to the Board. He also welcomed Bob
34 Gilfilian and announced that Mr. Gilfilian's AELS term would begin on March 1, 2003, and that
35 he would be an observer for part of the day.
36

37 The Board requested the Executive Administrator invite the new Division Director, Rick Urion,
38 to the next Board meeting.
39

40 **Agenda Item 2 – Review/Revise Agenda:**
41

42 The Chair indicated that the agenda was subject to time changes. Since one item could take
43 additional time: Brown had given reconsideration notice on the Arctic course approved at the
44 November meeting.
45

46 The Chair asked for revisions to the agenda, and revisions were made as follows:
47

- 48 • Brown suggested adding a topic to the agenda regarding resolutions so that the Board
49 could track its progress on actions.
50

1 **Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Report**

2
3 The Chair brought to the Board’s attention that he spoke to Linda Perez, the Governor’s Ethics
4 Supervisor for Board Chairs with respect to his participation in approval for arctic courses. He
5 stated that he has taught one of the arctic short courses and he would no longer be teaching that
6 course. Ms. Perez found no conflict of interest and consequently he would participate in the
7 discussion today. He further stated that the Executive Administrator also discussed this with our
8 Board attorney, David Brower, Department of Law and he agrees that there would no longer be a
9 conflict for him.

10
11 The Chair noted there were no additional ethics reports or disclosures by Board members.

12
13 **Agenda Item 4 – Review/Approve Minutes**

14
15 The Chair asked for any corrections or additions to the November 2002 AELS draft minutes.

16
17 Brown suggested Page 3, Line 22, “to the Council record process” should be deleted and
18 replaced with “means to acquire a Council Record”.

19
20 Brown suggested Page 7, Line 37, should read “RESOLVED” instead of “NOT RESOLVED.”

21
22 Brown suggested Page 9, Line 8, should read “NCARB Regional Chair” instead of “NCARB
23 Member Board Chairs.”

24
25 **On a motion by Kalen, seconded by Brown, and carried unanimously, it was**

26
27 **RESOLVED to approve the November 2002 AELS draft minutes, as corrected.**

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

30
31 **Agenda Item 5 – Correspondence**

32
33 The Chair brought up the following correspondence:

- 34
35 1. Letter of 11/5/02 from **Chuck Casper** re: suggestion for definition of incidental
36 practice of minor importance. The Board held a short discussion and asked the
37 Executive Administrator to respond that they appreciate the offer to define “incidental
38 practice of minor importance” but that the Board does not embrace the idea of allowing
39 architects or engineers to practice outside their fields. If there is a specific exemption
40 that applies to the individual (i.e., residential, industrial exemption, etc.) individual that
41 is fine, but otherwise the Board addressed this in its Building Officials Manual by
42 stating there is no definition. The Board has concerns about projects (for use by the
43 public) that could be built without the expertise of an engineer or an architect if “of
44 minor importance” were somehow defined, so the Board decided there was not an
45 instance “of minor importance”.
46
47 2. E-mail of 1/21/02 from **Eric Heiss** re: Mentoring: Video conferencing face-to-face.

1 The Board discussed mentoring, and the purpose of face-to-face meetings. The Board
2 decided that video-conferencing met the intent with respect to the regulations but that
3 telephone conferencing would not meet the requirement and asked the Executive
4 Administrator to respond. There is not the flexibility within the regulations to reduce the
5 number of times that the mentor needs to meet with the mentee.

6
7 Gardner joined the meeting at 9:20 a.m.

- 8
9 3. Letter of 12/24/02 from **Robert L. Visser**, re: Tenure.

10
11 The Board discussed “tenure” and that the term has not been used with the design
12 professionals but that it would be a step towards national licensure. Individual states are
13 not willing to relinquish control over licensing requirements. The Chair instructed the
14 Executive Administrator to respond to the letter, and to mention the requirements for
15 Architect by Comity licensure and retired status licensure.

- 16
17 4. E-mail of 12/27/02 from **John Everett**, J.D., P.E, re: SPCC Plan Certificate Inquiries
18 re 40 CFR 112 requirements.

19
20 The Chair noted that there is an exemption for federal employees, not for contractors in
21 AS 08.48.341. The Board held a short discussion.

22
23 Mr. Gilfilian indicated that he has conducted many of these certifications and believes
24 that a registered engineer should be doing these projects .

25
26 The Chair instructed the Executive Administrator to respond to Mr. Everett that the
27 Board requires an engineer to perform SPCC plan certifications.

- 28
29 5. Fax of 1/02/03 from **M. Specter**, P.E., LS, National Academy of Forensic Engineers re:
30 Sanctions for Engineering Testimony.

31
32 The Board held a brief discussion and agreed that in Alaska expert witnesses are not
33 required to be registered design professionals. The Chair instructed the Executive
34 Administrator to respond to M. Specter that the AELS Board believes the evaluation of
35 credentials for expert witnesses is thoroughly explored through testimony and the legal
36 examination process by the courts.

- 37
38 6. E-mail of 1/3/03 from **Kathy Hart**, MBA, Oklahoma, re: Switch dates for Western
39 Zone Meeting 2005.

40
41 The Board held a brief discussion and asked the Executive Administrator to respond to
42 the Oklahoma Board that it has no objection to the date changes for the Western Zone
43 meeting in 2005 so long as the NCEES leadership has no issues.

- 44
45 7. E-mail of 1/15/03 from **Steve Mandt**, re: Architectural Engineering

46
47 The Board held a discussion about architectural engineering.
48

1 Mearig explained that the practice of architectural engineering is about building systems
2 and not building designs.

3
4 The Board discussed concerns about architectural engineering since the education seems
5 to touch on many disciplines and is not specifically civil engineering. There were
6 concerns about the references to architectural design because the person would not be
7 able to get licensed as an architect very easily since they would need to have a 5-year
8 Bachelor of Architecture degree in order to qualify. Issues that surfaced are that the
9 architectural engineering degree varies from university to university, and that some
10 jurisdictions are not offering this exam. While many states have non-discipline specific
11 licensure for engineering, in order to get licensed in Alaska applicants would need to
12 take the Civil Engineering exam. The Board is continuing to decide which engineering
13 disciplines to offer for licensure in Alaska and will evaluate the viability of exams at the
14 national level as well as the educational programs offered as part of this process.

- 15
16 8. E-mail of 1/23/03 from **Robert Whaley** regarding FLS application linked to PLS
17 application.

18
19 The Board discussed the process it took to develop the regulations that phased in the
20 new requirement for education. The Board generally felt that the regulation changes
21 gave enough lead time and allowed adequate time for applicants to work their way
22 through the system. The Board did not specifically offer a grandfathering clause but
23 rather one of a phase-in time that they thought was lengthy enough to allow candidates
24 time to comply.

