

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
August 5-6, 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 August 5-6, 2010 in the Legislative conference room at 600 Railroad Avenue, Wasilla, AK.
18

19
20

Thursday August 5, 2010

21
22

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Roll Call

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

24
25 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

- 26
27
- Richard Heieren, Land Surveyor, Chair
 - Boyd Brownfield, Civil Engineer, Vice Chair
 - Harley Hightower, Architect, Secretary
 - Clifford Baker, Land Surveyor
 - Donald Shiesl, Public Member
 - Burdett Lent, Landscape Architect
 - Daniel Walsh, Mining Engineer
 - Brian Hanson, Civil Engineer, Mining Engineer
- 30
31
32
33
34
35

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

- 37
- Don Habeger, Director of the Division of CBPL
 - Vern Jones, Executive Administrator
 - Alicia Kelly, Licensing Examiner
 - John Savage, Investigator
 - Katherine Mason, Administrative Officer II (via telephone)
- 38
39
40
41
42
43

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

- 45
- John Horan, PS representing himself
 - Lance Mearig, PE representing himself
 - Dalton Benson representing Senator Menard
- 46
47
48
49
50

51
52

Agenda Item 2 – Review/Amend Agenda

1 Chair: Hopefully everyone has had a chance to review the agenda. Do you have any
2 changes?
3

4 Jones: under 7 we have a few items to add, the letter to Mr. Cooper. An email to the
5 Department of Justice and a letter to Mr. Hughes. We have a couple of additions under 8,
6 an email re surveyor education and a couple more letters that I'll pass out later. And, we
7 have our Director here today and he would like an opportunity to speak.
8

9 Chair: Will you be here all day?

10
11 Habeger: No sir, I have to go back to Anchorage at 9:45 so hopefully you will have a few
12 minutes we can squeeze in.
13

14 Chair: Absolutely. We will accommodate you at your convenience. We will go through the
15 minutes and then turn it over to you if that's alright?
16

17 Chair: We'll have Don talk to us here in about five minutes. Do we have any additional
18 changes to the agenda? I'll entertain a motion to accept the agenda as amended.
19

20 **On a motion duly made by Brownfield, seconded by Lent it was**
21 **RESOLVED, to approve the agenda as amended.**
22

23
24 Hearing no objection the motion passed unanimously.
25

26 **Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Reporting**
27

28 Chair: Ethics reporting? Brian did you want to talk about that right now?
29

30 Hanson: Sure, I work for DOWL HKM and I believe they are going to come talk to the Board
31 today and I just wanted to get that out there and request direction from the Chair on whether
32 I should be involved in that or recuse myself.
33

34 Chair: Based on what you have told me I think you should probably recuse yourself. Any
35 other ethics?
36

37 **Agenda Item 4 – Review and approve minutes of February 11-12, 2010 meeting.**
38

39 Chair: Ok, let's go right to minutes from the regular meeting May 26th -28th hopefully
40 everyone has had an opportunity to review those minutes. Does anyone have any
41 additions, changes that they'd like to see? Dan.
42

43 Walsh: Commented that he couldn't read the entire minutes because of the length. He
44 skimmed for his name but that it was just overwhelming and recommended summarized
45 minutes instead of verbatim minutes. He would like his overall thoughts to be there but not
46 exact words.
47

48 Brownfield: Agreed with Walsh. Summarize but maintain the pertinent issues that are
49 discussed.
50

51 Baker: Agrees with Bo and Dan. He pointed out a section where he felt that the verbatim
52 record didn't accurately portray the intent of the speaker.
53

54 Shiesl: Agrees with previous speakers but doesn't want to go to the other extreme where

1 there is too little information in the minutes. I think that even though it's verbatim it is
2 misleading in some cases.

3
4 Lent: Didn't have an opinion on verbatim or summary minutes but commented on the
5 grammar and stated that he had a lot of corrections to pass to Vern.

6
7 Jones: I will do whatever the Board's pleasure is. I would like to caution you if you're afraid
8 of what's in the minutes. You need to be aware that these minutes are published on-line
9 and that the disc's (referring to the audio recordings) that we make are available to the
10 public on request. So if you're worried about what you're saying, you need to worry about it
11 before you say it.

12
13 Hightower: Not sure which way to go so will defer to the majority.

14
15 Hanson: Likes the shorter minutes except for the public testimony portion which should be
16 verbatim.

17
18 Brownfield: Commented that Vern did a great job and that it was a lot of work. His primary
19 concern is that they be accurate. Pertinent, factual, succinct.

20
21 Jones: That took about 6 hours a day for 3 weeks. What I will do from now on is summarize
22 what you say. The public testimony will be as verbatim as I can get it but as far as the
23 general business I'll summarize as best I can.

24
25 Chair: Any further comments? I'll entertain a motion to approve the minutes as submitted.

26
27
28 **On a motion duly made by Hightower, seconded by Shiesl, it was**

29
30 **RESOLVED to approve the August 5-6, 2010 meeting minutes as submitted.**

31
32 Lent: I would like to make a friendly amendment that they be approved with minor
33 corrections.

34
35 Jones: He's going to give me a bunch of grammar corrections.

36
37 Chair: Ok with you Harley? And the second? It has been moved and seconded with a
38 friendly amendment to make grammatical and spelling corrections.

39
40 Hearing no objection the motion passed unanimously.

41
42 0810 - Chair: Notes that Craig Fredeen has joined the meeting then gives the floor to
43 Director Habeger.

44
45 Habeger: I've been in South East for 32 years, got involved in a number of enterprises
46 down there. Got into construction, tried my hand at teaching but I ended up becoming part
47 of the maritime industry down there. Did that for 25 years. The economy caught up with our
48 industry and about a year ago by found myself trying to decide what to do next. Then an
49 opportunity came along to be the Director of the Division of Corporations, Business and
50 Professional Licensing. My wife said we had to stay in Juneau, I kept looking outside, she
51 eventually won so we are in Juneau still. So that's my quick history.

