

1 Joining part of the meeting was:

2
3 Dale Nelson, 409 W 12th Avenue, Anchorage, AK representing the Alaska Professional
4 Design Council (APDC) and the Alaska Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE),

5
6 Carol Olson, Deputy Fire Marshal, 5700 E Tudor Rd, Anchorage, AK, representing the Fire
7 Marshal's office;

8
9 Chris Miller, 601 College Road, Fairbanks, AK 99701, representing Design Alaska;

10
11 Tim Sprout, PO Box 81730, Fairbanks, AK 99708, representing the Alaska Society of
12 Professional Land Surveyors (ASPLS); and

13
14 Stephen Gemmell, PO Box 757380, Fairbanks, AK 99775, representing Electrical
15 Engineers.

16
17 **Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Report**

18
19 The Chair asked if any members had any ethics disclosures to report.

20
21 Heieren indicated he was elected as the Western Federation (WestFed) delegate for the Alaska
22 Society of Professional Land Surveyors (ASPLS), and in doing so is one of the Directors on the
23 ASPLS Board. Since he is active in the professional society and will represent the ASPLS, he
24 wished to disclose his association. He provided a letter to the Executive Administrator.

25
26 The Board held a short discussion and the Chair felt there was no conflict but asked the
27 Executive Administrator to check with the attorney for a ruling and report back to the Board.

28
29 **Agenda Item 2 – Review/Revise Agenda:**

30
31 TENTATIVE AGENDA Revised 5/27/05
32 June 2-3, 2005

33 Thursday, June 2-3, 2005

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 (Feb05mtg)	Chair/Board
5. 9:25 a.m.	Correspondence: Complete list/Corr. in Public Packet	Chair/Board
6. 10:00 a.m.	Subgroups (meet in Subgroups)	Chair/Board
	(a) Engineering Disciplines	Gilfilian/Board
	(b) Incidental Practice	Maynard/Board
	(c) Continuing Education	Brownfield/Board
	(d) Electronic Transmittals & Signatures- carry over from Feb 05	Fredeen/Board
7. 10:45 a.m.	Investigator Report –George Weaver	Board/Weaver
8. 11:00 a.m.	Meet with Building Official- Fairbanks: Steve Shuttleworth Meet with Fire Marshal designee, Carol Olson, Deputy Fire Marshal General Discussion	Board/Officials

12:00 p.m.	Lunch	
9. 1:15 p.m.	Public Comment	Chair/Board
10. 2:15 p.m.	<p>Proposed Regulation changes</p> <p>(a) Closed to comments. Dept. of Law reviewed Regulations Project .105 Canadian Comity, .185 Sealing Specifications, Architect Education (technical adoption)- Lt. Governor signed - final adoption (efd 6/11/05).</p> <p><u>(b) Public noticed 2/2/05, comment ended 3/11/05.</u></p> <p><u>Closed to comments but held over for re-write.</u></p> <p>Expedited processing for engineer, architect, and surveyor comity record holders in order to expedite licensure (one regs project):</p> <p>.105 (f) NCEES Model Law Engineer</p> <p>.103 (b) NCARB Blue Book Certificate</p> <p>.107 NCEES Model Law Surveyor</p> <p><u>(b) (c) Additional regulations for the Board to consider (public notice requested:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. .990 (34) (35) Land Surveying activities (NCEES model rules) 2. ____ Inclusion/Exclusion of Surveying 3. ____ Continuing Education for Land Surveyors 4. ____ Landscape Architect Mentoring 5. 067. Date of Experience (Engineers/Surveyors) 6. .064. 065 Surveyor exam name change for PLS FLS to PS and FS (NCEES) 	<p>Chair/Exec. Adm./ Board</p> <p>Exec. Adm. /Board</p> <p>Exec. Adm. /Board</p>
11. 3:30 p.m.	Application Reviews (Executive Session –until completed)	Chair/Board
5:30- 6 p.m.	RECESS UNTIL 8:00 a.m. Friday, June 3, 2005	

The Chair asked if there were any changes to the agenda and the following changes were made:

Cyra-Korsgaard referred to correspondence in reference to the Juneau High School and indicated that the Board's attorney will address this and asked that this matter be held to discuss with the attorney.

The Chair asked to have this moved to Tab 16.

Gilfilian asked if the Board should allow the Deputy Fire Marshal to participate now. Carol Olson responded she was observing the meeting and would participate during her designated time (Tab 8- Meet with Fire Marshal).

Baker brought up an item to discuss with the Investigator: Follow-up to ensure disciplinary actions have adequate follow-up to be certain the stipulations are adhered to by any licensee who has had problems and any restrictions to their practice.

The Board Chair asked to add the item to Tab 7.

Agenda Item 4 – Review/Approve Minutes

The Chair asked if there were any changes to the draft minutes from the AELS Board meeting February 17 – 18, 2005.

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

RESOLVED to adopt the minutes from the February 17-18, 2005 meeting, with no changes.

The Chair indicated the minutes were approved as written.

1 **Agenda Item 5 – Correspondence**

2
3 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to go through the Correspondence. The Executive
4 Administrator went through the correspondence:
5

6 Hansen Engineering, LLC, Ronald Hansen, PE letter of May 23, 2005 requested the Board
7 consider increasing the minimum requirements for engineering license be set at a Master's
8 Degree in Engineering.
9

10 The Board held a discussion.
11

12 Gilfilian explained the national level concern has been expressed that the number of
13 engineering credits for an undergraduate degree have been reduced and some courses are no
14 longer required.
15

16 Brownfield felt to take action at this point would be premature.
17

18 The Chair indicated the Board would discuss this under New Business as the Board may need
19 to vote at the National Council on Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors (NCEES) at the
20 annual meeting in August.
21

22 Ric Martinez email of May 18, 2005, complained about the National Council of Architectural
23 Registration Boards (NCARB) customer service.
24

25 The Executive Administrator indicated AELS staff helps to intervene and remedy issues
26 applicants have because the national council is responsive to the Member Boards. She
27 indicated that sometimes problems arise, and in this instance the applicant had a great deal of
28 difficulty and frustration over the process.
29

30 The Board held a short discussion and the Chair directed the Executive Administrator to draft a
31 response to NCARB so the organization is made aware of the problems and can work to
32 remedy the processes used. It is up to the applicant to request any transmittal of information but
33 staff can often bridge the problems they may encounter by working with NCARB.
34

35 The Board suggested the application form or website posting should advise applicants to notify
36 the Board when requesting a transmittal since the staff could better assist the applicant.
37

38 Brian Templin letter of May 18, 2005, asked the Board to approve the University of Wyoming
39 Land Surveying Certificate as a board approved curriculum in land surveying (24 credits) no
40 degree.
41

42 Baker liked the program but the total number of credits is a disparity in the number of credits in
43 a 2-year degree program than are offered in this program. There are important courses that
44 students take in a degree program besides strictly surveying courses.
45

46 The Executive Administrator stated there is not currently a Board approved course for land
47 surveying curriculum and it would be helpful if the board developed a list.
48

49 The Chair asked Baker and Gilfilian to participate in developing a list of approved courses.
50

51 Jenny Smith email of March 28, 2005 requesting guidance if Master's Degree (MS) in Arctic
52 Engineering or Mechanical Engineering would suffice for education credit for a Mechanical
53 Engineering license by examination.

1 The Board held a discussion and some members felt the MS in Arctic Engineering was most
2 suitable for a Civil Engineering license as the course work and components were most
3 compatible with civil engineering. Others recognized that some mechanical engineers seek the
4 degree because it is accessible and is beneficial in Alaska.

5
6 **On a motion by Baker, not seconded, and withdrawn, it was**

7
8 **RESOLVED that the Master's Degree in Arctic Engineering would qualify for**
9 **education credit for civil engineering licensure. The Board held a short**
10 **discussion and decided it could not make a blanket statement on qualifying**
11 **education without first reviewing the curriculum of all MS Arctic Engineering**
12 **programs.**

13
14 **Baker withdrew his motion.**

15
16 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to research arctic engineering degree programs
17 for the Board to review at a later date.

18
19 Gilfilian stated he holds this degree which is compatible with civil engineering but felt the
20 potential applicant should apply in order to get a specific determination.

21
22 Fredeen felt the Aeronautics and Astronautics degree was somewhat similar to mechanical
23 engineering but agreed that not enough information was given to make a sufficient
24 determination about the qualifications. It was also not clear from the email if the applicant has
25 already passed the Fundamentals of Engineering examination, but it appeared the experience
26 in the military may qualify her to sit for the exam without the additional year of education credit.

27
28 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to respond to Smith and suggest she make an
29 application for the Board to review.

30
31 Chris Ambourn email of April 21, 2005 with a complaint about the Alaska Land Surveying
32 Examination room. There was a disruption when the PE candidates left the room and some
33 land surveyor examinees still had a few minutes of examination time left.

34
35 The Board discussed the room and concurred with the Executive Administrator to request the
36 lead proctor to use a separate room or partitions to keep the examinees from disruption. The
37 Executive Administrator explained the room has been used for countless exams without
38 problem but felt the matter warranted specific attention and she would work to be certain there
39 were minimal disruptions for candidates. It was unfortunate the applicant was disrupted.

40 41 **Agenda Item 6 –Subgroups**

42
43 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to review the prior subgroup assignments.
44 Continuing Education Subgroup: Brownfield, Chair; Fredeen, Maynard, and McLane.

45
46 The Chair appointed Hightower to serve on the CE Subgroup since McLane's term ended.

47
48 Incidental Practices Subgroup: Maynard (Chair); Baker, Brownfield, and Cyra- Korsgaard.

49
50 The Chair did not assign any new members to serve on the Incidental Practices Subgroup but
51 recognizes Cyra-Korsgaard's term will end June 30, 2005.

52
53 Engineering Disciplines Subgroup: Gilfilian (Chair); Iverson, Hughes, Fredeen, and McLane.

54
55 The Chair appointed Morris to serve on the Engineering Disciplines Subgroup since Iverson's
56 and McLane's terms have ended

1
2 Electronic Transmittals and Signatures, Fredeen (Chair) Peirsol, Gilfilian, and Maynard.

3
4 The Chair appointed Heieren to serve on the Electronic Transmittals and Signatures Subgroup
5 since Peirsol's term has ended.

6
7 The Chair recognized and introduced Dale Nelson, representing the Alaska Professional Design
8 Council (APDC) and the Alaska Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE).

9
10 Break: 955 a.m.

11 Reconvene: 10:05 a.m. and broke into Subgroups.

12
13 The Chair reconvened the meeting at 10:50 a.m. and asked Subgroup Chairs to report after
14 lunch to enable the investigator to give his report.

15
16 **Agenda Item 7- Investigator Report – George Weaver**

17
18 George Weaver introduced himself as an investigator with the agency who splits his time
19 between the AELS Board and contractor's investigations. He described the investigative
20 process for new AELS Board members to help them better understand their role and the
21 confidentiality required of them.

22
23 The Board discussed the Investigative report, the numbering system and corresponding code in
24 the foot notes of the report so Board members would be able to tell how old the case was and
25 what type of case was opened.

26
27 Baker expressed concern when a Memorandum of Agreement is issued that there is not
28 adequate follow-up. He has knowledge of a land surveyor in his region that has been
29 submitting work but has licensure restrictions. He does not believe the building officials are
30 checking to see if the licensee has restrictions.

31
32 The Executive Administrator discussed the current conditions in place for posting disciplinary
33 actions and for a searchable database that lists restrictions. Some Board members felt it
34 sufficed while others felt more needed to be done.

35
36 Morris did not believe the Board should rely on the Building Officials to carry out enforcement.

37
38 The Chair created a Disciplinary Action Subgroup and asked Baker (Chair), Morris, and
39 Hightower to review disciplinary actions and processes and to report back at the August
40 meeting with recommendations.

41
42 The Board discussed the Investigative Report and pending actions with the investigator.

43
44 Fredeen asked if the investigators were allowed to travel for training and explained the Board
45 could request it in the budget process.

46
47 Weaver responded he has not traveled for training in recent years.

48
49 Weaver explained he could use good training in administrative actions since most of his
50 experience is in criminal law.

51
52 Fredeen suggested the investigator request travel to the NCEES meeting and the Board could
53 request training in the budget.