25
26 The Executive Administrator indicated that there could be candidates who were in the
27 examination process for years. She indicated there was not any easy way to tell which
28 candidates took the Fundamentals of Land Surveying Examination (formerly the Land
29 Surveying In Training or LSIT examination) but had not yet taken the Professional Land
30 Surveying (PLS) or state specific Alaska Land Surveying examinations (AKLS). She
31 also indicated that some Alaska candidates for the PLS/AKLS have taken the FLS
32 examination in other jurisdictions and that there wasn't any way to know who might
33 apply in Alaska.

34
35 Kalen was empathetic to the concerns of any land surveyors who had not realized that
36 they needed to apply by a time certain to take the PLS exam.

37
38 The Chair indicated that the changes to the regulations were adopted by the Board and a
39 time-certain date was clearly indicated and that there has never been a link between the
40 two applications, nor is there a link between engineering applications for the
41 fundamentals and professional exams. The Chair also indicated that the Board has
42 reviewed at least one instance where a land surveyor was licensed in another jurisdiction
43 and was unable to obtain comity because of Alaska's requirement for minimum
44 education standards of 2-3 years for land surveyors.

45
46 The Executive Administrator indicated that there was an application regarding this
47 regulation change that the Board would be reviewing in Executive Session.

- 1 9. E-mail of 12/18/03, FYI: **Jack Warner**, Exam review on AKLS, recommended no
2 review.

3
4 The Executive Administrator explained that the AKLS examination is a multiple-choice
5 examination and that the Board has used the guidelines established by the NCEES for
6 any examination reviews. The NCEES has eliminated examination reviews and the
7 Board has followed suit. This
8 e-mail from Test, Inc., our contractor for providing the psychometrical reliability of the
9 examinations, reaffirms the decision to not allow examination reviews.
10 The Board agreed that examination reviews should not be allowed with the multiple-
11 choice exams.

- 12
13 10. E-mail from NCARB, **Katie Wulf**, FYI, NCARB Revised definition of Health, Safety &
14 Welfare.

15
16 An architect promotes the health, safety, and welfare of the public by planning and
17 designing buildings, structures, and the spaces within and surrounding such buildings
18 and structures, that

- 19
20 ➤ minimize the risk of injury to persons or property, and comply with all applicable
21 building and safety codes;
22 ➤ are durable, environmentally friendly, cost-effective, and conserve resources;
23 ➤ are aesthetically appealing;
24 ➤ function properly in all relevant respects; and
25 ➤ enhance the public's overall sense of well-being, harmony, and community, and
26 integrate effectively with the surrounding environment.

27
28 An architect shall prefer the client's interests over the architect's interests and, when the
29 issues are clear, the public's interest over both.

30
31 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to look at NCEES for a definition to bring
32 back at some future date.

33
34 Break: 10:25 a.m.

35 Reconvene: 10:35 a.m.

- 36
37 11. Memo of 1/17/03 NCEES, **John Billingsley**, Proposed amendment to Bylaws.

38
39 The Chair indicated this is an information item.

40
41 The Chair moved to Tab 6.

42
43 **Agenda Item 6 – Proposed Regulations Changes.**

44
45 The Chair brought up item under TAB 6A and indicated the regulation project was stale and any
46 changes to the regulations would require additional public noticing.

47
48 Brown asked to postpone discussion on that item, and to take up item under TAB #6B at this
49 time.

1
2 The Executive Administrator briefly explained the technical changes.

3
4 Brown explained that for Architect by Comity applicants, we require NCARB Council
5 certification, the “Blue Book” Council record and it really isn’t necessary to have additional
6 requirements to show proof of having met the intern development program. The NCARB staff
7 evaluates the records and shows the work experience determination.

8
9 **On a motion by Brown, seconded by Mearig, and adopted unanimously, it was**

10
11 **RESOLVED to adopt the proposed regulations that were public noticed for 12 AAC**
12 **36.061, 12 AAC 36.063, 12 AAC 36.103, and 12 AAC 36.185 and to request the**
13 **project be sent to the Department of Law for review.**

14
15 Although there were no public comments the Board considered the cost to private persons of the
16 regulatory action being taken.

17
18 The Chair announced there were no objections, and the motion passed.
19 The Chair signed the adoption order and gave to the Executive Administrator to submit.

20
21 **Agenda Item 7 – Old Business**

22
23 The Chair explained that an item was up for reconsideration, the Arctic Course that the Board
24 had approved in November 2002.

25
26 **On a motion by Brown, seconded by Kalen, and not adopted, it was**

27
28 **RESOLVED to reconsider the CE A 680 Arctic Engineering short course.**

29
30 A lengthy discussion followed.

31
32 The Chair indicated that he no longer teaches the arctic course and that he had discussed this
33 with the Ethics Supervisor at the Governor’s office, and the Executive Administrator discussed
34 the matter with David Brower, the Board’s Assistant Attorney General. Both attorneys agreed
35 that without the conflict of interest of teaching a course, he would be able to participate in the
36 discussions.

37
38 A discussion followed.

39
40 The Chair indicated that he wanted to remind Board members that this is probably the only
41 opportunity to change the approval before the course begins.

42
43 Brown asked how many votes are needed to pass the motion and the Chair responded a simple
44 majority of those present.

45
46 McLane reminded the Board that some of the members who voted initially were not present and
47 a new member has been added.

1 Mearig asked if the Chair could vote on reconsideration and the Chair responded that he could do
2 so.

3
4 Gardener asked if the Board could reconsider the course today but postpone making a decision
5 until May.

6
7 The Executive Administrator indicated that David Brower indicated that the Board must make a
8 decision on the course now because the course either met the requirements or did not meet the
9 requirements. If the Board postponed its decision, the course would be taught, and those taking
10 the course could be licensed. The attorney advised her that the Board could only reconsider this
11 motion because it may have erred in initially adopting the course. It is important to take action at
12 this meeting to decide if the course meets the criteria for the arctic course.

13
14 The Chair asked for a roll call vote, and the votes were as follows:

15

Board Member	Yea	Nay
Brown		X
Mills		X
Gardner		X
Kalen	X	
McLane		X
Mearig		X
Miller	X	
Peirsol	X	
Total	3	5

16
17 The Licensing Examiner announced the vote is 3 yeas, 5 nays and the motion failed.

18
19 The Chair reiterated that the vote to reconsider the course failed.

20
21 Peirsol asked if Board members would share views on the vote as she was disappointed not to
22 have taken up the course review at this time.

23
24 McLane indicated that there was a clear majority in November and he was comfortable that the
25 Board had considered the contents of the arctic course.

26
27 Mearig stated that there were different Board members in attendance from the last meeting.

28
29 **On a motion by Brown, seconded by Mearig, it was**

30
31 **RESOLVED to reconsider the arctic courses in November 2003.**

32
33 Discussion followed.

