

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

STATE OF ALASKA
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING
BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS & LAND
SURVEYORS

10
11
12
13
14

Minutes of Meeting
February 11-12, 2010

15 By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6,
16 the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors held a meeting
17 February 11-12, 2010 at the State Office Building, 333 Willoughby Avenue, 9th floor
18 conference room A, Juneau, Alaska.

19
20
21

Thursday, February 11, 2010

22
23

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Roll Call

24 The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

25
26 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

- 27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
- Richard Heieren, Land Surveyor, Chair
 - Boyd Brownfield, Civil Engineer, Vice Chair
 - Harley Hightower, Architect, Secretary
 - Clifford Baker, Land Surveyor
 - Donald Shiesl, Public Member
 - Richard Rearick, Architect
 - Eric Eriksen, Electrical Engineer
 - Burdett Lent, Landscape Architect
 - Daniel Walsh, Mining Engineer
 - Craig Fredeen, Mechanical Engineer
 - Charles Leet, Civil Engineer

40 Representing the Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing were:

- 41
42
43
44
45
46
- Vern Jones, Executive Administrator
 - Alicia Kelly, Licensing Examiner
 - John Savage, Investigator (via telephone)
 - Katherine Mason, Administrative Officer II

47 Representing the Department of Law was Assistant Attorney General, Gayle Horetski.
48 Representing the Department of Public Safety, Fire Marshall's Office was Carol Olson
49

50 Members of the public in attendance for portions of the meeting were:

- 51
52
- Patrick Kalen, PS, representing ACSM

- Tim Sprout, PS, representing ASPLS
- George Imbsen, Civil Engineer, representing himself
- John Squires, Civil Engineer, representing himself.
- Dale Nelson, Civil Engineer, representing APDC and ASCE
- John Hargesheimer, Civil Engineer, representing APDC & UA

Agenda Item 2 – Review/Amend Agenda

The following changes were made to the agenda:

- Read letter re investigator into record after ethics report
- Add 8 c) Report by Lent on LA by experience only.
- Add 8 d) Prohibited practices, exemptions
- Add 8 e) Memo to Jenny re fee setting
- Item 10 standing committees should be renumbered G. Investigative, H. Guidance Manual, I. Legislative Liaison, J. Emeritus Status and K. Bylaws
- Add B+30 under NCEES reports in new business

On a motion duly made by Baker, seconded by Fredeen it was

RESOLVED, to approve the agenda as amended.

Hearing no objection the motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Reporting

- Leet reports: 1. His company is suing another company on an ethics violation.
- 2. One of the projects we did back in 04 did not have a prime review.

Chair: I don't see that as anything more than for the record.

Baker informed the Board that he is now a State employee and issues may come up that may require a recusal from him.

Agenda Item 4 – Review letter Hightower drafted.

Hightower: Change the section after architects etc., after serves add "serves the public in the regulation of" and then in the last paragraph delete the comma after public.

Chair: Let's take a minute to read this.

Baker points out that we are not as large as some other boards and questions the statement that we are the largest board.

Brownfield states that we are the 3rd largest but with 4 separate independent professions, one of which has 6 different disciplines we are the most complex and suggests that, that wording be used.

Harley: I'll redo this and give to Vern.

Baker suggests we point out that we are probably the only state that only has a portion of

1 one investigator and a lot of the other boards aren't as diverse as ours.

2
3 Chair: I think the letter probably does the job at this point. The most important thing in the
4 letter is that we think, as a board, we need the support of at least one individual investigator.

5
6 Jones: Back to the agenda, we need to do something tomorrow regarding the Anderson
7 hearing.

8
9 Chair: Right let's put that under new business.

10
11 Chair: Let's move on to review and approval of minutes of November 19-20, 2009. Chair
12 comments on completeness of minutes.

13
14 Shiesl reports that he had ask Vern if the AAG had reviewed the Bylaws and evidently she
15 didn't have time.

16
17 Jones: At first it didn't look like she would get to them but then she called for another copy
18 so she may have something for us when she joins the meeting.

19
20 Shiesl: Page 25 line 6 reads continuous – should be contentious.

21
22 Lent: Page 26 line 18. On the previous item I was explaining the CLARB annual meeting
23 and then there is a motion by Leet seconded by Walsh on an entirely different subject. Is
24 there some way we should be separating this?

25
26 Chair: I don't see any problem in the way that that's set up.

27
28 Lent: Page 27 line 21 the information in the applicants files.

29
30 Chair: Thank you Bert.

31
32 Walsh: Page 15 on line 9 talking about how geologists are licensed, don't use that word use
33 certified instead of licensed.

34
35 Eriksen: There is a typo on page 5 line 25 my last name is misspelled and again on page
36 14, line 34.

37
38 Walsh: My email has changed, Chair, pass on to Vern

39
40 **On a motion duly made by Sheisl, seconded by Baker, it was**

41
42 **RESOLVED to approve the November 19-20, 2009 meeting minutes as**
43 **amended.**

44
45 Hearing no objection the motion passed unanimously.

46
47 **Agenda Item 6 – Board Correspondence Sent Since May 2009**

48
49 Chair: We are ahead of schedule so let's move on to Item 6.A. This is a letter that went out
50 to all engineering registrants. Does anyone have any comments?

51
52 Walsh responds that he liked it.

53
54 Brownfield asks Vern to not include anyone not licensed in Alaska. He points out that there

1 is a lengthy response from a structural engineer and it should be disregarded. He further
2 states that this is an informal request for comments from registrants and not a public
3 hearing.

4
5 Chair states that in the decision process that's fine but it is correspondence and, though
6 uninvited, should remain part of the record.

7
8 Brownfield concurs but requests that it not be included in the packet his committee reads.

9
10 Chair agrees and says that he considers this a precursor to actual public notice of a possible
11 regulations change.

12
13 Chair explains to the Board that Brownfield, Lent, Leet and himself spent time talking to
14 APDC and some legislators regarding Board travel. He further stated that he would be
15 excusing himself early for lunch to meet with a deputy director and that since this has
16 already gone to Jennifer Strickler he doesn't feel we are circumventing the chain of
17 command. He received a lot of positive feedback from the legislators and feels that they are
18 extremely sympathetic to the process and they endorse Board attendance at the national
19 meetings.

20
21 Brownfield added that the president of the Senate was strongly supportive of that. He
22 listened very intently and he agreed that we must have the authorization to travel.

23
24 Baker feels that Board members should not be forced to pick and choose which meeting
25 they attend.

26
27 Eriksen states he is unclear on his responsibilities as Legislative liaison and asks if he
28 should have been at the meeting with the legislators.

29
30 Chair responds that it would have been helpful if he could have been there.

31
32 Baker adds that every year he has flown in early but couldn't this year.

33
34 Hightower: In my letter we say 9 professional disciplines. Do we mean disciplines or
35 members?

36
37 Shies: We mean disciplines.

38
39 Jones: Maybe 9 professions would have been a better way.

40
41 Baker mentions that we are considering bringing in the geologists.

42
43 Chair: That's way down the road, let's go ahead and call John he's probably waiting. Carol
44 Olson will be with him. Just a quick side note, her daughter was stabbed in Fairbanks and
45 almost died. She almost lost her arm. She caught a burglar in her home.

46
47 Break 0920 – 0928

48
49 **Agenda Item 5 - Investigative Report**

50
51 Called John Savage and Carol Olson

52
53 Savage: Things are going good, we're keeping an even keel as far as closures and
54 openings and if we can maintain that, I'll be happy. We have two new filings with the AAG's

1 office but no AAG has been assigned yet. We have about 6 more that are going and I'm
2 hoping to work some agreements out prior to that, time will tell, by the next board meeting.
3 Things are coming to a head and with our new matrix we are going get a few more that are
4 going to go over there.

5
6 Chair: We have your written report and everything looks in order. Does anybody have any
7 questions of John?

8
9 Fredeen: On your new cases there are a couple of falsified applications on there. I don't
10 know if I've seen those before, can you describe, with three of these items there is an
11 advisement letter what...uh

12
13 Savage: I'm going to be real generic about this, so I don't expose anything. Goes on to
14 explain that cases are opened under what they appear to be or what they are initially
15 reported as and that could change and when they are closed sometimes the initial branding
16 sticks. He further explains that some of them were because we had deleted one of the
17 ethics questions and then added it back later and licensees renewing didn't realize it had
18 changed. One we found that the individual had reported years before and for whatever
19 reason it was overlooked.

20
21 Hightower: We've reviewed the letter requesting the additional investigator if we get it out
22 today will we be on schedule?

23
24 Savage: Yes.

25
26 Chair: Would you like that faxed or would...

27
28 Savage: Your sending to director and cc to chief right?

29
30 Chair: Yes

31
32 Savage: Ok, Vern would probably know how is most appropriate. He goes on to explain that
33 he doesn't want to lose what we've gained and that some other boards, Guides for instance,
34 have one full time investigator that has no other responsibilities and they are about to add a
35 second investigator and that AELS needs to jump on the bandwagon.

36
37 Chair responds that his only comment would be that we are being penalized for your
38 efficiency.

39
40 Savage adds that when the public safety and someone's enjoyment on a hunt is more
41 important than building safety he has a problem with that.

42
43 Chair: We don't want to wait until the dam breaks, when we see a crack we fix it.

44
45 Savage explains that he has been working closely with Carol and Tim Fisher and now has
46 access to Hansen software and can see where they are at on a building. Can't scan
47 drawings yet though but really starting to work out well.

48
49 Chair: That's a good segue into Carol now if she could speak to the Hansen software.

50
51 Olson explains that they had a little difficulty getting John access because of the public
52 safety firewall but worked around it. They initiated some work related input that would be
53 specific to John. It will allow him to go to the initial screen to see if it's something he needs
54 to look into. She thinks this will be really good as they are asking for more documents to be

1 submitted electronically. He has view only rights, he can't manipulate data.

2
3 Chair asks Carol and John to speak to the use of industry standards in disciplinary actions
4 where there are no Statute or Regulation violations but industry standards are not being
5 met.

6
7 Savage states that he is powerless unless a Statute or Regulation has been violated unless
8 it's a blatant disregard for public safety and that would be a call from the review team that
9 would say that this is absolutely not engineering standards. Then it could be spun into
10 something that this is below minimum standards. Am I on the right track?

11
12 Chair: Yes that's the point I wanted you to make and asks if Carol is dealing with this too.

13
14 Olson: yes.

15
16 Savage states that he doesn't think the Board realizes how flippant some of these
17 individuals can be and that he thinks it's because over time there has been more finger
18 shaking and less disciplinary action. That it's taking time but stepping in will definitely make
19 a difference.

20
21 Chair, Cliff has a question.

22
23 Baker asks about an email he sent John asking what kind of enforcement we have against
24 unlicensed practice, if there is anything our Board can do other than a cease and desist
25 letter or does it have to go through civil court.

26
27 Savage responds that there are many different types of unlicensed practice depending on
28 how you look at it. It could be someone practicing out of their area of expertise or someone
29 from out of state. For those out of state we go to their investigators and get pretty good
30 results. They may not be worried about Alaska but when it affects their home state it's
31 different.

32
33 Baker says he is referring to someone like a survey technician going out and doing
34 boundary surveys, setting corners and he has never been licensed.

35
36 Savage responds that he thinks we can take a stance and get action taken, probably like a
37 fine and an official order that they are not to do this again. If they did then it would be more
38 severe. It will depend on manpower and feasibility. Right now we can't get everything. We
39 have to concentrate on the most important things that effect public safety and that is going
40 to get the word out to people that we are taking action.

41
42 Chair asks if there are any further questions for John or Carol. Hearing none he expresses
43 the deepest sympathy of the Board regarding her personal tragedy and hopes that all is
44 going well for her.

45
46 Olson thanks the Chair.

47
48 Chair thanks Olson for her participation and Savage for all he does for the board and
49 assures him we will submit the letter today.

50
51 **Agenda item 7 – Correspondence Received**

52
53 a. Responses to General Licensure request for comment.
54 Brownfield says that he is very pleased with the response.

1
2 Baker states that he is jealous of all the response the engineers received and what little
3 response the surveyors received.

4
5 Lent asks Bo to share some of the conversation he had with the legislature regarding
6 General Licensure.

7
8 Chair: That should be covered under committee reports, we are presently on
9 correspondence.

10
11 **b.** Responses to Surveyor request for comment.

12
13 Chair states that we have received 19 responses which is about 4% of surveyors.

14
15 **c.** Email from Dale Nelson with 3 white papers attached.

16
17 Chair: He calls it a draft on Alterations of Documents. I think it's a final from Harley, and the
18 Specialty Contractors, I don't know if you want to go into that at this point or put it under
19 Incidental Practice under Special Committees.

20
21 Hightower says that what he thinks needs to be done is since all of these subjects are
22 intertwined we need to take a whole new look at that section on Incidental Practice instead
23 of sending through piece meal and asks Dan for his help.

24
25 Chair: We will make sure that is on the "to do" list under Dan and Harley's name.

26
27 **d.** Report from Pat Kalen on discussions at APDC luncheon.

28
29 Chair asks if any comments. Hearing none he proceeds.

30
31 **e.** Email from Ron Pearson regarding experience for dual licensure.

32
33 Chair: It's on the, to do list for Bo.

34
35 **f.** Note from John Cooper, PE regarding a request for a regulation project.

36
37 Chair, asks if Rearick would respond to this, maybe not a regulations change but something
38 in the Guidance Manual. This is good way to run things up the flag pole then if there is still
39 confusion move on to regulations project.

40
41 Baker points out that in several states they feel that reviewing a professional's plans is
42 professional practice and making comments without going through a professional is
43 unlicensed practice.

44
45 Chair asks Baker to collaborate with Rearick on a response.

46
47 **g.** Email from Davy McDowell regarding NCEES Bylaws.

48
49 Chair asks for comments, hears none. Sees this as an informational thing and ask if
50 someone will look at this for the National meeting.

51
52 Walsh will take a look at it.

53
54 Shiesl: Who's Bylaws?

1
2 Chair explains that they are NCEES Bylaws and they ask each board for input. He remarks
3 that Shiesl needs to go to the Denver meeting.
4

5 **h. Email from Dave Curtis regarding NCEES Western Zone**
6

7 Chair identifies him as the secretary/treasurer for Western Zone and asks if any comments.
8 Hearing none he continues, explaining that he will be attending this meeting and ask Board
9 to nominate Gilbert Chavez as VP of Western Zone.
10

11 Fredeen adds that this position is a stepping stone to the President later on.
12

13 Chair asks for a motion to endorse the nominate Gilbert Chavez as VP of Western Zone.
14

15 **On a motion duly made by Baker, seconded by Walsh is was**
16

17 **RESOLVED to nominate Gilbert Chavez for the office of Vice President of Western**
18 **Zone of NCEES.**
19

20 Chair: It's been moved and seconded, is there any discussion?
21

22 Fredeen observes that we know Gilbert and he's good but seems kind of early to endorse
23 before any other names have been put forward.
24

25 Chair states that he has been to several meetings outside Western Zone and there is no
26 indication that anyone will object. Pat and Gilbert vied for the position previously and there
27 is an unwritten commitment that Gilbert would step in next.
28

29 Brownfield cautions against offering support before the whole field is known referring to a
30 previous situation where the Board voted to support an individual and then the delegates
31 wanted to change at the meeting and couldn't.
32

33 Fredeen suggests that whoever goes to the meeting discusses the candidates and comes to
34 a conclusion for the Board.
35

36 Chair: So you're giving proxy to who ever goes to the meeting? He continues that he will
37 take that under advisement and ask that motion be withdrawn.
38

39 Baker: I withdraw the motion.
40

41 Walsh notes that there were a couple pieces of correspondence under item 6 that were
42 skipped.
43

44 Brownfield explains an inquiry from the US Department of Labor regarding use of design
45 drawings and specification in Alaska. They were confused on what site adaption meant and
46 I had several conversations with them and ended up writing a letter and that they were
47 extremely happy with the service we provided.
48

49 Chair: Is there a 6 d?
50

51 Jones: 6 d is a response from NCEES regarding our request for out of state proctoring past
52 the October deadline and the answer was no.
53

54 Chair: That was based on an inquiry from?

1 Jones: Mr. Rodes.

2

3 Chair: And 6 e?

4

5 Jones: Is Harleys letter to Carla Williams.

6

7 Hightower: It hasn't gone out yet.

8

9 Jones: He ask several other people to review it and not all responded.

10

11 Chair asks Rearick if he had any comments on it.

12

13 Rearick agrees with the draft.

14

15 Chair: Put it in final form and have Harley sign and get it out.

16

17 0920 – 0928 Break

18

19 Chair: Lets go to old business.

20

21 **Agenda item 8 – Old Business**

22

23 a. Mail out regarding the industry standard on Mortgage Location Surveys.

24

25 Chair asks Leet if he wants to speak to this and then advises that he shouldn't. He further
26 states that we should probably drop this.

27

28 Jones says he checked with the AAG and she said there was no problem if the Board
29 wanted to put out a letter

30

31 Chair responds that he believes that the society is doing it and we should probably table it
32 until they have addressed it and if they are not successful we'll bring it off the table. On that
33 basis we'll table 8a indefinitely.

34

35 b. Licensing Environmental and Structural Engineers without requiring the civil
36 examination.

37

38 Brownfield: This is part of the General Licensure business. Structural and Environmental
39 engineers are always saying we need this. It crops up all the time. I think it's premature to
40 make a judgment at this time. It's in the big mix as a General Licensure item.

41

42 Chair: So it's an on-going item in committee and should probably be put there in the future
43 instead of where it is, ok Vern?

44

45 c. Landscape Architects and the Anchorage Muni requirements.

46

47 Lent, explains that the Muni of Anchorage had a regulation that required a Landscape
48 design be done by licensed Landscape Architects and this conflicted with our Statute. He
49 worked with the Muni to come up with language that was satisfactory to them and did not
50 conflict with the State Statute. It was provisionally adopted and they anticipate adoption
51 after final review this summer.

52

53 Brownfield asks if they are back in line yet.

54

1 Lent responds that they have been in line all along. They just haven't adopted the new
2 language. It's called the title 21 rewrite.

3
4 **d. Prohibited Practice exemptions.**

5
6 Chair asks Harley if he wants to deal with this later under committee reports.

7
8 Hightower: Yes.

9
10 **e. Memorandum to Jenny Strickler regarding fees.**

11
12 Chair explains that the reason for the memo was that fees were increased in a previous
13 cycle because of an accounting error and then when the error was caught during the sunset
14 process they were dramatically lowered and now when it comes to the next cycle they will
15 have to be raised again and we were advising the administration that we want to be in the
16 loop next time.

17
18 Lent withdraws his item dealing with landscape architect licensing requirements.

19
20 Chair: That finishes up old business. It's too early for the AAG so let's jump into Special
21 Committees.

22
23 **Agenda Item 10 – Special Committees**

24
25 **General Licensure**

26
27 Brownfield states that he doesn't have much more than he already reported on, the issue is
28 up and well and we are getting good comments. We closed comments on February 28th and
29 the committee will decide on recommendations to bring to the Board.

30
31 Chair suggests that it would be productive that we have what is required to make the
32 changes to regulation or statute by the May meeting. If a statute change is needed we will
33 need an early introduction and Bo did an excellent job of laying the groundwork for that
34 yesterday. I believe it will require a statute change and we need to get that to APDC and
35 the lobbyist as soon as possible.

36
37 Fredeen offers that it is too aggressive to write all the regulations for general registration in
38 one quarter.

39
40 Brownfield: We will give it a shot and as soon we have a schedule I'll let you know.

41
42 Leet points out that some of the comments indicate that not all licensees understand what
43 general licensure means.

44
45 Fredeen adds that he saw a lot of negativity in the comments and asks if there is going to be
46 a summarization table.

47
48 Eriksen says his take on the comments was that it was a pretty even split between pros and
49 cons. He also noted ideas presented in them that the committee hadn't thought of.

50
51 Brownfield says that he has gotten some fresh ideas and valuable feedback from the
52 comments. We also got feedback that's not valuable, the biggest one is, "we're big enough,
53 we don't want them in here", stay out of my turf, they may not say it in exactly those words
54 but that's what they mean". They are saying if you bring more people in here it's too

1 competitive". He adds "competition improves quality, in my view". So we are getting good
2 feedback, things that I hadn't thought of before and thought maybe, that is a consideration
3 and how can we still have general licensing and fix those problems? General Licensure
4 means a particular thing to a particular state and they're not all the same. In general they
5 are but there are many roads you can take and still achieve what we need to. We need to
6 look at it in detail and right now we are in the gathering part.

7
8 Walsh: We are giving the committee a task by May to write General Licensure regulations.
9 I think it more appropriate for the committee to bring recommendations to us, then we
10 decide if we want to go down that road or not.

11
12 Fredeen: That's kind of what I was getting at.

13
14 Jones: I've gone through the statutes and regulations and I don't think this going to be as
15 hard as you might think.

16
17 Fredeen: The big thing I'm most concerned about and I think the general public's going to
18 be worried about is the enforcement portion. That's going to take a lot of going through
19 other states and picking out the verbiage that works. Getting the license to be general is
20 one thing but the enforcement of it is a long arduous path of research.

21
22 Brownfield adds that the committee will try to make the timetable the chair wants but they
23 are not going to go so fast that they don't do a good job. And if it looks like they won't make
24 it he will communicate that and give some sort of schedule after speaking to the rest of the
25 committee. We will give it our best shot.

26
27 Rearick agrees with Dan and does not think we should have any presumption that General
28 Licensure is what we want to do or not. Even though we have received a lot of support one
29 way or the other we need to research the content. The committee should be coming forth
30 with an analysis of that content and an analysis of what's being done in other states so we
31 have a basis for deciding how we want to move forward.

32
33 Leet adds that we have done some analysis already and most states have gone to General
34 Licensure. He gives some history on how we got where we are now and adds that this
35 mostly affects the civil discipline more than anyone else. He thinks we are beyond research,
36 we know other disciplines want to develop and the committee should get their stuff together
37 for the May meeting and that's the time to discuss it. Not debate what the committee's
38 supposed to be debating, in this forum.

39
40 Rearick: I thought that was the point of Bo's letter to get comments from engineers. We
41 haven't reviewed that, we haven't commented on that yet.

42
43 Lent states that he didn't see anything from Norm Gutcher who of all people has a lot to say
44 on this subject, or Ted, and I suggest we contact these two people for their response.

45
46 Chair: This was sent out to all engineers so they had an opportunity to comment.

47
48 Brownfield: We need to be careful that we don't pick out certain people we like. Everybody
49 got the letter and had an opportunity to comment. I think it's unfair for us to pick and chose
50 who we want to listen to so I don't think we need to make a special effort more than what we
51 already have.