52
53 One of the things that was impressed upon me as we discussed the new position is looking
54 at a number of items and trying to get a handle on those. It had become clear to those that I

1 report to that we could do a little better job with fiscal issues. So that was high on their list.
2 And to kind of tighten up our relationships with some of the various boards and be more
3 proactive. So that's some of the direction from my superiors.
4

5 As I have quickly looked at the scope of what we do and by the way I've only been there 5
6 weeks, so not a whole lot of time. But it's clear to me that with something like 117,000
7 licenses all funneling through a pretty small Division we have a pretty big task. I think staff is
8 stellar. I think they're doing a good job and where licenses have to be looked at and
9 doubled checked they're doing a good job there also.
10

11 That's leading up to what I have to talk about. One of the things, again, those that I report to
12 noticed right away is that travel in our Division was a little bit out of sync. What I mean by
13 that is the expenditures for travel were increasing year after year and yet we were going to
14 the Legislature as a Division saying that we were flat lining. Those that I report to were a
15 little bit uncomfortable with that kind of delta or disconnect so I started to look at the issue.
16 What I have before you, this is really my working document. I showed it to Vern, we talked
17 about it, Vern asked if he could bring it to the Board and I said sure, why not.
18

19 He went on to explain his spread sheet and the large gap between what we spent on travel
20 last year and what we projected for this year. As well as the gap between what has been
21 allocated to our Board for travel and what we are requesting. Any increase to the allocation
22 will have to come from another program within the Division. He explained that the
23 Legislature had mandated a 10% cut in travel across the board and that we were going to
24 have to come up with something between what we want to spend (\$87,000) and what we
25 have to spend (\$39,000). He doesn't want to have to do without supplies because we spent
26 all our money on travel. He pointed out that as FY10 is closing out he is having trouble
27 finding the funds to pay all the bills. It's not that the money is not there it's that the
28 appropriation is not there.
29

30 That's my message to the Boards. I don't have the solutions yet but wanted to get the
31 information out to you and we try to come up with a solution together. Any questions?
32

33 Baker: Comments that if monies are not spent in a given year then they are taken back and
34 the following year the section is told that you didn't use it last time so you don't need it this
35 time. Some of the reason for present requests exceeding previous years expenditures is
36 that the requests were denied in previous years. There is a need to look at more than one
37 year to balance things out.
38

39 Habeger: Acknowledges that it's a good point but also points out that the Division spend
40 \$125,000 more than was appropriated. And that when that happens it comes at a cost to
41 other activities.
42

43 Hanson: References a previous number of 12% of the travel allocation is AELS and asks if
44 we produce 12% of the revenue.
45

46 Habeger: The 12% figure is what the FY end might look like. Only onboard 5 weeks and
47 picked travel as a start because it was on his employers mind. This is only a tool to look at
48 the total issue. Have to look at revenue, and expenses in a broad sense.
49

50 Fredeen: Points out that we are self funded through our fees and have no monies going into
51 or coming out of the general fund. He asks how our boards activities, since we are self
52 funded through our fees, affect the appropriation.
53

54 Habeger: Not 100% sure. Just beginning to go back through the files and see how that was

1 set up. Really can't answer that question. Our budget comes in several components.
2 Personnel, travel and two others that escape me at this time. We get it in 4 lump sums and
3 we have about 11M to work with. They recognize the fees you take in and reallocate them
4 out to us to play with to meet your needs and keep from costing licensees an arm and a leg
5 for what we are doing here.

6
7 Brownfield: Explains how complex our Board is and how hard the job is because of that.
8 And how we need to keep in line with other States if we are going to be able to license by
9 comity. If travel is curtailed then we can't do our job, it's that simple. We are not a burden
10 we contribute our share through our fees. The Board has a very difficult mission because
11 we are not a one subject focus. We have to be multi-faceted, an engineer may have to
12 represent landscape architects or surveyors. He explains that the meetings cover national
13 and international issues. That multiple presentations are happening at the same time and it
14 is advantageous to have several representatives at each meeting.

15
16 Walsh: Mentioned that with budget constraints this year we may have to make do with less
17 but our input to the fee setting process would be to add a little to the fees to cover our travel
18 in the future.

19
20 Habeger: Thinks this is very germane and wants to have real figures to take to the
21 Legislature as well as justification for the request.

22
23 Baker: Points out that Guides have a larger travel budget than AELS and not a big or
24 complicated a board.

25
26 Jones: Explains that the Guides/Transporters still administer/proctor their own exams and
27 we contract that out so they need more instate travel.

28
29 Baker: But we're still paying for it.

30
31 Habeger: Still a germane issue and my superiors recognize that and want to get a handle
32 on it. Nursing for example is going to have a 1.4M roll forward and they are out of sync too
33 and we recognize this as a legitimate issue.

34
35 Jones: Asks the Director if he knew of the accounting error in online licensing that caused
36 the large roll forward for AELS then explains how the error occurred and the effects.

37
38 Habeger: I was not aware of that.

39
40 Hightower: Points out the fact that several Board members are on National committees and
41 the importance of that and how attending the National meetings help to get an appointment.
42 He stresses the value of the interaction with other jurisdictions on these committees and the
43 added knowledge of the profession that is gained and the benefit to the Board and the State
44 and points out that some of the travel is reimbursed by the National organization.

45
46 Habeger: Understands the value but points out that all travel is recorded as a debit and the
47 reimbursement is recorded as revenue but hopes to track them better so we can show them
48 as offsets.

49
50 Lent: Added support to Hightower's comments

51
52 Shiesl: Stresses the educational value of attendance at the National meetings as a public
53 member and also notes that we have several new Board members.