34
35 Mearig suggested that a presentation be made prior to any decision, perhaps at the August 2003
36 meeting.

- 1 Brown stated that the arctic courses have not been looked at in any thorough way in probably
- 2 twelve years and now that we have changing technology and different delivery methods it makes
- 3 sense that the courses be reviewed on the basis of criteria.
- 4
- 5 Gardner offered to serve on a subcommittee to review arctic courses and develop the criteria.

1 The Chair restated the motion:

2
3 **On a motion by Brown, seconded by Mearig, it was**

4
5 **RESOLVED to reconsider the arctic courses in November 2003.**

6
7 The Chair asked if there were any objections and Kalen objected. The motion passed with one
8 nay.

9
10 The Chair explained that there were visitors who wished to comment on the arctic course and he
11 asked them to briefly comment.

12
13 **William Nelson, Ph.D., P.E.**, explained that he taught the semester course for arctic engineering
14 for many years, and at one time over 200 students a year were taking the course. He also teaches
15 a short course of about 35- 37 hours in duration. It has been his experience that about half the
16 students begin the course feeling resentful that the course is required, but by the end of the
17 course they are very appreciative of the information provided. Still, many errors are made in the
18 field in terms of arctic engineering. He supports peer review and strongly recommends keeping
19 the requirements in regulation. He feels that a 45-hour course really isn't sufficient to teach
20 arctic engineering and does not support a course of 10-15 hour duration.

21
22 **Bob Carlson, Ph.D., P.E.**, gave a brief history of the arctic course and stated that he thinks the
23 3-credit course is essential for the practice of engineering in Alaska. Even in the semester-based
24 course, he thinks that he is not able to adequately cover the material.

25
26 **Robert Lang, Ph.D., P.E.**, UAA Dean of School of Engineering, explained that he is a
27 registered civil engineer in California and is applying for registration in Alaska. He stated that
28 Orson Smith had prepared a power point presentation and he would cede his time to him. He
29 agreed with the other comments on the importance of arctic engineering but that there are many
30 different ways to meet the needs ranging from the semester course, to the short courses, and the
31 web-based courses.

32
33 **Bart Quimby, Ph.D., P.E.**, UAA Professor & Chair, Civil Engineering, expressed the
34 importance of arctic engineering, although a course cannot alleviate all problems. He would like
35 to see some type of outcomes assessment for those taking the course, perhaps an examination.

36
37 **Orson Smith, Ph.D., P.E.**, Associate Professor, Program Chair, Arctic Engineering expressed
38 that he did not want to give his copyrighted material as public comment. He preferred to give his
39 presentation to the Board in the fall. After discussion with other faculty and the Dean, Robert
40 Lang, he offered to allow the Board members access to the course (complimentary) by enrolling
41 them in the course so that they could follow along with the students. He said that the Board
42 should offer an examination if they do not think that the course is adequate.

43
44 The Executive Administrator furnished Dr. Smith a copy of the Board Roster.

45
46 **Hannele Zubeck, Ph.D., P.E.**, UAA, Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering,
47 stated that she is the instructor of the Short course and explained that portion of all of the
48 modules in the 3-credit semester based course are presented in the short course. Instead of one
49 module per week, the modules are presented daily.

1
2 **John Zufelt, Ph.D., P.E. Research Hydrologist**, U.S. Army, described errors he thinks are
3 happening because federal workers are exempt from registration and are not required to take the
4 Arctic Course. He teaches CE 682 - Ice Engineering at UAA. He suggested that the Board
5 consider continuing education as one means to help keep engineers educated.

6
7 Break for Lunch: 11:35 a.m.

8 Reconvene: 12:55 p.m.

9
10 The Chair reverted back to:

11
12 **Agenda Item 6 – Proposed Regulation Changes**

13
14 The Board held a discussion on the Engineering disciplines. The Executive Administrator
15 provided draft language of how our regulations could be listed in 12 AAC 36.990, modeled after
16 the method that Nevada currently has in place. Nevada lists the engineering disciplines based on
17 the specialty exams that NCEES offers.

18
19 McLane suggested removing definitions but thought that the Board had voted against developing
20 a regulation project to add all or a few of the disciplines. He also was concerned about the
21 Board's composition if all were added. He suggested that the Board retains the core disciplines
22 and adds only the ones that have been requested by individuals.

23
24 **On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gardner, it was**

25
26 **RESOLVED to develop definitions for NCEES specialty disciplines of engineering.**

27
28 The Board discussed which specialties they might add or not add to the current six disciplines
29 listed. Concern was expressed about investigating people working outside their disciplines if so
30 many disciplines were offered in Alaska. Currently there are only six disciplines and they are
31 defined. If 19 disciplines were offered, many of those disciplines would overlap one or more of
32 the current six disciplines.

33
34 **On an amendment by Peirsol, seconded by Kalen, it was**

35
36 **RESOLVED to prioritize the list and then to develop definitions for as many**
37 **specialties as possible.**

38
39 The amendment passed 5-3, with Brown, Mills, Gardner, Mearig, and Peirsol as yeas, and Kalen,
40 Miller, and McLane as nays.

41
42 The amended main motion reads:

43
44 **On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gardner, it was**

45
46 **RESOLVED to prioritize the list of specialty disciplines and then to develop**
47 **definitions for as many NCEES specialties as possible**

1 The main motion passed 5-3, with Brown, Mills, Gardner, Mearig, and Peirsol as yeas, and
2 Kalen, Miller & McLane as nays.

3
4 **Agenda Item 8 – Public Comment**

5
6 **Scott Sandlin, past President, AIA-Alaska**, requested the Board consider an alternative
7 Architect by Comity licensure. He expressed that many other jurisdictions allow reciprocity
8 without the NCARB council certification. He outlined fees for going through the current
9 NCARB Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) procedure as costing about \$3,500 on top of the
10 State fees required.

11
12 He reminded members that he spoke to the Board last May, and again, requests the Board
13 implement alternate paths besides the NCARB certificate and BEA process.

14
15 Brown identified the primary issue as one of education. There were changes within the
16 architectural education system that left some people without a NAAB accredited degree unable
17 to qualify for council certification. She indicated that Alaska has always modeled NCARB
18 requirements. There has been a reluctance to water down the educational requirements for the
19 few people in Alaska who want licensure but do not meet the minimum standards for education,
20 particularly when there is a process in place at the national level to address their concerns.

21
22 The Chair thanked Mr. Sandlin for bringing back his issue to the Board.

23
24 **Agenda Item 9 – Application Reviews**

25
26 **On a motion by Kalen, seconded by Gardner, and unanimously adopted, it was**

27
28 **RESOLVED to go into executive session for the purpose of reviewing applicant files.**

29
30 The Board went into executive session at 2:10 p.m. and recessed at 7:00 p.m.