52
53 Baker says that he agrees with Bo. And as far as the surveyors lack of response I have
54 gone out to numerous local chapter meetings and told them that if they feel strongly about

1 something and don't respond they may end up with something they don't like. He adds that
2 if we end up not going with General Licensure we should look at adding some disciplines.
3 We can't just leave it the way it is. He then gives an example of the additional knowledge
4 required of an environmental engineer vs. a civil engineer.

5
6 Brownfield: This committee is going to look at it from no change, to partial change, to full
7 change. We need to do what's best for the state of Alaska and we will shoot for what the
8 chair wants us to do.

9
10 Chair: This was not intended to be an ultimatum. I think it imperative that you go to Denver
11 and that be your top issue. Bo does have that on his agenda and I would not expect the
12 final decision until November. If we don't start setting goals we will be through another
13 legislative cycle. As you know an environmental engineer came in here and testified 8 years
14 ago and was assured the Board would deal with this issue and we are being irresponsible in
15 our duties for not dealing with this in a timely manner. He adds that even though you've had
16 40 responses that's less than 1% and it's our duty to do what's right for the public's health,
17 safety and welfare. He then asks Rearick to be a member of the committee.

18 19 **As-Built/Record Drawings**

20
21 Chair: As built and record drawings, initially I gave some definitions to Harley for as built
22 surveys, can you speak to that?

23
24 Hightower states that we have talked about record drawings and as built drawings and that
25 we just need to get that in the Guidance Manual. He then asks what document the definition
26 of as built survey comes from.

27
28 Chair: It's ACSM NSPS uh, national society definitions. The important thing is to always put
29 the tag on the end. It's an as built survey or it's an as build drawing or a record drawing.
30 Those can be easily defined in our Guidance Manual. I recommend that the as built survey
31 be added to the Guidance Manual Bert. Harley will provide those to you. He then explains
32 that the ALTA-ACSM surveys don't use the as-built term, but if we distinguish between as
33 built drawings and as built surveys that should answer all our questions.

34
35 Hightower says that he had defined them wrong that the term "as-built drawings" is now
36 called "record drawings" and that we will have two definitions, one will be as built drawings
37 and the other as built surveys.

38
39 Chair: Does that make that committee go away then?

40
41 Hightower: Yes.

42 43 **Incidental Practice/Specialty Contractor**

44
45 Chair: Incidental Practice/Specialty Contractor Harley are you ready.

46
47 Hightower: Yes. Basically, the subjects of Incidental Practice, Site Adaptation, Exemptions
48 and Field Alterations, all of those sort of needed cleaning up together. I was asked to do a
49 position paper so we could start moving this along and get the Statutes and Regulations
50 changed. Dan sent this letter regarding Exemptions and that whole area has some
51 ambiguities and on my to do list was to respond to Dan's letter and I did that but didn't have
52 time to do what I recommended., it will take a new look at that whole section. I'll do that and
53 ask Dan to review it.

1 Brownfield then explains his and Eric's work on the issue of traffic lighting with DOT and
2 offers to share his views on this with Harley.

3
4 Hightower adds that he thinks there are many other areas in the Statutes where similar
5 cleanup is needed. He thinks that some areas were put together without a lot of thought
6 and we are seeing some unintended consequences and different interpretations.

7
8 Chair: As a follow-up. A Statute change regarding Alteration of Field Drawings, APDC
9 lobbyist John Walsh has indicated that the regulation change was adequate and until he and
10 APDC see that those are ineffective then that's the time to push for a Statute change. I
11 didn't have a strong argument because I don't have examples of Municipalities violating that
12 regulation so we need to decide if we want to move forward with that Statute change.

13
14 Hightower: So right now it isn't moving forward? Chair, no.

15
16 Hightower: That's good because I may need to look at it again as a result of what I'm doing
17 now.

18
19 Chair: It may come into play in the next session but it's not on anyone's agenda.

20 21 **Licensure Mobility**

22
23 Walsh: I've been too busy to get anything together.

24
25 Chair: Your involvement and participation in the last four months has been stellar so I have
26 no complaints. I believe it's an ongoing issue but it can be held in abeyance while we deal
27 with this General Licensure.

28
29 Brownfield: I haven't done anything because of this other load I have but Dan's done a lot.
30 We'll get together and compare notes.

31
32 Chair: I would rather you didn't do anything at all and just focus on General Licensure.

33
34 Brownfield: Why doesn't Dan take over as chair?

35
36 Walsh: That's fine, want to stay on the committee?

37
38 Brownfield: Sure.

39
40 Rearick: NCARB is struggling with that as well, I don't know if there is anything at the
41 Western Zone Conference but if there is I'll pay attention and at the National Conference as
42 well.

43
44 Chair adds that there've been threats from a legislator that if we don't deal with it the
45 legislature will.

46
47 Baker points out that General Licensure will address Mobility as well so we are dealing with
48 it.

49
50 Eriksen volunteers to be on the committee.

51
52 Chair advises the board that Mark Morris has said he would apply in Canada and be our test
53 case so I would appreciate if, on your to do list you would contact Mark and see what the
54 progress is.

1
2 **Mining Engineers/Geologists**
3

4 Walsh: Vern just last week sent out this packet of information that was handed out, 10 E. I
5 encourage particularly the civils to look through this as its most directed at them. He goes
6 on to explain that last meeting he had commented that he expected future licensing by this
7 board would impact the civils the most and from the looks of this information that was right
8 on. He continues, I would like some feedback from civils on this, I looked at their incidental
9 practice matrix and was surprised that geologists compared to civil or geotechnical
10 engineers. The cover letter is from Dave Stanley the chief engineering geologist with DOT,
11 he just says this is worth looking at regarding geologists and we should look at what other
12 states do and not rush into anything. Most importantly with regard to general licensure and
13 disciplines, item two, he starts to break down the different categories of geologists so if we
14 went down this avenue of regulating geologists we would be into the same problem we are
15 trying to address with NCEES and engineers, there are at least half a dozen categories,
16 maybe more. As Richard said this is way down the road and I think it shouldn't be a high
17 priority except in the regulatory realm of this Board but it is something we need to think
18 about because geologists are being certified and they think that certification allows them to
19 practice.
20

21 Chair: Any questions?
22

23 Walsh: We were talking about exemptions and I just want to throw this out and I don't want
24 to be critical or judgmental of Mr. Stanley but we see what these exemptions are and how
25 unclear they might be. Here he uses the title Chief Engineering Geologist. Now that would
26 be prohibited by our regulations because he's not a licensed engineer, he doesn't have the
27 right to use engineer in any way in connection with his name. But he probably does so
28 because he's unaware of the regulation or he's using one of the exemptions because he
29 works for the State he's exempt. Does that exemption actually entitle him to do that?
30

31 Brownfield: No I don't think he's exempt if he works for the State, he's exempt if he works
32 for the Federal Government on projects that they have on land that they own but I don't think
33 that carries forward to the State.
34

35 Hightower: Under these exemptions it could. There are a lot of ways you can interpret this
36 and it's ambiguous enough that we need to clean it up.
37

38 Chair: This is probably one of those you need to keep documents as this progresses along
39 to make sense of all of it. Based on what you just said Dan there should be a civil engineer
40 on the committee.
41

42 Walsh agrees, and Chair then adds Brownfield to the committee.
43

44 **Land Surveyor Education Committee**
45

46 Baker explains that he has taken the letter responses and put them in a spread sheet which
47 shows quite a bit of support for a degree of either 2 or 4 years. He notes that a few of them
48 still favor an avenue to licensure by experience in excess of what the Statute allows and
49 would require a Statute change. He states that while not receiving near the response the
50 engineers did. In discussions he has had at various chapter meetings and at least twice at
51 annual meetings, the percentages follow the general trend and that we will continue to
52 accept comments for another 6 months. He will continue to make presentations at
53 meetings. He has received comments in person from individuals that said they favored the
54 4 years but didn't want to write a response. He advised them that the vociferous minority

1 will impact the majority and if they don't say anything they have no one to blame but
2 themselves. I'm still receiving letters and I'm not making a recommendation at this time, I
3 want to give it a full year like we said we would.

4
5 Chair: Are there any other comments? Since I'm on that committee also I would add that
6 this is only a 4 % response to a mail out and even the response the engineers received was
7 low. I'm not going to be persuaded one way or the other by 4% of the registrants, I'll listen
8 to everyone and those are not high enough numbers to make a determination.

9
10 Eriksen states that the same thought was going through his head as he was looking at the
11 table. The ideas and discussion generated was more valuable than the quantitative analysis.

12
13 Chair: It's not a democratic thing and we are not going to look at it in that vein.

14
15 Baker adds that there are some possibilities out there for doing something like x-ray
16 technicians and radiologists and electrical engineers and electricians where we have
17 professional surveyors and then you have certified technicians that are allowed to do certain
18 things. It's another issue but I know a number of surveyors that are happy where they are at
19 and have been practicing for 20 years and never wanted to pursue the professional side of it
20 and yet they want to have that recognition and do mortgage surveys

21
22 Leet advises to be wary of the 2 tiered system. He thinks you will find that a lot of electrical
23 and mechanical contractors are practicing electrical and mechanical engineering. As for the
24 low response, consider how many people actually voted in the last election. What you get is
25 maybe a statistical average. I'm not a statistician but I do know that Gallup polls don't poll
26 100% of the population. What we've done is poll everyone and gotten a certain response. I
27 think the thing is to gather the information you get but ultimately the board sees stuff that the
28 people who respond don't. They're not here on Thursday afternoon when the files are
29 reviewed.

30
31 Chair: You're exactly right.

32
33 Leet: I hear time and again from my surveyors that they want experience over education and
34 I think you need to consider that.

35
36 Baker reminds the board that they are here to protect the public not to protect their individual
37 professions and while the registrants may be against what the board does, we are here to
38 protect the public not our various professions. It's hard sometimes to get this across to the
39 body you are a part of, that you are not here to stress their needs you are her to protect the
40 public.

41
42 Brownfield concurs with Baker and adds that the key to making his mind up is not that 80%
43 want something it's what is in the best interest of the State of Alaska.

44
45 Chair: The only thing I would add to that is we have not made a final decision. I cannot
46 speak for the rest of the board. I have an opinion and a lot of facts and I'll share those as
47 time permits but again at this point we are still in the fact and information gathering stage.
48 And to speak to Chuck's information, absolutely the best mentor I had in becoming a
49 surveyor has zero schooling in surveying and I consider him one of the best surveyors I've
50 ever been around. And the best surveyor I've ever been around, his name is Neil Eklund,
51 he's up in Fairbanks, he has zero schooling in surveying academically but he is without a
52 doubt the best surveyor I've been around. So education is not the only thing that a person
53 should be measured by. I just wanted to state that for the record. I won't state any names
54 but the best architect I know did not graduate and I would put him up against anyone in the

1 State of Alaska.

2
3 **Agenda item 9 – Regulation Update.**

4
5 For the record we will now go to item 9a. Please note Gayle Horetski has entered the room
6 and I welcome her to our meeting and I appreciate you taking the time to meet with us.

7
8 Horetski thanks the Chair and introduces herself to the board and explains her position and
9 how the AG's office supports the Board. She then delves into her first topic which is a
10 memo from Walsh to Jones asking for clarification on Exemption 08.48.331 (a)(9). She then
11 explains that 8.48.331 is a laundry list of exemptions that have come in over time some
12 more recently than others. This Statute was originally adopted in 1972 and has been
13 amended 8-9 times most recently in 2008. She then reads the exemption, which exempts a
14 person employed by a post secondary institution to teach engineering and states that the
15 lead in wording in the Statute is "this chapter does not apply to" so the question is, could he
16 practice another discipline without violating the Statute. She then reads from the memo and
17 asks if Mr. Walsh is present.

18
19 Walsh answers yes and points out that this is just an example that there are many of the
20 exemptions that raise questions.

21
22 Horetski: When the courts look at statutes including exemptions the purpose is to follow the
23 Legislature's intent, to do what the Legislature intended when the exemption was adopted.
24 So in Alaska the legislative intent is the guiding light. So I am happy to reassure you
25 gentlemen that the exemptions listed here would be interpreted by the court in a common
26 sense, not literal, point of view with intent to basically do what the Legislature wanted when
27 they adopted it. She then passes out an example of a case that upholds her explanation of
28 how the court looks at these things.

29
30 So even though in a literal sense, and I agree with you on that, it says section 08.48 doesn't
31 apply to someone employed by a post secondary institution I can assure you that, that is not
32 how it will be interpreted by the court. They are only exempt in that role and that activity,
33 which is teaching.

34
35 Walsh: That was an extreme example of what we are dealing with. Our problem is working
36 with our enforcement people, trying to define what that exemption really applies to. There's
37 no clarity here for us to make the decisions. It could be decided in court but we don't have
38 the clarity to make those decisions.

39
40 Horetski: You have to look at each exception and you have to see what is described there.
41 And then the analysis is that the person in that role doing that particular work, that that role
42 and that work does not constitute violation of this chapter. They are not authorized to do
43 anything they want to. The investigators can't go after them if they fall within the exemption.

44
45 Hightower: One particular exemption is 7, the problem is that electrical and mechanical
46 administrators are preparing engineering drawings and constructing with those and if I'm not
47 mistaken even the Fire Marshall's office interprets this that they can do that. I think I know
48 what the intent of this was and it's not to allow them to practice mechanical and electrical
49 engineering but that's what they're doing. Please comment.

50
51 Horetski reads the exemption and comments that electrical and mechanical administrators
52 are licensed also and that they are allowed to do things that fall within their license even if it
53 overlaps with another license.

1 Hightower: That isn't overlapping, it's replacing.

2

3 A lengthy discussion followed between Hightower, Horetski, Brownfield, Fredeen and
4 Eriksen.

5

6 Chair intercedes and asks the Board to get back on track and points out that the AAG was
7 not prepared to address specialty contractors.

8

9 Horetski explains how the work load in the AG's office is split up with the regulations and
10 legislative part done in Juneau and the majority of disciplinary cases handled in the
11 Anchorage office. She adds that the investigators in Anchorage that are handling our
12 cases/complaints are advised by Karen Hawkins and if they have a question about how this
13 exemption interacts with a certain statute they should be asking the attorneys in the
14 Anchorage office who can do legal research and can say this exemption came about in
15 1975 and this is the scope of work that can be done under it. She cautions that there are
16 places where the same work can be done by several different licenses and then goes into
17 exemptions 13 and 14 and how they came about to further clear up conflicts with the public
18 safety statutes regarding what the fire marshal can do and suggests that maybe more
19 clarification is needed in these other exemptions regarding construction contractors so
20 everyone knows what they can and can't do.

21

22 Baker goes back to number 9 and states if I read this with common sense it means that a
23 person can teach engineering but can't go out in public and practice it.

24

25 Horetski: That is correct if they are teaching, they are not violating 08.48.

26

27 Walsh: What if we had an individual teaching engineering but they had no training in
28 engineering.

29

30 Horetski asks, then what are they doing teaching engineering and what's wrong with the
31 University.

32

33 Walsh: But would that violate the statute?

34

35 Horetski: No.

36

37 Chair: Gail you've answered my questions very well.

38

39 Horetski: Could I just say, you have a general statute that says you can't practice
40 engineering without a license and then you have a special statute with a list of 14 things that
41 says notwithstanding what we've just said these people can do the following things. So,
42 you have a general rule and then you have an exception to the general rule, there's no
43 conflict there, there's an exception to the general rule. Teaching is a practice but there is an
44 exception that applies, so that teacher is not violating the statute.

45

46 Fredeen asks if there is some other record when a statute is adopted that outlines the intent
47 for the bases of the statute.

48

49 Horetski: Yes that's a very good question. The farther back you go the scantier the records
50 are and the more difficult they are to access. But the records that do exist are here in the
51 Legislative Reference Library. But for the newer records they're more comprehensive and
52 are online. You can go to your computer and look up 1992 and what you'll find when you do
53 that is the minutes of the Legislative Committee that considered the bill so you can print
54 them and read them and see what the witness' said about why the changes were needed

1 and why they would be good and you can look at the questions that the Legislators asked in
2 that meeting, often very helpful in that they will say, well will this effective what hospitals can
3 do blah, blah, blah... and the answer is no hospitals can do... so later on when the
4 question, what can hospitals do, comes up you can see what the intent was and you can
5 also see amendments that were made to the bill and by who and why they thought the
6 language change was needed. If it was a Governors bill you get the cover letter that went
7 over with it with an analysis of what the bill does and the AG's letter to the Governor
8 reviewing the bill and saying this is what it does and sometimes it will say this is a piece of
9 junk and you should veto it. So, there is a wealth of information available to the court or to
10 anyone to say that the Legislature meant to accomplish this goal.

11
12 Chair: Thank you, there was another item?

13
14 Horetski: I think the other project was, Mr. Chairman, that you ask me to go through your
15 Board Bylaws and identify what should be removed and to review a publication of your
16 Board Policy & Historical Information. She then hands out copies of the documents with the
17 items crossed out that she thinks are not needed and explains each one and why it isn't
18 needed and/or shouldn't be in the Bylaws.

19
20 Horetski then goes into the Policies and Historical Information and notes that there are large
21 portion already in regulation and asks if the Chair wants to go through them line by line.

22
23 Brownfield: As Vice Chair, I think we have enough to chew on, no need to go through line by
24 line, your notes are well organized.

25
26 Horetski: The ones I marked are the ones that you need to add to regulation if you want
27 them to be enforceable. Policies are not enforceable.

28
29 Chair: Thank you Gail we will be getting back to you on all of this.

30
31 Horetski: If it doesn't work out call me, and I'll help.

32
33 Chair: States that he must leave for a luncheon with the deputy commissioner regarding
34 board travel and turns the meeting over to the Vice Chair at 11:40 a.m.

35
36 **Agenda Item 15 – New Business**

37
38 **a. Amendments to NCEES Bylaws.**

39
40 Brownfield asks everyone to read the document and then he will take comments.

41
42 Walsh says that we have already discussed this and he agreed to read it and report back.

43
44 Brownfield: You'll be at the meeting, correct? We are not bound to these but we try to follow
45 them if they fit Alaska's needs.

46
47 Walsh: Yes I'll be at the meeting and that was under 7 g., correspondence, and at that point
48 I said I would read and get up to speed.

49
50 Brownfield: Ok, we'll leave it in your capable hands.

51
52 **b. Building Information Modeling (BIM)**

53
54 Rearick: I was covering that. I did a little research through NCARB and also through NCEES

1 just to see how they are handling it and basically both organizations, are taking the position
2 that they should let industry lead and see where they go with it before we start messing with
3 regulation. Both are following it and I know that NCARB will be discussing it continually at
4 both national and regional meetings and I think it's on the agenda at an NCEES upcoming
5 meeting too. There is nothing for us to do to respond to this yet because industry has not
6 moved in a clear direction.

7
8 Brownfield: So we let them take the lead and keep in touch?

9
10 Rearick: Yes, as we attend national meetings just pay attention to the issue and follow it and
11 I'll continue to monitor with respect to NCARB.

12
13 c. NCEES Reports.

14
15 Baker: Mine is going to come from the Law Enforcement committee meeting I went to a
16 couple weeks ago. I would like to get on a computer during lunch and get some of my
17 material and give it right after lunch.

18
19 Brownfield: We have public comment right after lunch so between that and executive
20 session you can do your report.

21
22 Fredeen: I attended two task force meetings for the Engineering Education Task Force in
23 Phoenix and Dallas. There were a couple of things we were asked to do. One is to put
24 together some 1 page briefs for various groups such as the legislature, students, engineers,
25 different people that are trying to understand exactly what B+30 is and where we are. The
26 other larger one that we spend most of our time doing was looking for alternatives to B+30
27 or now what they are calling masters or equivalent, the MOE. There were two alternatives
28 that surfaced. One of them is called the Super B which is a Bachelor's degree with over 150
29 credits which include 70 credits of math and science. Of all the disciplines we looked at this
30 might apply to 5-10 programs in the entire country. That one is actually going to go forward
31 to the UPLG. I think it's going to be useless because in 10 years those are going to end up
32 being Masters Degrees. The other one is interesting, it's an ABET Bachelors Degree plus a
33 lot of these one week courses like NFPA or ASCE. Arctic Engineering is a one week course
34 worth 3.3 CEU's or something like that and allowing those as being equivalent to the credits,
35 because they are a more intensified knowledge transfer. That was the hard thing. They kept
36 getting caught up on an hour of class time and an hour of these courses. The numbers
37 aren't exact yet, it's about half of 30 credits but you have to have six years of experience,
38 not four and it is a mentored program something like the Canadians do or like IDP. It's a lot
39 of extra stuff but members of the committee didn't think that would fly at the member board
40 level. I'm hoping that member boards apply that better as an exact alternate to MOE. There
41 are two things that will show up later on, there is Model Law 20/20 which has B+30 in it and
42 there is also just Model Law which has recommended ways to get your PE license where
43 you've got ten years of experience or whatever and they won't get you the MLE but they are
44 accepted methodologies. So that's another debate that's going to come. This is an
45 equivalent alternative but is it on par with the MOE. That's where we are.

46
47 Lent: I stepped out of the room for a second and I had a committee report on the Guidance
48 Manual.

49
50 Brownfield: Go ahead.

51
52 Lent: Backing up to a number 9 item, the Bylaws, if you're going to have it in there let's call
53 it by the right name. Guidance Manual is what it's changed to, on page three they are still
54 calling it the Building Officials Manual. In item 10, I believe, or in one of your handouts you

1 have a Standing Committee Report for the Guidance Manual. Richard requested that we do
2 a formal report once a year as to the changes we would make and to suggest those
3 changes at the February meeting.

4
5 Walsh: Sorry to interrupt Bert, I just think that in light of what the AAG just did to our Bylaws
6 and Policies I suggest that she look through this and do exactly what she did with that
7 because, for example we have exemptions in here, she's going to strike all of this stuff and
8 say you can't have that in here because it's already in statute.

9
10 Lent: This is not regulatory, this is something you mail out to people who are responsible for
11 Building Departments and Planning Departments so they have something to refer to and yes
12 she should go through this and strike a bunch of things in here that probably are not
13 applicable. Your shaking your head no Craig.

14
15 Fredeen: That is an FAQ, nothing more. I personally took issue with this striking of
16 everything because by doing this you're requiring everyone to know and have readily
17 available the 18 regulations on the front and no one is going to read every word of those
18 statutes and regulations. So that book there is an FAQ and nothing more. If it's a matter of
19 her going through and making sure what's listed in there is up to date and is accurate with
20 what we currently have, that's fine.

21
22 Walsh: Do we even have the right to send this out? That's all I'm saying.

23
24 Shiesl: I agree with Dan.

25
26 Baker: I agree with both Bert and Craig. This is something I would think would be a stack
27 sitting there at the Building Officials office of various Municipalities so if someone comes in
28 with a project you say ok, here's where you need to go to look these things up, but we will
29 give you a brief description or synopsis of what they are. If you hand that to someone they're
30 not going to look all those things up.