54

1 Fredeen: Explains the importance of being able to send more than one individual to each
2 meeting because multiple presentations are occurring at the same time. Points out that a lot
3 of things are happening in the industry. There are many Issues concerning education,
4 international licensure mobility and how every State is dealing with these issues and the
5 value of interaction. He adds that our Board is presently dealing with a change to General
6 Licensure and a re-write of a significant portion of the engineering regulations and how
7 interaction with other Boards helps to simplify that process.
8

9 Habeger: Responds that in his past experiences in the maritime industry he was at one
10 point VP of government operations and knows that if you're not at the table you are eaten
11 for lunch. But again stresses that we have this delta between what the Legislature has
12 given us to spend and what our wants are and that he is asking for our help in finding the
13 right number. If it's more than they allowed we need to explain why and what the benefit to
14 the State was.
15

16 Lent: Adds that at these meetings committee members help produce and grade the exams
17 and participate in important discussions regarding best practices in the areas of public
18 safety and the environment.
19

20 Brownfield: In an effort to wrap up the discussion states that the Board wants to help but
21 the State has to understand that they are here voluntarily and usually spend more money
22 doing their jobs than the State reimburses. And that to do their jobs properly travel to
23 national meetings is necessary.
24

25 Habeger: reiterates that his door is always open.
26

27 Hightower: Offers that a lot of people look at Board travel as a benefit and some sort of
28 pleasure trip when actually its anything but pleasure and most can't afford to be out of the
29 office for a week at a time several times a year and as Brownfield pointed out usually spend
30 more than the State reimburses.
31

32 Chair: We have addressed this to some degree. We've formed a committee and we would
33 like to be involved and engaged in the process for certain. I did confront the issue and was
34 a little shocked with what the Legislature did. We usually meet in Juneau in February and
35 we went around to different Legislators and discussed the issue of the benefits versus the
36 cost and to a man every Legislator endorsed our travel as of high importance to them. We
37 certainly would engage any Representative or Senator to reinforce that travel issue and
38 support any travel that any member of this Board would like to do. It increases our
39 awareness of what's happening in the profession. An educated well informed Board is an
40 effective Board.
41

42 He goes on to explain that it is very cost effective to the State in the way of savings on
43 investigations, attorney fees etc. And that this is a voluntary Board whereas in about half of
44 the other states the Boards are paid for their services. And that the Board will work with the
45 Director as best we can.
46

47 Baker: Points out that 50% of the members of this Board are members of National
48 Committees so this board has a large impact compared to other States regarding what
49 happens a the National level.
50

51 Chair: Adds that he has not met one registrant that has objected to Board travel. The
52 licensees that he has talked to realize how advantageous and cost effective it is for the
53 Board to attend these meetings and be educated about National trends, State trends and
54 professional advances.

1
2 Brownfield: Gives examples of himself and Heieren being on the examination committees
3 and writing and scoring exam questions. He adds that international issues are becoming
4 more prevalent. All the world wants to come to America and a lot of them to Alaska
5 because of our natural resources and become engineers. This has a profound effect on the
6 health, safety and welfare of the public.

7
8 Chair: Thanks the Director for coming introducing himself and discussing these issues with
9 the Board today.

10 11 **Agenda item 6 – Expenditure Report**

12
13 Jones: Good morning Cathy you're in the meeting now.

14
15 Mason: Gives the board report on expenditures explaining that the figure will change
16 slightly because the report is as of June 30th and the FY ends July 31st. The final report will
17 be sometime in late August. Total expenses were \$717,100 and revenue \$827,200. You
18 are 110,100 to the good which will add to the roll forward. The Board allocation percentage
19 is 11.66%. This is the portion of the total indirect expenses that AELS is responsible for.

20
21 Walsh: Asks if the travel figures were for just State funded travel or includes travel funded
22 by National Organizations.

23
24 Mason: Explains that travel requests reduce the funds allotted for travel even though an
25 outside organization may reimburse it.

26
27 Walsh: In some cases we actually submit a travel request to the National Organization.

28
29 Mason: Yes but your trip is paid for by the State up front and then reimbursed, is that
30 correct Vern?

31
32 Jones: Explains that some travel is paid directly by the National Organizations.

33
34 Mason: Says that if the State doesn't pay up front then it doesn't go against our
35 authorization.

36
37 There was a short discussion among the Board members and Vern on how the travel is
38 funded. Jones reminded that reimbursements were logged in as revenue not as
39 reimbursements.

40
41 Shies: Ask if the 11.66% is our share of the departments overhead.

42
43 Mason: Responds that for FY10 it is but that changes depending on how many licensees
44 each board has for that year.

45
46 Chair: Thanks Cathy for her input.

47 48 **Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report**

49
50 Savage: Passes out this business card and asks the Board to refer any complaints to him
51 immediately and not to take any action on their own.