54
55 Hughes explained his findings that at least one state agency is using non-licensed engineers as
56 consultants.

1 The Chair asked Hughes to file a complaint with the investigator of any instance of this so the
2 actions could be investigated as unlicensed practice.

3
4 **Agenda Item 8 – Meet with Building Official and Fire Marshal**

5
6 The Executive Administrator explained she invited both the Deputy Fire Marshal and the
7 Building Official to the meeting. She explained she did not get confirmation from Mr.
8 Shuttleworth, but he has participated at the last two meetings in Fairbanks, which was very
9 beneficial to the Board. Apparently he was not able to attend.

10
11 Carol Olson introduced herself and described she has seen several copyright stamps on plans,
12 and one set needs investigation but cannot be copied.

13
14 Weaver explained the purpose of copyright is to protect the content of the work. The Attorney
15 General's office will have to provide an opinion on how to handle the matter since he cannot get
16 an expert opinion and he is not a practitioner and cannot make determinations on the practice.

17
18 Olson explained in this instance the agency recently has sent a letter to the party advising them
19 to provide the appropriate professional stamps on the documents.

20
21 The Board held a short discussion

22
23 Cyra-Korsgaard asked if the Fire Marshal could suspend local authority if jurisdictions are
24 approving documents that do not have the proper professional stamps.

25
26 Olson explained the process is generally to suspend the jurisdiction for 30 days if the jurisdiction
27 is out of compliance in order to allow them to remedy the issue.

28
29 The Board held a general discussion about the desire to provide better information to the
30 licensees and the public about changes and requirements. Greater participation and interaction
31 is welcome and the Board discussed possible ways to provide more information to the public.

32
33 Olson explained the Fire Marshal often attends home shows and her staff would be willing to
34 help disseminate information on behalf of the Board. She finds the Board's website helpful and
35 often checks for current licenses and has plans to attend future meetings.

36
37 The Board held a general discussion on activities and training done by the Fire Marshal.

38
39 Morris asked if the Board could work with the Director on enforcement statutes to require
40 contractors to work only with sealed and signed drawings.

41
42 The Board held a lengthy discussion about unlicensed practice and its efforts for outreach.

43
44 The Chair asked to break for lunch and to reconvene for public comment.

45
46 Break for lunch at 12:05 p.m.

47 Reconvene: 1:15 p.m.

48
49 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

50 Ken Maynard, Architect, Chairperson

51 Clifford Baker, PLS, Land surveyor

52 Boyd Brownfield, PE, Civil Engineer

53 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member

54 Craig Fredeen, PE, Mechanical Engineer

55 Robert Gilfilian, PE, Civil Engineer

56 Richard Heieren, PLS, Land Surveyor

1 Harley Hightower, Architect
2 Richard Hughes, PE, Mining Engineer
3 Kimberly Mills, Public Member
4 Mark Morris, PE, Electrical Engineer
5

6 **Agenda Item 9- Public Comment**
7

8 The Board reconvened at 1:15 p.m. and all members were present. The Chair asked for public
9 comments:

10
11 Chris Miller, Mechanical Engineer, Design Alaska, is also registered as a Fire Protection
12 Engineer in Oregon. He is also a member of the local Planning Commission and there are
13 many similarities between them. He encourages the Board to have more dialogue with
14 licensees and he has just recently started reading the Board's minutes. He suggested a letter
15 be sent to the licensees during the renewal process.
16

17 The Executive Administrator suggested a letter, or at least the meeting summary should be sent
18 with renewals to provide information to licensees.
19

20 Miller explained he felt the current system of providing fire protection services works well and
21 cautioned the Board about making any changes that may add a burden to owners.
22

23 Miller spoke to expanding disciplines. He viewed Environmental Engineering as a subset of
24 Civil Engineering and thought it would be good to add as a discipline. He does not see the
25 same circumstance for control systems, which he works with, because it is done inside other
26 disciplines. For a small state he could envision 17 stamps would be required for projects and
27 that seemed absurd so he recommended keeping the disciplines as they are currently. He did
28 not see a need to license Geotechnical Engineers.
29

30 Miller recommended the Board not increase the minimum standards to require a Master's
31 degree for licensure for engineers. He did not think the candidates learn building codes in
32 school and agreed they should get education credits but it should not be necessary for minimum
33 qualifications. He explained his experience is based in part on the nine Mechanical Engineers
34 and 2 Petroleum Engineers who currently work for him.
35

36 Miller supported continuing education and indicated that he complies with CE for renewal of his
37 Fire Protection Engineering license in Oregon. He feels the majority of engineers do CE based
38 on what they need to keep current with their profession. He does not see value to certify those
39 actions to meet CE would prefer the Board put its efforts toward more enforcement of existing
40 statutes instead of imposing more regulations on the whole group by adopting a regulatory
41 requirement for CE. He did not believe mandatory CE would fix unlicensed practice issues.
42

43 In his role as a Planning Commissioner Miller encounters some poor work on plot plans and,
44 based on his knowledge of this Board and the enforcement actions the Board can take, he
45 plans to submit complaints in order to help raise the level of competency. Changes have
46 happened in the industry. No one really envisioned larger buildings routinely being built such as
47 the Walmart and Lowes types of stores, and it is important to have public protection for them.
48 He appreciated the information on the Board's website and shares the information he gains from
49 reviewing the Board's website. He appreciated the unlicensed practice information and minutes
50 that are posted and he shares information he obtains from the website with his staff.
51

52 The Board held a short discussion about zoning and plot plans.
53

54 Dale Nelson representing APDC and ASCE submitted a response to the Board's request for
55 consideration of engineering licensure, discussing professional engineering licensure and
56 posing questions to the Board on directions it could pursue, ranging from a singular registration
57 for licensure (non-discipline specific) and subsets or branches of engineering. He mentioned he

1 noticed there is not an NCEES PE examination for geological engineering. He hoped the Board
2 would make a determination on this subject, work towards it and inform the engineering
3 societies of its plan.

4
5 Gilfilian explained that the control systems, geological and environmental engineers have
6 expressed interest in licensure and the Board decided to test the waters with licensure of these
7 three disciplines. The feedback from the professional societies and individuals has been mixed.
8 The Subgroup discussed non-discipline specific engineering and the need and disadvantages of
9 expansion of engineering branches.

10
11 The Board held a discussion about working within disciplines and how the code of ethics plays a
12 role currently in Alaska. The Board felt there are subsets within civil engineering, and there are
13 civil engineers whose practices are not structural, as well as structural engineers who work
14 exclusively in structural work and never branch out into other areas of civil practice. Those
15 engineers must work within their sub-discipline and that system seems to work well.

16
17 Hughes spoke to the concern of Geological Engineering and stated that this engineering group
18 is interested in an exam offered by another jurisdiction as the base exam.

19
20 Morris thanked Nelson and expressed interest in getting more comments back from engineers
21 on engineering disciplines.

22
23 Nelson informed the Board that the APDC has developed a working group with Sam Kito as the
24 facilitator. The group is comprised of an engineer, landscape architect, land surveyor, and
25 architect and he hopes a representative of the AELS Board will work on this issue.

26
27 The Chair responded he would provide a name to the group.

28
29 Nelson spoke to the 'body of knowledge' of engineering and the Board's goal to ensure public
30 health, safety, and welfare. ASCE will review and submit a formal position on minimum
31 education for engineers for licensure.

32
33 Nelson supported continuing education as a condition of license renewal. The ASCE also
34 supported continuing education as a majority, although that view is not unanimous.

35
36 Tim Sprout, representing the Alaska Society of Professional Land Surveyors (ASPLS) spoke in
37 opposition of expanding engineering disciplines because he felt the current disciplines are
38 satisfactory.

39
40 Sprout also informed the Board that ASPLS is not opposed to the plan for NCEES exam
41 administration but he expressed concern about the cost of travel if the national organization is
42 sending proctors here from outside of the state.

43
44 He appreciated the Alaska Land Surveyors (AKLS) workshop being held in Fairbanks.
45 The Executive Administrator explained the NCEES usually does use local proctors.

46
47 Stephen Gemmell, PE, EE, representing himself, stated he works for the University of Fairbanks.
48 He spoke about CE from his perspective as a plan reviewer who has experience as an
49 electrician, an electrical administrator, and an engineer. He is currently active in his professional
50 society, the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc.(IEEE). He has conducted an e-
51 mail survey of electrical engineers on mandatory continuing education and found most
52 respondents were in opposition to mandatory CE. About 1 in 20 was in favor of a program, and
53 there was some strong opposition locally to mandatory CE. The industry as a whole currently
54 submits to some continuing education. He researched to see if he could find a correlation
55 between the quality of work and CE. He found one article in the Wall Street Journal dated April
56 2004. The article starts out stating heart attack patients get the same care whether or not their
57 doctor has taken continuing education classes and their findings show there is not an increase in

1 mortality for patients whose doctors do not submit to mandatory continuing education.

2
3 Gemmel's conclusion is CE really matters based on the person. People who want to continue to
4 learn do so, and a mandatory program may pass on a small burden as an added cost. If the
5 licensee is working he has the potential to enhance his profession and it may not be necessary
6 to require formal classes. There is a shortage of engineers currently, and if there is mandatory
7 CE, some may not renew and the system seems to be working well currently. Roughly half of
8 the states require mandatory CE and this may not be the right time to embark on a mandatory
9 program.

10
11 Brownfield indicated that mandatory CE has been increasing rapidly since 1996 and his
12 correspondence from IEEE shows support at the national level.

13
14 Gemmel responded that the national organization has taken a position to support CE but he felt
15 many of the local IEEE members do not support mandatory CE. The Alaska Chapter sent in a
16 letter in favor of CE based on the national organization's view but that letter of support does not
17 reflect the views of many IEEE local members.

18
19 Fredeen indicated the AELS Board will make the decision on CE, and would not allow a national
20 organization to dictate the outcome. He thanked Gemmel for sharing his candid views.

21
22 Fredeen asked him for suggestions on communicating with contractors since Gemmel is also an
23 electrical administrator. The Board is interested in outreach and education about the State's
24 requirements and one aspect would be to provide information to contractors who are not familiar
25 with regulations requiring drawings to be stamped by engineers. Since there is an exemption
26 for residential (up to a 2 story, 4 Plex), if a contractor ventures into commercial buildings they
27 may not be aware of the requirements for design professionals.

28
29 Gemmel invited the Board to send a speaker to one of the local IEEE meetings to start the
30 outreach process. He added that if the Board does embrace mandatory CE, he hopes it would
31 consider accepting Internet courses so licensees will have reasonable access to courses
32 without having travel costs to absorb.

33
34 Break 2:25 p.m.

35 Reconvene: 2:28 p.m.

36 37 **Agenda Item 3 – Proposed Regulation Changes**

38 39 **Agenda Item 10- Proposed Regulation changes**

40
41 The Executive Administrator referred to item (a) and indicated the regulations project was
42 reviewed by the Department of Law and signed by the Lt. Governor and will become final on
43 June 11, 2005. The regulations forwarded to the Lt. Governor makes changes to 12 AAC
44 36.105, Canadian Comity, 12 AAC 36.185, sealing specifications, and 12 AAC 36.107, Architect
45 Education standards. The packet includes the technical edits made by the Department of Law.
46 The comment period has closed and the public comments are included in the packet for
47 reference. The Board adopted these regulations at its February 2005 meeting and asked to
48 have them forwarded to the Department of Law.

49
50 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the regulations project before them and there
51 were none.