31
32 Walsh: That's exactly my point Cliff, they're going to take this and say you've given me
33 guidance, it may not be appropriate guidance because I'm too lazy to look all that up myself.

34
35 Baker: we could put a disclaimer on the front. The lay person out there is not going to know
36 where to go for all that stuff if you take it out of this.

37
38 Rearick: I like the idea of this but I can see where the AG's office is coming from in respect
39 to basically we are reprinting statute and regulation and we may be in error even just in
40 typo's in the printing of this and therefore we are giving people the impression that this is the
41 statute or regulation. Maybe what we could do is have a Guidance Manual that references
42 the detailed statute or regulation number with the description of what it is. They would still
43 have to do their research to find it but at least it's a roadmap.

44
45 Brownfield: I sort of agree with everyone except for the fact that what Craig says is true if
46 we do away with that without some sort of reference we are right back where we started. It
47 seems like there is a way we, in this little organization, can have some guidelines
48 somewhere. I don't care what you call them, if they don't like the word Bylaws, and I
49 understand that but somewhere, where we have a ready reference and we can look things
50 up. It becomes more efficient during meetings and when we are sitting back doing this stuff
51 ourselves. I reject this attitude that if it's in regulation it can't be anywhere else.

52
53 Walsh: I can see people saying the same thing about professional engineering, architecture
54 and land surveying, it's too complicated I'll just do it myself, and that's kind of where we are.

1 This is her field, she's the expert, and we ought to at least ask her advice.
2
3 Rearick: Often on information pamphlets or public information type bulletins where they cite
4 statute, regulation or law they will have a disclaimer directing to the actual law and saying
5 the law takes precedence over this. Maybe doing something like that up front would help
6 our case and the other thing I wanted to say is that the FAQ, it seems like the Board should
7 be able to make some interpretation on the regulations as a Board because we are
8 enforcing them. Without changing statute or regulation, it's just our interpretation of them as
9 a body. I don't know that the AG's office seems to want us to do that or not but as a Board it
10 seems like we have to. Where we do have FAQ in this Manual I think anytime we can cite a
11 regulation or statute, we should.
12
13 Shiesl: After looking at what she did to the Bylaws, I'm a little gun shy but I agree with Dan
14 that she needs to vet this and if it comes back with one page instead of 15 pages then we
15 need to start arguing with her.
16
17 Fredeen: I'm always weary of asking a question that I might not like the answer. I think this
18 is a situation that if we give this to her it needs to be direct guidance. To me, if we give this
19 to her it's more of a back check to see if they are up to date.
20
21 Eriksen: I got the sense that she was concerned with what we were calling these things. As
22 soon as we put the word Bylaw in the Bylaw document, that's where the red flag went up for
23 her. Maybe Guidance manual is not the red flag, maybe we could ask her for advisement
24 on what we are trying to accomplish and ask her what we should call it, not so much what
25 the content is.
26
27 Lent: I would be happy to sit down with her and explain the intent of this and how it's to be
28 used by building department employees and by people who do construction inspection. And
29 that this is an easy reference guide for them to find out where to look up the regulations.
30
31 Brownfield asks if he has gotten any feedback from the public.
32
33 Lent: I am not the one who distributes it so I would have to defer to Vern.
34
35 Jones: No, no feedback.
36
37 Brownfield: Who is it distributed to?
38
39 Jones: It's on the web site.
40
41 Walsh: I was wondering how many policies we have that she said must be in regulation that
42 might be incorporated in this?
43
44 Shiesl: You're not going to get any feedback from the public on something like this unless
45 you stop distributing it.
46
47 Brownfield: It should have a purpose and be used. If not, then maybe we have the wrong
48 document.
49
50 Shiesl: The Municipality has this and was paying to make copies and we couldn't keep up
51 with the demand. On the internet, how can you tell, unless you look at the hits.
52
53 Jones: We might be able to do that, I think people do use it. I haven't got any feedback on
54 whether it's good or bad but have been asked if there is a more up to date copy available.

1
2 Fredeen: This is a document that's been around longer than I've been on the board. And
3 I'm kind of weary of dropping something that's been around so long. It's also a way to
4 transfer information on to the next people. There has to be some way to do that and I don't
5 think everything has to be in regulation.

6
7 Brownfield: You remember we had a questionnaire we called a jurisprudence exam. We
8 called it an exam and she said no, you can't have an exam, so we called it a questionnaire
9 and that solved the problem. It's still with us so if we decide it's important enough and its
10 used enough then we couch it so that it satisfies the AAG's requirements. We are at the
11 end of this conversation and we are not ready to drop it but we still have a lot of questions.
12 Don if I were in your shoes I would want to drop it also.

13
14 Shiesl: Are you talking about the Bylaws. I'll come up with a two pager. I'll take what she
15 wrote and revise it into a final and send it to Vern.

16
17 Fredeen maybe we could include all these references in there. Maybe put the title, and then
18 the statute or regulation, so we know where to look for it. This is a good roadmap for us.

19
20 Brownfield: Are there any comments on that suggestion?

21
22 Lent: This started out as a committee report from me and I'd like to continue that when we
23 come back.

24
25 Brownfield: For you Don, what Craig mentioned is a good idea. Rather than verbiage, put a
26 title and the statute or regulation that covers it, plus a disclaimer in case of change, which is
27 common practice and bring it back to us at the next meeting? It is now ten after and we
28 have to be back in our chairs at 1:15 for public comment. Bert we will take up after and you
29 will be number two because Cliff was not ready we will take it up after public comment and
30 before executive session.

31
32 Baker: I can do mine in the morning.

33
34 Brownfield: Ok you do it first thing in the morning and Bert we will pick up yours between
35 item 11 and 12 before executive session and after public comment.

36
37 Lets break for lunch and be back in our seats and read to go for public comment at 1:15.

38
39 Lunch break 12:12 to 1:15.

40
41 **Agenda item 11 – Public Comment**

42
43 Chair: We are not here to debate things. We're here to take public comment. If we have
44 enough time we may ask some questions but any kind of oral testimony that's being
45 provided, I urge you strongly to submit written comments. We have someone signed up
46 that is in Anchorage and we will be dialing him. Again we have a three minute time limit for
47 each person.

48
49 Note: Called Anchorage, Mr. Ayers was not available for comment.

50
51 Chair: please take a seat down at the end and state your name for the record and proceed
52 with your testimony and thank all of you for coming.

53
54 Mr. Imbsen: My name is George Imbsen, I live in Douglas and have been working for DOT

1 in our Bridge Design Office since 1976 and I'm here representing myself. I'm here to give
2 verbal comments in response to your letter regarding a General Engineer license. While
3 this was the main question I began to focus on while reading the first page of your letter. I
4 began to realize that the issue of fragmentation had to be addressed also. This became
5 apparent after reading the bulleted items on the second page. And it is with fragmentation
6 that I will begin to opine my support for General Licensure.

7
8 Last year while you held your meeting in Juneau, I testified during the public comment
9 period against carving out a portion of the civil engineering discipline and adding a structural
10 license. I gave my arguments against the structural license.

11
12 If you start to fragment the licenses to satisfy various lobbying efforts it seems to me you will
13 open the door to more and more fragmentation. The curricula of higher learning institutions
14 are becoming more specialized and more pressure for fragmentation will inevitably follow.
15 Going down this fragmentation route the Board will be creating more turf wars. You will
16 have to draw more lines to define areas of authority. Will I have to defend the civil
17 engineering turf from mechanical engineers because a bridge has more than a specified
18 amount of movement? I believe the fragmentation route is the wrong way to go.

19
20 I understand that the Board has to consider the testimony of engineers not now covered by
21 the six disciplines recognized here and also address the need for public safety. Creating
22 more disciplines or adopting General Licensure will create more work for the Board. The
23 Board could just resist adding more disciplines, defend the status quo, and do nothing. But I
24 believe that in the long run the best solution is to adopt a General License. This may be
25 why about eighty percent of the States have done this.

26
27 I believe the Board can more easily address the fragmentation pressures by working within
28 the structure of General Licensure. I do not believe that General Licensure will require
29 significantly more oversight or enforcement. In fact if we, the practicing professional
30 architects, engineers and land surveyors, adhere to the Statutes guiding our behavior, I
31 don't believe there should be any more oversight or enforcement. We should all be
32 practicing within the limits of our expertise.

33
34 Thank you for your attention and your work on this issue.

35
36 Chair: Very refreshing, thank you very much. Are there any Questions?

37
38 Baker: I would like to make a recommendation, that you submit what you read there.

39
40 Mr. Imbsen: I will.

41
42 Brownfield: John, you and I worked together for a long time. I was one of those guys you
43 guys were talking to down here a year ago, I'm glad that you have a refreshed position
44 because I agree with you wholeheartedly.

45
46 Chair: Thank you, I don't know who was the next person signed up, Pat or Tim?

47
48 Mr. Kalen: For the record my name is Patrick Kalen, you've heard from me before on the
49 issue of education. I do know that ASPLS appointed an education committee to study it and
50 the education committee presented ideas to the chapters. I can tell you what I saw at both
51 Anchorage Chapter meetings and Fairbanks chapter meetings that there was no support for
52 taking the engineers out of the table. The education committee came up with various
53 options of tables and one of the options was to look at more experience and that's where the
54 idea arose about repealing the statute because you have an 8 year limitation in Statute that

1 makes it impossible to do that even though that was the initial idea. The Education
2 Committee presented their study at the Survey and Mapping Conference last year and then
3 they thought they were getting to present it to you at the May meeting in Fairbanks and
4 there is a little bit of heartburn over having a bunch of surveyors come to the meeting only to
5 find that the regulation was adopted before the public meeting even began and there is
6 going to be problems with that sequence because there is some people that didn't like it.
7 The ASPLS is heading in that direction, you'll hear from Tim about it, he's turning the gavel
8 over to Ken Ayers in a couple of weeks and Ken is very interested in this subject and I hope
9 you will figure out how to listen to what he has to say. A lot of what he has says is actually
10 well grounded in opinions from the surveying and mapping community. Some of us think
11 that the removal of the engineers from the table is not really so much of a, what do you call
12 it, public interest deal, uh, serving a public need, but it looked like a turf deal trying to guide
13 people, to force people to go to the Geomatics college. It affected lot of people who were in
14 the mill who would have presented two years of engineering experience and now can't
15 because it's just gone. And that's about all I have to say and I hope you learn to work with
16 ASPLS as we move on. I'll answer any questions you might have. I remain of the opinion
17 that you need to look at that Statute before you take anything off the table.

18
19 Chair: Thank you Patrick, are there any questions? Thank you Patrick. Tim Sprout,
20 representing ASPLS. Just for the record Ken Ayres had requested to give public testimony
21 and we called him and he advised he was unavailable. I wanted to interject that, you two
22 were out of the room when we attempted to contact him.

23
24 Mr. Sprout: I'm Tim Sprout, I'm outgoing President of ASPLS. I want to clarify one thing
25 that the Education Committee was not addressing removal of the engineering requirement
26 from the table. The ASPLS Education Committee was drafting a concept of requiring a four
27 year degree. Because the Education Committee was directed by the Board of ASPLS to
28 draft an education table requiring a four year degree and the engineering issue was not
29 addressed, as far as I know, by that committee. As part of our compromise the Education
30 Committee did draft an alternate version of allowing a two year education requirement if they
31 increased experience and that's what the repeal of Statute AS 08.48.171 is involved. To
32 repeal, the limitation on allowable work experience for surveyors. I personally think that's a
33 pretty good compromise and I support that. Overall as a society I've been hearing
34 grumblings of dissatisfaction and real hesitancy to support this Statute change because they
35 don't want to modify the tables because they feel like they're afraid of it, they're kind of gun
36 shy about that. I want to accept responsibility for not communicating to the membership
37 early enough about the removal of the engineering experience. I'm not quite sure how this
38 thing happened with this. I know that there was probably not enough discussion with the
39 membership about this modification removing the engineering experience from the table.
40 That's where our Society is right now, were in discussions now about how to move forward
41 and I hope that repeal of the Statute will move forward. But, there is no consensus at this
42 time on this issue. Thank you.

43
44 Chair: Thank you Tim, are there any questions? Thank you, Tim, very much for coming
45 all the way down here to testify before us. I do appreciate everything that you've said and
46 the issue specifically dealing with the engineering removal from the tables. It went through a
47 public hearing process, which was normal for this Board. It is regrettable that there has
48 been some misunderstanding, but hopefully as a Board member I will address that at your
49 annual meeting towards the end of February here and I'll stand up there and have all the
50 rotten vegetables thrown at me. That is not just your responsibility it is mine too. Point in
51 fact if you look at the written record there was a lot of information generated to everyone, not
52 just through you but everyone on the Board and they should of, uh, you don't have to take
53 responsibility for other Board members and their negligence.

1 Mr. Sprout: Thank you.

2
3 Chair: For the record state your name.

4
5 Mr. Squires: My name is John Squires. I'm sure the present Board's very familiar with my
6 name. I'm here speaking on behalf of Mr. Cooper who has written a very fine letter to you
7 concerning Building Officials doing engineering work. This arose from a problem I had. A
8 friend of mine got very sick and another engineer asked if I'd take over a project that he had
9 started. I looked at it and said this isn't going to take me any time and I ended up dealing
10 with Building Officials that wrote back emails to me that said we don't accept your
11 calculations. One place he asked me what the forces were acting on the shear of a screw.
12 And it was quite evident he didn't have the foggiest idea of the engineering involved. The
13 situation dragged on from May the first, until the middle of August. The Building Permit
14 wasn't issued until the middle of January. In fact I had called Mr. Cooper to come in and
15 help me with it and review what I had done to make sure I was doing everything correctly.
16 In speaking with some of the people in Anchorage, design professionals, they have
17 encountered similar problems in dealing with Building Officials that are untrained. In six
18 weeks you can become a plan reviewer. I think the point of a plan reviewer is to ask the
19 design professional "are you sure this is right" and drop it at that rather than to insist that you
20 engineer something the way he thinks it should be built. And that was the situation I was in.
21 He kept trying to impose his engineering on me rather than reviewing mine. I would like you
22 to consider this, discuss it and get it out there for further discussion by the rest of the
23 engineers in the State about reviewing by Building Officials.

24
25 Also, I had a case that went for a number of years. If the Board so chooses, I would like to
26 come in and talk to you about some changes that could be made so that we don't have that
27 sort of a situation come up for someone else. At your discretion, I live here in town and I
28 can come back and meet with you. Thank you very much for your time.

29
30 Chair: Do we have any questions from the Board? I would just make a couple of
31 comments. 1. We have assigned someone to the inquiry by Mr. Cooper and we'll be
32 responding to that as best as we can. Luckily we have someone here representing all
33 design professionals that might speak to this a little bit and what I would encourage you to
34 do, rather than anticipating some schedule of meeting with us on a one to one basis, I would
35 encourage you to submit something in writing. If you anticipate some kind of regulation
36 change the process would work a lot better if it was in writing and give us the contact
37 information and it'll be handled a lot easier that way, frankly, if that suits your thinking.

38
39 Mr. Squires: I was just putting it out there and offering.

40
41 Chair: We appreciate it very much and I have no qualms dealing with helping to make the
42 process a little more palatable. Please do submit something in writing to us in that vein.

43
44 We have Dale Nelson from APDC.

45
46 Mr. Nelson: For the record, Dale Nelson and representing APDC, Alaska Professional
47 Design Council. First of all I want to thank those that came down for our Legislative Fly-in.
48 We've had a light agenda but it's been very good, Richard, Bo, Bert thank you for touring the
49 halls with us and anybody else that may have been missed. First of all it has been a light
50 agenda, it's an election year, but we still have to keep ourselves in front of the Legislators
51 and make our presences known and we've done that well. One of the things that came up
52 last night is a point of clarification and it pertains to position papers. And this, when sent
53 forward, is communications. The last time I met with you I'd sent an email out with the white
54 papers out there. Communications is to, do we forward, do we wait, do you what? I

1 emailed them to Vern and also, Richard, you got a copy of them and they pertained to the
2 sealed drawings, the specialty contractor exemption and there was also in that attachment
3 to be submitted, the land surveyors tables for your degree.
4

5 Chair: No, there were three items.
6

7 Mr. Nelson: QBS is the one that is probably not on your, you probably received it but its
8 QBS it probably not something this Board, unless this Board wants to get involved with it.
9

10 Chair: We received correspondence from APDC on QBS, alterations of documents and
11 specialty contractor exemptions.
12

13 Mr. Nelson: there wasn't a third one on uh.
14

15 Chair: Fourth one, oh, on the eight year Statute change from a requirement of eight years
16 maximum experience and education.
17

18 Mr. Nelson: I think the point's made. We've got to get our communications clear. I'll step up
19 too, I didn't ask enough questions.
20

21 Chair: That paper was actually submitted by Pat and that is on record. We haven't dealt
22 with it as a Board yet, that particular issue, but it's nothing to do with the tables it's a Statute
23 change.
24

25 Mr. Nelson: So, I do have, uh, I don't want to take up a lot of time here. The point is that we
26 need clear communications and I'm part of the "we" as to which items to address and start
27 work toward that.
28

29 Chair: Eric is actually in charge of that committee and you should exchange phone numbers
30 and emails and he should be your point of contact on all of this and when things go awry we
31 can blame you two.
32

33 Mr. Nelson: Oh, good, you got to at least know where to go.
34

35 Chair: Is that it?
36

37 Mr. Nelson: No, I just need to clean this one up because it's out there and please note that,
38 and Vern for your record too, that earth link fell and it is the same account name but is now
39 gmail.com. Now may I get back to our presents here?
40

41 We didn't have anything in front of the Legislators, we talked about what was going on and
42 what we can support and one of them is the Governor's 100 million dollar deferred
43 maintenance bill that he has. We talked the Capitol but more specifically there's a bill that
44 Senator Jonny Ellis has got out there it's Senate bill 206 for 50 million dollars for an
45 engineering building at UAF and 50 million dollars at UAA and you know the APDC Board
46 passed that and it's part of the education getting to meet the staffing. So we've seen a lot of
47 people, we've got a lot of people yet to go meet. So, we will continue to do this and be here
48 for you if there is something we can pick up and Eric and I will talk to each other here to
49 keep this thing moving. In a nutshell that's it.
50

51 May I add one more thing? On the General Engineer, Bo, you asked me about it, I'm
52 looking for my sheet where I had marked up. I do know I had two primary things pertaining
53 to the General Engineer that was sent out. One is that, I'm not in favor but I know we're
54 going to go there. I mean it's just a fact of life, you look across all the other States, with that

1 said there's a Model Law and also the fact is that we can be as compatible as we possibly
2 can State to State. Don't make it difficult for ourselves, you are the one that will have to deal
3 with this.

4
5 Chair: Are there any questions? Bert.

6
7 Lent: I just wanted to thank you, Dale and John Walsh for working with us on our subject
8 matter here and hope you'll continue to do so.

9
10 Mr. Nelson: It's a pleasure. We even got the Governors attention this time around. He
11 invited us to lunch and we joined in with the AGC. So it was a good opportunity so we
12 continue to grow and when you guys have issues, we can bring it to his attention. And I
13 may speak to the Building Officials. You know some time back I made a comment about
14 your little booklet, it was out there, not this one, the guide and so forth, and what you're
15 experiencing I've experienced as well. I built my own home and I'm not a structural
16 engineer but my partner came in who is a structural engineer stamped it, he is a very
17 competent individual. Building departments have a hammer over your head, there's got to
18 be some way if it's stamped by a registered professional engineer, architect. That has to
19 mean something, but it doesn't seem to with some of the questions they ask, so if there's
20 some way we can join forces and work this issue.

21
22 Chair: We're hamstrung in that the complaint process actually has to go to our investigator.
23 It has to go through steps and procedures. It can't be brought before the Board first. I think
24 all the professionals deal with this. It gets rather complicated because they're holding, you
25 know, four of a kind in their hand because if you mess with them too much they're going to
26 jerk you around on the next project, so you start cow-towing to them and even though
27 they're not licensed they manipulate the system and it gets a little tricky to deal with. I think
28 what I would do, probably, is go the Society route first and see if you could get some local
29 chapter support on a letter head, it's just an option.

30
31 Baker: I would also like to make a recommendation. If you look at our Statutes, we just had
32 some of this pointed out, its 8.48.331 talks about exemptions. Number 13, page 8, number
33 13, if you could look at that and come up with some support to help us deal with that,
34 Richard Rearick and I were going through it. It basically says that an intern can review your
35 stuff. They don't have to be licensed.

36
37 Mr. Nelson: I'm shaking my head. Ouch!

38
39 Chair: But there's a sense of, I think that's where I would go the Society route first.

40
41 Baker: That's what I'm saying if they could take a look at that and come up with some way
42 to address it. I'm on the NCEES National Law Enforcement Committee and this actually
43 came out at this last meeting two weeks ago that a number of States will not allow any
44 Building Official or Government Official to review plans without having a professional
45 licensee on their staff.

46
47 Mr. Nelson: Wow, I'll bring this to the Board meeting and get something started on this.

48
49 Chair: If you go the right route, recommendation, again you have to go through, the first
50 thing you have to bring up is some kind of position paper and you have to base on actual
51 factual encounters that you've had that have caused problems and his is a good example.

52
53 Lent: Just in the way of a question. You started to refer to this in your conversation and I
54 was wondering if you had any guidance for us or thoughts on this regarding your experience

1 with it?

2

3 Mr. Nelson: Yes, but it's at the office are you the point of contact?

4

5 Lent: I'm in charge of the committee.

6

7 Chair: John you should look at that Guidance Manual too, it's on the web site. Finally, Dale
8 you were going to speak to, uh...

9

10 Mr. Nelson: ASCE? What it is, is a lot of discussion you've had with me & Bo's had with me
11 and it pertains to the, American Society of Civil Engineers, ASCE and putting on that hat, I
12 am a Governor for the American Society of Civil Engineers region eight and that represents
13 nine states and a section of California. But putting that aside is that the ASCE has been a bit
14 of a proponent of continuing education and it's also the uh, my point and direction here is to,
15 uh, there's been the Masters and the Masters plus thirty and really all I wanted to speak to
16 the Board is to really what is ASCE doing? You folks that go to NCEES, your vary familiar
17 with the intern, what's going on, you see ASCE there, we've got different representation
18 across the board and Craig has been going there a long time. My purpose here today is
19 that ASCE is talking to a lot of societies and I've got a list, I can just read through them,
20 there are a lot of them, many of them have objected to what the ASCE is doing. There are
21 others that are supporting it. You pretty well know that because you've been there to
22 NCEES and the discussions. But, my point here, just to the Board is the Masters keeps
23 sticking in people's minds. I am a large proponent of continuing education as you have it
24 for re-licensing and so forth, it's just part of our business. The other part of it is that I'm on
25 the advisory Boards for Washington State University at the Department of Civil and
26 Environmental Engineering. We have a large need for engineering. My son just went
27 through here and graduated a couple years ago. He's a structural engineer in the Seattle
28 area. That's kind of my back drop why I see the education stands out there. So, if I may
29 walk through this there are two steps.