52
53 Shies: Asks which boards this is a problem with
54

1 Chair: Answers that it has been a problem with this board and reiterates the importance of
2 the Board staying out of any complaints and letting the investigator handle them.
3
4 Savage: Goes over the investigative process and how important it is to do everything the
5 same way every time. And how deviations can waste a lot of time and money by getting a
6 case thrown out because of irregularities.
7
8 Lent: Asks if Board members can file a complaint if they find a violation.
9
10 Savage: Explains that Board members may file a complaint but that it has to be done just
11 as anyone from the public would file it. Once filed it's in the investigators hands and the
12 individual filing it is out of the loop.
13
14 Brownfield: Reiterates what Savage has said and adds that our regulations allow a Board
15 member to file a complaint through the Board Secretary.
16
17 Savage: Explains the reasons and importance of getting all complaints and questions
18 regarding rules and regulations or possible violations of them in writing. He further states
19 that if they are not in writing he will not act on them. He needs everything in writing so if
20 questioned in the future he has the exact question and answer to back him up.
21
22 Jones: Points out that a lot of people will shop for the answer they want. If they don't get
23 the answer they want from me they will call Alicia and ask the same question.
24
25 Savage: Explains the process and his actions when one of the ethical questions on an
26 application is answered yes. He goes on to point out a problem with NCARB's disciplinary
27 database whereby they limit the types of violations that can be reported and the danger of
28 us licensing someone with serious violations in another jurisdiction.
29
30 Lent: Adds that CLARB also has a disciplinary database that can be accessed by the MBE.
31
32 Chair: Asks Hightower to follow-up with NCARB
33
34 Brownfield: Asks Vern if he checks the databases.
35
36 Jones: Answers, yes and explains the process.
37
38 Savage: Asks if he can have access to the CLARB database.
39
40 Jones: I'll find out.
41
42 Baker: Adds that a lot of States feel that on consent agreements that once the licensee
43 agrees it doesn't need to be reported to the national database and that the NCEES Law
44 Enforcement Committee is trying to change that attitude.
45
46 Savage: Adds that there is a misconception that if a consent agreement is issued it's
47 because there isn't enough evidence which is absolutely not the case. It is usually because
48 of investigative workloads or costs of going to trial. It's a good tool to benefit both the State
49 and the individual in some cases.
50
51 Brownfield: Points out that it is a punitive action and should be recorded.
52
53 Savage: Apologizes for not having an investigative report for the board packet. They have
54 a new program and are having problems with it.

1
2 Chair: Makes note to the Director that Savage's performance has been stellar although he
3 is spread over numerous boards and explains the function of the Investigative Advisory
4 Committee. He gives credit for the interaction with the Fire Marshal's Office to Savage and
5 stresses how much the whole process has been improved since Savage became the AELS
6 Investigator. He adds that he has been very effective and that it would be desirable to
7 remove some of Savage's other Boards so he could devote more time to AELS.
8

9 Savage: Goes over the change of command and will bring his new Chief investigator to the
10 next meeting if possible and introduce him. He sees good thing happening in the future.
11 Some old cases still working in the AG's office but hopefully soon there shouldn't be any
12 cases over a year and a half old.
13

14 Lent: Mentions that the case backlog has been significantly reduced since John has been
15 the Investigator.
16

17 Chair: Adds that his efficiency was rewarded with piling more on and that that wasn't
18 appropriate. And further adds that the Board appreciates his work. He also points out for
19 the benefit of the Director that the Fire Marshall is usually here but couldn't make it this time.
20

21 Brownfield: Points out that in the past the Board had no dialog with the Fire Marshall and
22 that Savage was instrumental in bringing the two entities together.
23

24 Savage: Give some of the credit to the people in the Fire Marshalls Office for the
25 cooperation. He explains how they use the help of the ABC Board sometimes to bring
26 projects into compliance.
27

28 Chair: Asks Jones to remind him to address the absence of two Board members later.
29

30 **Agenda item 7 – Board Correspondence sent since May 2010.**

- 31
32 a. Letter to Mr. Cooper.
33

34 Chair: It's pretty self explanatory. Are there any Questions?
35

- 36 b. Email to the U.S. Department of Justice
37

38 Brownfield: Fills the board in on the request from DOJ and that his answer was self-
39 explanatory and that they were very happy with our response. The case involved an expert
40 witness that didn't stamp his opinion. Our response was that he doesn't have to stamp it but
41 that not doing so detracts from its value as a professional opinion.
42

- 43 c. Response to Mr. Hughes.
44

45 Fredeen: Explains that Mr. Hughes letter pointed out that more contracts were requiring an
46 engineer stamp fire protection drawings and that he was concerned that some of them may
47 not be qualified and wanted to Board to weigh in on the issue. The Board response was
48 that if Mr. Hughes feels that an engineer stamped fire protection drawings and wasn't
49 qualified that he should file a complaint with our investigator.
50

51 Hightower: Offers a scenario that he can legally stamp a 500 bed hospital but that he is not
52 qualified to do so. So if he has an employee that is qualified he could review and stamp the
53 drawings. Is he then in violation?
54

1 Fredeen: The key here is that it would come under the responsible charge. You reviewed
2 his work and to the best of your knowledge it's correct. So when it comes to fire protection
3 drawings we do rely on the NICET 3 or 4 individual who does the calculations.

4
5 Hightower: Does that mean a mechanical engineer is not qualified.

6
7 Fredeen: No, I think the key there is responsible charge. If they are using their expertise in
8 fire protection systems to review it ok but if they have no expertise in sprinkler systems they
9 shouldn't stamp or sign.

10
11 Hanson: Adds that using Hightower's example of the 500 bed hospital. He's not qualified
12 but as long as he employs people that are and oversees their work he's not in violation of
13 Statute or Regulation.

14
15 The discussion continues about Hightower's example with the final outcome that the
16 qualified individual should be stamping the drawings.

17
18 Brownfield: In situations like this I always try to put it into a court room scenario as a test.
19 What defense or authority do you have to do this? If its sound you're probably ok if it's not
20 sound you're probably not ok.

21
22 Hightower: Adds that in a lot of cases that on State or local government projects they will
23 insist that they go out and get some expert to do the work but the local firm is still the prime
24 and ends up stamping the work. So if it ends up in court the local firm is getting sued and
25 the outside firm that did the work is clear and free.

26
27 Hanson: On these responses it might be helpful to see the original question.

28
29 **Agenda item 8 – Correspondence Received since May 2010**

30
31 Chair: Is that something we can assign?

32
33 Baker: We have a break scheduled between agenda items 7 and 8.

34
35 Chair: We will break until 10:00

36
37 Break from 9:50 to 10:05

- 38
39 a. Email from Elizabeth Holmgren re PDH's for passing the LEED exam

40
41 Chair: Do you have any comment Harley?