31
32 **Wednesday, February 26, 2003**

33
34 **Agenda Item 10 – Convene/Roll Call**

35
36 Members present and constituting a quorum at 8:10 a.m. were:

37
38 Robert Miller, Chairperson, Ph.D., Civil Engineer
39 Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor
40 Scott McLane, Land Surveyor
41 Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer
42 Patricia Peirsol, Architect
43 Kimberly Mills, Public Member
44 Kathleen Gardner, Vice-Chairperson, Mechanical Engineer
45 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect

46
47 Absent were:

48
49 Ernie Siemoneit, Secretary, Mining Engineer

1 Donald Iverson, Electrical Engineer
2
3 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:
4

5 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
6 Julie Adamson, Licensing Examiner
7 Elton Engstrom, Licensing Examiner
8

9 Joining a portion of the meeting, in person were:
10

11 John R. Clark, Investigator
12 George Weaver, Investigator
13

14 Carl Grundberg, AIA-AK, Chair, representing AIA-Alaska
15 808 E Street
16 Anchorage, AK 99501
17

18 Joining a portion of the meeting, by teleconference was,
19

20 David Brower, Assistant Attorney General
21

22 The Chair asked if there were any concerns about files that needed to be addressed.
23

24 The Executive Administrator explained there were several files that needed to be discussed.
25

26 The Chair asked for a motion.

1
2 **On a motion by Kalen, seconded by Gardner, it was**

3
4 **RESOLVED that the Board go into executive session for the purposes of discussing**
5 **applicant files.**

6
7 The Board went into executive session at 8:11 a.m.

8 The Board came out of executive session at 9:20 a.m.

9
10 Break: 9:29 a.m.

11 Reconvene: 9:35 a.m.

12
13 **Agenda Item 12 – Board Action on Hearing Officer Proposed Decision.**

14
15 The Chair brought up the Hearing Officer proposed decision in Tab 12 and asked John Clark,
16 Investigator, to present it to the Board.

17
18 Clark outlined the Findings of Fact and Conclusion by Hearing Officer Stebing on the Patrick W.
19 Moore, Case 0103-95-010 and 0103-98-003. Clark indicated that there were several options for
20 the Board that were outlined in the Recommendation, Option 1 through 4. Option 1
21 recommended (a) a disciplinary sanction should be imposed upon Patrick W. Moore of a fine of
22 \$4,000, payable within 120 days of the Board's final administrative order in the case; and (b)
23 Moore should not be granted licensure in Alaska again until his fine is paid in full.

24
25 The Board had other options to reduce the penalty or sanction; to reject the decision; or to have
26 the entire record prepared for Board review.

27
28 Clark explained that the agency conducted an investigation and prepared an accusation
29 containing two parts. Count 1: Moore practiced professional engineering in 1995, during a time
30 period when his license was lapsed; and Count II: Moore practiced professional engineering in
31 1998, when his license was lapsed.

32
33 The Board held a short discussion.

34
35 **On a motion by Kalen, seconded by Brown, and unanimously approved, it was**

36
37 **RESOLVED to adopt the hearing officer recommendations in Option 1 and institute**
38 **a \$4,000 fine for unlicensed practice for Patrick W. Moore.**

39
40 The Chair signed the Board Action on Proposed Decision and asked the Executive Administrator
41 to provide this document to the Investigator.

42
43 The Chair asked to postpone the Administrator's Report and Goals and Objectives until later, and asked to bring up
44 the budget report

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

46
47 The Chair noted that John Clark and George Weaver were present.

48
49 Clark discussed the Investigator Report, routine investigative processes, and cases in the report.

1 Clark mentioned the home inspector's bill and that he and the Chair had participated in
2 legislative hearings to ensure that architects and engineers would be exempt and would provide a
3 seal and signature when submitting reports. Under the bill, home inspectors would be licensed
4 under the Division of Occupational Licensing but not under the AELS Board.
5

6 Clark brought up design competitions and the Board held a discussion about exactly what
7 constitutes an offer to practice. Our regulations are silent on design competitions. One concern
8 was that if arctic considerations and local codes were not employed early in the design process, it
9 could be problematic to the overall building design. The Board discussed the difference between
10 the conceptual drawings done for design competitions and the contract drawings used for
11 building construction. At the contract drawing stage, the drawings prepared for the construction
12 of the project would need to be completed under the purview of registered Alaskan architects,
13 engineers, land surveyors, and landscape architects. The Board felt that it is important to
14 Alaskans to have the benefit of many people submitting to design competitions but it is equally
15 important to ensure that final construction documents are produced by registered Alaskan design
16 professionals.
17

18 Gardner suggested that answer may be in the clarification of the difference between conceptual
19 design drawings and design development and construction drawings and that it might be more
20 apt to use the term "concept competition".
21

22 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to find out how many other jurisdictions require
23 architects to be registered before competing in design competitions.
24

1
2
3 **Agenda Item 14 – Budget Summary Report**
4

5 The Chair gave a brief overview of the budget to the new Board member.
6

7 The Board held a discussion about the budget comparisons and felt that it would be easiest for
8 them to view the charts by renewal cycle years since the fees are calculated based on the
9 expenditures and revenues for those timeframes. They asked the Executive Administrator to see
10 if it could be reported by cycle, and preferably about the same date so that the Board could better
11 track where they were in the cycle, for example: 96-97, 98-99, 00-01, 02-03, 04-05. They were
12 also interested in comparing this year to last year, and track the carryover on a regular basis. The
13 Executive Administrator said she would discuss this with the Administrative Manager.
14

15 The Chair indicated that in November the former Director had reviewed the Board's budget and
16 explained that it seemed likely that the Board would have a small surplus, that fees would likely
17 be kept the same but that this would be revisited in July when the fiscal year is over. The former
18 Director reiterated her expectation that fees would likely stay the same for the next renewal cycle
19 and that an increase would not likely happen until the 12/31/05-renewal cycle.
20

21 The Board asked the Executive Administrator to convey to the new Director that the continuity
22 of fees is very important to the Board. The Board discussed and the Chair noted that the
23 Executive Administrator is the designated contact between the Board and the administration.
24

25 Break: 9:20 a.m.

26 Reconvene: 9:35 a.m.
27

28 **Agenda Item 16 – Meet with David Brower, Assistant Attorney General**
29

30 The Chair indicated that David Brower, Assistant Attorney General, was on-line by
31 teleconference.
32

33 Brown asked for guidance on design competitions and explained that there can be open requests
34 for competitions for designing buildings or facilities and she gave an example of the
35 Municipality of Anchorage bus shelters, or a new museum building.
36

37 The Board discussed design competitions and what constitutes an offer to practice.
38

39 Brower suggested the Board might want to consider a regulation that specifically addresses
40 design competitions.
41

42 The Chair referred to 12 AAC 36 105 (d) and asked about the intent of the regulation.
43

44 Brower responded that it is quite difficult to find information on old regulations and that the
45 Board can determine what the regulation means as it pertains to current circumstances.
46 Sometimes the meaning of regulations evolves over time.
47

48 The Chair asked about a circumstance where information is exchanged in Executive Session and
49 since that information exchange is confidential, could it later be disclosed.