30

31 One is the engineer intern and it's a Bachelors, ABET plus the FE exam to be that engineer
32 intern. Or, it's the Bachelors plus a Masters, ABET plus an FE exam. In other words the B
33 here is not an ABET Bachelors in engineering but is a Bachelors in some related field, that
34 they can get into a Masters program and get a Masters degree in engineering that Boards
35 like yourself here will recognize and they can take this FE exam. So that's the FE part of it.

36

37 Now the next step is setting for the PE, professional engineers exam and again we will see,
38 if you can keep in mind the Bachelors as an ABET, a Bachelors plus a Masters to get the
39 engineering intern. Now to get the check off to take the PE exam it would be the EI plus a
40 Masters in engineering plus experience. Experience is going to be a common thread
41 through all of these. Then the second one is a Masters, ABET plus experience or again if
42 you have the Bachelors plus a Masters, ABET and 30 plus the experience. So, it's really not
43 a Masters program and you hear Masters through there but that is an individual's choice.
44 So the thing is you look down through here it's always an ABET is the thing you look for and
45 then the experience. So, it's on these two sheets and all I'm trying to do, and I've probably
46 confused you more is the fact that it isn't a Masters plus thirty it is the Bachelors, Masters
47 you can have a Masters with or without ABET you can have a Masters with no thirty hours
48 plus experience. So, a weave through as how you get hours plus the experience to get your
49 permission to sit for the PE. Masters is in there but it isn't the primary thing.

50

51 Chair: Thank you, any questions?

52

53 Walsh: Just a quick comment, I'd love to discuss that with you in greater detail sometime.
54 The common thread you mentioned through there is ABET and my own personal comment

1 there is don't put too much weight on that. I think ABET is sometimes as much hindrance,
2 as a positive thing.

3
4 Chair: Any other questions? Thank you very much Dale for coming and taking the time out
5 of your fly-in schedule to speak with us.

6
7 Mr. Nelson: If you have questions you have my card.

8
9 Chair: if you have some kind of paper or something, a position paper about what you were
10 speaking, that would be great.

11
12 Mr. Nelson: Yes I will do that and put it on a chart so you can look at it.

13
14 Chair: For clarification for everybody this has been adopted on a national level?

15
16 Mr. Nelson: Yes, ASCE. Craig sat in on a lot of this and its part of that Model Law. And we
17 just talked about it, uh, the General Engineer, that's a Model Law and this is a Model Law.
18 It's a matter of your Board adopting, if you want to or not.

19
20 Chair: Thank you Dale. We don't have anyone else signed up so with that I'll close public
21 comment. Cliff?

22
23 Baker: I was going to make a motion to go into executive session.

24
25 Chair: A motion has been made, do I hear a second?

26
27 Brownfield: We have some unfinished business with Bert.

28
29 Baker: I withdraw the motion.

30
31 Lent: While you were gone we started, but got stopped very quickly on the annual report for
32 the Guidance Manual. I'll just talk briefly about that because a cloud has been placed over
33 this whole Manual. You, unfortunately, were not with us when this happened. Immediately
34 after I started to give this report, thought probably valid, was brought up that a lot of the
35 information in this Manual should, as a suggestion was made that it should be passed in
36 front of the Legal Department, and Gayle specifically, based on what occurred with your
37 other document this morning. So, I'll just mention that and then the rest of the fine Board
38 Members can decide what you want to do and how you want to proceed on that subject
39 matter.

40
41 Just to bring you up to date on what I've been doing and is in my report. You want to refer
42 to the annual Standing Committee report. The reason it's annual is because you, Richard,
43 felt that it should be reported once a year and then update the Manual once a year. So,
44 that's what I was shooting for. There were no actual new changes in Regulations or
45 Statutes that have occurred since last year at this time. Subjects that are still being studied
46 are exemptions, specialty contractors, stamping of ninety five percent drawings. As built
47 drawings were on there but Harley just gave me the updated wording. So that's one item
48 now that we can put in. Incidental practice and then I've got possible additional changes to
49 site adaptation and design documents. So, those items are still under study. I'll be placing
50 information about as built drawings into the Guidance Manual if the Guidance manual
51 survives.

52
53 In the August meeting it was requested that I include the Disciplinary Guidelines and
54 Sanctions into the Guidance Manual. I got to thinking about this, probably a dangerous

1 thing to do, but I'd really like to discuss this because I don't think that the Guidance Manual
2 is the appropriate place for this. These are regulations that have to do with penalties that
3 you would assess somebody that's doing something wrong and I don't think this is for the
4 public's purview. There are amounts in there for specific violations and amounts to be fined
5 and I would prefer something in there about this is for guidance of the Disciplinary
6 Committee. I will read you a paragraph I came up with as a suggestion and substitution for
7 taking all that information on the Disciplinary Sanctions and the Disciplinary Guidelines and
8 trying to put them in the Manual. I don't think that's the appropriate thing to do. And I open
9 that subject for discussion by the Board.

10
11 Alright then they're three small corrections to the Manual that I'd like to see executed. When
12 I checked the online copy just last week these three were missing. The first one is page
13 one, third paragraph, instead of saying "best practices" the comment was they would like to
14 say "sound practices". The second item, addresses on page three the last item, we've got a
15 phone number that's got an extra digit in it. I brought that up but it didn't get changed. And
16 then we have missing on page ten, the reference to putting the signature and date within a
17 certain distance from the seal, I believe it was 1 to 1 1/2 inches. Those are three minor
18 changes we need to make and we can do that now along with the new definitions for the as
19 built. Regarding disciplinary, here's my suggestion and then you can open this for
20 discussion. Instead of giving them the information I mentioned before about violations and
21 fines and all that. I would suggest adding this paragraph in the Manual after the sections
22 that deal with stamping and signing.

23
24 Officials of Government agencies who are responsible for review and approval of
25 construction documents need to be attentive and thorough and make sure there are no
26 violations and that the work is done by the appropriate registered professionals. Should
27 violations be detected and they are not corrected they need to be reported. The State of
28 Alaska has investigators, disciplinary sanctions and disciplinary guidelines that are in place
29 and that deal with such violations. The proper procedures to notify the investigators in the
30 Department of Commerce and Economic Development, I give their phone number or to file a
31 complaint, I give their email address. That then raps up my report.

32
33 Chair: Thank you Bert. Are there any comments? I would entertain a motion to accept Bert's
34 modifications to the Guidance Manual. I may have missed your discussions about the
35 validity of the Guidance Manual. But, I would not presume that there are any problems with
36 it at this point and just go ahead and entertain a motion to accept your modifications.

37
38 **On a motion duly made by Fredeen, Seconded by Hightower is was**
39
40 **RESOLVED to approve the proposed changes to the Guidance Manual**

41
42 Chair: Is there any further discussion? Dan!

43
44 Walsh: Question, one of the things Gayle pointed out to us this morning pertaining to our
45 policies, and I'm just wanting to make sure in my mind, is this the only place where we
46 reverence the distance the signature is from the seal?

47
48 Chair: That is correct and it is not in regulation and bless her heart I do appreciate what
49 she's saying but a predecessor of hers or a co-AAG had actually interpreted that we should
50 come up with a certain distance. We can remove it out of the Historical Information and until
51 it's challenged, in my opinion, we really don't need to worry about it and it is an appropriate
52 place to leave it in the Guidance Manual. Bert!

53
54 Lent: So, we have a correction, that's two inches?

1
2 Fredeen: Yes two inches.
3

4 Chair: I would defer to Vern to alter the Historical document to reflect Gayle's changes. Is
5 there any further discussion about Bert's suggestion? Hearing no objections we will accept
6 Bert's suggestions in the Guidance Manual and I will interrupt very quickly. Someone's
7 taken time out of his lobbying efforts on behalf of APDC to come down and testify before us,
8 John Hargesheimer if you have three minutes we will open up public testimony again for
9 you. Please state your name and who you are representing and/or your place of
10 employment.

11
12 Mr. Hargesheimer: My name is John Hargesheimer and I am representing NORTEC
13 Engineering and also on the APDC legislative committee and the College of Engineering
14 and Mines, University of Fairbanks advisory council. So, I guess you could say I represent a
15 couple of people.

16
17 First I would like to say I appreciate and thank each of you for your participation on the
18 Board and your commitment to this, I know you guys are paid lots of money. So I want to
19 make sure you understand I appreciate the effort you put in for the professional
20 associations.

21
22 Richard and I talked briefly, earlier and he ask me to come down and talk about my position
23 on the General Licensure issue that you guys have been moving around. I'll have to say
24 that I originally got my license in 1979 I think it was. My undergraduate is in Chem. E, my
25 Masters is in Environmental and I'm registered as a Civil. When I applied to the Board there
26 was no Chem. E. discipline here in the State and there still isn't and there sure wasn't any
27 environmental at the time. So when I applied to the Board to sit for my exam. The Board
28 denied me because I was a Chem. E. I had to go in front of the Board and point out that my
29 Chem. E curriculum had thirty or forty extra credits on top of what's required for a civil. My
30 environmental practice was closest to civil so I chose civil in order to get registered. The
31 Board basically, after I appealed the decision, let me sit for the exam and I passed the exam
32 in 79 but it delayed me a year while I got an appointment to come in front of the board for
33 the appeal and we're still really wrestling with this issue, what is it, thirty years later, of what
34 are we going to do with the different disciplines. I personally think that the General License
35 approach is the way to go. You look at me again, I'm a registered civil, if you came in and
36 asked me to design your highway, I'd say no. You know, that's not my expertise even
37 though I have a civil license and technically licensed to design a highway, it's not my
38 expertise, I don't have the capability to do that and I wouldn't do that for a client. So, you're
39 always going to have the issue of a professional staying in his areas of expertise and
40 staying away from the areas he's not an expert in regardless of whether you go to General
41 Licensure or whether you expand the disciplines you have under the existing program. So, I
42 think that's kind of, I mean you're always going to have bad apples too. So, I don't think
43 whether you choose one approach or the other that it's going to tend to change. That
44 argument to me doesn't hold much water. I think most of us are quality professionals and we
45 work in the areas we feel competent and comfortable in. I think the other thing to me is the
46 bigger issue. When you look down the road I think that the whole issue of how we should
47 push ahead with the licensing issue should be looked at from an international perspective.
48 We're messing around with it at the State level. I hold another license, an industrial hygiene
49 license, NCIH and that's a national license that's recognized internationally. I personally
50 think that's the direction we're ultimately going to be, looking to get comity on an
51 international level. So, I think when you sit down and look at this issue of whether you're
52 going to push ahead with more disciplines or go to a General License, and again, I say we
53 can go either way. I think the General Licensure issue fits in the international a little bit
54 better and I think that's the way this Board should look at it. Maybe you can't accomplish

1 the international component of it now but move Alaska in that direction and let your
2 predecessors act on it down the road. Those are my two comments. One is that I
3 encourage the Board to grab hold of this issue that's been in front of you for many, many
4 years. And, I guess my recommendation would be, I don't know if this has been done, but
5 from a process perspective I would encourage you to basically undertake some kind of a
6 study to see what the rest of the nation has done within the United States and you can look
7 at some of the International issues and see what portion of those you can integrate into the
8 local problem of how are we going to consider the different disciplines. So, that's my input
9 for the day.

10
11 Chair: I appreciate that very much, John. Do we have any questions?

12
13 Leet: John what do you normally stamp with your civil license?

14
15 Mr. Hargesheimer: Environmental, water and waste water, clean-up site work, demolition.

16
17 Leet: In 1978 then, when you got licensure your license would have been in chemical
18 engineering, correct?

19
20 Mr. Hargesheimer: Is that the concept under the General Licensure?

21
22 Leet: Yes, it would have been.

23
24 Mr. Hargesheimer: I had both degrees at that time. I had a Bachelors in chemical and a
25 Masters in environmental.

26
27 Leet: Here's my point though. He's now doing work that in 1979 he had to. He took the
28 test and so on and so forth, but that's kind of where you're going. Now somebody like you is
29 doing this kind of work because you took the civil test but in the future you may not get the
30 opportunity to take the civil test because you'll end up taking the chemical engineering test
31 or the environmental test.

32
33 Mr. Hargesheimer: If you go with the increased disciplines I would have to decide which to
34 test for. And, my opinion is that whether I tested for the Chem. E or the environmental, once
35 I got that license I'd still have the responsibility to only practice in the areas I have the
36 capability in. The other issue we haven't brought is continuing education. So, over a thirty
37 year career you got a license as an elephant trainer and down the road you pick up
38 continuing education and peer assistance guidance that allows you to do tiger training.
39 You're back to whether or not each of us on a day to day basis, stay in the areas we're
40 qualified in. I think that when you look at that you're going to find that the overriding majority
41 of us are quality individuals that are going to perform as professionals. And, you're still
42 going to have some bad apples in the basket that gives Vern a job. I think when you look at
43 it from an International perspective and the budget factor going to the multiple discipline
44 approach trying to manage that program that it becomes economically not workable.

45
46 Baker: I would like to make the recommendation that you put this in writing.

47
48 Chair: Thank you very much for coming in your input is greatly appreciated.

49
50 **On a motion by Baker, seconded by Leet it was**

51
52 **RESOLVED to go into Executive Session under authority of AS 44.62.310 to review**
53 **applicant files.**

1 The Board went into Executive Session at 14:20.

2
3 18:40 adjourned for the evening.

4
5 **Friday February 12, 2010**

6
7 08:08 meeting called to order

8
9 Chair: Let's go ahead and start the meeting:

10
11 Jones: roll call, all present except Leet. (was in the restroom) Joined the meeting at 08:10.

12
13 Baker: Do we need to go into executive session to review that one case?

14
15 Chair: I think Vern has direction.

16
17 Jones: You talking about Anderson? Ok, if you're going to discuss it you have to go into
18 Executive Session and Alicia and I have to leave the room. If you decide you need to ask
19 the lawyers any questions we have to get a hold of both Gayle and his lawyer on the phone.

20
21 Baker: I'd like to get it out of the way. I can make a motion to go into Executive Session.

22
23 Jones: You don't have to go into Executive Session and discuss it. If you have all read that
24 and made your decision you can just make a motion and vote on it.

25
26 Chair: Let's go into Executive Session.

27
28 **On a motion duly made by Baker, Seconded by Walsh it was**

29
30 **RESOLVED to go into Executive Session under authority of AS 44.62.310 to review**
31 **the Anderson case.**

32
33 Hearing no objection the motion passed.

34
35 The Board went into Executive Session at 08:10

36
37 08:40 The Board came out of executive session.

38
39 Chair: We are back in session. Cliff.

40
41 **On a motion duly made by Baker, Seconded by Brownfield it was**

42
43 **RESOLVED, to adopt the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge in the**
44 **matter of Robert L. Anderson OAH No. 09-0603-AEL.**

45
46 Chair: It's been moved and seconded is there any further discussion?

47
48 Jones: Roll Call vote:

49
50 Baker: Yes.

51 Brownfield: Yes.

52 Eriksen: Yes.

53 Fredeen: Yes.

54 Hightower: Yes.

1 Leet: Yes.
2 Rearick: Yes.
3 Shiesl: Yes.
4 Walsh: Yes.
5 Heieren: Yes.

6
7 The motion passed unanimously.
8

9 Chair: Thank you, vice chair Brownfield will be preparing a letter to the soon to be registrant
10 regarding this matter.

11
12 **Agenda item 15 – New Business – continued.**
13

14 Chair: Let's get back on track with the agenda and under new business we've had a report
15 already from Richard and Harley regarding BIM, is that correct? And, we had a report from
16 Craig. Dan.

17
18 Walsh: In reference to my Finance Committee work. Nothing going on there, we have
19 meeting the first week of March down in New Orleans and I'll be going to that. Before we
20 get off of new business I just wanted to ask Craig a few questions about B+30. Is that ok?

21
22 Chair: Yes..
23

24 Walsh: Dale, yesterday, was mentioning a whole bunch of degree options. Can you bring
25 us up to speed?
26

27 Fredeen: Dale was kind of moving some things around on his chart there. The current
28 ways you become licensed, there is Model Law 20/20 and there is Model Law we've got
29 right now which is, as is where is, Bachelors 4 years, and that's Model Law. There's Model
30 Law 20/20 which is the MOE, Masters or Equivalent. The ways you would achieve that are
31 a Masters degree plus three years, and Bachelors plus thirty credits. Now you heard M,
32 ABET and B, ABET. I think most of you are aware that ABET will now do dual certifications
33 on Masters Degrees and Bachelors Degree. Before, it was one or the other. There are
34 hardly any accredited Masters degrees. Now they are actually going to accredit Masters
35 and Bachelors degree. What that allows is before we used to have a Bachelors degree that
36 was ABET accredited and then the Masters degree in engineering whether it was civil or
37 whatever. But now what this allows is if you end up having a biology degree you can get a
38 Masters that is ABET. Before if you had, a biology degree and you got a Masters in civil
39 engineering or something I don't think the Model Law would agree with that because a
40 Masters degree wasn't necessarily stringent. It didn't have all the requirements of the
41 Bachelors of engineering. So, this M, ABET is a way that a Masters degree, If they give an
42 M, ABET the University is required to make sure that applicant has all of the prerequisites
43 for an ABET accredited Bachelors degree. So you can come in with a biology degree or an
44 engineering degree that's not ABET accredited and get the M, ABET and you're good with
45 Model Law. So, a B plus M, ABET is that one leg. So there's a B, ABET plus Masters,
46 Bachelors plus M, ABET, and then ABET Bachelors plus 30. And, I think there's a PhD
47 version in there too. Those are the categories that are current Model Law. Actually Model
48 Law 20/20.
49

50 Walsh: At one time, it seems, you were involved in trying to put a little pressure on ABET
51 through NCEES to see if we could get some changes. Is that moving forward?
52

53 Fredeen: Other professions are working on it. The non ASCE Societies are working on
54 that. It comes up in every meeting and we have a representative from ABET at our

1 meetings now and also a representative from Educators of Secondary, what's the, uh, EE,
2 what's the professional society of professors?
3
4 Walsh: The only one I'm aware of is NAPE. Is this more just for engineering stuff?
5
6 Fredeen: Yes.
7
8 Eriksen: is MOE new terminology?
9
10 Fredeen: Yes, MOE is Masters or Equivalent. But they haven't come up with anything for
11 this super B yet. I think we're calling it B plus 6M or something. B plus six years mentoring.
12
13 Baker: So you have the super B which is Bachelors plus 30?
14
15 Fredeen: No, that's Masters or Equivalent. Super B is the new one that's going to come out
16 this year as an alternate and it's a 150 credit Bachelors with 70 or 115 credits in math and
17 science or something like that.
18
19 Baker: When I was in college they used to have a lot of credits required and it's gone down
20 to 120 so they are doing the super B to get back to where they were, basically is what your
21 saying.
22
23 Walsh: This is still being driven by ASCE?
24
25 Fredeen: Absolutely!
26
27 Chair: If we move as a Board at the National Conference we should make sure we've got all
28 our ducks in a row before we get there. I was called on the carpet pretty heavily about
29 making sure all the Board was aware of what was happening.
30
31 Fredeen: Can you expand on that? On the treasures vote?
32
33 Chair: No, on the Alaska proposal that was presented at the National. In other words when
34 we bring proposals forward we should make sure the whole Board is aware of what we're
35 doing.
36
37 Brownfield: Let me just expand a little bit on that. What happens is if we come to some
38 conclusions and maybe all of us don't know about it, and even if we go to a meeting be it
39 Zone or wherever, and we are put on the spot to make decisions that the whole Board
40 hasn't been made aware of. We lock in on a decision and that decision was too early and
41 we don't have a chance to absorb all of the updated information to make the correct
42 decision. And for us to say well that was our stance, we agree to it before we came down
43 here, now we just can't change it. You get into that situation sometimes.
44
45 Chair: It's a dilemma.
46
47 Brownfield: We need to make sure we all are aware and the majority of us agree on which
48 way to go.
49
50 Chair: Even if that happens, that may be the option of trying to get some kind of a read from
51 everybody by email or something.
52
53 Eriksen: The more reason for people to go to these.
54

1 Chair: The more people that are there the better. I don't fault anybody for anything I'm just
2 trying to say that it's tough. Eric!
3
4 Eriksen: Craig, can you summarize where the Board is at with B+30?
5
6 Chair: We wish it would go away.
7
8 Brownfield: We could just fire Craig.
9
10 Fredeen: We haven't really, uh...
11
12 Chair: If you want a more formal position on it maybe you should put together something
13 and then we can just go on record and not maybe submit anything on a national level but
14 you know emphatically where we sit.
15
16 Fredeen: I think definitely, and I would say that I think I kind of wore out our welcome at the
17 National meeting for the next couple years as far as making any Alaska motions. So I'm not
18 going to be putting forth any more resolutions or anything like that. I'll find someone else to
19 put them forward for me. I need another State. Because the State of Alaska and the State
20 of Nevada, on this issue are pretty much, we get up to speak and everyone just starts
21 looking at their blackberries or whatever, it's the same six people that have been talking on
22 this issue since day one and everyone just goes here's Alaska here is this pro guy here's
23 Nevada, here's this pro guy, on and on.
24
25 Baker: I do want to relay to you, Craig, that at my Law Enforcement meeting, people asked
26 about you and they said that you spoke real well and that, uh, of course these were the ones
27 that supported our view, and they always appreciated when you got up and talked and said
28 they thought you did a very good job. I just wanted to relay that to you. Not everybody
29 thinks that Alaska has worn out our welcome.
30
31 Eriksen: I think if we have concerns, our welcome is not as important as getting our points
32 across. Maybe there are other ways to go about it but we shouldn't be pressured by that.
33
34 Chair: I think all of us are in a learning process and one of the things that happens is you
35 understand, there's no question in my mind that everybody on the national level knows
36 where Alaska stands. And my impression was that they feel like they got hit with it quite a
37 bit.
38
39 Hightower: At NCARB Craig would get the duct tape award. (laughter)
40
41 Chair: We've beat that to death and I don't think we need to dwell on it any more. Let's go
42 ahead and move to your report Cliff on the Enforcement Committee.
43
44 Baker: We meet two weeks ago, January 19th in Nashville, TN. We had nine charges, and
45 I'll go through these real quick.
46
47 Charge one was to evaluate the 2009 annual law enforcement program. It was pretty
48 complete, program and we had all the same things. We are looking at a couple of additional
49 topics. One is the use of electronic seals and then another one is investigator safety which
50 is starting to be an issue in some of the areas down there. I've actually talked to John about
51 that and he said when he goes out to the bush, when he has to go and investigate a site he
52 will call and let people know because he doesn't know if he's walking in on a meth lab or
53 something. It is an issue he thinks about a lot.
54

1 Charge two was to review the Investigative Enforcement Guidelines and the Training
2 Manual. It was determined that we didn't need to do any changes to the Training Manual
3 but we had a few minor changes to the Investigative Enforcement Manual with one section
4 that we wanted to add. And, this had to do with the Board action when there has been a
5 case that has been adjudicated and to make sure that when a case was adjudicated that the
6 results of disciplinary action notification should be made through the Board news letter, web
7 site posting, and other methods as determined by the Board and in addition the Board
8 should post the disciplinary action on the Enforcement Exchange at NCEES. There is
9 another charge they looked at on this but were the Enforcement Exchange is critical is they
10 checked with a lot of States, whether or not they were using this. Some of the States and
11 Maine in particular said, well, and they mentioned one particular case. They had a bad case
12 where the guy really screwed up and they pulled his license, the guy accepted that he
13 messed up and he agreed to give his license up and they said since he agreed to all this we
14 are not going to put it on the Exchange. So then I say well what if he goes to Alaska and
15 applies for a license, how are we going to know that he really screwed up and he did
16 something that was atrocious, caused possible harm to the public, we wouldn't know. So,
17 hopefully they get that across that just because the guy agrees and it gets resolved in a
18 manner that they like they still need to put it someplace so that we can reach it.