1 The Executive Administrator reviewed the items the board previously adopted at the February
2 2005 meeting, and referred to items in the Board's packet under Tab 10:

- 3
- 4 1. .990 Land Surveying Activities
- 5 2. Inclusion/Exclusion
- 6 3. Continuing Education for Land Surveyors
- 7 4. Landscape Architect Mentoring
- 8 6. .064/.065 Surveyor exam name change to FS and PS by NCEES
- 9

10 The Executive Administrator reviewed the final portion of the packet, under Tab 10 (b)
11 Expedited Processing for Comity Applicants, which was public noticed. The comment period
12 has ended but the Board should review the rewrite for consideration of final re-adoption of the
13 rewritten regulations:

- 14
- 15 .105 (f) NCEES Model Law Engineer
- 16 .103 (b) NCARB Blue Book Certificate
- 17 .107 NCEES Model Law Surveyor
- 18

19 She explained the Legislature was recently granted the authority to review draft proposed
20 regulations to determine if the proposed regulations conform to the statutory authority. During
21 the review process, the Legislative attorney had issues with the draft regulations proposed. The
22 attorney did not believe they constituted a checklist as currently drafted and yet it was referred
23 to as a checklist. The approach staff took was to use the existing corporations regulations in 12
24 AAC 36.135 as a model since staff processes corporate applications without the Board's review.
25 The attorney raised a number of issues, not the least of which is if the Board can delegate its
26 authority to approve comity applicants to its staff without specifically reviewing the application.
27 Currently, several boards within the Agency, including the Board of Nursing, issue licenses to
28 applicants who are certified by national organizations. The Board of Nursing developed and
29 adopted a checklist for this purpose. The Agency attorney asked the Executive Administrator to
30 rewrite the proposal and to use a model, such as the Board of Nursing program guidelines and
31 to submit the drafts to the Board to adopt.

32
33 The proposal before the Board contains a checklist for each profession that the Board needs to
34 review and consider adopting at this meeting, and draft regulations that identify the checklist
35 staff would use prior to licensure. Under the regulation proposal, staff would not have any
36 discretion in reviewing applications. The applicant would request a council record be submitted
37 from the respective national council to the jurisdiction. Board staff would review the council
38 record to ensure the appropriate documentation was contained in the record. If the conditions
39 for experience, education, and examination were met, plus any additional requirements (such as
40 the arctic course completion), the applicant would qualify for licensure. There are sometimes
41 missing items. For example, at times the council record does not provide an updated license
42 verification, or a verification may not list the specific discipline of the engineering examination.
43 When an item is incomplete or missing, staff currently contacts the council and its staff provides
44 the information. However, generally the council certificate contains more information than is
45 needed. The national council also provides a separate evaluation of the applicant's record,
46 which is an internal checklist that shows how the licensee met the minimum requirements for
47 certification. The State's minimum qualifications are satisfied by the criteria for education,
48 experience, and exam required by the council for certification.

49
50 Dale Nelson, representing APDC asked if the Board could delegate the responsibility to staff in
51 the proposed change to adopt checklists.

1 The Executive Administrator responded this was an issue raised by the legislative attorney.
2 She felt that the distinction is that there would not be any discretionary decision since the
3 candidate has met national certification the Board would adopt based on the staff review of the
4 items on the checklist. Staff would not examine experience to evaluate if the candidate met the
5 requirements. Instead, staff would check if all of the items listed on the checklist are in the
6 council record and if any additional requirements, such as the arctic course, had been met.
7 This is an issue for the Department of Law and the Legislative attorney to sort out and make
8 recommendations.
9

10 The Executive Administrator explained one additional proposed regulation change in the packet:
11

12 5. 12 AAC 36.067. Date of Experience (Engineers/Surveyors). Director Urion has asked the
13 Board to consider a change to allow candidates to sit for the exam based on experience
14 projected to the date exam scores are received rather than to project experience to the exam
15 date which is currently allowed under 12 AAC 36.067.
16

17 The Executive Administrator referred Board members to what should be item (c), a group of
18 regulations that have been adopted by the Board for public noticing at the February 2005
19 meeting and were developed but have not yet been public noticed. The only item the Board has
20 not previously reviewed is item #5, Date of Experience, which was requested by the Director
21 and can be discussed later.
22

23 The draft proposed regulations the Board adopted in February were not public noticed by the
24 agency staff because of time constraints. Once staff met with the attorney the regulations
25 specialist formatted and reviewed the project and presented them for the Executive
26 Administrator's review earlier this week. Since it was so close to the AELS Board meeting, the
27 regulations staff thought it beneficial for the Board to review the specific language and to
28 readopt it for public noticing.
29

30 The Chair asked to review the proposed regulations one at a time.
31

32 The Executive Administrator explained she met with the Board's attorney, David Brower and he
33 has reviewed the draft regulations which he believes fall under the broad definition in AS
34 08.48.341 (13) "practice of land surveying".
35

36 The Executive Administrator referred to item (b), and she explained that, for Engineer Licensure
37 by Comity, applicants who hold a model law designation could request submittal of a council
38 record to Alaska that designates them as model law engineers (MLE). The requirements for
39 model law engineer means the registrant is certified by the national council, NCEES. The
40 requirements are defined in the NCEES Model Rules, August 2004, as follows:
41

- 42 (a) Hold an accredited degree Engineering Accreditation Commission of ABET
43 (EAC/ABET);
- 44 (b) Pass the 8 hr. Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) exam, and an 8-hr. Professional
45 Engineering exam using the NCEES Cut score;
- 46 (c) Have completed four years of acceptable engineering experience after confirmation of a
47 BS engineering, which may include up to one year of experience for a graduate
48 engineering degree,
- 49 (d) Have a record clear of disciplinary action.
50

51 Additionally, the engineer must successfully pass the arctic engineering course required in 12
52 AAC 36.110.

1 For Engineer by Comity, the Board decided several years ago to accept the NCEES MLE for
2 engineers as satisfying 24 months of responsible charge work experience for engineers
3 because MLEs satisfy 48 months of post exam work experience. The Board was content that
4 during 48 months of work experience the applicant would have sufficient responsible charge
5 work experience. The Board based that determination on its examination of MLEs that came
6 before the Board.

7
8 Applicants for Architect by Comity must submit a council record, blue cover that demonstrates
9 the applicant has met minimum qualifications for licensure. The education standards are
10 adopted each year. The standard NCARB certification requires applicants to:

- 11
12 (a) hold a NAAB-accredited or CACB accredited degree;
13 (b) satisfy the Intern Development Program (IDP),
14 (c) pass the Architect Registration Exam (ARE);
15 (d) hold a current license in one of NCARB's 55 member registration boards;
16 (e) and have a record clear of disciplinary action.

17
18 The Executive Administrator explained there is flexibility in the national process to allow
19 candidates who do not specifically meet the standard criteria to have a combination of
20 education, examination, and the experience requirement. Each council record is evaluated to
21 ensure the applicant has met the requirements. This allows for a candidate who took an earlier
22 version of the national exam, or who holds a 4-year degree, to obtain licensure with more
23 experience or they could take certain courses.

24
25 Applicants for Land Surveyor by Comity is similar to the NCEES MLE process in that the
26 applicant has met certification. As staff developed the checklist for Land Surveyor by Comity,
27 one conflict with current regulations was discovered. There is a requirement for applicants to
28 have 36 months of responsible charge work experience under a registered land surveyor in
29 order to obtain licensure. The Council record does not have that requirement. Instead, the
30 NCEES requires surveyors to have 48 months of appropriate experience. She suggested the
31 Board would have to make a determination if the certification met the 36 months under a
32 registered land surveyor requirement. Unless the Board was willing to accept the certification
33 as satisfying this provision, the file would have to be reviewed by the Board and there would not
34 be expedited processing.

35
36 Morris commented on temporary licensure in Washington State that is offered because
37 establishing a council record can take months and wondered if the Board could adopt similar
38 rules.

39
40 Mills clarified this proposal would only assist applicants who have already established a record,
41 but that his suggestion could be considered later.

42
43 Fredeen suggested one revision to the Engineer by Comity Checklist: to add in a provision for
44 requiring a current model law certificate. At times, he has noticed the evaluation of the council
45 record has been dated much earlier and he wanted to be certain the record would reflect any
46 disciplinary action taken subsequent to the evaluation.

47
48 The Executive Administrator indicated staff checks a national database on disciplinary action
49 prior to licensure but she would update the checklist to add a box for "current model law
50 certificate."

51
52 The Executive Administrator explained that in order to accept the Land Surveyor (MLS)
53 certification without work experience verifications, the Board would have to make a
54 determination similar to accepting the MLE, i.e., that the requirements for experience in the MLE
55 certificate have been determined to meet the 36 months of responsible charge work experience.

1 Baker asked to review the model law surveyor (MLS) requirements in order to make that
2 determination.

3
4 Cyra-Korsgaard noted a typo on the checklists and the corrections for engineer cited should
5 read 12 AAC 36.105, 12 AAC 36.103 for Architects, and 12 AAC 36.107 for Land Surveyors,
6 and asked to have the checklists corrected. She asked if staff could also develop a checklist for
7 Landscape Architects by Comity.

8
9 The Chair asked to have the checklist developed for landscape architects and brought to the
10 Board at the August meeting.

11
12 Baker indicated he reviewed the NCEES Model Law for Surveyors and does not believe the
13 experience in the record would meet the requirement of 36 months of experience listed in
14 12 AAC 36.107.

15
16 **On a motion by Baker, seconded by Fredeen, and adopted unanimously, it was**

17
18 **RESOLVED to remove the Application Checklist for Land Surveyor by Comity and**
19 **draft regulation change 12 AAC 36.196(d) from the regulations project.**

20
21 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none.

22
23 **On a motion by Gilfilian, seconded by Brownfield, and adopted unanimously, it was**

24
25 **RESOLVED to adopt the Application Checklist for Engineer Registration by**
26 **Comity, MLE, and Application Checklist for Architect by Comity, as amended.**

27
28 The Chair asked if there was any further discussion.

29
30 Cyra-Korsgaard asked to have someone speak to the motion to provide clarity in the minutes so
31 the public will understand why the Board is taking this action.

32
33 Gilfilian stated he thought the checklist process would be beneficial for mobility and the rationale
34 is straightforward.

35
36 Baker noted that applicants achieving certification by the national council have undergone a
37 rigorous process to gain the Model Law designation, and in doing so, the Board determines
38 those candidates have met our requirements for licensure, provided they have passed the arctic
39 course, and have submitted an application and paid the fees.

40
41 The Chair asked if there was any further discussion and there was none. He asked if there
42 were any objections and there were none, so the motion was adopted.

43
44 **On a motion by Gilfilian, seconded by Brownfield, and adopted unanimously, it was**

45
46 **RESOLVED to adopt the draft regulations as rewritten, 12 AAC 36.196, Review of**
47 **applications, as amended to remove item (d) the form titled "Application Checklist**
48 **for Land Surveyor Registration by Comity" and move the project forward to the**
49 **Department of Law for review.**

50
51 The Chair asked if there was any objection and there was none so the motion was approved.

52
53 The Executive Administrator referred to the packet, Tab, 10, and the first item in the packet on
54 page one, 12 AAC 36.064, which shows up on the agenda as item # 6. She explained the
55 NCEES changed the names of the exams for surveying.

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

2
3 **RESOLVED to readopt the draft regulations, and send to interested parties**
4 **proposed changes to 12 AAC 36.064, and 12 AAC 36.065 changing the title of the**
5 **'Fundamentals of Land Surveying' examination to 'Fundamentals of Surveying'**
6 **Examination, and 'Professional Land Surveying' examination to the 'Professional**
7 **Surveying Examination'.**

8
9 Cyra-Korsgaard suggested the draft changes also be sent to the professional societies, APDC,
10 and ASPLS, as well as the interested parties' list.

11
12 The Executive Administrator brought up Tab 10 (c) Landscape Architect Mentoring.

13
14 On a motion by Gilfilian, seconded by Baker, and adopted unanimously, it was

15
16 **RESOLVED to re-adopt 12.AAC 36.068(c) and a new subsection (f) to create a**
17 **landscape architect mentoring program.**

18
19 The Chair asked if there was any discussion.

20
21 Gilfilian asked for an explanation on the 3-4 years of experience.

22
23 Cyra-Korsgaard responded it mirrors the regulation as many landscape architect members hold
24 a 5-year degree.

25
26 On an amendment by Gilfilian, seconded by Baker, to clarify the experience needed to
27 revise the language conceptually to read:

28 **...an applicant must complete four years of quarterly face-to-face meetings if they hold a**
29 **4-year degree or must complete three years of quarterly face-to-face meetings if they**
30 **hold a 5-year degree.**

31
32 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none and the amendment was
33 adopted. He asked the Executive Administrator to work with the regulations specialist or
34 attorney to put the language in good form.