1
2 Brower suggested that the Board's actions on specific items or files discussed in Executive
3 session are not made public. Items should be made public as part of the process of the Board
4 only when they are discussed on the record and when action is taken on the record. Other
5 specific information that the Board has discussed is confidential and is not part of the record.
6

7 Brown asked Brower to look at the deadlines in 12 AAC 36.062- 12 AAC 36.065 and asked if
8 the deadlines were firm deadlines or approximate deadlines.
9

10 Brower responded that they were firm deadlines.
11

12 The Chair asked specifically if an applicant had taken the Fundamentals of Land Surveying
13 Examination but missed the deadline in 12 AAC 36.065 (a) (B) to apply for the second
14 examination could they take issue with the deadline. The applicant thought he was on the track
15 for the Professional Land Surveying examination by applying for the first one. The Chair added
16 that the Board set up specific requirement changes for land surveyors and engineers. The land
17 surveyor requirements for education and experience changed in 2001 but the engineer
18 requirements will go into effect in 2004.
19

20 Brower thought that the deadline was firm and that applicants who missed the deadline would
21 need to meet the new standards and that generally enough lead time is built in so that the
22 applicants can comply with the new rules.
23

24 The Chair thanked Brower for his participation and requested that he participate at the May
25 AELS Board meeting, at least by teleconference.
26

27 The Chair took up the next item on the agenda, Old Business.
28

29 **Agenda Item 17 – Old Business**

30

31 The Chair brought up Old Business, Canadian Reciprocity. He advised that Mearig, Peirsol, and
32 Miller have attended conferences with Canadian groups and have held discussions about
33 reciprocity between the respective countries. NCEES has not been receptive to the request to
34 eliminate the need to examine Canadian applicants and consequently the Canadian groups are
35 trying to foster bilateral agreements between the Canadian provinces and individual jurisdictions
36 such as Idaho, Washington, Oregon and Alaska.
37

38 The Chair asked if the Board was interested in developing any waivers for examination.
39

40 Mearig suggested that the Board could have two classes of FE waivers depending on the degree,
41 for example 8-10 years work experience for those having a degree, and 20 years for those
42 without a degree.
43

44 **On a motion by Brown, seconded by Gardner, and unanimously approved, it was**
45

46 **RESOLVED to request the Executive Administrator to draft language to modify**
47 **regulations to allow for Canadian reciprocity; and to allow work experience gained**
48 **under Canadian engineers to be accepted for engineering applicants.**
49

1 A short discussion followed.

2
3 Brown suggested that the motion could possibly cover FE waivers or PE exam waivers, with a
4 certain amount of work experience.

5
6 The Chair would like to assist and suggests the Board work in concert with other Western States.
7 The Idaho administrator is working on a white paper to outline the issues.

8
9 Mearig offered to assist with the project.

10
11 The Chair noted that the Board had a guest, Mr. Carl Grundberg, and he welcomed Mr.
12 Grundberg and introduced him as the new AIA Chair.

13
14 **Carl Grundberg, AIA Chair** asked to present a letter in opposition to the arctic engineering A
15 680 UAA course that the Board approved in November 2002. The AIA-Alaska does not believe
16 that the course meets the minimum requirements.

17
18 Break for Lunch: 11:50 a.m.

19 Reconvene 1:15 p.m.

20
21 Cyra-Korsgaard and Gardner are absent. Iverson and Siemoneit are excused.

22
23 **Agenda Item 18 – Legislation**

24
25 Erosion Control

26
27 Kalen referred to an item under Tab 18 that was brought up at an APDC legislative meeting.
28 Clint Adler, P.E. submitted an issue relating to the statutory exemption under AS 08.48.331 (11)
29 regarding erosion control. He suggests clarifying the exemption with the addition of “where
30 structural reinforcement of earth is not necessary.” The purpose of the suggested language
31 change to the exemption is to ensure an engineer is used for design and construction of all
32 rehabilitation and erosion control structures.

33
34 The Board discussed possible ramifications of the change and were concerned about how it may
35 affect mining restoration efforts.

36
37 The Chair asked to have the language sent to Siemoneit for his comments before the Board
38 weighed in on the specific language.

1 Safety Codes

2
3 The Board discussed Colin Maynard's briefing on Safety Code issues and while they have no
4 specific authority over codes an opinion could be expressed.

5
6 Kalen stated that the Alaska Professional Design Council (APDC) is working to have a task
7 force sort out the issues.

8
9 Specialty Contractor

10
11 The Chair read the revised language change that the Board adopted at its last meeting:

12
13 AS 08.48.331(7) a specialty contractor licensed under AS 08.18 preparing shop or field drawings
14 for work designed by a professional architect, engineer, or landscape architect.

15
16 The Chair noted that Kalen had forwarded the proposed statutory changes to Senator Therriault's
17 office, along with requests for changes to term limits and continuing education.

18
19 Kalen noted that he had done so but that Senator Wilken or Senator Seekins would likely be
20 drafting language for introduction, probably in different bills.

21
22 Brown preferred to have all the Board's statutory requests in one bill and would like to see a
23 clean version submitted.

24
25 The Chair moved to Agenda Item 19.

26
27 **Agenda Item 19 – Other Regulations**

28
29 McLane spoke about the Land Surveyor Model Law. He indicated that there has been an effort
30 at the national level to add photogrammetry and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to the
31 definition of land surveyors. He has spent some time working on draft language that could be
32 presented in May.

33
34 The Chair asked if he would work with Kalen and the Executive Administrator on the draft
35 language.

36
37 The Executive Administrator discussed issues surrounding the changes to the language in the
38 expired certificate regulations, 12 AAC 36.165, and that the Board may wish to have some
39 flexibility to stipulate licenses and add peer review for instances of marginally competent
40 applicants.

41
42 Brown agreed but felt that the Board could postpone that kind of action until a regulation project
43 was in the works.

44
45 **Agenda Item 20 – New Business**

46
47 Brown asked to have the Chair invite the Director to our next meeting and the Chair indicated
48 the Executive Administrator would pass on the Board's interest and request.

1 The Chair brought up exam security issues and indicated that the NCEES is very interested in
2 having all jurisdictions allow NCEES to administer the exams. They say that there are large
3 liability issues involved due to lost examinations and NCEES may require a state that wants to
4 continue administering the exam to post a \$1 million dollar bond.