19
20 Charge three was to publish an ongoing column in the Licensure Exchange. This month,
21 actually, I'll have my first article ever published and another one will be coming up in a
22 couple of months that I've written but we are looking for anybody that wants to write an
23 article, you don't have to be on the committee to write articles. It would be nice to have
24 them that deal with enforcement issues but they don't necessarily have to. Some of the
25 suggestions are articles directed to Board members covering what should be expected from
26 the investigative staff or responsibilities related to investigations, Boards constituency and
27 what to expect from the Legal Council and what to do if not getting the needed information.
28 I think that would be a real good article for us, it's something we've been struggling with ever
29 since I've been on the Board.

30
31 Charge four was to review the words complaint and charge in the Model Law and Model
32 Rules they are interchanged a lot times and they actually have different meanings so we
33 went through and cleaned that up a bit.

34
35 Charge five was to study and provide recommendations, on how Member Boards should
36 conduct investigations and deal with disciplinary actions that have occurred outside the U.S.
37 when evaluating actions for licensure. It was determined that this was not a real big concern
38 at this time for any Member Boards and we did a listserv search and none of them seem to
39 have an issue but we felt that we should put guidelines in place, because as there is more
40 mobility from outside, and we are seeing more and more of that all the time. I think it needs
41 to be something that we should do. They're recommending that each Board or member put
42 together an affidavit that you have the applicant sign saying that he has not had any
43 disciplinary action. And, then it also gives you the right to go to that country and they can
44 release the information to you because unless they have that request they're not going to
45 release anything. Having it all in one affidavit, if he's unwilling to sign it that must mean
46 there's something there he doesn't want released. If you try to do it after the fact it would be
47 pretty tough.

48
49 Charge six was the feasibility of NCEES putting together short courses and stuff, on ethics
50 or whatever that could be used by the Member Boards as part of their disciplinary action for
51 people and we felt that there's enough other groups that are putting these courses together
52 that we don't really need to do that.

53
54 Charge seven was, in my opinion, one of the most exciting ones and that was to study and

1 recommend new technology and training for Member Board Staff and Investigators and Law
2 Enforcement. I passed out one of the things that I really thought was impressive was that
3 new memo pad. I think that's something that's not just for Law Enforcement. I can see a
4 fantastic use for surveying. I think anybody, you know, architects, engineers go out to sites
5 to do inspections and they can write all that stuff down and it's automatically a hard copy
6 because it is an ink pen and it's automatically gone onto a thumb drive that you can put in
7 and they both look identical. To me it's a fabulous tool, especially if you're going out to do
8 inspections in the weather it's real easy to lose that hard copy and you can have this thing
9 be an exact replica of what you draw up. I do have a big stack here of other things we
10 reviewed. We went into rugged computers, notebooks. We went into voice recognition
11 programs that probably would help Alicia tremendously to transpose all this stuff. And into
12 other programs or case file programs that were pretty neat. If anybody wants to look at
13 those I've got a stack here.

14
15 Charge eight. That was the one I talked about earlier, whether they should put disciplinary
16 action on the Enforcement Exchange. We are looking at putting a white paper together on a
17 lot of reasons why we should do this and I think that the case in Maine is a real good
18 example of why we need to do this.

19
20 Charge nine was to ensure significant issues of the committee are submitted to the Council
21 at each Zone meeting. So, that's basically what we went through to be presented at the
22 Western Zone and the Eastern Zone meetings. We came up with new charges for next year.
23 A lot of them are continuous charges we have every year like reviewing the program and
24 stuff. And basically that is the report.

25
26 Chair: Did you want to follow-up, Vern, with anything about posting?

27
28 Jones: No, I just made myself a note here to find out who is responsible for doing that
29 because we are a little behind.

30
31 Chair: so that is on Vern's to-do list. Are there any questions? I think a follow-up to monitor
32 that whole thing as far as our Board is concerned would be very helpful and appropriate.
33 You're actually dealing an issue of enforcement that is what I thought this board should have
34 been all about from the very beginning. From the day I accepted an appointment here,
35 besides testing I thought that was what this Board was all about.

36
37 Baker: I did check through Vern and through John about how things might get posted.
38 Because we do use the service that they have and apparently there is somebody, I was told
39 that these go through but they are not sure who and I'm not sure how frequently it gets put
40 into the system.

41
42 Jones: That's what Ginger told me, and I thought at first it would be her. What I will do if
43 this person is overloaded with work and there is no legal reason that I can't, I'll volunteer to
44 do it for this Board because it's not getting done.

45
46 Chair: Are there any questions? I'll go through my report as quickly as I can. I attended a
47 NCEES Exam for Professional Surveyors Committee in January. Computer Based Testing
48 was discussed. The FS and the FE will probably, they're shooting for a 2013 date of making
49 that a reality for NCEES. They've ask me to, informally at this point, to participate in what is
50 called a Professional Activities and Knowledge Study, it's called PAKS. That term, if you've
51 been to NCEES you may have heard that term before but about every eight years they get
52 together and evaluate, basically it's a report on NCEES and the progress of how things are
53 working. It sounds very interesting and very challenging. The other thing that was made
54 quite apparent in the process of the exam, we'll come back to the computer based exam.

1 The FS will probably be curriculum based. What that basically means is, the FE exam for
2 example is a curriculum based exam and the pass rate if you have no academic back
3 ground is very, very low and that's basically what's going to happen on a national level. So,
4 the surveyors are falling in step and whether, in fact, education becomes a main portion of
5 our tables, for degree requirement. In five years you won't be able to pass the FS exam
6 very easily without having a heavy academic back ground. The pass rate, this always
7 fascinates me, and I might have mentioned it before, but the pass rate is a little deceptive.
8 Fifty-three percent is the cut score for a typical exam for surveyors. In the last five years
9 that's been the average and that means fifty-three of the questions out of a hundred are
10 answered correctly, you answer fifty-four, you pass. It's a little misleading, most folks think
11 that seventy is a passing score but in fact it's not, a fifty-four would be on average if you took
12 the Professional Surveyor exam. What I'm seeing on a national level, and I don't fault
13 NCEES for it, I don't fault any of the volunteers that are involved in this whole process. It's
14 just the nature of the beast. But, I see this as a crack in the dam, so to speak and I don't
15 want the dam to burst and then try and fix it. I want to try and fix the crack and I believe
16 education has to be an important part of it. And, again, whether we go to a four year degree
17 requirement in our surveying tables or not the exam is going to take care of it anyway. I
18 actually reviewed four of the tests and very honestly took the exam myself and on average,
19 and I don't consider myself in the top of my field by any stretch of the imagination, but out of
20 a hundred questions I was hard pressed, and these four exams are going to be given over
21 the next two years, I was hard pressed to miss one answer out of a hundred questions. So,
22 that gives you an idea of how low the bar is. I'm not very impressed with it. And I've written
23 some of the questions myself, so I'm not, again, I'm not trying to be critical of the system
24 necessarily, its working to some degree but I think there's a way to fix a lot of it and I'm
25 going to be involved in that fix, hopefully.

26
27 We had seven charges, I don't know if you'd be interested in that, I'll hand that around. I
28 don't know if everybody gets a copy of the NCEES final Annual. The only thing I'd point out
29 in there is the first surveyor was registered in 1891 in California. If everyone didn't realize,
30 they were arguing, it's always interesting to understand historical information, where things
31 come, why things happen. But, they were arguing over mining claim boundaries in
32 California so they instituted a licensing process in California. Then in 1928 the St. Francis
33 dam failed in California, it was a California State project, and killed 430 people and the
34 Legislature turned around and instituted an engineering act that started licensing engineers.
35 Sometimes it's interesting to understand where we're coming from. We are public health,
36 safety and welfare without a doubt, so, there is a need for that. I think I would mention
37 participating organizations and a liaison council, I've noticed in the back, if you guys didn't,
38 that in fact there's actual Professional Societies that are involved with NCEES and maybe
39 some of your Professional Organizations should think about that, it's only a \$300 annual
40 membership and that way they can become active in NCEES. And that's the end of my
41 report. Don!

42
43 Shiesl: Just a couple questions regarding the pass rate. Do you know off the top of your
44 head what the pass rate is and do you see them toughening up the standards?

45
46 Chair: This has been driven by law suits and they have this fancy term, psychometrician
47 where they go through a statistical analysis of questions, and what's fair and what's not fair
48 and I've encountered questions that were blatantly wrong and yet they keep them in the test
49 because in their analysis they've determined that they are good questions. I don't believe I
50 just said that.

51
52 Brownfield: I would suggest, because it's very difficult, and I've been to about two or three
53 of them when I go, because I learn something every time I go there, on how NCEES on the
54 engineers side and I'm sure it's the same...

1
2 Chair: It is exactly the same.

3
4 Brownfield: It is a very complicated way to do it but they've got a lot of history that
5 demonstrates what they're doing is very correct. But, if fifty-three, uh, by the time you get
6 through all of the applications, including cut scores, if you and I take one and we're
7 engineers and we don't do it very well then all of a sudden we will raise that bar to them or
8 lower it. You need to attend one of the sessions, last time they had two of them and I
9 attended both of them because I find it very interesting how we go about getting that final
10 score. It's complicated, I couldn't tell you here today, but you'd find it very interesting. A cut
11 score of fifty-three does not mean simply, you get fifty-three out of a hundred. There is a lot
12 more behind that that gets you to fifty-three. And, it could probably be equivalent to
13 seventy-five. So I would suggest...

14
15 Shiesl: Do you know what the pass rate is off the top of your head? I mean the number of
16 people.

17
18 Chair: That actually dictates where the cut score is. They will make sure that a certain
19 number of people will pass.

20
21 Brownfield: It changes from year to year, it doesn't remain the same.

22
23 Baker: In my meeting I did talk to the Executive Administrator of NCEES and I complained,
24 extended your complaint more or less. And you're right, you say curve and they get really, it
25 starts smoking off the top of their head. They just don't like that. But to be fair too, like
26 Richard said, there's two or three questions that he's actually taken that are blatantly wrong
27 and when they give these hundred questions, when you get together after the exam and you
28 go over these things if you do come up with a question, we do the same thing with our State
29 exam. If you do come up with a question that is wrong or that is misleading or has more
30 than one answer, you take that out and so you're really not getting that fifty-three of a
31 hundred, its fifty-three of what's remaining. Unfortunately for you Don, I don't think Bo's
32 suggestion would work because I think in order to be part of these, to see that, you have to
33 be an SME and if you're not registered you're not an SME.

34
35 Chair: No, he's talking about the classes that are given at the NCEES meetings. Don
36 needs to go to that.

37
38 Brownfield: Yes, you normally have two of them. It's even getting to the point where if you
39 have a question that's too easy that detracts from that and they take those out. If you get
40 one that nobody gets ever, all of a sudden that becomes, and this is odd, but that becomes
41 a question that if it's in there it makes people that don't know anything get better. I mean it's
42 really interesting, the depth at which they go into this.

43
44 Shiesl: You know it's an art to put together a test.

45
46 Chair: Another fascinating thing about the computer based testing is the way the nursing
47 computer based testing is set up is you actually answer a few questions and end up
48 passing. The computer is statistically analyzing your test as you go along answering
49 different questions. And a person could pass the exam after taking fifty questions or the
50 computer could keep going and you would have to answer two hundred questions before
51 you would get through it. So there are many individuals that even though it's a four hour test
52 for becoming a registered nurse, they're done in half an hour and other individuals go for the
53 full four hours and never even pass the exam. And they can actually fail a lot quicker than
54 that, there's a computer check list. Chuck was first.

1
2 Leet: Another thing is that questions on the computer are graded for level of difficulty. So
3 your first question might be a very simple one. You get that right and you move up to the
4 next level. It's kind of like playing computer games, it progressively gets tougher as you
5 keep answering those. Basically the computer is saying in level one you got all ten of those
6 right so you go to level two. So in level two you got all of them right. Maybe in level three
7 you missed one so they keep going until you get statistically enough to say that you
8 progress up to the next level.
9

10 Brownfield: Real quick to wind it up. What we should take from this is we are looking into
11 General Licensure and we're looking at putting in more examinations. If we go to the extent
12 that we now are responsible to create an exam, these exams are rearranged every time
13 they take it. They put new ones in they take old ones out, they keep some that historically
14 have been good. But, it requires millions of dollars, because not only are they coming up
15 with a test but it's got to be just exactly right with all this background and technical stuff we
16 have to do. Plus the fact they have to worry about security and places and proctors. I mean
17 it's huge. So when we look at it as a Board, should we go into a new profession or a new
18 discipline, we've got to make damn sure somebody has that quality of an examination.
19 Because we, here at this table aren't going to do it and the State of Alaska's not going to
20 foot the bill.
21

22 Hightower: I serve on the NCARB Broadly Experienced Architect Committee if you would
23 like a short report on that? It's a committee that has method and process for NCARB
24 certification for non-traditional methods that someone who doesn't have a five year
25 accredited degree. It's very cumbersome and very expensive and I think very unfair. But it's
26 in place and there's not much we can do about it. The only significant thing from our last
27 meeting is they are looking at deleting the interview requirement which will take a lot of
28 expense for the applicants out of it. It's something that I feel that probably most newly
29 registered architects, it's a process that they, couldn't get through so that tells me it would
30 be unfair. Many of these people, who are doing this, are already licensed. They've been a
31 principle architect for 15 years and we put them through this long cumbersome, expensive
32 process.
33

34 Rearick: The thing about it though is it does provide a mechanism for those folks to get
35 licensed where right now there's no other avenue if they don't meet the NCARB
36 requirements. But, I think like Bo said about the testing, I don't think we would want to take
37 on having to go through and verify their equivalent education because NCARB's already got
38 that in place. And, it's a very detailed and expensive process to be able to do that and we
39 don't have the resource on the Board. So, my thought is that on an NCARB level is where
40 we mainly need to lobby and where Harley being on the committee, that helps because he
41 can put his input on what that program should be and there is an engineer in our office that's
42 going through that right now to become licensed in Alaska as an architect, he's already
43 licensed in Washington and it's a very arduous and expensive process, but, uh...
44

45 Hightower: It costs about \$6000. But if you don't get through, you have to pay it again. It's
46 not like we do, you know, a conditional approval or something to give us more information.
47 It's just starting over and it's very expensive. I've voiced my opinion enough that I'm kind on
48 the same list that Craig is. I got the duct tape award on that committee and so I'm just
49 cooperating and doing my job now.
50

51 Rearick: I think putting all of our eggs in one basket with NCARB, we may be limiting some
52 applicants from getting licensed in the State but they performed a service that is going to
53 provide for more uniformity between the states and to a level that we couldn't do.
54

1 Chair: Thank you Harley, any questions? You brought up an interesting point that, uh, in
2 the networking that I've done, it is very common, I haven't polled all the states, but Boards
3 actually interview applicants before they're approved for licensure. It's very common. We've
4 probably listened to three or four applicants that come in to answer questions because they
5 halfway expected that they needed to talk to the Board. It's something that maybe we
6 should look into a little bit harder and think about because people aren't, I mean it becomes
7 very impersonal this whole process and sometimes that bothers me.
8

9 Eriksen: Maybe base it on passing the Jurisprudence Questionnaire, if they passed and had
10 less than 95 or something like that.
11

12 Leet: How many files did we review yesterday?
13

14 Jones: We don't have a count, maybe 100 to 110.
15

16 Leet: If you were to interview you're looking at, what, 15 minutes to half an hour?
17

18 Chair: I wouldn't say that everyone would be interviewed. I would say we would give them
19 an option.
20

21 Rearick: In Washington, I got licensed down there and that was a requirement to be
22 interviewed by a Board member. So, I actually ended up going to a Board Members house
23 where the interview was conducted. I didn't find a lot of merit to it.
24

25 Jones: Some of the Boards meet monthly so those that do interview's probably don't have
26 such a long list.
27

28 Chair: That's one of the beauties of computer based testing too. NCEES sees the potential.
29 And nurses presently, you can go in and take your exam anytime you want. So there is lot
30 of things that can happen if we catch up technology wise. I am strongly in favor of computer
31 based testing. It's inevitable and it will end up being a good fair thing, I think. But Dan
32 probably has an alternate opinion.
33

34 Walsh: No, I am just curious if computer based testing has the ability to limit the depth of
35 the question?
36

37 Chair: Yes, because it does turn it all into multiple choice. They call the questions, items and
38 the item bank is probably going to have to increase four fold in order to make it work. Both
39 the PS and PE are all written now and would have to totally be revamped to get the second
40 stage into computer based testing. There was a detailed report because we are moving
41 forward with the PS in particular for computer based, even though that's three or four years
42 beyond the 2013 goal. Eric.
43

44 Eriksen: I didn't have a question, but since you called on me. You don't have the
45 opportunity to see the work that went into answering the questions and measuring that. Is
46 that kind of what you're asking that for?
47

48 Chair: I'll end this discussion I hope with this final thought and that is, that the bottom line is,
49 with NCEES in particular, it is not an academic test. It doesn't measure the level of
50 proficiency necessarily. The advisory committee from NCEES said that they're an
51 underwriters laboratory and that's a good analogy. They measure minimum competency, if
52 it's not going to start a fire go ahead let the appliance be there. But, it does not say that it's
53 good, better of best, it just says it's good enough to do the job. So, it's minimum
54 competency, that's a scary thing to think about but that the way that it has to be. Are there

1 any other questions? Bert.

2
3 Lent: I just had a very brief statement about a teleconference call that CLARB had here. I
4 was here on Wednesday. Would you like to hear about it?

5
6 Chair: Yes, sir.

7
8 Lent: Ok, Vern was kind enough to set me up with a phone and a quiet space. Everybody
9 was there AK, AZ, HI, ID, WA, OR, UT, MT, NV, CA, and of course representatives from the
10 national office. BC was the only one that wasn't there. They are probably getting ready for
11 the Olympics because they're generally in attendance. This is preliminary to the spring
12 meeting that they're holding in Dallas, to which both Chuck and I are going to be going.
13 That is scheduled for the end of this month. They will be discussing some interesting things.
14 One of the things they want to do is get a data base on pass/fail rates on their examination
15 programs and publish those. That has been asked for, particularly by the delegation from
16 Montana. And then also a chap from the state of Utah is interested in a copy of our new
17 regulations that pertain to continuing education. Then I had a question that came up
18 regarding the teleconference. And that was, when you submit a Board Report for this
19 Board, that Vern was kind enough to put together for us. Now we are calling our act in that
20 report a title act. Now, I'm questioning that. Why aren't we calling it a practice act?
21 Because it states very clearly in the regulation that you're not allowed to practice in the
22 profession of landscape architecture if you don't have a license. So, if you're not allowed to
23 practice, why are we calling it a title act? Is there an answer for that? I'll just bring that up
24 as a question, that's all I have to report on that.

25
26 **Agenda item 18 – Board Travel**

27
28 Chair: Thank you Bert. Are there any questions of Bert? Next on the agenda is the
29 expenditure report but we'll jump over that and the Examiner Report. We can go to Board
30 Travel and discuss that real quickly or longly, however you want to do it. There is a list on
31 tab 18 on the back. The ones that Vern has listed as attending are in fact, those are certain
32 because the actual Board Members will be paid by NCEES to attend. So, I would open up
33 the floor for discussion as to what we should do here. I would preface it with I am going to
34 meet with Jenny here this afternoon and try and do some more lobbying. I would really like
35 to see Harley and Richard and Bert even attending some NCEES so that they understand
36 that they are representing their profession in one respect but again we're trying to monitor
37 everybody. There needs to be some more interaction and Don, you will be for certain on the
38 list for the Annual Meeting for NCEES in August. Dan.

39
40 Walsh: I knew you were working the travel memo so my recommendation would be just to
41 follow what's on that spread sheet and put it forward.

42
43 Lent: I just wanted to support you. I attended the NCEES Annual Meeting here in
44 Anchorage and it was extremely valuable to me. They had an excellent presentation on
45 enforcement. It was really an eye opener for me to attend that. They were very helpful and
46 hospitable to me and I enjoyed that group. Along the lines of the Board I wanted to mention
47 that just recently in this part of this teleconference CLARB has nailed down their fall
48 meeting. It's going to be in Baltimore the first week in September.

49
50 Chair: We will actually be discussing the calendar later. Let's go ahead, no one wanted to
51 go the Western Zone because they thought it jeopardized their chances of going to the
52 Annual. So, I ended up going, we had to put a name forward so I put my name in and I'm
53 going to Western Zone as the funded delegate. NCEES funds one of us to go, and Alicia is
54 going also. At the NCEES Annual Meeting we have Dan Walsh, John Savage, Don, and Bo.