35
36 The Chair indicated the main motion was before them, as follows:

37
38 On a motion by Gilfilian, seconded by Baker, and adopted unanimously, it was

39
40 **RESOLVED to re-adopt 12.AAC 36.068 (c) and a new subsection (f), as amended.**

41
42 Cyra-Korsgaard advised the Board there will be comments, as she has already heard from
43 some people, but she thinks it is a good starting point and good to start the discussions.

44
45 The Chair asked if there were any objections to adopting the main motion and there were none.

46
47 On a motion duly made by Cyra-Korsgaard, seconded by Brownfield, and adopted
48 unanimously, it was

49
50 **RESOLVED to readopt the draft regulations for mandatory Continuing Education**
51 **for Land Surveyors as a condition of renewal and to public notice the project to**
52 **land surveyors and interested parties.**

1 Baker spoke in support of the draft language and noted the only change from the ASPLS
2 proposal was to follow the NCEES suggested guidelines with respect to membership with a
3 professional society. The NCEES guidelines require licensees to be actively involved through
4 committee work or hold an officer position in order to get continuing education credit.

5
6 The Board held a discussion about the proposal.

7
8 Fredeen wanted to be sure that the Board was not going to pre-approve courses as the
9 prospect would be too time consuming for staff and the Board.

10
11 The Executive Administrator referred the Board to 12 AAC 36.410, which sets up the criteria
12 and explicitly indicates the Board will not pre-approve courses.

13
14 The Board discussed if the proposal needed more review and decided to continue the process
15 of public noticing the project. They felt that if there were areas that needed better clarification
16 the items would surface during the comment period and the Board's final review in August.

17
18 Morris wanted to be certain licensees could take web-based courses and it was agreed web-
19 based courses were permitted.

20
21 The Chair asked if there was any objection to the motion and there were none so the motion
22 was re-adopted.

23
24 The Executive Administrator reiterated the Board readopted the project and previously decided
25 to send this to all registered land surveyors. She previously prepared a letter to send along with
26 the regulations to all land surveyors and worked with Barbara Gabier to be certain the
27 comments would be reported to the Regulations Specialist, not the AELS staff, and so that letter
28 will accompany this project.

29
30 The Chair agreed the letter will accompany the project and it will go to APDC and ASPLS, as
31 well.

32
33 **On a motion by Cyra-Korsgaard, seconded by Mills, and not adopted, it was**

34
35 **RESOLVED to readopt the definitions in 12 AAC 36.990 for standards for mortgage**
36 **location surveys.**

37
38 Baker felt it was not ready for readoption as the ASPLS has not yet formally adopted the
39 standards. He thought it would be ready to bring back to the August meeting.

40
41 Cyra-Korsgaard withdrew the motion.

42
43 The Chair asked Baker to bring back the proposal to the August meeting and the Executive
44 Administrator to put it on the agenda.

45
46 Gilfilian wanted to make sure it is on the record that he is opposed to the standards being
47 included in the AELS regulations. It was discussed at the February meeting last year and the
48 Board voted to have the standards someplace else, such as Title 34, but not to put the
49 standards in the AELS regulations. Our regulations pertain to licensure, not to professional
50 standards of practice. His concern is that if all professional practices were put in this section it
51 would be an immense volume of information.

1 Baker agreed because there are many surveying standards, not just this small segment that
2 deals with mortgage location surveys. He explained for new members that a Valdez resident
3 complained about an inadequate mortgage survey that resulted in a bill being introduced
4 several years ago. The ASPLS worked with the legislator to address the lack of consistency in
5 mortgage location surveys commonly known as "as-builts". The Board objected to the
6 standards being placed in regulation and recommended the problem be addressed in Title 34
7 rather than in the licensing of land surveyor standards.

8
9 The Board held a lengthy discussion about the standards of practices and where these
10 standards should be located.

11
12 Heieren suggested that mortgage survey standards should be brought back to a committee
13 level. He noted that standards have been adopted at a national level and felt this matter could
14 be deferred to the August meeting and would allow ASPLS another chance to examine the
15 matter.

16
17 **On a motion made by Heieren, seconded by Gilfilian, and unanimously adopted, it was**

18
19 **RESOLVED to pull the project 12 AAC 36.990 (a) (34) and (35) from the proposed**
20 **regulations previously adopted to be public noticed in order to allow the**
21 **professional society an opportunity to complete a review.**

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

24
25 The Chair assigned Baker, Heieren, and Gilfilian to review Mortgage Location Survey Standards
26 and report back in August 2005 with recommendations.

27
28 The Executive Administrator referred to Tab 10, page 4 of the 05/31/05 Draft
29 111. Practice of Land Surveying.

30
31 The Executive Administrator explained this draft was adopted at the February 2005 meeting for
32 public noticing and is under consideration for readoption. At the national level, the NCEES has
33 adopted a definition for surveying that includes Geographic Information System (GIS) and
34 Photogrammetrists, and has revised the Model Rules, August 2004, 210.25 Inclusions and
35 Exclusions of Surveying Practice. Adopting these changes that recognize the work of GIS and
36 Photogrammetrists that falls under surveying will assist the public and practitioners to determine
37 if the services they provide fall within the scope of practice of surveying and that requires
38 licensure as a professional land surveyor. GIS and Photogrammetrists working under the items
39 in Exclusion of Practice would not require licensure as a PLS. In essence this proposal would
40 provide detail in regulation to correspond to the statutory definition of land surveying. The
41 proposed regulation change would identify the activities that fall under the statutory definition
42 and the activities that fall outside land surveying.

43
44 **On a motion duly made by Gilfilian, seconded by Baker, it was**

45
46 **RESOLVED to readopt 12 AAC 36.111, the Practice of and Surveying, Inclusions**
47 **and Exclusions of Surveying Practice.**

48
49 Gilfilian asked for clarification on the Editor's note and his concern the date is August 2004 and
50 the regulation will be final after that date.

51
52 **On an amendment by Gilfilian, seconded by Baker to remove the August 2004 date.**

53
54 The Chair indicated there were no objections and the date was stricken.

55
56 The Executive Administrator explained the attorney recommended it and the Board cannot allow

1 the national organization to make changes without first reviewing the changes. So that is why
2 there is a date and a reference where this material can be found.
3

4 **On a motion duly made by Gilfilian, seconded by Baker and adopted unanimously, it was**
5
6 **RESOLVED to readopt 12 AAC 36.111, the Practice of and Surveying, Inclusions**
7 **and Exclusions of Surveying Practice, with the August 2004 date stricken.**
8

9 Cyra-Korsgaard asked for clarification on the definition of land surveying.

10
11 The Executive Administrator explained this does not change the definition of land surveying.

12
13 Fredeen felt this section could be an area to put the mortgage survey standards.

14
15 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none.

16
17 The Chair asked to hold discussion of the Date of Experience until the Director's time slot.
18

19 **Agenda Item 11 – Application Review**

20
21 **On a motion duly made by Gilfilian, seconded by Baker and adopted unanimously, it was**
22
23 **RESOLVED to go into executive session for the purpose of reviewing applicant**
24 **files.**
25

26 The Board went into executive session at 3:50 p.m.

27
28 The Executive Administrator placed a sign on the door that the Board was now in Executive
29 Session.

30
31 The Board recessed at 6:40 p.m. until 8:00 a.m. Friday, June 3, 2005.
32

Friday, June 3, 2005

Agenda Item 12 – Call to Order/Roll Call

Friday, June 3, 2005

TIME	TOPIC	LEAD PERSON
25. 8:00 a.m.	Call to Order/Roll Call Executive Session to Complete Application Review –Continued, (if necessary)	Chair/Licensing Examiner/Board
26. 8:10 a.m.	Application Review, if necessary.	Examiner/Board
27. 8:30 a.m.	Budget Summary Report	Chair/Board
28. 9:00 a.m.	Meet with Rick Urion, Director (by Teleconference)	Director/Board
29. 9:30 a.m.	Meet with David Brower, Attorney (by Teleconference) Discussion Items	Chair/Attorney
30. 10:00 a.m.	Old Business: a) Fire Protection (FPE); (NCEES Policy #25); NICET technicians (Fire Protection will also be on August AELS agenda for any input) b) Continuing Education Subgroup Report c) Temporary License for Emergencies d) Geological Engineer – Expand Disciplines e) Environmental and Process Control Engineering f) Potential Statute change: residential single family dwellings up to 4 stories should not require mechanical or electrical engineer Landscape Architecture – overlap (pending subgroup) n) Engineering/Land Surveying overlap (pending subgroup)	Fredeen/Board Brownfield/Board Gilfilian/Board Hughes/Bd Chair/Board Exec. Adm/Board Maynard/Board
2. 11:15 a.m.	New Business: a) NCARB Resolutions b) NCEES Resolutions Exam Administration – ELSEES- update on NCEES to oversee exams	Maynard /Board Exec. /Board
3. 11:45 a.m.	Legislative Report - HB 35, other bills	

The Chair brought the Board out of executive session and called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.

Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

Kenneth Maynard, Architect, Chairperson
Boyd Brownfield, PE, Civil Engineer
Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member
Craig Fredeen, PE, Mechanical Engineer
Robert Gilfilian, PE, Civil Engineer
Richard Heieren, PLS, Land Surveyor
Harley Hightower, Architect
Richard Hughes, PE, Mining Engineer
Kimberly Mills, Public Member
Mark Morris, PE, Electrical Engineer

Absent was:

Clifford Baker, PLS, Land Surveyor, who joined the meeting at 8:20 a.m.

1 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

2
3 Rick Urion, Director (joining a portion of the meeting by teleconference)
4 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
5

6 Joining a portion of the meeting by teleconference:

7
8 David Brower, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Law
9

10 **Agenda Item 13 – Application Reviews**

11
12 The Board held a discussion about the process of application reviews and any issues they had.
13

14 **Agenda Item 14 – Budget Summary Report**

15
16 The Board held a discussion about the Budget Summary Report, direct and indirect costs, and
17 the budget process, and reviewed the expenditures between the 5-year comparison actuals and
18 the 3-year comparison.
19

20 The Board took a brief at ease while the Executive Administrator called the Director.
21

22 **Agenda Item 15 – Meet With Rick Urion (by teleconference)**

23
24 Rick Urion, Director, Occupational Licensing joined the meeting by teleconference at 9:05 a.m.
25

26 The Chair had members introduce themselves, as there are three new board members the
27 Director may not have met.
28

29 The Chair asked about the renewal fees.
30

31 Urion responded he spoke to the administrative manager and it appears that the fees will
32 remain the same.
33

34 The Chair asked for investigator travel for them for site investigations.
35

36 Urion felt the last time the Board met in Fairbanks the investigator asked for travel by car and he
37 thought it was too expensive.
38

39 Brownfield asked if several Board members could meet with him to discuss several issues.
40

41 Urion responded he was receptive to this idea.
42

43 Urion explained the difference between fees and fines. He has tried to use fines collected on
44 behalf of the programs to offset their operating costs but has not been successful in pursuing
45 this. He indicated he would try to pursue this again next session and may need Boards to
46 support this effort.
47

48 The Chair indicated the Board members were interested in helping pursue this.
49

50 Brownfield asked to have that item added to the list for discussion.
51

52 Gilfilian brought up the proposed regulation change on 12 AAC 36.067.
53

54 Urion explained a prospective engineer complained about the way the experience is calculated
55 and missed qualifying for the exam by less than 2 months. He felt the board should allow
56 candidates to sit for the exam earlier and it seems the national organization is considering the
57 same proposal. He hopes the board will give serious consideration to the proposal.