5
6 The Executive Administrator indicated that the Board had previously asked NCEES for an
7 estimate of administration costs. Concerns were raised by the Board at that time about additional
8 administrative costs to candidates and that NCEES may reduce the number of exam sites within
9 Alaska from three sites to one site. The Executive Administrator indicated she should have new
10 cost estimates for the Board to review at the May meeting.

11
12 Brown brought up resolutions for WCARB and NCARB and her support for 3 one year terms for
13 regional director in the hopes that it may give people more time to move up within the ranks in
14 the NCARB organization.

15
16 Mearig brought up electronic signatures and inconsistencies within the practice within the state
17 and asked for clarification between an electronic facsimile or image of a signature.

18
19 John Clark, Investigator joined the meeting.

20
21 The Board and the Investigator discussed the requirement for sealing construction documents.
22 As long as one signed set is on file, preferably in the office of the registered design professional,
23 the set can be reproduced or sent electronically.

24
25 Brown brought up the issue of temporary licenses and asked if the Executive Administrator
26 could look into the possibility of the Board issuing temporary licenses for limited projects.

27
28 The Board held a short discussion and requested that the Executive Administrator produce draft
29 language for the Board to review at its May 2003 meeting.

30
31 **Agenda Item – New Business**

32
33 The Chair asked to revert back to Tab 13, Administrator's Report.

34
35 The Executive Administrator gave the highlights of the administrator's report. There had been
36 an irregularity during the December Landscape Architect Registration Examination. The test
37 was not compromised but a candidate was unable to test due to a lack of communication between
38 the proctor and the division staff. She referred to the LARE detailed list of instructions for the
39 Proctor to adhere to when administering the exams and indicated she thought her staff had taken
40 measures to ensure a good examination administration outcome. She referred to complaints by
41 the candidate who tested and indicated that appropriate adjustments would be made to the room
42 site. The solution is to either send an AELS licensing examiner to oversee the next exam or find
43 another seasoned proctor.

44
45 She discussed the electronic technology upgrades that the Board had requested in 2000, and
46 explained that most of the items had been completed except for developing a checklist, scanning
47 in documents, and on-line applications. She advocated for on-line applications as beneficial to
48 clients who did not live in Juneau or Anchorage since those applicants could drop off an
49 application and pay fees.

1 She mentioned that she discussed this with the new Director. There would still need to be a
2 faxed or hard copy of the signature page submitted before an application would be considered
3 completed, similar to the Permanent Fund Dividend requirement to submit a signature page for
4 PFD applications.

5
6 The data processing section has been working to assist staff in executing merges to the data
7 within the AELS database, which has been helpful for score reporting and could be enhanced for
8 other purposes.

9
10 The Board discussed the list and agreed that #5, on-line access checklist, and #7, scanned-in
11 documents/applicant review file are no longer a priority and could be deleted.

12
13 **On a motion by Brown, seconded by Peirsol, and unanimously adopted, it was**

14
15 **RESOLVED to move forward with on-line applications.**

16
17 The Chair indicated there were no objections, and the motion passed.

18
19 Break: 3:30 p.m.

20 Reconvene: 3:40 p.m.

21
22 **Agenda Item 20 – Read Applications into Record**

23
24 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Gardner, it was**

25
26 **RESOLVED to approve the following list of applications for comity and**
27 **examination as read, with the stipulation that the information in the applicant's file**
28 **will take precedence over the information in the minutes:**

NAME	DISCIPLINE	EXAM/ COMITY	BOARD ACTION
1. Alter, David	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic)
2. Barclay, Donald	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved
3. Baxley, Jason	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved
4. Burgess, Christopher	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic)
5. Cooper, Robert	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic)
6. Curtis, Craig	Architect	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic)
7. Fraley, James	PE-Mechanical	COMITY	Approved
8. Galunic, Branko	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic)
9. Gatrell, Douglas	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved
10. Gould, Thomas	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved (pending transcripts, PE exam and current license verification)
11. Gralund, Matthew	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved
12. Hardianto, Franciscus	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic)
13. Harezlak, Maciej	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved
14. Hedrick, Donald	Architect	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic, current license and reference registration #'s)
15. Herth, Steven	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved
16. Huang, Kuoh-Ih	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved
17. Jariwala, Kalpesh	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic)
18. Ji, Shihong	PE-Electrical	COMITY	Approved
19. Johnsen, Jan	PE-Mechanical	COMITY	Approved
20. Kearns, Thomas	PE-Civil	COMITY	Approved (pending current license verification)
21. Kenney, Todd	PE-Mechanical	COMITY	Approved
22. Kerby, R. Patrick	PE-Electrical	COMITY	Approved
23. Lafferty, Mark D.	PE Electrical	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic)
24. Lang, Robert J.	PE Civil	COMITY	Approved
25. Magsi, Imran G.	PE Civil	COMITY	Approved
26. Malmedal, Keith N.	PE Electrical	COMITY	Approved (pending current license)
27. McElroy, Wilson F.	PE Mechanical	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic)
28. Meeks, Donald J.	Architect	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic)
29. Moor, David M.	PE Civil	COMITY	Approved (pending verification of current license,)
30. Ness, William H.	PE Civil	COMITY	Approved
31. Parsons, Brock K.	PE Mechanical	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic)
32. Rentz, Ralph	Landscape Architect	COMITY	Approved
33. Rhoades, Erskin P.	Architect	COMITY	Approved
34. Riley, Greg L.	PE Civil	COMITY	Approved
35. Sampson, Robert W.	PE Civil	COMITY	Approved
36. Scott, Khristopher J.	PE Civil	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic)
37. Sobczak, Kelly L.	PE Civil	COMITY	Approved
38. Wagner, Linda J.	Architect	COMITY	Approved (pending arctic)
39. Way, Paul T.	PE Electrical	COMITY	Approved
40. Westra, Steven P.	PE Civil	COMITY	Approved (pending Arctic)
41. Adams, Michael	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
42. Anderson, Brett	FE	EXAM	Approved