42
43 Hightower: No but if you need someone to answer this letter I need to talk to someone
44 that's LEED Certified.

45
46 Brownfield: Asks who provides the exam and if they put any credit hours on it.

47
48 Fredeen: Responds that it is the USGBC, U.S. Green Building Council and no they don't
49 give credit hours for it.

50
51 Brownfield: Points out that it is up to the institute or organization to assign credit hours to
52 their activities or courses and the Board doesn't get into that.

53
54 Baker: Offers that it shouldn't be up to the instructor of the course to determine the amount

1 of credit it should be an outside agency.

2
3 Fredeen: Volunteers to write the letter because he is a LEED AP. He adds that if one takes
4 an 8 hour course to prepare for the exam they get a certificate and credit for the course but
5 if you take the home study method you get nothing. He compares it to getting a second
6 license. You don't get CE credit for getting a second license and adds that this is the same
7 thing. It's an exam to obtain a certification and does not count as continuing education. The
8 only way to get credit is to take a course to prepare for it that has been assigned a number
9 of credits.

10
11 Walsh: Adds that if you look in the regulations, examinations are not approved continuing
12 education.

13
14 The discussion continued for a few minutes regarding what counts as CE and what doesn't.
15 Like home study and online courses.

16
17 Brownfield: Again stresses that it is not the job of this Board to assign PDH's to a course or
18 activity. It is up to the course designer or a review organization. This Board only reviews
19 what was provided.

20
21 Walsh: Added that he wasn't arguing that the certification count but that just studying for an
22 exam at home shouldn't count and the exam itself wouldn't count but a formal course of
23 study that has been assigned a number of PHD's would.

24
25 Hightower: Asks why she is asking the question.

26
27 Jones: Responds that she had put LEED exam on her CE report and the Board didn't give
28 her credit for it.

29
30 Hightower: Continues that if she took a course of study and passed the exam she maybe
31 should have gotten some credit for the course of study.

32
33 Baker: Adds that he has taken correspondence courses that when finished he took a test
34 and was given a certificate with a certain number of credits on it and maybe she just didn't
35 submit enough documentation.

36
37 Brownfield: Asks if the organization that administers this exam gives it any credit. If they
38 don't put any on it then she don't get any credit.

39
40 Chair: Wraps up with a statement that if the provider doesn't assign credit then our
41 regulations don't allow for it and asks Craig if he can respond to the letter tactfully.

42
43 Fredeen: Asks if he should sign the letter since he is a LEED certified AP.

44
45 Hanson: Asks if we need a special committee on continuing education questions because
46 more will come up.

47
48 Brownfield: We don't want to get into adjudicating that.

49
50 Hanson: Thinks maybe we need a committee to be consistent with determinations.

51
52 Jones: I'll work on it. And explains that when someone ask a questions they are told the
53 Board doesn't pre-approve and then the criteria in the regulation is read to them verbatim.

1 Fredeen: Suggests that the Board put out some type of guidance on what was found during
2 the audit and what the Board is looking for in the way of proof of attendance and completion.

3
4 Chair: Asks Brian to look on the website and evaluate what he finds and come back with a
5 recommendation as to whether we should have a committee.

6
7 Lent: Asks Vern if he advises callers to call their professional society.

8
9 Jones: If they ask where these courses are available, I do. I recommend that they check
10 with the State and National societies. Because they will have a list or in some cases provide
11 courses themselves. I've never done this, but Ginger went up on the web and did a search
12 for continuing education for engineers and got more hits than anyone could look at in a
13 lifetime. The information is there, you just have to look for it.

14
15 Chair: Could you run that correspondence by Brian too.

16
17 **b. News release from NCEES re Gulf oil spill.**

18
19 Brownfield: Recounts Dan's input at the Western Zone meeting about licensing professors
20 and government exemptions from licensing. He further feels that it should be addressed on
21 the National level but the board maybe could plant the seed.

22
23 Chair: Points out that Dan responded at West Zone as a registered professional, not as a
24 board representative. And asks him if he feels that the Board should act on this.

25
26 Walsh: Replies that it's up to the board and he thinks that NCEES is working on this. He
27 heard them discussing the industrial exemption but not the government exemption and of
28 course the discussion about licensing faculty.

29
30 Baker: Points out that this is mostly about the spill in the Gulf and is concerned about what
31 authority the State would have outside the three mile limit.

32
33 Chair: Asks Walsh to represent the Board on this issue and bring up the governmental
34 exemption issue at the National conference in Denver and report back to the Board.

35
36 Lent: Thinks since we are an oil producing state with offshore drilling and transporting oil
37 over great distances by pipeline, that we are in a position to insist that something be done
38 about this, that professionals be involved.

39
40 Baker: States that Cuba is now considering offshore drilling in their waters and all the
41 currents are coming toward us and there is a lot of concern in Florida about this.

42
43 Chair: Dan will follow up on this at the national conference and report back at our next
44 quarterly meeting.

45
46 **c. Email from Mr. Jim Campbell re use of electronic signatures on original**
47 **drawings.**

48
49 Chair: Asks if we are addressing this in the regulation portion?

50
51 Jones: Partially, but he is just saying we should join the 21st century and accept more use of
52 electronics. He thinks electronic signatures can be validated to the point where they should
53 be acceptable now.

1 Chair: Asks if Fredeen wants to address this, having been on a committee that had looked
2 at this in the past.

3
4 Fredeen: We actually allow electronic signatures, there just has to be a wet signed copy
5 somewhere so this individual can wet sign an 11x17 copy, shove it in a drawer and then
6 electronically sign all he wants to.

7
8 Jones: He knows that, that's not what he's asking. He is asking you to change your
9 regulations to accept electronic signatures on original documents.