1 You want me to just go down through like and whoever gets funded for that then we turn
2 around and
3
4 Shiesl: Could you start over again, I missed what you were talking about.
5
6 Chair: I'm just trying to resolve the NCEES Annual Meeting and it is very frustrating
7 because one of the things is that it is important that we are involved in the Annual Meeting in
8 particular. A lot of decisions are made. A lot of information is put out there. And, the most
9 effective way to deal with it is, because it's too much, in my opinion, for two guys to do, I
10 think even for four people it's over whelming. One of the things we have to do when we go
11 to these annual meetings is we assign duties to each individual and stay on track and make
12 sure we are not all trying to do the same thing. It's very effective to assign different duties
13 and we are not duplicating efforts.
14
15 Baker: I'd like to say that it is very frustrating to be on these committees and not be able to
16 follow up and go to the meetings that your committees are going to be presenting at.
17
18 Brownfield: There are two sides to that. You get on a committee and all of a sudden your
19 priority is there all the time. All of us need to be going there and it may be that, especially if
20 you're not in a heavy time, you may have to sit it out because you don't get an automatic
21 seat every year, because there are eleven of us sitting here.
22
23 Baker: The other question I have is that you mentioned that you'd like to see Harley and
24 Richard go to these, and Bert, but what about some of us going to theirs and if you did go to
25 theirs would it take you off the priority list to go to NCEES? That's a question because my
26 first obligation, of course, is going to be to NCEES. If I'm going to lose my position on
27 NCEES by going to CLARB or something then I'm not going to go to those.
28
29 Eriksen: It seems like where your going is starting with NCESS, that's going to be your
30 number one priority. Start with the annual meeting however that falls out then kind of
31 prioritize
32
33 Chair: And then whoever is on top of the list will end up going to the Western Zone. Do you
34 follow that Vern?
35
36 Jones: I didn't follow this part of it.
37
38 Chair: We have a travel priority list and Dan and John are going for sure and then it would
39 go down from Don, Bo, Cliff, Chuck, Eric, Craig and then myself, because I'm going to
40 Western Zone. Then whoever doesn't get selected for the National Meeting then you just go
41 down the list for the Western Zone. Who can attend the National right now?
42
43 Shiesl: I think I can. Vern called me about the Western, I just can't do that one but I can do
44 the National.
45
46 Chair: Craig can you do the National?
47
48 Fredeen: I'm pretty sure I can.
49
50 Chair: Eric, can you do the National?
51
52 Eriksen: I think so.
53
54 Chair: So everybody that's on the travel list should have their names submitted for the

1 National for NCEES. Craig.

2
3 Fredeen: I was just going to say since we're submitting this letter we can say, this is what
4 we would like to do every year. But, since this year it's kind of late, what we'd rather do is
5 have more attendance at the Annual meeting since it's too late for us to get signed up for
6 the Western Zone. That way we could get more engineers into the Annual this year and
7 next year go into that cycle you propose.

8
9 Jones: I've already spoken to Jenny about when we pay our dues, if we have the
10 opportunity to add extra money to cover travel. I think Western Zone and CLARB do this, I
11 don't know about the others. NCEES makes a partial reimbursement but she sounded like
12 she would be ok with that. Say, like for CLARB if our dues were \$4000 for the year we
13 would give them \$5500 and we use that \$1500 to offset expenses to send people to the
14 meetings.

15
16 Chair: \$6500 goes to NCEES from us so they make most of their money off the test. That
17 sounds good and she already has the letter with the spread sheet?

18
19 Jones: I gave it to her a few weeks ago and yesterday I gave her the one regarding John.

20
21 Chair: Whoever is left, not able to go to NCEES, we will put on the list for Western Zone
22 and hope for the best.

23
24 Baker: Quick question on this priority list, as someone goes does the priority list change?
25 Whenever I look at this it's always been in the same order.

26
27 Chair: Once you go to one meeting you go down to the bottom of the list.

28
29 Baker: But I'm just wondering if they go to the bottom and the list stays the same and we
30 are just supposed to know in our heads who has gone. If Dan is next does that mean Vern
31 and John have already gone?

32
33 Chair: It is a travel list. It isn't just an NCEES list. This is not set in concrete and I have
34 anxieties because of something you mention earlier. There are things someone is working
35 on and they can't attend because of there's a fairness issue here. It's a dilemma to work
36 with. Everybody should be going to these if they have the ability to go.

37
38 Brownfield: I think there's a set of priorities here. I want to go to CLARB or one of the
39 others but my first obligation is to NCEES. And, we're not there yet to go to the other ones
40 simply because we can't even get enough people in the NCEES. I voiced many times with
41 Richard. I don't like this 1 through 7. I think to a certain extent we ought to create what we
42 think we need. If we don't, we aren't going to get it. If we only send one guy here and
43 maybe one over here because we think someone is going to deny it. We don't want to do
44 that and we didn't. I think our Chairman has a responsibility to make some decisions that
45 you and I may not like. I would go to a different system than Richard has. Richard's the
46 boss so we'll go with his system. But I don't agree with it. I think the final decision is his but
47 among us to see how we can do it. If we want three people to go to a session at one time,
48 let's put them down in priority listing. Before, he was on the priority list to NCEES on the
49 Western Zone, and on the other one so, he went regardless. Well, maybe we can't afford
50 that but at the same time if that issue is the top issue, he needs to go. So, there are
51 decisions that we have to make that are hard sometimes. If we have three in each, for
52 instance put down what we think we have to have. Put down the priorities, you know, if you
53 can't have three then two and which two should go. Then submit that with a strong
54 recommendation. We did that when I was in the chair and we got everything we ask for.

1 There was three of us went in every one of those. My point is, I think we have to make
2 some hard decisions sometime and it can't just be on a rotating list.

3
4 Chair: Eric first and then Vern.

5
6 Eriksen: I think what you're trying to say is we want a system that's flexible enough, not so
7 bureaucratic that we can't achieve our goals and I don't think that's Richard's mission in the
8 list. I think it's more of a means to try and have some sort of process to evaluate it and then
9 I assume that if something is not in line with our objectives we can deviate from the list. You
10 have my support on however you want to do it.

11
12 Jones: What I was going to suggest is when we put in a travel request we have to submit
13 the names. But, you could probably decide how many you want to send to a meeting and I
14 could go to Jenny and Lynne and say this is what they want, how many will you approve.
15 And once you have approval for a certain number then you could decide who goes.

16
17 Lent: Ok, you're talking about fairness. I respectfully request to be put on the priority list
18 because I did get a lot out of that NCEES meeting. I think it's important for me to learn
19 more about the engineering function and vice versa. And, Vern, I think will back me up we
20 got a lot of valuable information when we went to the CLARB meeting.

21
22 Walsh: We made a big first step. We've got the memo out there and you're pushing hard.
23 We may not get there this year but just need to keep pushing. Like Vern says we put in a
24 number of names and they hack it down by some percentage, I don't know what the gain
25 would be there but if they hack people off of it what I would recommend is we get back to
26 them and say all these people need to go. And, they may not approve it but we need to
27 keep pushing. We're talking \$10 to \$15 apiece per licensed individual to fund travel
28 requests and that's not a lot of money.

29
30 Leet: If they say no, then ask them to defend their no. That is why you've got to ask why?

31
32 Fredeen: I'm going to say it brutally. In the ideal world we can send as many as we want.
33 But, currently looking at this list and our current situation I know it's very beneficial getting
34 cross travel between the disciplines as far as NCARB and CLARB and NCEES. If in the
35 process of doing that we end up cutting people out of trying to get to their meetings. I think
36 it's more important that people get to the meetings in their industry than to meetings in
37 someone else's industry. So, with all due respect I believe we should be sending as many
38 engineers to NCEES as we can, and surveyors.

39
40 Hightower: I agree with Craig on that. I've been to an NCEES meeting and got a lot out of it
41 but it's more important for me to go to NCARB and WESTCARB, particularly if you're on the
42 National Committee. There is interaction in those meetings. And, if you're not on a National
43 Committee and you want to get on one you need to go to the meetings. If you, and this is
44 something I'm certainly not interested in, but if you want to get into a National Office you
45 have to be at those meetings for face recognition. So, I would always defer to the engineers
46 to go to theirs and so-on.

47
48 Chair: Who would be interested in going to the Western Zone meeting?

49
50 (Note: the general consensus was "if I can't go to annual I'll go to Western)

51
52 Chair: Dan you wouldn't mind going to the Western Zone, would you go?

53
54 Walsh: Sure

1
2 Chair: You're going to the National because you're on the top of the list. And the Don will
3 go and then Bo and I'll push as hard as I can. I'll just close with this whole discussion with in
4 the Legislative meetings we held, we focused on this issue and ironically we had huge
5 support. We mentioned it earlier, yesterday. The Legislators that we talked to were 101%
6 behind us and understood exactly what we were talking about. They thought it was
7 unconscionable that we weren't being fully funded for any travel that we wanted.

8
9 Brownfield: They used that word, the President of the Senate used, unconscionable.

10
11 Chair: Right, he said it was a travesty that we weren't. And, that's the President of the
12 Senate, that's not a small person and I'm going to relate that to her. I don't want her to be
13 blindsided and get confronted by this issue. She needs to know that she needs to focus on
14 this. Because it's an important issue, it's not a party. It's a responsibility that we take very
15 seriously. We have to understand what we're doing here and we can't do our job correctly,
16 and we've said that we will, without attending these meetings.

17
18 Baker: You brought up something that I think actually hurt our travel program. When we
19 went to Memphis, there's a photograph that ended up in our meeting and I think that may
20 have had an effect and it shouldn't have.

21
22 Leet: They have to understand that part of these meetings is the socialization.

23
24 Baker: The photo is not something that should have ended up where it did.

25
26 Chair: I think we have a good feeling and will be in touch with you on who will be attending
27 the NCEES Annual meeting. I'll do my best to follow through with all of that. With that let's
28 go to our Expenditure Report.

29
30 **Agenda item 16 – Expenditure Report**

31
32 Mason: I'm Kathy Mason I'm the Administrative Officer for the Division.

33
34 Chair: Thank you, Kathy, for coming in and presenting your report to us in person, we very
35 much appreciate it.

36
37 Mason: Sure, and if you have any questions while I'm going through or any other questions
38 after I'm done I'll be more than happy to try to answer them and if I don't have an answer I'll
39 do some research and present it to Vern and he can distribute it to everyone. So, let's just
40 start with personnel services. I've been trying to go over with the Boards, when I go over the
41 amounts to explain a little bit of what's included in some of these calculations. For your
42 direct, that would be your examiner or your Exec. And it could also include reg. projects that
43 are directly related to your Board that Jun does or, if you have a specific item that has been
44 legally researched by Karen Wilke, who is our Paralegal, that doesn't need to go to the
45 Legal Department these would be included. So you have \$113,000 that has been expended
46 this year to this date. And, for the indirect costs, those are your cost allocations and the cost
47 allocation is determined by a percentage and that percentage is the total number of licenses
48 divided into how many licensees you have. Your indirect percentage this year is 11.66
49 percent. So, in personnel services you have \$76,400 to date and that would include a
50 portion of my salary the director's salary all my support staff's salary. And that would be
51 figured on the overall admin indirect which at this point would be figured on \$655,227 times
52 11.66 percent. Then we get into travel expenses and that's pretty cut and dried, it's your
53 Board travel and your Executive's travel.

1 Leet: Is the indirect still at the 11.66%?

2
3 Mason: Yes, all your indirect will be allocated by the 11.66%. And the \$1000 in the indirect
4 would be like Lynn's travel and Jenny's travel. Then you get to contractual expenses. The
5 direct at this point is \$21,200. And, those are expenses like phone calls that we can directly
6 identify as your Board. They would be supplies that we order. They would be the renewal
7 forms. Those are all identifiable to your Board. The indirect expenses would be the
8 interagency expenses. They would be any costs that we can't identify directly to you,
9 building maintenance the maintenance on copiers and that kind of thing. These costs at the
10 \$21,000 are things that are directly related to your Board. We have services we purchase
11 from other agencies and those would be up in here to some extent because we could
12 identify anything that you could have legally. But if we had a reg. project that effected the
13 whole Division we wouldn't be able to identify that. That's where you would be allocated at
14 the 11.66 percent. Things like building maintenance for the Commissioner's Office or our
15 Fiscal Department. Their services would be a portion of that so, on that overall right now
16 those are at 1,786,600 and your portion is the 11.66 percent. So it comes out to \$208,000.

17
18 Chair: Let's just let her give her report and you catalog your questions for afterward so it
19 isn't so disruptive.

20
21 Mason: Ok, so, your supplies expenses are just that. Those are \$403,000 at this point.
22 And the indirect are \$2,700. At this point we haven't bought big equipment or purchased
23 any new computers or anything. So if we bought computers that would be your direct
24 expenses because we would be able to identify that a new computer went to Vern or his
25 Staff. Copiers and that kind of thing that we would purchase toward the end of the year,
26 those would be allocated from the indirect. But we don't have anything like so far. So, your
27 total indirect at this point is \$154,700. And we are a little bit more than half way through the
28 year so those are staying right in tune with what has happened in the past. Currently your
29 indirect is \$288,400 and that is pretty much staying in tune. It might be a little bit higher than
30 last year but you always expect your indirect expenses to continue going up. Your total
31 revenue at this point was \$731,400 and you're to the good by \$288,300 so your expenses
32 are less than your revenue so you're in the Black. And, your roll forward is way up there.
33 Your fees are supposed to reflect your costs so these roll forwards aren't supposed to be as
34 big as they are. I'm done.

35
36 Chair: Cliff has his hand up. Did you have a question first, Chuck, I didn't mean to interrupt,
37 did you have something you wanted to follow up? Ok, Cliff.

38
39 Baker: I'm just curious regarding the contractual services. The indirect costs seem to be
40 quite a bit higher than what I've seen in the past and we are only, like you say, a little bit
41 over half way through, so if we go on to June 30th, I'm thinking that's going to be quite a bit
42 higher.

43
44 Mason: This could be normal, it depends. Every year at the beginning of the Fiscal year we
45 do a, and I'll just show you because I have my back up here. I do an allocation for all the
46 licensees and it depends on the overall licensees and what your licensees are. So, if you
47 have more licensees your percentage is going to be larger, if you have fewer they are going
48 to be less. It fluctuates year to year so your allocation might be bigger this year than it was
49 last year or vice versa. Does that make sense?

50
51 Baker: Right, but it's also telling me here since it's quite a bit higher, and we're barely over
52 half way compared to the full years that just past. That the indirect expense is quite a bit
53 higher. I mean substantially, it's not just a little bit, it's a huge amount, almost 50%.

1 Mason: A lot of that is State services or purchased from other organizations. You know, if
2 they've done a big reg. project for the whole department, it could be legal services. It could
3 be building expenses, insurance, maintenance, all that goes up on a yearly basis.

4
5 Baker: But a 50 or 100 percent increase seems pretty dramatic. Your half way through the
6 year and your already more than those for full years. So, by the time you go another five
7 months it's going to be dramatic. So, it's at least 50% if not more.

8
9 Shiesl: Yes, that's an area of concern but you may have been hit by a special project that
10 was, that is not usually...

11
12 Mason: I can probably take a look at the break down and see if there is anything that will,
13 you know compared to last year.

14
15 Shiesl: My question is with your roll forward, which is fund balance, what do they
16 recommend to carry as a fund balance?

17
18 Mason: To be honest, it should be really close to zero.

19
20 Shiesl: Even in the revenue producing departments?

21
22 Mason: Yes, because by Statute we're supposed to be adjusting the fees according to what
23 we feel your expenses are going to be. And, it's real hard to do and that's why some of
24 these have gotten so big. Take one of the other Boards, they want to take on a new
25 program and they think they need a new office assistant so that is figured into the fees. But
26 if that doesn't happen and we've increased the fees to cover that, or, if you calculate that
27 your fees are going to be a certain number to bring in the revenue, then all of a sudden you
28 have a great year and all kinds of people move into the State and you generate all that
29 revenue. So, it's not a perfect science.

30
31 Shiesl: I understand. My next question then is, are the license fees generally stable in this
32 division? Or, does it fluctuate quite a bit.

33
34 Mason: Well, it does fluctuate some. And, it depends too, what's happening in the next
35 biennium, what you're planning on doing for projects and stuff. Because those have to be
36 considered, Or if you know you have a legal case coming up. We would project what you
37 might be using over the next biennium and put those in and if something didn't happen then
38 of course you would wind up with excess revenue.

39
40 Leet: I don't know if the roll over is that much.

41
42 Chair: Just to help you, if it would be at all possible at our next meeting if you could give a
43 short indication of what might be causing that fluctuation.

44
45 Mason: Yes, I can give you an idea of what it's made of. I've got another Board, the
46 Psychology Board that has some of the same questions so I'm doing them a comparison for
47 a few years on personnel services and contractual because that's where the questions
48 come in.

49
50 Brownfield: Generally speaking on the direct, that is us here, Vern, Alicia, that's the bulk of
51 it rest of it is the indirect support that we get from you, from somebody that's giving others
52 that same support. My question on 11.66, and somehow I thought earlier, or about four or
53 five years ago it was about 12.5. And, with the discussion and your agreements that this is
54 our percent of the number of registrants based on the total number in the State of Alaska,

1 that's the share we get. What is the smallest Board that we have that is on this same
2 system here and how many people do they have and where I'm going is, if we have 11.66.
3 When you get to smaller Boards that only have very, very little and all of a sudden their
4 percentile is 1.4 or whatever, I don't know. Is there any adjustment there where we actually
5 are, have to, in other words, where they become recipients of funds they don't make and
6 we become a donor just because they have a certain minimum? So 11.66 is direct, uh,
7 indirect.

8
9 Mason: That's the indirect. The direct is not an allocation. That is a direct expense that we
10 can identify related to your Board.

11
12 Brownfield: We are not, for instance, paying for services of smaller Boards because they
13 don't get the revenue we do?

14
15 Mason: No, their fees are done just like yours and it's reviewed by what they bring in and
16 what they spend. But, say for instance you have five licensees in a Board or I mean 40
17 licensees in a Board they are not going to have the same allocation of indirect expenses that
18 you would because they're utilizing less resources.

19
20 Rearick: I think Chuck mentioned that we've got the two year licensing cycle. So, it would
21 be natural that that number would be high right now. But then on the roll forward, if we do
22 have a real high roll forward number due to increased licensure. Then we also can assume
23 that we are going to have increased investigations, increased administration, etc. And. I
24 think that needs to be considered in the next year's fees.

25
26 Mason: It is considered. When I review these fees, I review all this here, over the last
27 couple of years, which is historical data. Then anything that Vern tells me that's going to
28 happen in the next two, or may happen or any projects the Board is considering or if you're
29 trying to get a new person because you've gotten so big or a new position or a project will
30 require more staff or you've got legal, those are all calculated into the fees. We will look at
31 the next two years and if your roll forward is still up there then, of course, your fees would
32 come down. The fee setting is not perfect, it's based on historical data and what we think
33 will happen in the next biennium.

34
35 Chair: Dan did you want to speak to, uh. There was a little bit of a disconnect and we
36 wanted to be involved in the setting of the fees and I know it was a misunderstanding that
37 you thought we had been contacted about this but in fact we hadn't. I'm not blaming anyone
38 at all but we did want to be involved a little bit and maybe Dan would like to speak to that a
39 little.

40
41 Walsh: As far as the fee setting process, from my perspective at least, the Board just didn't
42 have an opportunity to give serious input with respect to, like your saying, future projects,
43 future travel and we'd certainly like to do that in the future.

44
45 Mason: I had the fees done far in advance and that's what we're trying to do, give more
46 input to the Board. I'm trying to have the fees set, and I am for other Boards, your Board I'm
47 sorry you didn't get input, it was put out there in plenty of time. I'm setting the fees six
48 months in advance so they can go to the Board meetings like this. I've done them for the
49 PT OT Board so that they could review them and have some input on them. The fees were
50 done they were given to Ginger Morton, your previous Exec and whether they were given to
51 you all at a board meeting, I don't have any control over that. All I have control over is to do
52 the fees and then give them to your Exec to present at the Board. I'm really sorry because
53 that's what I'm setting fees for so you do have the input and you can provide, you know, why
54 we don't want the fees to go down or up and we can have discussion and it can go through

1 channels.

2

3 Shiesl: When you set your fees. What base figure do you use for the number of applicants?

4

5 Mason: Every year your Exec does statistical information and I take that statistical
6 information and use that. Basically we take the renewals. The applicants are taken over a
7 two year period and the renewals are taken the last year.

8

9 Chair: We love Ginger to death.

10

11 Mason: And I'm not saying anything. I mean she was in the process of leaving and there
12 was a lot of transition going on, so please don't think that I'm...

13

14 Chair: We aren't blaming her and we are not blaming you.

15

16 Mason: No, no I'm just saying that it's out of my hands once I give them, uh, you know,
17 Ginger was a wonderful lady.

18

19 Baker: A couple of things, when you come up with the fees are you presenting those fees to
20 the board to say this is what it's going to be or are you presenting them for discussion so
21 that we can come back to you and say one way or the other?

22

23 Mason: I've done both. What happens is basically it goes to you like this and it goes out to
24 everybody. And, you all try to make heads or tails of it and decide whether you like what is
25 there or not. Whether I've left out something and I can come into a Board meeting and give
26 you the run down.

27

28 Baker: So is that where we would come in and say we feel we need to increase our travel
29 budget and we want to do it so the fee is so much per licensee and you put it in and then
30 that is set aside for the travel?

31

32 Mason: The fees that I do are proposed fees. They go through the Operations Manager
33 which is Jenny and then they go through Lynne to approve them. Then they can be
34 presented to the Board go out for public notices. At point what you would have your
35 discussion and you would make your wants known and they would go into your minutes and
36 then Vern would send Jenny and Lynne the notes from the meeting and say the Board has
37 had this discussion this is what they've requested or not requested and why they don't feel
38 the fees should be this or whatever. Then that would be reviewed again at that point and
39 then they would make some kind of decision and the fees would be either changed or not
40 changed.

41

42 Baker: So when that is sent to us is it sent to in a, "so this is what the fees are going to be"
43 or is it sent to say, "ok, a percentage of those fees is directed to personnel expenses and a
44 percentage of those fees is directed to travel so that we can keep track ourselves on how
45 much we're using of the fees towards a certain service?"

46

47 Mason: I can go get you if you'd like the fees I did for you and show you what they look like.
48 Let me go get those so you can see how I calculate things.

49

50 Eriksen: It seems like there is a set process and our frustration is we are getting this after
51 the fact. It sounds like they get input from Vern, why can't we have a plan to schedule a
52 meeting prior to that period and have a discussion as an agenda item and give some input
53 to Vern to forward.

54

1 Leet: I think that in 2011 you'll be able to say at that meeting, here's what we want with fees
2 because at that time Cathy will be thinking about it.

3
4 Chair: Duly noted: I want to point out that the discussion that you had with her regarding
5 the increase in one area of contractual services. Indirect went way up but direct went way
6 down. So, there may have been some shifting of expenses and in fact things have been
7 running pretty smoothly.

8
9 Mason: This is what you would get when I did the fees. And then my back up is anything.
10 It goes from a request from somebody and these were, you know, someone wrote in that
11 they want something changed or something done differently. Then I would have the notes
12 in here and I could figure it into the fees. And then what I do is I take from the previous years
13 the calculations. I also take your, uh, these are the statistics from Vern that he does on a
14 yearly basis and then this is how I calculate the second portion where your fees are then
15 proposed and the revenue generated. So, you all are more than welcome to see how I
16 calculate it. I can pass this around, I can't let you keep it but certainly you can look at it and
17 see how I calculate things. I'm not sure that it's going to make sense. I was an accountant
18 in Finance before I came down here. I was an accountant III in Finance. So, you'll see that
19 I cross reference everything from all my pages so you can find all the calculations. I have
20 notes on everything. So, if you'd like, you can pass that around so that you can see.