1
2 Urion revised the draft regulation staff prepared and he will fax a copy to Fairbanks for the
3 Board to consider.
4

5 The Chair indicated the Board has not yet discussed the proposal but would do so.
6

7 Baker brought up the NCEES annual meeting, stating that one day is set aside for investigator
8 training, and asked if it would be possible to send George Weaver to this.
9

10 Urion felt there were some issues and there may be some staff retiring and they did not want to
11 train people who were leaving.
12

13 Fredeen asked what training the investigators receive.
14

15 Urion explained the investigators receive training in their law enforcement background and do
16 not receive specific training by the division.
17

18 Fredeen explained technology is changing and it is important to keep them informed.
19

20 Urion agreed and stated that there is a new chief investigator who has organized a training
21 session with the Department of Law - the first training ever given. He felt it was a move in the
22 right direction.
23

24 The teleconference ended at 9:25 a.m.
25

26 Cyra-Korsgaard asked to invite the chief investigator to attend the August AELS meeting.
27

28 **Agenda Item 16--Meet with David Brower, Attorney (by Teleconference)**
29

30 The Executive Administrator telephoned the attorney, who joined the meeting by teleconference
31 at 9:35 a.m. and the members introduced themselves.
32

33 The Board discussed the CBJ high school project and the question of whether CBJ needed to
34 hire a landscape architect. Brower felt he probably could not give a definitive answer and he
35 referred to 12 AAC 36.069, which refers to grading, clearing or shaping of land, and stated since
36 that work can be done by a civil engineer, it would not be necessary to have a landscape
37 architect involved.
38

39 Cyra-Korsgaard did not agree. She felt either could be involved but who could do the work
40 would depend on the final use, if it was fine grading, play surfaces, or walkway.
41

42 Brower did not think the statute supported her view and explained he is presenting his
43 professional view as an attorney, not as a design professional.
44

45 Brower researched Oregon's laws and noted a lot of site projects and light rail systems, etc.
46 where civil engineers and landscape architects were both involved. In a situation where
47 someone wants to build a park and have a snack shop and there is grading, shaping or clearing
48 of land, they would need one or the other but the law does not appear to require both.
49

50 Brower did not think that precluding a civil engineer from doing what a civil engineer normally
51 does as part of the job is the intent of the provisions in Alaska law.
52

53 Cyra-Korsgaard agreed but stated the person must be qualified and tradition alone does not
54 qualify a person. It falls back to education, experience and examination.
55

56 Brower reviewed the letters between the Board and the City and Borough of Juneau, and Minch
57 Ritter Voelckers, and explained they both refer to AS 08.48.

1
2 The Chair asked to comment and explained the school had been designed, was over budget
3 and had to be reduced in size of the project, and that reducing the size of the project is
4 substantially different than starting a new project.

5
6 Brower recalled there was not a requirement for a landscape architect to be on the initial
7 project.

8
9 Gilfilian referred to AS 08.48.281 (b) and read: Notwithstanding (a) of this section, this chapter
10 does not prohibit the practice of landscape architecture by a person who is not registered to
11 practice landscape architecture if the services being performed by the person are within the
12 scope of practice authorized by another license that is held by the person.

13
14 Gilfilian agreed as a licensed civil engineer the tasks of drainage, shaping and clearing of land
15 is certainly within his scope of practice, but he would not do the vegetation. He agreed with the
16 letter of response from the Board Chair, in Tab 5.

17
18 Brower felt the statutory definitions of architecture and engineering was very broad. He
19 mentioned landscape contractors are also licensed.

20
21 Gilfilian spoke to site distance and vegetation, stating that landscape contractors are not trained
22 to do that work but landscape architects are trained, and would be trained for playground
23 equipment, too. Those were the reasons for the profession to gain initial registration status in
24 Alaska.

25
26 Brower referred to the exemption for the building trades doing the work whom do not even need
27 a license.

28
29 Brower explained the exemption under 08.48.281 (b) is a huge exemption and he was not
30 prepared to make any blanket statements on who could do the work. His initial determination is
31 you could hire a landscape architect to do a playground and he referred to the regulation: 12
32 AAC 36.069 that states outdoor structures are allowed and yet there is not a definition for this.

33
34 The Chair indicated there is an Incidental Practice subgroup to sort this out, and he asked
35 Brower for a conclusion.

36
37 Brower explained there are various licenses to which the exemption may apply, although some
38 licenses protect the public safety more than others do.

39
40 Baker referred to the letter from MRV Architects, and felt the architect tried to tie percentage to
41 the cost of the project. Baker did not feel a percentage of the project was an appropriate way of
42 deciding the public protection.

43
44 Brower did not think the cost should be a determination. For example, a small electrical control
45 valued less than \$50 could be instrumental in how a system works, so monetary value does not
46 seem to equate. The Chair agreed.

47
48 Brower brought up planting plans and where the plantings would be deemed more important.
49 He felt certainly a landscape architect could do the work but someone else could also make
50 those determinations.

1 Morris indicated the crux of the issue seems to be the overlap in professions. In drainage and
2 shaping there is an obvious overlap between landscape architecture and civil engineering. He
3 felt if you drew two circles the overlap representing civil engineering and landscape architecture,
4 and then if you drew a third circle for architecture that overlaps with landscape architecture, it
5 would show a representation of the issues the Board is reviewing. It does not seem practical to
6 define exactly what each discipline does and then wage an argument as to who can do what.
7 He felt that to try to define who has the right to do what work will be difficult to determine.
8 Instead, each professional must exercise his right to perform duties he feels capable to perform
9 based on his education, experience and exam. He did not think you could use the statutes to
10 determine if the landscape architect is required on this job. The purpose of the statute is to set
11 the qualifications for licensure.

12
13 Gilfilian wanted to be sure the Board responds timely and he is concerned about the Board's
14 inability to provide guidance to parties who have asked for explanations about the practice of
15 landscape architecture. He thinks it is very important for the Board to give prompt guidance and
16 be more responsive to the public.

17
18 The Chair agreed with Gilfilian.

19
20 Gilfilian asked Brower to respond to another question the Board raised in February 2005 which
21 was whether the Board should adopt mortgage location standards.

22
23 Brower responded he recently discussed with the Executive Administrator of the Board adopting
24 standards developed by the ASPLS, and when there were changes to the standards the Board
25 would revisit and adopt the changes.

26
27 The Executive Administrator clarified the NCARB education standards the Board adopts
28 annually are not part of the practice of architecture. The education standards set the minimum
29 standards for qualifications for licensure. The Board is concerned about the precedence of
30 referencing one small sliver of professional practice standards for one profession within the
31 body of minimum standards for licensure embodied in the AELS regulations.

32
33 Brower indicated the Board regulates four professions and if there were 4 separate boards there
34 might be more problems.

35
36 Fredeen reiterated the mission and purpose of the Board is not to tell people how to do their
37 jobs but to set minimum standards for individual licensure.

38
39 Brower felt this board has a fairly broad mandate as far as adopting regulations.

40
41 The Chair indicated the Board has decided not to adopt standards of practice for the
42 professions it regulates and to leave those matters to the professional societies.

43
44 Gilfilian asked about the statutes regarding the National Institute of Certification in Engineering
45 Technologies (NICET) with respect to how fire protection services are offered in Alaska, which
46 seem to be working fine. However, there is an issue with respect to the statutes under
47 08.48.341 (12), which defines engineering, and AS 08.48.331 (7), the exemption for specialty
48 contractors, and he asked if there is a problem, and if so, if Brower had any suggested
49 remedies.

50
51 Gilfilian explained design work is being done outside licensed professional engineering and he
52 referred Brower to AS 08.48.281(a), Prohibited practice; 08.48.291; 08.48.341 (12), Definition of
53 engineering. He further described the requirement for engineering and pointed out there is no
54 specific exemption for the Fire Marshal permitting process.

55
56 Brower responded Fire Protection Engineering is licensed in other jurisdictions but not in Alaska
57 and he said he would look into the Fire Protection issues.

Fredeen also asked to have him cross reference the Fire Marshal's permitting program in Title 13 AAC.50.025 and to suggest how to embrace the current practices.

The Chair asked if there were more questions and there were none. He thanked Brower for his participation.

The Board took a break.

Break: 10:10 a.m.

Reconvene: 10:20 a.m.

Agenda Item 17– Old Business

Fire Protection

Fredeen summarized the fire protection services are offered. NCEES put out policy #25 prior to the February meeting and asserted an engineer needed to do the design work for all fire services. By law, engineers are not required for fire suppression systems but are used when the owner requests an engineer. When engineers are part of the process, they produce performance specifications but do not perform the design work for sprinkler systems. The NICET technicians put together the project, prepare the shop drawings, engineers review the shop drawings, and the Fire Marshal reviews the process. Engineers have review when they do oversight (inspection) but for a contractor that translates as a constant oversight. He felt the NCEES policy has been interpreted by fire protection contractors as meaning engineers are always involved.

NCEES asked states to adopt Policy #25. In presenting the policy to the public, the Board unfortunately created a resounding concern throughout the community of fire suppression contractors, who felt their livelihood was in jeopardy. In Alaska, 95% of the time fire suppression contractors provide the knowledge and expertise, and the relationship between these contractors, the fire marshal, and engineers is an important one in Alaska.

The Chair recognized Nick Bakic, and asked him to join the Board for a discussion.

The Chair asked to have Nick introduce himself. Nick Bakic, ACCEL, explained he has worked in the industry and in the NICET program for 16 years. He provided a handout for members that explains the National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE) oversees the program and most states have adopted NICET certification. In some places NCEES has been adopted but in Alaska, a person passing the NICET exam and listing five years of experience can be certified. In doing so, a loophole has been created and the Fire Marshal's program should close the loophole.

Bakic indicated there is a sufficiently trained force now.

Gilfilian brought up the issue regarding a problem between the Board's statutory requirements that design of systems must be under a licensed engineer, which does not comport with how services are provided in Alaska through the Fire Marshal's office. NICET program covers fire protection needs but may be out of compliance with the statutes. He has asked the State's attorney, David Brower, to look into this matter and, if necessary, propose changes to the statutes to allow for NICET technicians to continue to do design work under the permitting process by the State Fire Marshal.

The Board held a short discussion for clarification that the Board would like to recognize NICET technicians.

1 Bakic would like to assist the Board and would like some changes to the types of licenses and
2 large numbers of NICET technicians.

3
4 Fredeen would like to create a subcommittee to liaise with the fire protection contractors, the
5 State Fire Marshal, and the Board, to work through the issues of fire protection services and
6 come back with a proposal.

7
8 The Chair appointed Fredeen to Chair the Fire Protection Services Subgroup, and Morris to also
9 represent the Board. He asked Fredeen to put together a list of other parties that should be
10 represented on this subgroup, to discuss the issues, and to report back prior to the Legislature
11 with recommendations.

12
13 Bakic explained since Fire Protection Engineers (FPEs) are not licensed in Alaska there are
14 generally not requirements in proposals for FPEs.

15
16 Fredeen advised the Board the subgroup would take some time to sort out the issues.

17
18 (b) Continuing Education Subgroup Report

19
20 Brownfield referred to his report and reviewed the recommendations. He has found it is a mixed
21 bag but the majority of engineers and architects are in favor of some mandatory continuing
22 education. Clearly there are those opposed to CE. The IEEE written recommendation is in
23 support but the Board did hear from the Fairbanks section which is against a mandatory
24 program and noted a strong majority of the members was opposed to a regulatory program.
25 Brownfield reviewed the recommendations of his CE Subgroup Recommendations:

- 26
27 1. The Board should review the document and accept this as his final report.
28 2. The Board should prepare draft regulations for a mandatory CE program;
29 3. The Subgroup should present the proposed regulations to a panel of architects and
30 engineers;
31 4. The proposed CE program should be confined to the professions represented by a
32 permanent, voting Board member.

33
34 Fredeen felt that moving forward with recommendation #2 realistically may take 2-3 years for
35 the engineering community to embrace a mandatory CE program.

36
37 The Chair asked the members to read the report and to take up CE in August, and that
38 Brownfield add the IEEE recommendation into his report.

39
40 The Executive Administrator will add this to the August 2005 agenda.

41
42 (c) Emergency, Temporary or Courtesy License

43
44 Gilfilian indicated the Executive Administrator was researching the nursing board's work on this
45 issue.

46
47 The Executive Administrator reported she sent an email to find out more information and
48 recapped the discussion she had with Mr. Stewart and Bess Funk, who indicated nothing is
49 currently in place.

50
51 The Board held a short discussion about the intent of the proposed regulation change that
52 would allow a visual inspection of any structures for damage assessment for safety during
53 avalanches, earthquakes and other catastrophic situations, as a proactive measure.

54
55 Gilfilian clarified the purpose of the license is not just for people to obtain a courtesy license but
56 for forensic licensure. The current regulations lack any provision for those not licensed in
57 Alaska to participate during emergencies and for courtesy licensure.