10
11 Fredeen: I would be interested to know how he is keeping control of his stamp and
12 signature. He does mention, linked to a document in such a manner that a digital signature
13 is invalidated. I've heard that there is software out there from the Navy that will make your
14 signature disappear if the document is altered.

15
16 Baker: Relates a situation where an engineer he knows had a problem with someone using
17 his electronic stamp and signature while he was on vacation. This is an issue to be looked
18 at.

19
20 Jones: I had a surveying student that was working on a verification tell me one time, well
21 the boss gone right now but I have his stamp can I just seal it and send it in?

22
23 Shies: Whether it's wet or electronic, you can forge anything.

24
25 Brownfield: Believes that an original wet signature is hard to forge and until such time as it
26 can be guaranteed that a digital signature has the same security we shouldn't change. If
27 you can show a digital signature that is the original among all others and can't be duplicated
28 then we might want to consider it.

29
30 Chair: You sound like you have a good handle on it, could you draft a letter, run it by Craig
31 and forward to Vern?

32
33 The discussion continued for a few more minutes regarding current regulations.

34
35 **d. Letter from NCEES re NCEES Engineering Awards for 2011**

36
37 Baker: Asks if it has been distributed to the university.

38
39 Jones: Not yet but I will.

40
41 Walsh: I received a packet from NCEES and forwarded it to the Dean's office.

42
43 **e. APEGGA 5th Annual International Mentoring Conference.**

44
45 Chair: Any comments on 8 e?

46
47 **f. Email from Lenore Lucey re Registering Architects.**

48
49 No comments

50
51 **g. Email from Brownfield re Seattle times story on licensing Canadian Engineers.**

52
53 Brownfield: Thought it was interesting, since we are also work on the issue, that
54 Washington had taken an unprecedented step and accepted them. We should keep an eye

1 on how this turns out because we're going to have to face this pretty quick.

2
3 Walsh: Finds it interesting that the argument is always that Canadian Engineers are so well
4 trained and equipped as professional engineers that taking the PE exam should be a walk in
5 the park for them but they want to exempt themselves from it.

6
7 Brownfield: Adds that according to the article 80% of Canadians pass compared to 65% of
8 U.S examinees. That they consider their process and their engineers are equivalent to
9 engineers licensed in the U.S. even though they don't have an examination but they have
10 other things that make them as good as us.

11
12 Lent: CLARB has two Canadian Provinces taking the LARE so I don't see what the problem
13 is.

14
15 Brownfield: The problem is that they don't want to take our examination. They have a
16 mentoring system and they produce engineers as good, or better than ours. He relates a
17 discussion he had with six young Canadian engineers at a meeting and their contention that
18 taking the exam was no problem.

19
20 h. Email re surveying education.

21
22 Chair: 8h should just be cataloged with previous correspondence on this subject.

23
24 i. Email re ARE sunset rule

25
26 No comments

27
28 j. Email from Mr. Hamels re scanning originals and archiving electronically.

29
30 Chair: Is a different situation and has generated a proposed regulation that will be up for a
31 first reading today.

32
33 k. Chairs response to APEGBC's invitation to their 2010 Annual Conference.

34
35 Chair: An invitation from British Columbia to attend their Annual Conference, anyone
36 interested can follow up with that.

37
38 **Agenda item 9 – Old Business**

39
40 a. Building Information modeling (BIM)

41
42 Chair: Because Richard isn't here. Does anyone have anything to add to the BIM?

43
44 b. Reduction in Travel

45
46 Already discussed.

47
48 **Agenda item 10 – Regulation updates.**

49
50 a. Approve for public notice change to 12 AAC 36.010(d)

51
52 Chair: Vern did you want to speak to 10 a?

53
54 Jones: Explains a problem with the proposed change as it is written and offers to show the

1 correct way to change it if the Board decides to continue with the change.

2
3 Fredeen: Explained what brought the request for change up in the first place.

4
5 After a discussion it was decided to leave the regulation as is.

6
7 **On a motion duly made by Brownfield, seconded by Shiesl it was**

8
9 **RESOLVED to change 12 AAC 36.010(d) to remove the word “will” and add “at its discretion may”**

10
11
12 The motion failed by unanimous vote.

13
14 **b.** Approve for public notice change to 12 AAC 36.061 (a)(2).

15
16 Approved at the August meeting and included with these changes to save funds.

17
18 **c.** Approve for public notice change to 12 AAC 36.500-540.

19
20 Chair: Briefly explains the changes and notes that there was extensive discussion at the
21 last meeting and asks if there is any further discussion. He then asks for a motion to repeal
22 12 AAC 36.400-440 and approve for public notice changes to 12 AAC 36.500-540.

23
24 **On a motion duly made by Brownfield, seconded by Hightower it was**

25
26 **RESOLVED to repeal 12 AAC 400 in its entirety and approve for public notice changes**
27 **to 12 AAC 36.500-540 as amended.**

28
29 Baker: Should we mention that we are not just adding land surveyors to 12 AAC 500 but
30 changing it. There are several lengthy additions in there too.

31
32 Chair: We'll pause for a few minutes unless someone has some comments.

33
34 Hanson: Some of the language in here may be effected by general licensure and that
35 should be worked out now.

36
37 Walsh: Notes that a change needs to be made on page 5 near the bottom. Teaching
38 activities as noted in 1 through 6 as opposed to 1 through 4. Teaching or instructing doesn't
39 really apply to 5 and 6 so it should stay 1 through 4.

40
41 Chair: Are we ready for a reread of the motion?

42
43 Jones: Motion to repeal 12 AAC 400 in its entirety and modify 12 AAC 500 to include land
44 surveyors.

45
46 Chair: Does the Motion maker understand? And the second? (both responded yes)

47
48 Lent: Asks if this only affects land surveyors or are there changes for all other professions
49 also?