43. Anderson, Erin	FE	EXAM	Approved
44. Anderson, Monique	Land. Arch	EXAM	Approved (pending Arctic)
45. Anderson, Ryan	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
46. Baker, Grant	PE-Mechanical	EXAM	Approved
47. Barney, Steve	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
48. Beaton, Barbara	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
49. Benson, Jeremy	FE	EXAM	Approved
50. Berggren, Michael	FE	EXAM	Approved
51. Bingham, Brett	PE-Electrical	EXAM	Approved (pending Arctic)
52. Boris, Todd	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
53. Boyle, Dennis	Land. Arch.	EXAM	Approved (pending Arctic)
54. Bradford, Traci	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
55. Briggs, Peter	Land. Arch.	EXAM	Approved (pending Arctic)
56. Burke, Duane	FE	EXAM	Approved
57. Callaghan, Steven	Land. Arch	EXAM	Approved (pending Arctic)
58. Carey, Bryan	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
59. Carter, Kyle	PE-Electrical	EXAM	Approved (pending Arctic)
60. Coghill, William	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
61. Cordova, Richard	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved (pending Arctic)
62. Craig, Robert	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
63. Currey, Jeffrey	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
64. De La Pena, Gracia	FE	EXAM	Approved
65. Dietrick, Andrew	FE	EXAM	Approved
66. Dopperpuhl, Jeremiah	FE	EXAM	Approved
67. Drage, Jeremiah	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved (pending FE verification)
68. Escamilla, Paul	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved (pending Arctic)
69. Evans, Simon	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved (pending FE verification)
70. Everard, Jason	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
71. Finnegan, Mike	FE	EXAM	Approved
72. Greenshields, Sherrie	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
73. Hadley, Sheri	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
74. Hall, Mark	PLS/AKLS	EXAM	Approved
75. Helgeson, Chad	PE-Chemical	EXAM	Approved
76. Herrett, Robert	PE-Electrical	EXAM	Approved
77. Hoen, Howard	PE-Mechanical	EXAM	Approved
78. Hoffman, Paulette	FE	EXAM	Approved
79. Holmes, Travis	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
80. Howard, Chad	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved (pending Arctic)
81. Jones, Scott	FE	EXAM	Approved
82. Joos, Aaron	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
83. Kemp, Christopher	PLS/AKLS	EXAM	Approved
84. Kenny, Tait	FE	EXAM	Approved
85. Khan, Imran	FE	EXAM	Approved
86. Lagoda, Mikhail	FE	EXAM	Approved
87. Lemay, Patrick M.	PE Civil	EXAM	Approved
88. Levy, Heather Ann	FE	EXAM	Approved
89. Llanos, Thomas G.	FE	EXAM	Approved
90. Makela, Julie A.	PE Civil	EXAM	Approved
91. Marvin, Peter	FE	EXAM	Approved
92. Mattson, Daniel	FE	EXAM	Approved
93. McEntyre, Scott	FE	EXAM	Approved
94. Mielke, Robert	FE	EXAM	Approved

95. Minish, Allen D.	PE Civil	EXAM	Approved (pending FE verification and Arctic)
96. Minish, Allen D.	FE	EXAM	Approved
97. Mygatt, William	PE Electrical	EXAM	Approved (pending Arctic)
98. Olson, Andree	FE	EXAM	Approved
99. Osburn, Joel D.	PE Civil	EXAM	Approved (pending transcript and Arctic)
100. Packee, Edmond	FE	EXAM	Approved
101. Petersen, Kelly L.	PE Civil	EXAM	Approved
102. Pillar, Christopher J.	PE Civil	EXAM	Approved
103. Ramos, Carl E.	PE Civil	EXAM	Approved (pending Arctic)
104. Reed, James B.	PE Civil	EXAM	Approved
105. Roberts, David C.	PE Mechanical	EXAM	Approved
106. Shields, Brennan	FE	EXAM	Approved
107. Shumaker, Brian R.	PE Civil	EXAM	Approved (pending Arctic)
108. Smith, Jeremie D.	FE	EXAM	Approved
109. Smith, Martin C.	PE Electrical	EXAM	Approved
110. Snow, Anthony	FE	EXAM	Approved
111. Stancliff, Andrea W.	PE Civil	EXAM	Approved
112. Stephen, Nathan	FE	EXAM	Approved
113. Stone, Terry	FE	EXAM	Approved
114. Szymkowiak, Vincent	PE Civil	EXAM	Approved
115. Tallman, Elizabeth	FE	EXAM	Approved
116. Thoma, Jason E.	PE Mechanical	EXAM	Approved
117. Towne-Chastain, Bettina	PE Chemical	EXAM	Approved
118. Tulip, Lars	FE	EXAM	Approved
119. Vaughn, Joy Anne	FE	EXAM	Approved
120. Vogel, Adam	FE	EXAM	Approved
121. Warren, Kirk H.	PE Civil	EXAM	Approved
122. White, Dan	FE	EXAM	Approved
123. Wilson, Ryan M.	PE Civil	EXAM	Approved
124. Woods, Karl D.	PLS/AKLS	EXAM	Approved

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

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

1. Dalal, Yogesh	PE-Civil	COMITY	Incomplete- Needs foreign transcript evaluation or additional work experience
2. Ganley, Francis	PE-Civil	EXAM	Incomplete-needs 13 months work experience after 4/2003
3. Hill, Jason	PE-Civil	EXAM	Incomplete-Needs additional 18 months work experience

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

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

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

1. Eaton, Harry	PE-Mechanical	COMITY	Denied Comity - Approved for PE-Mechanical Exam
2. Hennequin, Masako	FE	Exam	Denied, needs additional 24 months work experience
3. Gifford, Nichole	PE-Chemical	EXAM	Denied—needs 12 months responsible charge by PE in same discipline
4. Whaley, Robert	PLS/AKLS	EXAM	Denied, needs min. 2–3 yr. course wk
5. Kenney, Todd	PE-Electrical	COMITY	Denied Comity/ Approved for Exam

The Chair moved to the next item on the agenda, Goals and Objectives.

Agenda Item 14 – Goals and Objectives

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

The current Board goals are as follows:

Goal #1 – Increase Board's work efficiency.

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

Goal #2 – Increase Board's cost effectiveness.

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) All Board members or administrators who attend a regional or national professional function on behalf of Board shall submit a written report to rest of Board to share knowledge gained.	Attending Board member and/or Staff	Every Board meeting; ongoing
2) Examine financial feasibility of Board autonomy.	Gardner	2/2003
3) Obtain and analyze Board budget. annually and request audit of income or expenses as appropriate.	& Exec. Administrator	Ongoing

4)	Develop regulations that cover “minor importance” overlap between Architects, Engineers, and Land Surveyors’ professional practice.	Davis, Miller, Kalen	Ongoing 2/2003
----	---	----------------------	----------------

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

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

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

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

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

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Monitor and review latest federal regulations, state Board decisions, and national organization policies relating to NAFTA.	Board and Exec. Administrator	Each Board meeting; ongoing
2) Obtain adequate funding to send “discipline specific” Board members/ licensing examiner to National, and Zone meetings to ensure Alaska stays informed on national issues and can influence policy issues affecting their professions.	Board and Exec. Administrator	Ongoing
3) Investigate drainage, soils analysis, and hydrographic surveying under the definition of land surveying.	Kalen and McLane	2/2003
4) Investigate Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and photogrammetry.	Kalen and McLane	2/2003
5) Research CLARB council record.	Exec. Administrator, Cyra-Korsgaard	Ongoing
6) Stay current on all competency and regulatory issues of other jurisdictions	Board and Exec. Administrator	Ongoing

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

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Structure databases so that applicants can access	Cyra-Korsgaard and staff	5/2003

	application via internet and answer queries easily (for application checklist) (See Goal #1, and #4).		
2)	Update AELS Web Page, including postings of commonly asked questions (FAQs).	Licensing Examiner	Ongoing
3)	Update Goals and Objectives.	Davis	Ongoing

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

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

Agenda item 21 – Board Member Reports

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

Kalen reported on the AKLS workshop and referred to his written report that he handed out. He explained that they developed 30 new questions and that the next workshop will be tentatively scheduled in November. He thinks there will be sufficient numbers of exam candidates to hold the exams twice a year.