1
2 Gilfilian indicated he would bring this back at a future meeting and would look at the initial draft
3 Daphne Brown prepared, which he thinks is a good starting point.
4

5 (d) Geological Engineer- Expand Disciplines
6

7 Hughes informed the Board that Geological Engineers requesting licensure have approached
8 him.
9

10 **On a motion made by Hughes, seconded by Heieren, and adopted unanimously, it was**
11

12 **RESOLVED to move to public notice to interested parties, to add Geological**
13 **Engineering to the engineering disciplines licensed using the definition as**
14 **provided in Tab 17.**
15

16 The Board held a discussion about overlap of geological engineers who are currently licensed
17 as civil engineers.
18

19 Morris referred to Tab 6, and .910, a draft regulation that would not prohibit the practice of those
20 continuing to work in a specialty field under the broader scope. For example if an engineer is
21 practicing environmental engineering under a civil engineering license, and the Board later
22 licenses the specialty, the civil engineer would still be qualified to practice environmental
23 engineering since it is within his scope of practice. Morris appreciated the intent of 12 AAC
24 36.910, but expressed a concern that if the Board moved forward to license a specialty practice,
25 such as Geological Engineers, requests for proposals for state or federal projects may require
26 specifically a geological engineer be involved. In doing so they may preclude a civil engineer
27 from bidding on a project, even though they are highly qualified to do the work.
28

29 The Chair thought it was not the purview of the Board to protect the practice.
30

31 Morris thought the non-discipline specific licensure fits in better because it protects the public
32 but does not create confusion for the public and the owners.
33

34 Fredeen thought the non-discipline specific licensure should be reviewed and it also could solve
35 the issue of Board representation, and would list all the disciplines and would indicate to the
36 public the area of expertise an engineer was qualified to practice.
37

38 The Board had a short discussion about the Legislative Audit and this issue falls within the
39 recommendations of that audit.
40

41 **The Chair asked if there were any objections to the motion, and there were none.**
42

43 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to forward this to the Regulations Specialist for
44 public noticing to interested parties, and to work with Hughes for a list of any organizations that
45 should also receive the draft language.
46

47 The Chair recognized several people who have signed the sign-in sheet.
48

49 Randy Johnson, Fairbanks North Star Borough (FNSB) spoke to the Board last year about
50 subdivision plats. In October 2003 he sent in some questions to the Board for guidance on who
51 could perform functions. These questions created a lot of discussion about incidental practice
52 and overlap. Last year the Board suggested the FNSB change its requirements to make it clear
53 who can perform functions and the FNSB is in the process of doing so, but he felt it would be
54 good to have the Board's guidance as well. He informed the Board the FNSB will be permitting
55 storm water discharge (EPA) but it will take a couple of years to finalize the permitting process.
56

1 The Chair agreed the subgroup has not fully addressed this but would do so by August 2005.
2 The FNSB has standards but placing some parameters in ordinance would be too restrictive
3 and he gave some examples that would be too restrictive for the public and should be kept as
4 guidelines.

5
6 The Board held a discussion.

7
8 Martin Gutoski was concerned the fees will be increased for students taking the FE and FLS
9 exams. He has been a proctor for about 10 years and expressed concern about increased
10 costs.

11
12 The Executive Administrator explained the agency would contract with the NCEES for exam
13 administration of the national exams. She recommended the agency continue to offer the AKLS
14 exam as it is, once yearly. Adding an additional \$130 would make that an expensive exam for
15 surveyors. Instead, a Board member, along with hired proctors in Fairbanks and Anchorage,
16 could oversee the exam. Since it is only a 2 hour exam and is written and scored using Board
17 members and subject matter experts who are ASPLS members, it does not make sense to
18 charge a \$130 administrative fee.

19
20 The Executive Administrator asked to revert back to the subject of Geological Engineers and
21 one Board member thought the proposed regulation change should go out to about 3100
22 engineers whereas the Interested Parties List is substantially smaller, probably less than 500.

23
24 The Chair reaffirmed the proposed regulation project should go to the Interested Parties List
25 and the APDC, who can email it to licensees.

26
27 Break for Lunch: 12:00 p.m.

28 Reconvene: 12:40 p.m.

29
30 The Chair asked for a report from the Engineering Disciplines Subgroup.

31
32 Gilfilian referred to Tab 6, Draft for Discussion, 12 AAC 36.910. His subgroup met and
33 consisted of Board members Morris and Hughes. There was not consensus on Environmental
34 and Control Systems as the feedback has either strongly recommended or strongly opposed the
35 addition of Environmental or Control Systems Engineering as a discipline. He also referred to
36 the handout by Dale Nelson, APDC, and felt the Board should consider non-discipline specific
37 licensure. The only concern has been enforcement and public awareness. He would like the
38 Subgroup charge to be expanded to consider the PE license as a non-discipline specific license
39 with the specialty listed in the database. He suggested this proposal be researched and
40 circulated and he would report back at the August 2005 meeting.

41
42 Gilfilian would like to hold further discussion of Environmental and Control Systems Engineering
43 as additional disciplines.

44
45 The Board held a short discussion and was in general agreement with the two proposals.

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

48
49 **RESOLVED to move to public notice to interested parties 12 AAC 36.910 (d) and to**
50 **strike (a), (b), and (c).**

51
52 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none.

53
54 Cyra-Korsgaard was not sure about the numbering and the Executive Administrator explained it
55 was a proposal and the number would be reviewed by the Regulations Specialist and the
56 Department of Law and would be revised as necessary, as a technical amendment.

1 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to forward this to the Regulations Specialist for
2 public noticing to interested parties.

3
4 (f) Potential Statute change:

5
6 Residential single family dwellings up to 4 stories should not require mechanical or electrical
7 engineers.

8
9 Fredeen explained the statute has an exemption for single family dwellings but various building
10 officials have explained single family dwellings are becoming larger and more complicated. The
11 issue is whether there should be a requirement on larger single family dwellings for an engineer.

12
13 Cyra-Korsgaard also added that in some instances homes built with many bathrooms were later
14 made into bed and breakfasts without the use of an engineer and architect.

15
16 The Chair indicated that this item arose as a result of a discussion with Ron Thompson, Building
17 Official, and he assigned Hightower to meet with Thompson and report back to the Board at the
18 August meeting.

19
20 (g) Landscape Architecture (overlap).

21
22 The Chair reviewed the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) high school situation and stated the
23 original design was completed with a full complement of design professionals which, at the time,
24 did not require a landscape architect. The scope of the project has been reduced and the CBJ
25 wants the redesign to be done without the involvement of a landscape architect.

26
27 Cyra-Korsgaard stated the Board's investigator felt the project needed a landscape architect.
28 She felt the Board does not generally make the determinations but the investigator does.
29 However, she felt in this instance, the Board should give guidance. She has not seen the
30 project but referred to the packet and it said site amenities surround the building. She
31 explained the landscape architect would look at the outdoor space and design it for personal
32 safety, ADA, and outdoor use. She thought what needed to be considered was site adaptation
33 and if a civil engineer or architect wants to take responsibility for the design, and has the
34 experience, education and testing they could do the work. If the investigator found they did not
35 have the expertise, a case could be made against them.

36
37 The Chair indicated that historically the architect provided the services she described and it has
38 been a short time, five or so years, of licensure for landscape architects. Prior to that time
39 architects or civil engineers performed the work described and he felt there is a tremendous
40 depth of experience there.

41
42 Gilfilian referred to AS 08.48.281 (b), and read: "Notwithstanding (a) of this section, this chapter
43 does not prohibit the practice of landscape architecture by a person who is not registered to
44 practice landscape architecture if the services are being performed by the person are within the
45 scope of practice authorized by another license that is held by the person."

46
47 Cyra-Korsgaard asked to read the definition of architecture in statute.

48
49 Gilfilian read, "practice of architecture" means professional service or creative work in the
50 design of buildings, the teaching of advanced architectural courses in institutions of higher
51 learning, consultation, investigation, evaluation, planning, design, and professional observation
52 of construction of public or private buildings, works, or projects, and architectural review of
53 drawings and specifications by regulatory agencies; "practice of architecture" may by regulation
54 of the board include mechanical, electrical, or structural design of minor importance."

55
56 Mills asked for a definition of "works" and the Board held a discussion.

1 Brownfield clarified that public works means facilities or buildings.

2
3 Gilfilian referred to the definition of civil engineering that mirrors the statute. He referred to the
4 letter of April 19, 2005 from Sarah Lewis, CBJ, which refers to AS 08.48.331 (b), "The
5 requirement to be registered as a landscape architect under this chapter only applies to a
6 person who practices an aspect of landscape architecture that the board has determined affects
7 the public health or safety." The point she is making is that there is not a safety issue here.
8

9 The Board held a short discussion.

10
11 Morris described a diagram with an architecture circle overlapping with a landscape architecture
12 circle, and another diagram showing architecture and landscape architecture as separate circles
13 with no overlap. He felt the statutes describe an overlapping diagram for architects and
14 landscape architecture. He thought the CBJ was asking if architects have lost the right to
15 perform what they have performed for more than forty years. The code of ethics determines the
16 parameters and each professional must determine if he can perform the design work based on
17 education, examination and experience. He asserted it would be wrong for the Board to take
18 away an architect's rights to perform the design work outside of a building. He felt doing so
19 would describe the two separate circles not supported by the current statutes.
20

21 Fredeen thought the Board should form a committee to address the issue.

22
23 Mills thought the Board had a committee for Incidental Practice.

24
25 Morris asserted this is not incidental practice but is overlap between professions. Designing the
26 plantings and contour is not incidental practice and has huge ramifications. Each time the Board
27 brings in a new profession the Board will spend time discussing these issues.
28

29 The Executive Administrator added the APDC has formed a committee to work on the overlap
30 between landscape architecture and civil engineering and architecture.

31
32 Gilfilian gave a historical perspective. He explained that the environmental engineers were
33 seeking licensure at the same time the landscape architects wanted recognition of their
34 profession. All these issues were discussed and consensus was reached with the Alaska
35 Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). Engineers wanted to design outhouses, and landscape
36 architects wanted to do the same. At the time there was recognition that both professionals
37 could perform the work, and the Legislature made some changes to the bill.
38

39 Cyra-Korsgaard thought the Board should not struggle with this issue, but that it is incumbent
40 upon all professionals to work within their area of expertise. The profession of landscape
41 architecture is broad and some landscape architects work mainly in designing structures and
42 some work more in the area of planting plans but they all work within their area of expertise.
43 The Board should not refine what landscape architects can do and should not preempt anyone
44 from performing work, but the work must be confined to the area of expertise of the
45 professional. She referred to the letter from Chris Mertl, and she read a portion of his email of
46 June 1, 2005 that described the proposed high school outdoor people places and landscaping
47 which he felt had safety hazards and had not been thoroughly thought out. Public safety issues
48 included the bicycle and vehicular conflicts, as well as pedestrian access. She went on to
49 explain that the CBJ departments generally use landscape architects.
50

51 Mills referred to Mertl's comment that the lead architect recognizes the need for involvement by
52 a landscape architect.

53
54 Gilfilian referred to Minch Ritter Voelckers Architect's letter of April 14, 2005 that does not
55 support that statement. Paul Voelcker indicated that architects can provide the expertise
56 needed.

1 The Chair referred to Mertl's reference to 12 AAC 36.069 and noted the exemption in AS
2 08.48.331 (b).

3
4 Morris felt Mertl was using the separate circles, where the practices are separate and not
5 overlapping, and more than one discipline could perform the design in front of the building.

6
7 **On a motion made by Gilfilian, not seconded, and Withdrawn, it was**

8 **RESOLVED to prepare a letter to the City and Borough of Juneau and inform them**
9 **that, in this particular project, the Board does not see a need for a landscape**
10 **architect to be involved in this project.**

11
12 The Board held a brief discussion. Gilfilian withdrew his motion.

13
14 **On a motion made by Morris, seconded by Brownfield, it was**

15 **RESOLVED to write a letter of response to the City and Borough of Juneau and**
16 **reference the high school project. The Board understands there is a question**
17 **about who is qualified to perform the landscape architect work on this project.**
18 **Per AS 08.48.281(b) there is more than one discipline of licensed professional in**
19 **the State of Alaska that may be qualified to do this work.**

20
21 The Board held a brief discussion about context and the Board does not want to identify and
22 review each project case-by-case and the investigator makes the determination after reviewing
23 the plans.