50
51 Chair: Yes.

52
53 Hanson: It's the whole article 5.

1 Jones: Yes the whole section.

2

3 Chair: Asks Hanson for input regarding his comments about this change and general
4 licensure.

5

6 Hanson: Asks for a change to 510 (c) as it relates to general licensure and multiple
7 registrations. Under (c) I would like to add "must obtain a minimum of 24 professional
8 development hours". The next change is (f) on the following page. Since we are adding the
9 branch definitions to the definitions we would need to add it here. "Holding multiple
10 registrations and/or branches in the State" in the first sentence. In the last sentence change
11 to ""each branch and or registration held".

12

13 Jones: These changes should wait until after the general licensure regulations are adopted.

14

15 Baker: Agree with Vern.

16

17 Brownfield: Are we saying that general licensure should be in place before we do this?

18

19 Jones: I'm saying that we shouldn't change this to include general licensure until general
20 licensure is adopted.

21

22 Brownfield: Yes, and if we adopt it there is a certain public procedure we have to go
23 through.

24

25 Chair: So on that basis we are not going to change the one Jun has submitted to this
26 Board. Except the change to number seven. I would consider that a friendly amendment.
27 Any further comments? Does anyone need the motion restated? All in favor? Those
28 opposed? Any abstentions?

29

30 The motion passed unanimously.

31

32 d. Approve for public notice change to 12 AAC 36.185.(d)

33

34 Chair: This kind of falls back to correspondence we received from Jim Campbell. This
35 would need to be forwarded to Jun. Explains that this came about because of a policy that
36 the AG said was unenforceable and this is what Vern came up with. Let's discuss this and
37 word-smith it while Bo puts a motion on paper for Vern.

38

39 Fredeen: Points out that the Guidance Manual says 1 ½ inches so will need to be changed
40 also.

41

42 Chair: Bert will add that to his list of alterations to the Guidance Manual.

43

44 Fredeen: Can I be pointed toward the verbiage that says wet signature?

45

46 Jones: In seals it says will sign it. It doesn't say wet signature. That's in 48.221, page 4.

47

48 A lengthy discussion followed regarding the terms wet signature, owner of the documents,
49 the meaning of facility, length of retention and in what format they need to be retained. It
50 was decided that the word wet was not appropriate and should be changed to original hand
51 signature. And that scanning originals for archiving was acceptable because of storage
52 limitations and various retention schedules.

53

54 **On a motion by Brownfield, seconded by Baker is was**

1
2 **RESOLVED to change chapter 36. 12 AAC 36.185(d) to say the registrant shall include**
3 **the date each time the registrant signs and seals a document by inserting the date**
4 **within the seal or within two inches of the seal. And add a paragraph (f) An original**
5 **copy of all final drawings, specifications, surveys, plats, plates, reports, or similar**
6 **documents shall have an original hand signature. Such final documents may have an**
7 **electronic seal with date applied electronically or manually.**
8

9 Hanson: Friendly amendment or maybe a request that we separate this to two motions and
10 vote each separately?

11
12 Chair: any objection?

13
14 Brownfield: I don't have any objections to that.

15
16 Chair: Any other comments or questions? The motion as stated so that item (d) and a new
17 (f).

18
19 Lent: Wants to remove "within the seal" and just say within two inches

20
21 Maker of the motion and the second consider this a friendly amendment.

22
23 Chair: Reads the revised motion for (d).

24
25 Fredeen: Thinks (d) is pretty straight forward. But (f) is still kind of scrambled and he isn't
26 ready to support it as written and asks if we want to work on it some more or take a chance
27 and maybe send (d) forward by itself?

28
29 Chair: I don't have any problem with the way he worded (f). It will go through the public
30 process and be reviewed by law so there is plenty of time to think about it. All those in favor
31 of the motion to change (d) signify by saying aye. Those opposed? Any abstentions?

32
33 The motion passed unanimously

34
35 Chair: Rereads motion for (f).

36
37 Fredeen: Doesn't think the motions respond to the letter and we need to respond to the
38 electronic signature portion of the correspondence. It's just not finished in my opinion.

39
40 Brownfield: Points out that Mr. Campbell wants to do away with the wet signature and we
41 are saying you must have an original hand signature. That's the motion.

42
43 A discussion continues on the pro and con of the electronic seal and hand written signature.

44
45 Chair: Asks that the word copy be removed as a friendly amendment.

46
47 Discussion continues.

48
49 Chair: Vern for clarification this probably will be advertised before the next meeting? If we
50 approve this for advertising we will assign you the task to follow up with an addendum to this
51 if required. I don't think that it would fall outside of what we're trying to accomplish so
52 additional wording may be provided for (f) if you deem it necessary. That would be your
53 task that is assigned by our next meeting.
54

1 Hanson: Asks what the process is for these changes.
2
3 Chair: Explains and is interrupted by Jones.
4
5 Jones: Gayle has said that we can make changes after public notice as long as they are not
6 significant changes.
7
8 Chair: And it would go through her office again before adoption so I don't see any problem.
9
10 Hanson: If we vote to advertise this today is there another opportunity to vote on it.
11
12 Chair: Yes.
13
14 Discussion continues on how the signing and sealing process works and the use of
15 electronic seals and signatures and the problems with copying documents.
16
17 Lent: Explains that the correct way as he sees it is to print a copy, hand sign them and file
18 them. Then apply an electronic seal and signature to the copy on your hard drive and copy
19 them to a disc and deliver to the client. So this should be worded so that you have that
20 flexibility.
21
22 Chair: Indicates that Craig will address this in his follow-up and may discuss with Mr.
23 Campbell or not, it's his option.
24
25 Brownfield: Points out that we are not doing this for Mr. Campbell we are trying to do what's
26 best for the public.
27
28 Chair: If no further discussion I would call for a vote.
29
30 Baker: Can we table this until tomorrow.
31
32 Chair: Can you be ready by tomorrow?
33
34 Fredeen: I can put something together.
35
36 **On a motion duly made by Baker, seconded by Shiesl it was**
37
38 **RESOLVED to table this motion until the next day.**
39
40 Motion passed unanimously
41
42 Chair: I would entertain a motion to break for lunch
43
44 Baker: Moved Lent: seconded
45
46 Lunch 12:12 – 1:27
47
48 Meeting brought to order 1:27pm.
49
50 **Agenda item 11 – Public Comment**
51
52 Chair: John would you like to testify?
53
54 Horan: My name is John Horan and I'm a registered land surveyor, registered in 1981 in