21
22 Baker: I'd like to make just one quick comment. We've been struggling ever since I've been
23 on the Board with not getting the travel that we feel is required. I'm understanding correctly,
24 I think, that you're getting Vern the amount of expenses that are spent for certain items. So,
25 he's saying this is how much we spent on travel so you're using that to create a budget. But
26 that's not what we needed in order to be able to function as a Board and do our job
27 nationally because you're not presented with what we're not getting. Because we haven't
28 been approved for it, is that correct? Your getting what are our actual expenses and that
29 that's how you're basing the budget. But there's expense out there that we feel we need but
30 we aren't getting approved so that's not being included in the budget.

31
32 Mason: Those things would be at Jenny and Lynne's level. If you want certain things that
33 aren't being approved, that's beyond the scope of this. So, those are items that are at a
34 higher level. If I'm aware of those then they would be figured into the fees. Basically the
35 fees are done on historical data and projected knowledge of items to come.

36
37 Baker: Because we're being denied something its being falsely reported what we really
38 need.

39
40 Mason: That would be something that would probably go into your notes and into your
41 minutes to Vern and to Jenny and Lynne.

42
43 Lent: On historical information that you use to calculate fees, I just wanted to caution
44 everybody that we're going to have a little bit of a blip here that has to do with the institution
45 of continuing education, people dropping out of the system. We've got a 26% drop right
46 now and I'm sure that's going to be corrected but never the less that's quite a drop in fees
47 that are coming in. So were you aware of that?

48
49 Mason: But although there may be a correction, you know, maybe you won't bring in as
50 much money, you've got such a large roll forward at this point that it's not going to truly
51 affect your bottom line. Now, on the two year cycle it will, it will bring down your roll forward
52 but you still have such a large roll forward that you're not going to really feel it.

53
54 Lent: My worry was that you would have to drastically increase fees.

1
2 Mason: We will take away from your roll forward first and then what I'd do is, there's a
3 portion on there that says roll forward used on the first page. Those are calculated into the
4 fees. So, before I would raise fees your roll forward would be reduced to offset that.

5
6 Walsh: Could you remind me where the AAG expenses would come off of here.

7
8 Mason: Contractual and those would be direct for the most part, unless it was an overall
9 reg. project or a legal project or something that required legal services for the whole division.

10
11 Leet: How quickly do they turn in the bills.

12
13 Mason: I think they're monthly or quarterly.

14
15 Chair: My recollection is that question had been asked previously and the time lag was
16 pretty terrible it actually was carrying over from one Fiscal Year to the next and, point in fact
17 they were like a year behind on occasion. But that was a predecessor of yours and they
18 actually told us that the AG's Office sends their back up information, or charges, at their
19 whim.

20
21 Mason: Well you know we are all overworked and we have lots of paper work to push to try
22 as hard as we can to get everything on time. But even with me, you know, I rob Peter to pay
23 Paul and I drop one project to work on another project. So, bills might, you know, you may
24 see one Board Report that has basically nothing and then all of a sudden you get this huge,
25 it's because I paid bills at that point.

26
27 Walsh: Contemplating future involvement in setting future fees, what would be a good time
28 of year for us to anticipate, uh, this time of year or our May meeting?

29
30 Mason: Vern, remind me when your renewal was.

31
32 Jones: This last December.

33
34 Mason: This last December, so I would have done your fees, I haven't even been here a
35 year so I think when I came onboard I was doing fees four or five months in advance and
36 then Boards wanted to have more input so now we're doing it six months in advance. So if
37 your renewal is in December it would be done in June or July.

38
39 Jones: So in June of 2011, since our next renewal will be in December of 2011, we should
40 have something to present.

41
42 Chair: So, in our May 2011 meeting.

43
44 Mason: Right and if Vern, what I try to do is if I've got a Board that I know is meeting at a
45 certain time. Because everything follows a time line, they have to go out for public notice for
46 a certain amount of time, then they have to go Law, so all those, I mean there are like four
47 months that the fees have to be done in. So, if you guys are going to review them I need to
48 have them done probably for a Board meeting. If your only meeting every three or four
49 months. If you didn't get them in May the time frame of when you would meet the next time
50 would not allow enough time for you to review them. So, with that said, if Vern lets me know
51 ahead of time, if he sends me a note and says my Boards meeting in May I can try to
52 accommodate depending on what I have going on at that point. I have accommodated other
53 boards. If you give me enough time, they take me a week to do.

1 Leet: What happens is when the fees go out, you don't get the calls. This Board gets the
2 calls and it's good to have the answers.

3
4 Mason: Yes and if there's questions, I can do research for you, I can do comparisons, I can
5 provide you as much information as I can gather for you. I don't want to set myself up for
6 doing extra work but if there are specific items that you're concerned about I can put stuff
7 together for you.

8
9 Baker: Just to expand on what Chuck said. I've already received complaints because our
10 current fees dropped more than 50% so that means it will increase in 2011.

11
12 Mason: It probably won't happen because you've got such a huge roll forward that it will
13 keep being used against the shortfall and I would have to take a look at this to see what the
14 shortfall was in your fees. This is what your projected expenses were, plus your revenue so
15 your shortfall would have been \$529,000 this time and I've used that against your roll
16 forward to bring it down. But even with that said and done your still going to have a roll
17 forward next time of about \$350,000. Provided that everything is static, which it's not so you
18 could have a big roll forward or you could have a smaller roll forward but you will have some
19 kind of roll forward.

20
21 Chair: Any other questions? I very much appreciate your explanations. They have been
22 very helpful. It always helps us to be a little more educated to do a better job here. Thank
23 you Cathy and we look forward to talking to you on the phone when we meet in Fairbanks at
24 our next meeting in May. Next item, do you want to take a break here? Dan.

25
26 Walsh: I would like the Chair to entertain the idea of forming a standing committee for
27 budget at our next meeting.

28
29 Chair: Let's take a fifteen minute break. At eleven o'clock sharp we'll start the meeting up
30 again.

31
32 Break from 10:45 to 11:05.

33
34 Chair: Let's reconvene. On our agenda we're on examiners report but I have a feeling
35 someone wants to make a motion.

36
37 **On a motion duly made by Walsh, seconded by Brownfield it was**

38
39 **RESOLVED to form a standing committee entitled "Budget and Fees Committee" to**
40 **advise on a budget adequate for our Board mission, and appropriate fees.**

41
42 Chair: It's been moved by Dan and seconded by Bo, any discussion? All in favor? All
43 opposed?

44
45 Hearing no objection the motion passed unanimously.

46
47 Chair: It's done and duly noted Don. And to reiterate Don, I believe it should still be called
48 bylaws.

49
50 **Agenda item 17 – Licensing Examiners Report**

51
52 Chair: Vern will be emailing that to us. It just informational, it isn't an item we vote on or
53 anything. It's not imperative that we have it in our packets. We've gone through the Board
54 Travel. Bert.

1
2 Lent: On the Board Travel one item to add at the bottom of the chart, this is item 18,
3 CLARB Annual Meeting first week of September, Baltimore, MD.
4

5 Chair: Actually we haven't gone over the calendar yet. Could you get back with us before
6 the next meeting to let us know when that is exactly?
7

8 Lent: I'll get back to you long before that because we need to plan for it as the tickets and
9 reservations are difficult.
10

11 Chair: Lets go to Board Tasks, the to do list.
12

13 **Agenda item 19 – Board Tasks (to do list)** 14

15 Chair: There have been a lot of commitments in this meeting. But, what I'd like to do is go
16 ahead and go to each individual. Under Bo it's a white paper, that's been done. I think your
17 to do list now is to proceed with what was indicated, to summarize at the end of February
18 what is the next step in the General Licensure.
19

20 Brownfield: And you're going to send me language Vern?
21

22 Jones: I'll get with you before you leave.
23

24 Chair: And the other item was, you need to respond to an inquiry of 7.e. which was
25 regarding dual licensure, I believe. You'll compose a letter to respond to that? I wrote
26 down that, that's what you committed to when we were reviewing 7 e.
27

28 Brownfield: I also have a letter that Vern gave me that I have to do, regarding Mr. Sande.
29 And I have a letter to write to the individual that we just had motions on.
30

31 Chair: So you have four items. The supplemental work on incidental practice can be at the
32 bottom of the list.
33

34 Then we go to Chuck and you are going to follow through with a flow chart for evaluating
35 applications.
36

37 Leet: This is the one for comity. Yesterday I actually had a learning experience on that.
38

39 Chair: Dan you've accomplished everything in reviewing that to do list. Part of item 2 and 4
40 is ongoing.
41

42 Walsh: Yes, I think that's right. I volunteered to do the NCEES Bylaws review. If you want
43 me to do anything with the new Budget Committee, I'd be happy to do that.
44

45 Chair: Supplemental, Vern, to this is if we missed something when we are going over this
46 could you please add it to the list?
47

48 Don, you've got a marked up copy from Gayle now, even if it turns into one page it's still a
49 Bylaws thing. It would be real, even though it wouldn't be Bylaws, in my opinion she gave
50 us some real good information. She won't admit it to us but we do interpret and analyze
51 regulations and statute because if we look at intent. And one of the things I wouldn't mind is
52 an informational sheet at the end of the Bylaws, call it an exhibit or something. And you can
53 attach to those Bylaws the information she provided starting with the laws that affect us.
54 And also historical information that are in those Bylaws and attach as exhibits. Vern will

1 remove what she didn't like on those and forward a clean copy to you.
2
3 Shiesl: And I don't mind being on the Budget Committee.
4
5 Chair: And you can consider I'm your helper on the Bylaws too. Once you get through all of
6 that if you could report to me on that. I don't think there were any other things assigned at
7 this meeting, Don.
8
9 Shiesl: I can email you a copy.
10
11 Chair: Bert, you'll have the Guidance Manual.
12
13 Lent: Harley gave me the information on as built and record drawings.
14
15 Chair: Ok, then do a little blurb on the penalties, do whatever edits you feel necessary the
16 corrections and submit that to Vern and he'll do a proof on it and he will publish it as March
17 2010. Make sure we passed your verbiage for rather than including the penalties of, that
18 paragraph, include that where it's needed.
19
20 Lent: I also have to get dates for the CLARB Annual meeting to Vern. And ask Vern for
21 something else and that's we have a 26% dropout in landscape architecture. Thirteen
22 people didn't renew and I want to find out who they are and where they are.
23
24 Chair: Please report back to the Board on that. Richard, I thought there were quite a few
25 things that were..
26
27 Rearick: There are a couple things. That first item on Gayle's memo regarding email use by
28 the Board, I'm not quite sure exactly what I was supposed to do with that or where that email
29 is or anything about it really. I had commented at the last meeting about the member board
30 members that would violate the Open Meeting Act. And apparently there had been email at
31 one point in time from her, but I think it might have been before I came on the Board.
32
33 Chair: There have actually been no emails from her regarding that. It's all been verbal.
34 And, she's quoting a case law that actually went to the State Supreme Court regarding the
35 Precinct Boundaries Commission. The State Supreme Court ruled that email to the whole
36 body was in violation of the Open Meetings Act. The email that was cited in the court case
37 violating the Open Meetings Act was actually trying to set the time and the place of the
38 meeting. But somebody didn't like the outcome of the decision that the Precinct Boundaries
39 Commission, I don't know the official title of it, but they didn't like the outcome of the
40 decision so that threw the email into the mix. I'm not a lawyer, but in my opinion, that case
41 law does not apply. But she's working with only what she has, so to her defense I do
42 understand where she's coming from. But it's demonstrated by that court case we looked at
43 that anything we email is considered public. Gayle listed two attorney's in Anchorage, I
44 don't know if you got their names. I think as a "to do list" you should contact them and see if
45 they have a different opinion.
46
47 Rearick: Is that proper for me to contact them directly?
48
49 Chair: It's a huge Board issue, so my opinion is yes.
50
51 Jones: Any contact with the AG's office has to go through Jenny. What happens is we ask
52 them for assistance on a project and they assign someone to it.
53
54 Chair: Did you hear that?

1
2 Rearick: So I'll go through Vern. Basically what we are looking for from them is guidance
3 on emails.
4

5 Chair: Yes. And my feeling is to be able to accomplish work on a committee level, our
6 committees are made up of two or three people, that, that is not a violation of the Open
7 Meetings Act. It's not a formal Board decision process, so I don't see that it's a huge
8 problem.
9

10 Rearick: Ok, on some of the new tasks that I have, I was going to work with Cliff on Item 7 f.
11 Which was the John Cooper letter regarding the non licensure of Permitting Officials. And,
12 I'm being added to the Committee for General Licensure. So, Bo and Craig and others if
13 you want to task me with something give a holler or drop an email. Also on the Licensure
14 Mobility Committee, next month at the WESTCARB meeting I'll pay attention to that. That is
15 an issue that they talk about at the National level and bring back whatever I can find out
16 about it. There was an item at the last meeting that doesn't show up on my "to do list", but I
17 had in my notes. There was an email from an intern that I think was received just before the
18 meeting so it wasn't sent out and I think I was supposed to respond to that and didn't. So,
19 Vern, if you want to look at that email and I think there was another one that did get
20 responded to that was in our packed as a handout. I would be happy to respond to that, I
21 just didn't want to do it if somebody else had.
22

23 Chair: Ok. One of the things that happens, is, that Vern will be writing all of this down I
24 hope. And then he'll email out a "to do list" and if you see any changes that you want, get
25 back with him.
26

27 Harley, I saw the letter for Carla. That's very good, and that got sent off?
28

29 Jones: Not yet, but it will.
30

31 Hightower: Did we send that...
32

33 Jones: The other two are gone.
34

35 Hightower: Ok, good. And the review of Bo's letter that's past history?
36

37 Chair: Yes, I haven't mentioned that, but that's all gone now.
38

39 Hightower: I still have specialty contractors, incidental practice, exemptions and Dan's
40 letter, that's a work in progress. I'll try to have that all done by next meeting.
41

42 Chair: And then I did have down here a report that you were doing on the California
43 continuing education.
44

45 Hightower: They have a requirement for five CEU's on the subject of barrier free regulations
46 and that's the extent of their continuing education. It's just on that one subject. They had
47 some real stringent requirements on reporting. You've got to list the author or presenter of
48 the seminar and give a lot of background. I failed to do that and it's holding up my licensing.
49 They don't fine you or take your license they just won't re-issue it until you have everything
50 in order. So if you're licensed in California you've got to pay attention to their regulations.
51

52 Lent: Is that applicable to all professions?
53

54 Hightower: The Architectural Board is a separate Board so I don't know.

1
2 Chair: At this meeting, Harley, did you volunteer for any additional tasks?
3
4 Hightower: No, and didn't get any assigned.
5
6 Chair: I think the continuation of your committee work is in order of course.
7
8 Hightower: I had a lot to do in addition to this "to do list". I took care of it but forgot what it
9 was. If I could concentrate on this one thing and get it out of the way then I'll volunteer for
10 something else.
11
12 Chair: Eric, I think now that you've exchanged cards with Dale Nelson. He is the contact
13 point for legislation. We don't have anything pending right now but APDC does have a call
14 in forum that once you get on that list. If you could accommodated call-in interaction at those
15 meetings, they are usually afterhours, and hopefully won't disrupt your schedule if you're not
16 able to do that you might make sure Bo, or Craig are able to coordinate that effort and have
17 somebody substitute for you. Then you will be working on specialty contractors, is that part
18 of the committee tasks?
19
20 Eriksen: I commented a little last meeting and Craig and I reviewed some stuff and I would
21 be interested in, just since I had read through it have some opinions and thoughts I would be
22 interested in helping review that when you're done.
23
24 Hightower: Ok I'll give it to you and Dan to review and anyone else that wants to see it.
25
26 Chair: And at this meeting I asked you to do something else, do you recall what that was?
27
28 Eriksen: I was to get a hold of Mark and see if he applied to Canada. I ask to continue some
29 involvement in the Licensure Mobility Committee. I think that's all I have on my list.
30
31 Chair: So, I guess number three on all lists was comment on Bo's white paper, that's all
32 been done. So, that can be removed and I don't have to repeat that for everybody.
33
34 Craig, input on grandfathering, that still is important because it's an issue that needs to be
35 dealt with. That is one issue, even though there was support from DOT here, uh, George,
36 that's something we need to formulate. It would be very good to have a small paragraph,
37 basically for an understanding of how that process is going to work to a civil engineer that
38 has a high level of competence in being able to do structural work. And even though his
39 license will say Professional Engineer specializing in civil engineering he still should be able
40 to practice what he's been doing. Somehow we need to address that or formulate that so
41 that people will understand. It is actually the biggest issue that we're dealing with in this
42 process. The grandfathering of people that are practicing within their competence and even
43 though the license may say something else, for instance, John Hargesheimer is an
44 environmental engineer but his license says civil engineer.
45
46 Fredeen: This is kind of weird because we are all becoming general. The big thing before
47 was when we were adding structural engineers, environmental engineers..
48
49 Chair: I understand that but I'm trying to say that we need to be able to respond to that.
50
51 Fredeen: What's going to happen to my license?
52
53 Chair: What's going to happen to my license? Can I still do what I'm doing right now, what
54 I've made a living doing for the last 30 years? The big concern that I've heard was, you may

1 not do that but the next board in four years will take me to task because I only took a civil
2 engineering exam, I didn't take the environmental exam. And, any input you can have for
3 specialty contractors.
4
5 Fredeen: That reg. change died.
6
7 Chair: You've done your report on B+30. If there's more follow up to that from your
8 education committee that you need to do. Is there anything else at this meeting that we ask
9 of you?
10
11 Fredeen: I can't recall anything.
12
13 Chair: I can't recall anything either, but Vern will follow up.
14
15 Cliff, you have the spread sheet and as we receive more written comments, it looks very
16 good so we'll keep doing that. Has the fairness issue of CEU's, State registrants vs. comity
17 applicants, has that kind of...
18
19 Baker: It's been cleared up because we do require architects and engineers to take the
20 arctic engineering which really fulfills any CEU's that they would be required to have when
21 they come in. Unless of course they took the arctic engineering two years ago and are just
22 now trying to get their license. I think in 99% of cases it would be resolved.
23
24 Chair: Kind of dove tailing into that a little bit. There's been, in my mind, and maybe it's on
25 the web, but dual licensure. I wouldn't mind a discussion on that. I've actually been
26 confronted on that. If a fellow is a land surveyor and an engineer, do the CEU's for land
27 surveyor count for...
28
29 Brownfield: It's in the regulations.
30
31 Jones: It's in the regulations. You have to have at least 8 hours in each one.
32
33 Chair: And so, do we have on the web, for instance, surveyors have an explanation of all of
34 this?
35
36 Jones: All the instructions are on the web. You go to our website, click on continuing
37 education and it gives you the regulations and the instructions on how to fill out the forms.
38
39 Baker: It is to note that, most, higher elevation professions, surveyors, are required to have
40 more CEU's every two years than engineers. So they can fulfill that if they have dual
41 licenses just by having that extra surveying.
42
43 Chair: I think all of Gayle's to do's have been done.
44
45 Baker: Also on mine, just to reiterate, I'm working with Richard on 7 f, Cooper's letter.
46
47 Chair: Vern, I think the only thing was, there was a little bit of, you're going to do some
48 follow-up as far as the disconnect we had with the National data base and making sure that
49 we have published up to date on our own website the violations....
50
51 Jones: I think our website is pretty much up to date.
52
53 Chair: Anything else to bring up?
54

1 Eriksen: There were a bunch of questions regarding the Guidelines book after Gayle left.

2

3 Lent: The discussion was about Gayle editing our Guidelines booklet and the feeling was
4 that it's not of the same stature as our regulations.

5

6 Chair: I'm not an attorney, but I think it says it all. It's just intended to be a guide. I think if
7 you get asked the same questions 20 times in a year it makes no sense to me not to be able
8 to have some kind of FAQ and the answer to it.

9

10 Baker: I think we should probably come up with a disclaimer that goes on there saying that
11 this is subject to the Statutes and Regulations.

12

13 Chair: She doesn't like to state the obvious, but let's state the obvious.

14

15 Eriksen: I think that discussion was not so much to asker her to review it or should we have
16 a disclaimer but how do we craft it to have some sort of a Guidance Manual.

17

18 Lent: I can call her and ask her help on that.

19

20 Chair: No, I'd appreciate it if you did not do that.

21

22 Shiesl: I have a question about the hits on the website, if you could find out how many
23 people are using that.

24

25 Jones: I can check with the webmaster.

26

27 Chair: We are actually running behind and I am thinking of not breaking for lunch to finish
28 this. He will edit that and add the disclaimer.