24
25 **On an amendment by Mills, seconded by Fredeen, the Board did not identify separate**
26 **categories but multiple disciplines can do the work if they have the expertise to do so.**

27
28 The Chair asked if there was an objection to the amendment and there was none.

29
30 **The amended motion read:**

31 **On a motion made by Morris, seconded by Brownfield, and adopted unanimously, it was**

32 **RESOLVED to write a letter of response to the City and Borough of Juneau and**
33 **reference the high school project. The Board understands there is a question**
34 **about who is qualified to perform the landscape architect work on this project.**
35 **Per AS 08.48.281(b) there is more than one discipline of licensed professional in**
36 **the State of Alaska that may be qualified to do this work. The Board did not**
37 **identify separate categories but multiple disciplines can do the work if they have**
38 **the expertise to do so.**

39
40
41 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the amended motion and there were
42 none so the motion passed.

43
44 Cyra-Korsgaard reiterated the Board often receives correspondence from people seeking
45 guidance on projects and the Board should refer to the specific statutes and regulations. The
46 Board has not seen the drawings and cannot make a determination without having reviewed the
47 plans.

48
49 The Board held a short discussion about the investigative process and the role of the Board.

50
51 The Chair referred to Randy Johnson's request for answers to five questions and using this
52 theory; the process would be for Johnson to file a complaint and for the investigator and peer
53 review process to take place. He will respond to Johnson in a similar fashion.

1 h) Engineering/Land Surveying Overlap.

2
3 Heieren indicated the Subgroup would be working on the issues.

4
5 Stop Work Order

6
7 The Chair indicated the work would continue.

8
9 **Agenda Item 18– New Business**

10
11 The Executive Administrator mentioned 12 AAC 36.067 was held to New Business.

12
13 The Chair asked to take a short break to allow the Executive Administrator to get the proposed
14 regulation change and make copies.

15
16 Break: 1:30 p.m.

17 Reconvene 1:40 p.m.

18
19 The Executive Administrator explained there was a complaint filed with the Division by an exam
20 applicant who was found incomplete because they did not meet the required combination of
21 experience and education and were short approximately 6 weeks of work experience. The
22 applicant mentioned several other instances where the Board approved candidates in similar
23 circumstances. The Director asked her to review the other applicants and respond to the
24 complaint. She determined most of the applicants had additional combinations of education
25 and experience. In one instance it appeared the Board may have erred and approved a
26 candidate who was also short experience. She met with the Director and Licensing Examiner to
27 review the regulation that allows candidates to project their work experience to the exam date.
28 The draft proposed regulation is the result of this discussion. The question is if the Board is
29 qualifying a person for examination and they must have the 48 months of work experience, or
30 are they qualifying the applicant for licensure by examination and the applicant must provide
31 proof of experience at the time the scores are received. The applicant would not get licensed
32 until the continued employment was verified.

33
34 Fredeen expressed concern that the timeframe was too great, as the applicants affected are
35 typically short 2 or less months of work experience. He also felt that since the tests were
36 approximately 6 months apart, the proposed time frame would just shift the same issue by
37 one test cycle with applicants still requesting two more months of experience. He also did not
38 think the file should come back to the Board.

39
40 Mills concurred and suggested that staff verify the additional work experience.

41
42 The Executive Administrator explained that currently when experience is projected to the exam
43 date, the file does not go back to the Board for review, but the licensing examiner requests an
44 updated work experience verification from the employer to ensure that the applicant continued
45 employment. The Board held a short discussion about not requiring the application to come
46 back to the Board for further review so long as the applicant continued employment.

47
48 **On a motion made by Gilfilian, seconded by Cyra-Korsgaard, and approved unanimously,**
49 **it was RESOLVED to accept the version of the proposed regulation change to 12 AAC**
50 **36.067 as proposed by Director Urion and to send to interested parties.**

51
52 Gilfilian spoke to the motion and explained some states currently allow the applicant to get the
53 experience after the exam.

54
55 Brownfield stated that he is against substituting the experience after the exam. He felt it was
56 important to have the experience first.

1 On an amendment by Fredeen, seconded by Morris, and adopted, it was

2
3 **RESOLVED to amend the time frame from 6 months to 2 months, and from 180**
4 **days to 60 days.**

5
6 The Board held a discussion.

7
8 **The Chair asked for a roll call vote on the amendment, and the roll call was as follows:**
9

Board Member	Vote	
Baker	Yes	
Brownfield	Yes	
Fredeen	Yes	
Gilfilian		No
Heieren		No
Hlghtower	Yes	
Hughes		No
Maynard	Yes	
Mills	Yes	
Morris	Yes	
Total	7	3

10
11 The Executive Administrator took the roll call vote and the amendment passed 7-3.

12
13 **On an amendment to the motion, made by Morris, seconded by Mills, and adopted**
14 **unanimously, it was**

15
16 **RESOLVED that proof of verification of the remaining experience must be**
17 **provided by the applicant's supervisor prior to the license being issued.**

18
19 The meeting was interrupted at 2:20 p.m. by a fire alarm.

20 The Chair called the meeting back to order at 2:30 p.m.

21
22 Heieren felt the difference between 2 months and 6 months is not that great and thought the
23 Board should support the Director's motion.

24
25 Mills felt the Board was cooperating and discussed the motion and made some minor changes.

26
27 The Board held a short discussion.

28
29 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the amendment and there were none.

30 The Chair brought up the main motion:

31
32 **On a motion made by Gilfilian, seconded by Cyra-Korsgaard, and adopted unanimously,**
33 **it was**

34
35 **RESOLVED to accept the version of the proposed regulation change to 12 AAC**
36 **36.067 as proposed by Director Urion, as amended: from 6 months to 2 months,**
37 **and from 180 days to 60 days but proof of verification of the remaining experience**
38 **must be provided from the applicant's supervisor prior to the license being**
39 **issued.**

The proposed regulation would read:

12 AAC 36.067. Date of Experience. Computation of qualifying experience for admission to the examination as an architect, engineer, land surveyor or landscape architect is up to the date of the examination. The applicant can be approved for an examination if the computation of qualifying work experience is within 2 months (60 days) of the amount needed for registration but proof of verification of the remaining experience must be received from the applicant's supervisor prior to the license being issued.

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

The Board held a discussion and felt that it was important to convey to the Director the Board's interest in addressing the issues of the complaint he received. The national examinations are held every six months. Additionally, if experience was projected to six months it would create a situation where applicants could be two months short.

Some Board members felt the issue being addressed was that some applicants take the exam just prior to graduation in May and in those instances are 1 to 2 months short of work experience. This proposed regulation change will assist those applicants and addresses the issue of qualifying experience. Additionally, if the experience was projected 6 months, the likelihood of employment changes increases.

On a motion by Morris, seconded by Fredeen, and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to add 12 AAC 36.067 to the project to be public noticed to interested parties.

The Chair indicated there was no objection and the motion carried.

Agenda Item 22-Read Applications into the Record

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

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

The Executive Administrator read the following into the record:

APPLICANT NAME	DISCIPLINE	EXAM/COMITY	BOARD ACTION TAKEN
1) Anderson, Shelly	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
2) Atkins, Kenneth	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
3) Axford, John	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
4) Baker, William	Architect	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
5) Bjerkeset, Jody	PE-Civil	Exam	Conditionally approved, pending FE exam verification
6) Blotkamp, William	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
7) Bogert, Henry	Mining Engineer	Comity	Approved
8) Bronec, Alan	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
9) Campbell, John	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course and current license
10) Charlton, Nathan	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved

11) Chung, Jinsoo	Architect	Comity	Approved
12) Collin, Bobby	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
13) Dallam, Richard	Architect	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
14) DeLong, Hugh	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
15) Dibble, Robb	Civil Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending MLE NCEES Record
16) Eidinger, John	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
17) Eischens, Kevin	Land Surveyor PS	Exam	Approved
18) Gerdes, David	PE-Mechanical	Exam	Approved
19) Goldhammer, Edward	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
20) Gray, Mark	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
21) Harris, Kevin	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
22) Heitz, Jon	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
23) Hilmo, Tim	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
24) Joens, Douglas	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
25) Keen, James	PE-Mechanical	Exam	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
26) Knapp, Dorcel	PE-Mechanical	Exam	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
27) Lindberg, Robert	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
28) Manning, Charles	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
29) Martinez, Ricardo	Architect	Exam	Approved
30) McCarthy, David	Civil Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
31) McCarthy, Paul	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
32) McConnell, R. Steven	Architect	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course, verification of current license
33) Millam, Jason	PE-Civil	Exam	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
34) Miller, Christina	PE-Civil	Exam	Approved
35) Moore, Cody	FE	Exam	Approved
36) Nangia, Om	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
37) Pankey, Joht	Civil Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
38) Rhodes, Melanie	PE-Mechanical	Exam	Approved
39) Richards, Robert	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
40) Riley, Michael	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
41) Rowe, Jeffrey	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
42) Schointuch, Richard	Architect	Comity	Approved
43) Seaman, Timothy	Architect	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
44) Seferian, Marc	Civil Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
45) Shaw, Mark	Civil Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course

46) Spinner, Clotho	Landscape Arch	Exam	Approved
47) Staten, Michael	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
48) Swanson, Donald	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending Arctic Course
49) Thomas, Jane	Civil Engineer	Comity	Conditionally approved, pending verification of PE exam, current license, transcripts of B.S. Chem. Eng. from Purdue
50) Thomas, Leslie	Architect	Exam	Conditionally approved, pending payment of additional fees
51) Vasquez, Paul	FS	Exam	Conditionally approved, pending payment of additional fees
52) Winfrey, Scott	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
53) Wood, Carla	PE-Civil	Exam	Approved

On a motion duly made by Gilfilian , seconded by Mills, and adopted unanimously, 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

The Executive Administrator read the following applicants into the record:

54) Bozarth, Theodore	PE-Electrical	Exam	INCOMPLETE, needs 9 months additional work experience, Arctic Course, Transcript of BSEE
55) Ma, Haitao	PE-Mechanical	Exam	INCOMPLETE-needs 12 months R.C. /verify FE application approved, successfully pass FE for licensure.
56) Shahani, Aashish	PE-Electrical	Exam	INCOMPLETE, needs additional 2 months work experience

Agenda Item 18 – New Business

The Chair moved to New Business and briefly presented the NCARB Resolutions and referred to Tab 18:

1. California is looking to reconfigure the size of each region based on the number of member boards in each region and and the Chair anticipates opposition.
2. California and Colorado want NCARB to evaluate the recent changes to the NAAB Student Performance Criteria. Some students are not being required to understand the building codes (this also shows up as Colorado Resolution #3)
3. Colorado Resolution # 1 would add a public member and administrator to the NCARB Board of Directors and the Chair supports this addition.
4. Colorado Resolution #2 would allow Member Boards to vote on dues and fees at the Annual meeting.

NCEES Resolutions

Baker referred to Tab 18, the email for ACCA Motion #10, and explained the resolution was with respect to voting at meetings and if the MBA could vote if a Member Board identified an MBA as the Board's delegate.