Cyra-Korsgaard reported that she participated in a LARE grading committee, developing cut scores, and hopes to participate again next summer. The work reinforced her comfort level in the LARE grading process.

The Chair reported that he and the Executive Administrator participated in the NCEES Presidents' Assembly and that the NCEES is concerned about exam security issues. As a part of an effort to increase security NCEES is providing information to jurisdictions about restrictions such as not allowing proctors to also hold review courses.

The Chair reported that he attended the Pacific NorthWest Economic Region's Professional Mobility Forum February 11-12, 2003 in Seattle.

Brown urged members to participate in the WCARB meeting that would be held beginning on February 27- March 1, with the MBA meeting and the Executive Committee meeting.

Agenda item 22 – Review Calendar of Events.

The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, the tentative schedule for the quarterly AELS 2002/2003 Board Meetings and noted location change for August 2003 meeting (to be held in Juneau). The Board discussed the meeting dates, changed the date of the November meeting and the list is as follows:

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| May 21-22, 2003 | - Fairbanks, (Wed/Thurs) |
| August 21-22, 2003 | - Juneau |
| November 19-20, 2003 | - Anchorage** (Wed/Thurs, note date change). |

1

Out-of-State Travel			
May 15-17, 2003	Western Zone meeting	Red Lodge, MT	Miller, McLane, Gilfilian, Exec. Adm.
June 25-28, 2003	NCARB, Annual meeting	San Antonio, TX, Hilton Palacio del Rio	Peirsol, Brown, Miller, Mills, & Exec. Adm.

2

3 The Chair reviewed upcoming travel.

4

5 WCARB meeting: Brown, Miller, Gardner, and Peirsol, Siemoneit and Cyra-Korsgaard were
6 scheduled to attend. (Siemoneit and Cyra-Korsgaard were not able to attend). There are no costs
7 involved for Brown to attend the meeting as she serves on the Executive Committee.

8 Tentative delegates were set for the upcoming Western Zone and NCARB meetings.

9

10 Western Zone meeting: Miller, McLane, and Bob Gilfilian (Executive Administrator to contact
11 Mr. Gilfilian), and the Executive Administrator.

12

13 NCARB meeting: Brown, Peirsol, Miller, Mills, and the Executive Administrator.

14 There are no costs involved for Brown to attend the meeting as she serves on the Executive
15 Committee.

16

17 **Agenda Item 24 – Task List**

18

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

21

TASK LIST: ASSIGNED TO:	ASSIGNMENT:
Brown	Work with Executive Administrator on design competition language.
Cyra-Korsgaard	Work to develop definitions for all engineering disciplines.
Miller (Chair)	Work on Canadian comity and responsible charge language.
	Respond to correspondence (Executive Administrator to assist).
	Work to develop definitions for all engineering disciplines.
Kalen	Work on draft language for the model law surveyors.
	Assist Executive Administrator in preparing draft regulations for Model Law Land Surveyor.
McLane	Work on draft language for the model law surveyors.
	Assist Executive Administrator in preparing draft regulations for Model Law Land Surveyor.

TASK LIST: ASSIGNED TO:	ASSIGNMENT:
Mills	Serve on Subcommittee for Proposal for Nevada model licensing structure to develop definitions for engineering disciplines.
Gardner	Serve as Chair of Subcommittee on Arctic Engineering. Bob Gilfilian, incoming Board member offered to serve.
Gilfilian	Serve on Subcommittee on Arctic Engineering.
Peirsol	Review BOM. Executive Administrator to send electronically.
	Work on Design Competition language.
Siemoneit	Review Erosion Control proposed statutory exemption change
Executive Administrator	Draft response to correspondence received from Chuck Casper, Eric Heiss, Robert Visser, John Everett, M. Specter, K. Hart, Steve Mandt, and Robert Whaley.
	Check to see if NCEES has a specific definition for health, safety & welfare to compare with the new NCARB definition (KG, DB).
	Put fitness questions for renewal on May 03 agenda.
	Invite Fairbanks building officials to the May 2003 meeting.
	Draft language for Canadian work experience acceptable for engineering and FE waiver tier.
	Poll MBAs regarding design competitions. Work with Peirsol to develop language changes to address design competitions, if needed.
	Draft language for issuing temporary licenses for limited projects.
	Send BOM to Peirsol electronically.
	Send Erosion Control Language to Siemoneit.
	Send regs project forward to the Dept. of Law (.061, .063., .103; .185)
	Provide Assistance to Subcommittee on Arctic Engineering Short Course
	Assist Subcommittee for Developing definitions for engineering disciplines.
	Encourage Director to participate in AELS meeting in May and future meetings.
	Work with the OL data processing staff on on-line applications.
	Forward disciplinary action on Patrick W. Moore to Investigator; put in meeting summary & post to website.
	Look into the possibility of the Board issuing temporary licenses for limited projects to review at its May 2003 meeting.

Agenda Item 25 Board Member Comments

The Board discussed action taken on the arctic course at this meeting.

Peirsol asked for an explanation of the reasons Board members voted against reconsideration of the web-based arctic course because it was not clear to her why the course was not reconsidered and she would have liked to have had a discussion about the issue.

1 Mearig said that some Board members who reviewed the course initially were not present to
2 reconsider, that there had been a clear majority at the time, and that he thought the Board had not
3 erred. He thought that an exam should be given to ascertain expertise and that some
4 jurisdictions, like Idaho, have an open book exam.

5
6 McLane agreed.

7
8 Kalen would have liked the course to be reconsidered.

9
10 Brown indicated that there was not a strong sense of what the minimum criteria for the course
11 should be.

12
13 The Chair indicated he had not been aware that the full semester course would be discontinued
14 and that only the web-based short course would be available to students.

15
16 **On a motion duly made by Kalen and seconded by Peirsol and unanimously approved, it**
17 **was**

18
19 **RESOLVED to adjourn the meeting at 5:05 p.m.**

20
21 There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned.

22
23 Respectfully submitted:

24
25
26
27 _____
28 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator

29
30 Approved:

31
32
33
34 _____
35 Robert Miller, Chair, Ph.D., P.E.
36 Board of Registration for Architects,
37 Engineers, and Land Surveyors

38
39 Date: _____
40