29

30 Lent: Let me have the benefit of knowing how that's worded.

31

32 **On a motion by Baker, seconded by Eriksen it was**

33

34 **RESOLVED to approve the following list of applicants for registration by comity and**
35 **examination read, with the stipulation that the information in the applicants files will**
36 **take precedence over the information in the minutes:**

37

38

<i>APPLICANT</i>	<i>DISCIPLINE</i>	<i>EXAM-COMITY</i>	<i>BOARD ACTION</i>
Abaza, Osama	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam
Ahmed, Mohamed M.	FE Exam		Approved
Albers, Maria L.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & of the jurisprudence questionnaire

Albers, Matthew B.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Allely, Joshua Richard	FE Exam		Approved
Alley, Timothy J.	FE Exam		Approved
Alstrom, Crystal E.	FE Exam		Approved
Anctil, Matthew Brian	FE Exam		Approved
Anderson, Michael K.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & arctic course.
Anglen, Ben Z.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing NCEES Principles & Practices of Mechanical Engineering & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Arnold, Nicholas R	FE Exam		Approved
Arvey, David M.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon verification of FE & passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Austin, Jacob Adam	FLS Exam		Approved
Bablinskas, Krystin Kay	FE Exam		Approved
Baril, Paul Robert	Professional Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional on passing architect registration exam; successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire &.
Basri, Basri	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence.
Beiswenger, David Walter	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on verification of FE Exam; passing the NCEES Principles & Practices of Civil Engineering exam; &

			successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Bender, Jr., Christopher John	FE Exam		Approved
Benjamin, Sean Paul	FE Exam		Approved
Bergeron, Alex J.P.	FE Exam		Approved
Bloomfield, Jenelle R.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & passing an approved arctic engineering course .
Bohl, Randy M.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Bradshaw, Travis Michael	FS Exam		Incomplete - needs an additional 32 months experience per 12 AAC 36.064.
Broline, Gregory Anthony	FE Exam		Approved
Brookins, Billy J.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved -conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Bryant, Joe Allen	FE Exam		Approved
Burke, Richard S.	FE Exam		Approved
Burkes, Randall Lee	FE Exam		Approved
Cao, Xu	FE Exam		Approved
Carr, Bradd N.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved -conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam; successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire; & verification of 4 months of continuing employment.
Cheysobhon, Chanon C.	FE Exam		Approved

Choromanski, Clayton H.	FS Exam		Approved
Christensen, Peter Henry	FE Exam		Approved
Clifton, Mark James	FE Exam		Approved
Collins, Rodney Wotherspoon	FE Exam		Approved
Comer, Blaine M.	Professional Land Surveyor	Comity	Approved - conditional upon passing the AKLS exam
Cornell, Jeremiah Fort	Professional Land Surveyor	Comity	Approved (<i>still owes \$100</i>) – conditional upon receipt of all fees & passing AKLS exam
Cummings, Rodney M.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Dalsfoist, Michael Stephen	FE Exam		Approved
Dean, William Wesley	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
DeKruif, Kristian C.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing NCEES Principles & Practice of Mechanical Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & passing an approved arctic engineering course.
Dietrich, Adriana Marie	FE Exam		Approved
Dlugosz, Urszula M.	Professional Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional on passing all divisions of the Architect Registration Examination & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Doering, Joshua N.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on passing an approved arctic engineering course & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire

Donovan, Travis A.	FE Exam		Approved
Echeverria, Alfredo	Professional Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Eickelman, Sara Marie	FE Exam		Approved
Erbilen, Bora	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional on passing an approved arctic engineering course & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Erickson, Mark Alex	FS Exam		Approved
Erickson, Anita Yuet Fong	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Fagen, KC Earl	Professional Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional on passing an approved arctic engineering course.
Fagnant, Thomas D.	FE exam		Approved
Fischer, Cory J.	FE Exam		Approved
Forster, Bannie Kussin	FE Exam		Approved
Franklin, John Douglas	Fundamentals of Engineering	Exam	Approved
Frazier, Loran E.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional on verification of FE & successful completion of the Arctic course & jurisprudence questionnaire.
Frazier, Loran E.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional on Arctic & successful completion of the jurisprudence.
Frey, Jesse M.W.	FE Exam		Approved
Gagnon, Philip Francis	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional on successful completion of Arctic course & jurisprudence questionnaire.
Galbraith, Leon R.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles &

			Practice of Civil Engineering exam & continuing employment
Gallagher, Tara Jane	Professional Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing Architect Registration Exam & jurisprudence questionnaire.
Galligan, William Joseph	FE Exam		Approved
Gannon, Jerome D.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Gaulke, Jessica Sue	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the Arctic course & jurisprudence questionnaire.
Gomez, Rembert Augusto	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon foreign credential evaluation; successful completion of an approved Arctic course & the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Green, Duke Shane	FE Exam		Approved
Grieco, Frank M.	Architect	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & arctic engineering course .
Grieco, Frank M.	Professional Architect	Comity	Approved
Gross, Heather M.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon verification of Abet-accredited BSCE & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Grubbs, Joel Robert	Professional Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Hammerquist, Brad J.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam; approved arctic course, & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Harkacz, Jr., Orest M.	Fundamentals of Engineering	Exam	Approved

Harris, David E.	FE Exam		Approved
Harshbarger, Ned J.	FE Exam		Approved
Hauke, Michael	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Hayes, Jonathan L.	Professional Landscape Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional on passing landscape architect registration exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & approved Arctic course.
Heikkinen, Andrew Brian	FS Exam		Approved
Heikkinen, Andrew Brian	FS Exam		Approved
Heim, Carl F.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Heimerl, Joseph R.	FE Exam		Approved
Helmkamp, Mark J.	FE Exam & Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Heumann, Michael Paul	FE Exam		Approved
Hickman, Timothy	FE Exam		Approved
Honrud, Derrick	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam
Hove, Brent R.	Professional Landscape Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing all divisions of the landscape architect registration exam; successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & an approved Arctic engineering course.
Hsu, Joseph C.	Professional	Comity	Approved - conditional upon

	Mechanical Engineer		completion of approved arctic course; verification of education; & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Huff, Zachary Thomas	FE Exam		Approved
Hughes, Cory Shea	FS Exam		Approved
Hynson, William Thomas	FE Exam		Approved
Imlach, Logan A.	FE Exam		Approved
Irvin, Kyle D.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional on successful completion of the Arctic course & jurisprudence questionnaire.
Ivaniszek, Joshua F.	Professional Land Surveyor	Exam	Approved
Ivanov, Lauren Staff	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved –conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Jackson, Maureen D.	Professional Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of a current license in another jurisdiction.
Jaska, Matthew G.	Professional Chemical Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional on passing NCEES Principles & Practice of Chemical Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Johnson, Don E.	Professional Land Surveyor	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of CA FS & CO PS; passing AKLS exam; verification of education & 8 yrs of experience. (per 12 AAC 36.107)
Johnston, Christopher F.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Jordan, Aaron S.	Professional Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practices of Electrical Engineering exam, & successful completion of the jurisprudence

			questionnaire.
Jouridan, Donald R.	FE Exam		Approved
Kalmbacher, Jacob	FE Exam		Approved
Kamrath, Jody Ellen	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on verification of NCEES FE exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Kaplun, Kimberley A.	Professional Landscape Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional on verification of education; successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & arctic engineering course .
Kase, James D.	FE Exam		Approved
Keyuravong, Pisonth	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Kim, John H.	FE Exam		Approved
Kitchen , Tristan Charles	FE Exam		Approved
Korach, Kali M.	FE Exam		Approved
Korthauer, Aurelia	FE Exam		Approved
Kuehn, David Matthew	Professional Landscape Architect	Comity	Approved - conditional on passing an approved Arctic course & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Lawson, Theresa Antal	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Leifheit, Andrew M.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved -conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Leonard, Diana J.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Levison, Jeffrey Lawrence	FE Exam		Approved
Li, Xue	FE Exam		Approved

Lockhart, Tobias A.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon verification of FE exam; passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam; successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire; & receipt of fees.
Louie, Kenneth K.	Professional Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Lowell, David H.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Lutes, Kevin D.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Malveaux, Chloe Shani	FE Exam		Approved
Mann, Douglas Loftin	Professional Landscape Architect	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & approved arctic design.
Mao, Yin	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
McCarty, Michael Sean	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
McDonald, Gareth Gordon	FE Exam		Approved
McDowell, David H.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on payment of fees & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
McGee, Oran	FE Exam		Approved
McGill, Adam J.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
McKee, Edith J.M.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering

			exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
McKinney, Chad David	FE Exam		Approved
McMahon, Neil E.	Fundamentals of Engineering	Exam	Approved
McMullen, Kyle P.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved -& conditional upon verification of education & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Melendez, Victor M.	Professional Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on payment; passing NCEES Principles & Practice of Electrical Engineering exam; successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Menzel, Kyle S.	Fundamentals of Engineering	Exam	Approved
Middelstadt, Nicholas R.	FE Exam		Approved
Miller, Jeffrey A.	Professional Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved- conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & completion of approved arctic.
Miller, Joseph Michael	FE Exam		Approved
Moe, Jesse Logan	FE Exam		Approved
Molle, Bryant C.	FE Exam		Approved
Moriarty, John H.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & verification of current license; & JQ
Morse, Cory Jon	FE Exam		Approved
Morton, Devin Patrick	FE Exam		Approved
Mullin, Anthony P.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & verification of current license.
Murphy, Patrick Kelley	Professional Civil	Comity	Approved - successful

	Engineer		completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & educational & licensing verification.
Nabong, Loret Guintu, Jr.	FE Exam		Approved
Nasse, Taylor W.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Neumaier, JoAnn S.	Professional Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved
Ngueguim, Bertin Dijomo	FE Exam		Approved
Nichols, Sarah Elizabeth	Fundamentals of Engineering	Exam	Approved
Odegard, Jacob Roy	FE Exam		Approved
Oestgaard, Finn Erik	FE Exam		Approved
Ohlfs, Chan Suk	FE Exam		Approved
Olsen, Bjorn R.	Fundamentals of Engineering	Exam	Approved
Ong, Choo Soon	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – completion of arctic course & conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Oppegard, Erik Milo	FS Exam		Approved
Oquendo, Jose P.	Professional Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved –conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Electrical Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Parent, Mark J.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exams & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Parker, Blair C.	Professional Land Surveyor	Exam	Approved
Parkington, Todd S.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering

			exam; receipt of transcripts and successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Pearson, Katrina R.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Pendegraft, Lee Richard	FE Exam		Approved
Pendergast, Kevin J.	FE Exam		Approved
Pettibone, Glen J.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on completion of approved arctic course & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Polamarasetty, Ravi K.	FE Exam		Approved.
Poynor, Richard G.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & arctic course.
Presler, Wendy A.	FE Exam		Approved
Ramsey, Ryan	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the approved arctic course & jurisprudence questionnaire.
Rathbun, Aimee Annette	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Rearden, Sterling Michael	FE Exam		Approved
Regacho, Richard Rivera	FE Exam		Approved
Richardson, Donald J.	FE Exam		Approved
Roberts, Lauren M.	Professional Mining Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Robicheau, Neil Matthew	Professional Land Surveyor	Exam	Approved
Rohwer, Jason Alan	Professional Mechanical	Comity	Approved - conditional on payment of fees & successful

	Engineer		completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & Arctic course.
Rymut, Cody Dustin	FE Exam		Approved
Salem, Rifaat S.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion approved arctic course.
Samuel, Rinu	FE Exam		Approved
Sandefur, Andrea E.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & Arctic course .
Sanders, Nicholas E.	FE Exam		Approved
Santos, Dolores Adbel	FE Exam		Approved
Schaer, Eric Lorin	Professional Architect	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & arctic course & verification of current registration.
Scheer, III, R. David	Professional Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the Architect registration exam
Schiller, Benjamin J.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on verification of the FE Exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & Arctic req.
Schultz, Kirsten Lynn	FE Exam		Approved
Shaw, Wendy L.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Skinner, Alan F.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on passing test & verification of work through projected date.
Slater, Brian Andrew	FE Exam		Approved
Smith, Greg Colter	FE Exam		Approved
Smyth, William J.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the

			jurisprudence questionnaire.
Soriano, Rangell C.	FE Exam		Approved
Spackman, Michael E.	Professional Landscape Architect	Comity	Approved
Starr, Ryan Patrick	FE Exam		Approved
Szela, Ben R.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Taivalkoski, John David	Professional Land Surveyor	Exam	Approved - conditional on receipt of all fees & passing AKLS exam.
Taylor, Daniel Ryan	Fundamentals of Engineering	Exam	Approved
Taylor, Joseph Ryan	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Taubitz, Erin Ashley	Professional Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the Architect registration exam & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Tencza II, Michael G.	FE Exam		Approved
Theurer, Timothy Edward	FE Exam		Approved
Thompson, Glenn R.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Thornley, John D.	Professional civil Engineer	Exam	Approved
Tian, Zhida	FE Exam		Approved
Traylor, Helen A.	FE Exam		Approved
Trousil, Robert Emil, Jr.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on receipt transcripts and verification of FE exam & current license.
Tunley, John R.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Mechanical Engineering exam & successful

			completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Van Dyke, Laura Seeley	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & approved arctic course.
Vanderwaal, Samuel J.	FE Exam		Approved
Varney, Gregory L.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & arctic course .
Vasquez, Paul, III	Professional Land Surveyor	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing AKLS exam
Vercellino, Albert J.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Villiwock, Mark Edward	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Vogel, Paul	Professional Land Surveyor	Comity	Approved – conditional upon passing AKLS exam.
Volf, Kyle Charles	Professional Chemical Engineer	Exam	Approved upon passing the NCEES principles & practices of chemical engineering exam.
Walker, Matthew I.J.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon passing the NCEES Principles & Practice of Civil Engineering exam
Wetherholt, Raymond C.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Whittaker , Todd M.	Professional Land Surveyor	Comity	Approved – conditional upon passing AKLS exam.
Willman, Brian Michael	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Wilson, Gerrit Wayne	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional on approved Arctic course.
Winter, Katryn R.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire &
Wright, Craig Arlin	FE Exam		Approved
Xia, Fei	FE Exam		Approved

Yang, Mengwei	FE Exam		Approved
Yoo, Peter Minseog	FE Exam		Approved
Young, Rex E.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on receipt of fees and successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Zak, Jonathan M.	Professional Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on receipt of transcripts & successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & arctic course.
Zieserl, Michael E.	Professional Land Surveyor	Exam	Approved
Zimmerman, Damon L.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Zimmerman, Tyler D.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional on successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire &.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Hearing no objection the motion passed unanimously

On a motion duly made by Baker, seconded by Leet it was

RESOLVED to find the following list of applicants for registration by comity and examination incomplete.

Bergin, Caitlin Siobhan	FE Exam		Incomplete - needs to meet the education requirements of 12AAC 36.062
Fellows, Jeffrey A.	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Incomplete - needs an additional 144 months experience per 12 AAC 36.063
Hron, Benjamin J.	Professional Land Surveyor	Exam	Incomplete - Needs and additional 4 ½ months experience: 6 credit hrs in surveying courses per 12 AAC 36.065; pass the AKLS exam
Larson, Kelly Dean	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Incomplete - needs an additional 7 months of experience per 12 AAC 36.063, verification of the PE civil examination and successful completion of the jurisprudence

			questionnaire.
Lewis, Steven E.	PE - Civil	Exam	Incomplete - needs verification of experience per 12 AAC 36.063 & JP.
Magness, Gregory John	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Incomplete - needs 2 letters of ref from individuals who have worked with him longer than 1 year; per 12 AAC 36.105
Obidullah, ASM	Professional Civil Engineer	Comity	Incomplete - Needs foreign credential evaluation of BS and verification of an additional 18 months experience - OR an additional 30 months experience with his Masters, pass an approved Arctic course and successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Reynolds, Bradley F.	Professional Electrical Engineer	Comity	Incomplete - needs 2 letters of reference verifying direct experience from a PE in same discipline; passing the NCEES PE exam, & completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire.
Slette, John R.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - Needs an additional 8 months experience, verification of 24 months responsible charge experience by a registered mechanical engineer who was a direct supervisor, per 12 AAC 36.063 and successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire
Spotto, Michael A.	Professional Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Incomplete - needs two letters of reference from registered mechanical engineers; successful completion of the jurisprudence questionnaire & Arctic req.
Steffler, Brianna C.	Professional Land Surveyor	Comity	Incomplete - needs an additional 26 months experience, an additional 11 credit hours in surveying courses, pass the NCEES Principles and Practice of Surveying and pass the AKLS exam per 12 AAC 36.107.
Stephen, Michael R.	Professional	Exam	Incomplete - needs an additional

	Land Surveyor		2 months experience per 12 AAC 36.063.
Wycoff, Leif Austin	FLS Exam		Incomplete – needs an additional 30 months of experience in surveying per 12 AAC 36.064

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

Hearing no objection the motion passed unanimously.

Agenda item 21 – Review Calendar

Chair: Let’s review our calendar, we are still on record. Everything looks in order. Tentatively all we need to add to the calendar would be the CLARB meeting in September. Tentatively Bert has indicated that it will be the 8th, 9th and 10th?

Lent: Thursday, Friday and Saturday.

Chair: Sorry, 9th, 10th and 11th. Are there any other changes or additions? Note that our next meeting will be in Fairbanks on May 27th. August will be in Wasilla on the 5th and 6th, and in Anchorage, November 18th and 19th.

Lent: I spoke to Julie in the Wasilla Legislative office so she’s expecting us on those dates.

Jones: Is there a fee for that?

Lent: I think \$25.00.

Agenda item 22 – Board Member Comments

Chair: Next on the agenda is Board Member Comments or Good of the Order. We have signed all the wall certificates. I’ve signed the minutes and I’ve collected all the travel. We don’t have to have originals you can give Vern scanned or faxed copies.

Fredeen: What about plane tickets?

Jones: I need a copy of your itinerary. If you have your boarding passes give me those too just in case.

Chair: I don’t know if everyone realizes, but this is Chuck’s last meeting. We’ll miss you. I very much appreciate your involvement in the Board and you’ll be missed.

Walsh: Thanks to Richard for a good meeting and welcome to Alicia and thanks for a good first effort. On my list here is good-bye to Chuck. I wasn’t sure of your plans, I saw you had a few things on the “to do List”.

Leet: Well, the white paper is done. I’ll try to wrap up that little chart. I’ll get it to Richard and then what happens to it after that, I just wanted to do something with comity. It’s just kind of a flow chart.

Walsh: Good idea, anyway thanks for your past and your future good work, it’s been a pleasure working with you. I have a few more “good of the orders” rather than comment on the meeting. Based on what Gayle told us about exemptions and all that. It added a bit of clarity though there’s still some fog in my mind. I’ll continue to explore that topic with Harley and the rest of you. And again on what Gayle mentioned to us, we might want to take a look

1 at our mission statement. Vern did you send that stuff about the fees inquiry? I was just
2 going to say based on what we heard today from Cathy I'd be comfortable just dropping the
3 issue. I think what we found out is we need to be on top of that as a Board as far as timing.
4 That was probably as much our fault as a Board as it was fault beyond this room. I see
5 NCEES has started a new task force on faculty licensure. I think that's something we ought
6 to think about seriously and develop a position on.

7
8 Leet: Do you think that's a good thing or a bad thing?

9
10 I think it's something to think about, I don't have a final opinion on it yet. With respect to
11 B+30, I think those are all wrapped up together. That's all I have.

12
13 Hightower: I would like to thank the staff for all their hard work. And Chuck, it's been a
14 pleasure working with you. I'm sure we'll see you around. One issue that I'll probably bring
15 before the Board next time, I meant to this time. I've had three older registrants talk to me,
16 two of them over 90 and ones 85. They don't want to keep up their continuing education
17 credits but they would still like to call themselves an architect or an engineer. We don't have
18 any...

19
20 Jones: If they retire their license they can still use the title.

21
22 Brownfield: They can use the title but they can't practice.

23
24 Hightower: Oh, ok, that's all they wanted. That committee's over then that's all they
25 wanted.

26
27 Rearick: Alicia I'd like to welcome you to the Board. Vern thank you for all your hard work.
28 Chuck, it's been a pleasure and we invite you to come to our next Board meeting and give
29 public testimony but remember you only get three minutes. (Laughter) This is one year ago
30 that I started, it was down here in Juneau and it's been very educational and interesting
31 year. I look forward to continue serving the Board.

32
33 Lent: First of all. Richard you conduct a wonderful meeting, you move things along and
34 keep the air clear. I'm particularly awed by Alicia and her catching some things. That shows
35 some real sophistication and understanding and Vern you're to be complemented, she does
36 a wonderful job. I think all the rest of you guys are fantastic. I hate to see Chuck go
37 because Chuck and Colene Sullivan Leonard and the whole crew out in the valley have
38 known him for years. I hate to see him leave the Board and hope he does well in whatever
39 he chooses. Chuck we'll see more of you

40
41 Leet: You'll probably see more of me. As I said to Richard, things happen for a reason and
42 I think me being off the Board allows me another opportunity to serve elsewhere. I do have
43 an affinity for that building across, kitty corner from here. But as long as I'm a corporate
44 owner of a business I think I'd have difficulties being a politician. It takes an enormous
45 amount of time to run a business. I still have to be involved. I can't keep walking away and
46 let everybody else run it for me. That business isn't theirs. That being said, one of the things
47 that was curious is like Cliff said, now he's no longer a conflict of interest which is always an
48 issue. Local politics are definitely out for me due to that. I don't know if I have four more
49 years or if you just can service eight. Like my wife says you can always come back and do
50 this stuff later with probably a little bit experience level. I remember when me and Craig, I
51 think Craig was on before but I don't think I should have been on the Board. I don't think I
52 had enough years experience but I'm happy to be on the Board and I've used my five
53 minutes.

1 Shiesl: I want to reiterate everything. Chuck thank you for the help you've given me. Just
2 for the Board, I have received my phone call that I've been reappointed. Again, nice to meet
3 you Alicia and hope to see you at future meetings.
4

5 Eriksen: I appreciate all the administrative support and welcome to Alicia again. Thank you
6 and Vern I appreciate all your help. Chuck, I recognize you were very interactive in this
7 process and that's a good thing. I'm sure you will be missed and wish I'd known you longer.
8 I hope everybody enjoyed their visit to Juneau and our lovely weather. I look forward to the
9 next meeting.
10

11 Baker: I just wanted to ask Eric to put in my order for weather next year. I think this is the
12 best weather we've had here for any of our meetings since I've been on the Board. Chuck
13 I'll miss you on the Board and I'm sure I'll see a lot more you at the office. I did want to bring
14 up that one of the things Richard had asked me to do on my Law Enforcement Committed is
15 to have an overview of our Sanctions and Disciplinary Guidelines and I had that done and
16 we had some accolades. Alicia, congratulations, I think you did a very good job for your first
17 time around and I appreciate that.
18

19 Fredeen: Chuck, we're going to miss you. Your passion and opinions on things are exactly
20 what we needed on the Board. I'm sure we'll see you more, hopefully at the Wasilla
21 meetings. This is kind of a weird mix of hello's and goodbyes. Alicia, hello, welcome, you
22 did a great job. It shows well on Vern that you were prepared enough. I don't know what he
23 told you about the group, but you were prepared for it. Thank you Vern for all your hard
24 work and glad to see you have support now and don't have everything on your shoulders.
25 Now you can take a vacation.
26

27 Brownfield: Chuck, I hate to see you go and we'll stay in communication. If there's anything
28 I can do to help you personally or anything else just let me know. You know my number. If
29 I'm out in the valley someday I'm going to knock on your door just to see what you're doing.
30 As far as everything is concerned I guess the only thing I can say and make is short is ditto,
31 because it's all been said at least once and several times. Alicia you've done a spectacular
32 job for your first time. One would walk in here and think you've been with us the last four
33 years. So, I especially like that you're not shy about giving us back the same barbs that we
34 give you, you're just one of the team so appreciate everything your doing a good job. And
35 Vern, you've done a great job on bridging between Ginger and yourself so, and especially,
36 you bring a lot to this Board.
37

38 Chair: Thank you Bo. Again I've enjoyed this tremendously. This is very rewarding for me
39 on a professional level. And not to belabor the point, all of you I would give an A+ if I was a
40 teacher, excuse me Dan. Vern and Alicia it was a very smooth transition in my opinion. I
41 look forward to working with all of you for the next three years. With that I guess I'll entertain
42 a motion to adjourn.
43

44 **On a motion duly made be Brownfield, seconded by Leet it was**

45 **RESOLVED to adjourn**

46 Hearing no objection the motion passed.
47

48 Chair: We stand adjourned.
49

50
51
52
53 The meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m. February 11, 2010.
54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
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

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

Richard Heieren, PS, Chair
Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers, and Land Surveyors

Date: _____