1 The Board held a discussion clarifying the issue that some Boards felt the Member Board would
2 be disenfranchised if the MBA delegate could not vote. The Board sets policy and the MBA
3 implements the policy.
4

5 The Executive Administrator explained the NCEES wants representation by the professional
6 engineer and land surveyor to make decisions that affect the disciplines. If Member Boards can
7 delegate that responsibility, the NCEES would be concerned that MBAs would be the primary
8 participants and the NCEES would strongly oppose that movement.
9

10 Baker felt oftentimes issues arise at the meeting not specifically on the agenda.
11

12 The Chair indicated the Board did not support the motion.
13

14 Fredeen brought up the movement by NCEES to push the minimum standard for engineering as
15 the minimum qualification. For civil engineers that is good and ASCE supports this effort but the
16 mechanical engineering Master's program does not translate in the same way. He opposes
17 increasing the requirement for all disciplines.
18

19 Gilfilian felt that if the matter came to a vote at the NCEES annual meeting the Board should
20 give guidance and have reached a consensus.
21

22 The Board held a discussion.
23

24 The Chair indicated the Board does not currently support increase of the minimum requirement
25 to a Master's degree.
26

27 Fredeen offered to work on a position paper to present to the NCEES.
28

29 **Agenda Item 19 – Legislative Report**

30

31 The Executive Administrator referred to the printout of the history of HB 35, the sunset audit bill.
32 She gave a brief history of the bill and the bill status. The bill is before the Governor for
33 signature and includes an extension of the temporary, non-voting Landscape Architect Board
34 member.
35

36 **Agenda item 20- Administrator's Report**

37

38 The Executive Administrator referred to the written report in the packet. This has been a very
39 busy time, particularly since the Board hosted the NCEES Western Zone meeting in Anchorage
40 several weeks ago. The meeting was well attended and, due largely to Kimberly Mill's efforts as
41 Host Committee Chair, was quite successful.
42

43 The Executive Administrator advised the next license renewal cycle would come up in
44 November 2005 and in the packet are copies of the fitness questions and the Board should
45 review those and take them up in August 2005.
46

47 The Executive Administrator asked for assistance with the annual report and Gilfilian and Morris
48 offered to help.
49

50 **Exam Administration – ELSES- update on NCEES to oversee exams**

51

52 The Executive Administrator explained the agency would like to have the NCEES oversee exam
53 administration. Mr. Mendenhall mentioned, informally, during the fire alarm a concern that the
54 University would like the Board to continue oversight. One possibility to explore would be to see
55 if the agency would contract with the NCEES for some of the exam, and for the FE contract to
56 be with the University. She explained the agency incurs travel and labor costs for the oversight
57 of the exam. In some jurisdictions the Boards subsidize the costs to students.

1 The Executive Administrator explained she marked up a draft contract and the agency is hoping
2 to have the contract reviewed for the April 2006 exam. If the Board would like to have input it
3 should happen by the August meeting. The issue is exam security and liability for the exam
4 costs and the Board has already embraced this effort in February 2005.

5
6 The Board held a discussion.

7
8 **On a motion made by Morris, seconded by Cyra-Korsgaard, and approved unanimously,**
9 **it was**

10
11 **RESOLVED to support the NCEES examination administration of the national**
12 **examinations for FE, PE, FS, and PS and request the Director to review the**
13 **possibility of a contract with the University of Alaska to continue administering**
14 **the examinations to the FE students.**
15

16 Cyra-Korsgaard indicated the reason the Board is interested in the University of Alaska
17 continuing to proctor the exams is that, if the agency uses the NCEES ELSES examination
18 services, the cost will go up for students. The Board wants to minimize the cost to students in
19 order to encourage them to start the licensure path.

20
21 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none.

22
23 Hughes indicated he would check with the University of Alaska to obtain costs.

24
25 **On a motion made by Gilfilian, seconded by Mills, and adopted, it was**

26
27 **RESOLVED to advise the Director the Board would like any cost savings obtained**
28 **by using the NCEES ELSES examination administration to be used to subsidize**
29 **the examination costs for the Fundamentals of Engineering and Fundamentals of**
30 **Land Surveying students.**
31

32 The Chair asked how this would work administratively and a discussion ensued.

33
34 Baker felt this should apply only to students, not to all applicants for examinations.

35
36 Morris was inclined to want to keep the University of Alaska proctoring the exams and not worry
37 about subsidizing the cost of the exam.

38
39 The Executive Administrator indicated the Board could request the agency do this.

40
41
42 The Chair asked for a roll call vote that was taken, as follows:
43

Board Member	Vote	
Brownfield		No
Fredeen	Yes	
Gilfilian	Yes	
Heieren	Yes	
Hightower		No
Hughes	Yes	
Maynard		No
Mills	Yes	
Morris		No
Baker	Yes	
Total	6	4

1
2 The Executive Administrator noted the motion passed 6-4.
3

4 **Agenda Item 21 – Goals and Objectives**
5

6 The Board did not review its Goals and Objectives, currently listed on the AELS website.
7

8 The Chair asked members to review the Goals and Objectives between now and the next
9 meeting and to suggest changes.
10

11 **Agenda Item 23 – Review Calendar of Events, Confirm AELS Meeting Dates**
12

13 The Board Chair reverted back to the Incidental Practice Subgroup and indicated the group has
14 not made progress as there is a case pending. He felt the subgroup may be able to make some
15 progress by the August meeting.
16

17 The Board briefly reviewed the calendar.
18

19 The Chair indicated the two architect Board members, himself and Hightower, would be
20 attending the NCARB annual meeting in Miami in June, and Maynard is the designated voting
21 delegate.
22

23 The Chair indicated Gilfilian, Brownfield, Baker, Heieren and Fredeen would be attending the
24 NCEES Annual meeting in Memphis in August, with Gilfilian as the voting delegate.
25

26 The Chair confirmed the AELS Meeting dates, after the Board held a brief discussion:
27

28 **2005 AELS Tentative Board Meeting Dates:**

29 Aug 18-19– Anchorage
30 Nov 17-18 – Anchorage
31

32 **2006 AELS Tentative Board Meeting Dates:**

33 February 9-10 – Juneau
34 May 25-26 – Fairbanks
35 August 17-18 – Anchorage
36 November 16-17- Anchorage
37

38 **Agenda Item 26 – Board Member Comments.**
39

40 The Chair brought up the next agenda item, Board Member Comments, Task List, and
41 Housekeeping:
42

43 Fredeen welcomed new members, and thinks it was an excellent meeting and the new Board
44 members hit the ground running, and thanked staff, and goodbye to the departing members.
45

46 Gilfilian agreed and felt the Board accomplished a lot and he is pleased, and thanked the
47 Executive Administrator.
48

49 Hughes thanked the Executive Administrator, welcomed new members.
50

51 Brownfield welcomed new members and said goodbye to outgoing members who will be sorely
52 missed, and how much we rely on the Executive Administrator
53

54 Hightower liked how the meeting was run.
55

56 Heieren felt a bit overwhelmed but looks forward to working with the Board.

1 Baker wanted to commend Mills and the Executive Administrator for doing an outstanding job
2 for a great NCEES Western Zone meeting.

3
4 Morris said he enjoyed the meeting, feels overwhelmed but is excited about serving on the
5 Board.

6
7 Cyra-Korsgaard thought this would probably be her last meeting as she has served 8 years and
8 her term ends June 30, 2005. She indicated she will serve until her replacement is announced.
9 She very much enjoyed working with the Board and felt it was an education and she has
10 enjoyed working with everyone, and especially the Executive Administrator who is well
11 organized and has provided a wealth of information to the Board. She wished the Board well as
12 it continues its challenges.

13
14 Mills stated this would likely be her last meeting, too, but it has been her great pleasure to serve
15 on this board, as a first time Board member. It has been a wonderful experience. She felt the
16 Western Zone meeting went well and offered to assist the Board during the 2006 NCEES
17 annual meeting. One thing she wanted to accomplish was to create a public portion on the
18 AELS website to provide help

19
20 The Executive Administrator expressed her gratitude for this opportunity to work for the Board.

21
22 Maynard welcomed new members, and bid farewell to outgoing members. He thinks the
23 Executive Administrator has done a tremendous job, as well as her two assistants.

24
25 The Chair asked the Board to pass in the travel reports to the Executive Administrator.

26
27 Subgroup Assignments:

28
29 Continuing Education to make recommendations to the Board. Brownfield (Chair), and
30 Fredeen. Maynard.

31
32 Electronic Transmittals and Signatures: Fredeen (Chair), Gilfilian, and Maynard.

33
34 Incidental Practice Subgroup: Maynard (Chair), Baker, Brownfield, and Cyra-Korsgaard.

35
36 Engineering Discipline Subgroup: Gilfilian (Chair). Hughes and Fredeen;

37
38 Disciplinary Action Subgroup to review disciplinary action and process and to report back at the
39 August meeting with recommendations. Baker (Chair), Morris and Hightower

40
41 Fire Protection Subgroup to put together a list of other parties that should be represented on
42 this subgroup and to report back prior to the Legislature. Fredeen (Chair), and Morris.

1 **Task List:**

Maynard	Chair, Subgroup on Incidental Practice. Serve on Continuing Education Subgroup.
	General correspondence.
	Respond to Randy Johnson's questions on overlap.
Baker	Serve on Incidental Practices Subgroup.
	Baker, Heieren, and Gilfilian to review Mortgage Location Survey Standards and report back in August 2005 with recommendations.
	Chair, Disciplinary Action Subgroup, report back recommendations at August 2005 meeting
	Develop a list of board approved land surveying curriculum.
	Bring back the proposal of mortgage location standards to the August meeting and the Executive Administrator to put on the agenda.
Brownfield	Review travel and budget for the Board.
	Chair, Continuing Education Subgroup, Serve on Host Committee Subgroup.
Cyra-Korsgaard	Serve on Incidental Practice Subgroups.
Fredeen	Serve on Subgroup for Continuing Education.
	Chair, Electronic Transmittals and Signatures Subgroup.
	Chair, Fire Protection Subgroup
Gilfilian	Serve on Subgroups: Engineering Disciplines (Chair), Incidental Practice, Electronic Submittals and Signatures.
	Baker, Heieren, and Gilfilian to review Mortgage Location Survey Standards and report back in August 2005 with recommendations.
	Circulate to professional societies non-discipline specific license
	Review the initial draft Daphne Brown prepared on Emergency Licenses and Courtesy or Temporary Licenses.
Heieren	Baker, Heieren, and Gilfilian to review Mortgage Location Survey Standards and report back in August 2005 with recommendations.
Hightower	Research with the Anchorage Building Official single family dwellings and if there should be a requirement for stamping larger single family residences.
Hughes	Serve on Engineering Discipline Subgroup.
	Serve on Subgroups: Incidental Practice, and Engineering Disciplines.
Mills	

Executive Administrator	Invite the chief investigator, building official, and fire marshal to attend the August AELS meeting.
	Assist the Chair with general correspondence.
	Add to the application forms or website posting to advise applicants to notify the Board when requesting a transmittal since the staff could better assist the applicant.
	Research arctic engineering degree programs for the Board to review at a later date.
	Ask the investigator to request travel to the NCEES annual meeting and the request training in the budget.
	Send a letter with renewals, or at least mail the quarterly meeting summary to provide information to licensees.
	Develop a checklist for landscape architects by comity and bring back to the Board at the August meeting.
	Send draft changes of surveyor CE to the professional societies, APDC, and ASPLS, as well as the interested parties list
	Move regulation project forward to public notice to interested parties: Checklists for architects by comity, engineers by comity; land surveyor inclusions and exclusions; landscape architect mentoring; geological engineering; dates for engineering experience.
	Develop draft regulations for surveyor model rules adoption.
	<p>Agenda items to add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary License for Emergencies (Old Business) <input type="checkbox"/> Mortgage location standards revisited (Old Business) <input type="checkbox"/> CE action plan (Old Business) <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Discipline Licensure (Old Business) <input type="checkbox"/> Review application fitness questions for upcoming renewal <input type="checkbox"/> Disciplinary Action Subgroup- recommendations on follow-up
	Invite the Chief Investigator, Building Official, and Fire Marshal to the August 2005 Board meeting in Anchorage.
	Review Fitness questions.
	Add a FAQ for the intent of 12 AAC 36.185 (d) to the Building Officials' Manual.
Brower	Gilfilian explained design work is being done outside licensed professional engineering 08.48.281(a), Prohibited practice, 08.48.291, Violations 08.48.341 (12), Definition of engineering, and it appears there is a statute violation. Brower said he would look into the Fire Protection issues mentioned.

1 On a motion by Mills, seconded by Cyra-Korsgaard, and approved unanimously, it was

2
3 **RESOLVED to adjourn the meeting at 3:40 p.m.**

4
5 There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned.

6
7 Respectfully submitted:

8
9
10 _____
11 Ginger Morton, Executive Administrator

12
13
14 Approved:

15
16
17
18 _____
19 Kenneth D. Maynard, FAIA, Chair
20 Board of Registration for Architects,
21 Engineers, and Land Surveyors

22
23
24 Date: _____
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57