1 Alaska. I've been registered in Florida, surveyed there for 10 years and I'm getting about
2 ready to retire. The reason I'm here, before I say that, first of all thanks for having this
3 meeting here in Wasilla. I probably would have never had this opportunity if I hadn't noticed
4 that you were going to have the meeting here. I'm here because my son surprised me
5 recently, he's got a BS degree in biology and was going to go on to medical school, decided
6 that he didn't really want to go to medical school that what he really wanted to do was be a
7 land surveyor. He's been surveying with me since he was 7 years old, he's now 24. And I
8 was really surprised, I don't know if it's the father son relationship or what. So he said what
9 have I got to do, I have a BS degree and took advanced math and science courses. So I
10 said ok, I'll find out. Well then I found out that apparently there's some discussion between
11 this two and four year degree. And I noticed that some surveyors have responded, I saw the
12 sheet, I was a little bit distressed to find out that my letter wasn't listed on there. That I sent
13 in February. I electronically transmitted it around the 15th of February. Right after Gary
14 LoRusso had printed his letter in the local chapter news letter. So, I'm double happy to be
15 here so I can get my testimony on the record.

16
17 First of all I support the two year program. I'd like to see the existing geomatics two year
18 program have a little more legal teeth to it. Because in my opinion surveying is a trade,
19 except for the legal responsibility. And it's the legal responsibilities, that quasi-judicial aspect
20 of the profession that makes it professional. We make decisions that judges make and we
21 make them every day. Those decisions are important and they're binding. In my
22 experience, and I've been an expert witness in a dozen or so cases here in the State and
23 several out of the State. I have found that surveyors single biggest weakness is their
24 knowledge of legal principles. And I think Gary LoRusso in his letter also pointed that out. I
25 really believe that two years of technical education, surveying is mathematical in terms of
26 the trade itself, the actual action of doing the work, it's highly mathematical and I don't
27 believe a four degree is necessary. I don't even believe, and I have 9 years of college
28 including a masters degree and I've taken four semesters of calculus, deferential equations
29 and theory of equations. I don't believe calculus is necessary for surveying. I also have a
30 degree in electrical engineering. It certainly, at one time, was necessary in that field.
31 Today, let's face it, computers do all our work, we don't use slide rules anymore. This idea
32 that we have to understand complex equations even for engineers, I think, is non-existent
33 anymore. I think that what makes a good surveyor is, in my experience, having dealt with
34 hundreds of surveyors, is attitude. The desire to do a good job, the desire to be precise, a
35 degree of common sense, especially with it comes down to ascertaining boundary locations
36 which I think is the most single important thing we do. So I think I've supported continuing
37 education, and I still do. I had it in Florida for 10 years before Alaska enacted that
38 requirement and I learned a great deal in those continuing education courses in Florida.
39 That is the best way to ensure that practicing surveyors maintain their level of competency.
40 So basically I'm in the category of supporting the two year program, not increasing it to a 4
41 year program. But I don't have a real problem with civil engineers taking whatever courses
42 they need to also get an associate degree in surveying and be qualified once again because
43 I think civil engineering and surveying are very closely tied together. We do usable area
44 determinations all the time, we do all kinds of things that overlap the civil engineering field.

45
46 As far as my son's concerned, the primary reason I'm here, is, I'd like to know and he'd like
47 to know, he's told me, I've pretty much got a year of the two year program. If I can go back
48 to college for a year and get the right to take the test and achieve registration, then it's worth
49 it to me. But if I have to do three more years, that would make his total college commitment
50 7 years, probably couldn't afford it, just wouldn't do it. So I came here today to try to find out
51 if a decision has been made, to put my input in to keeping it to 2 years for him. Because he
52 wants to make a decision this year whether to go back, he really is a good surveyor, he's
53 been doing it since he was 7. And he's gotten better over the years. And not only him,
54 there's other people that have contacted me about getting their registration and how much

1 college are they going to be required to do. And some of these people have been surveying
2 15 years or longer. Is there planning to be a discussion about this at this meeting? I didn't
3 see it on the agenda.

4
5 Chair: What we do is we take testimony and you can ask questions and we can respond to
6 those questions.

7
8 Horan: That's really the only question I have, is where are you on that and, is there any
9 indication, I noticed on the list of the 31, there were 16 people that went for the 4 year and
10 15 people that wanted some other adjustment or no adjustment. So looks like if you add my
11 comment then it makes it 16/16. So that's all I had to say.

12
13 Baker: I apologize if your letter didn't get put in here, I'm not sure where it went. Normally
14 we go out for a 30 day comment period and this, we thought, was a big enough issue that
15 we wanted a full year. So our year is basically up after this meeting and we are going to
16 take this and put these comments together with your comments today and try to come up
17 with something that we are going to do. Probably by next meeting we will put something
18 forward to go out for public comment so then you'll get another time period to put comments
19 in. We really haven't approached anything yet, although, I feel that it's pretty strongly
20 supported that education, you said there's 16 for 4 year but also out of the other 16 there
21 are some that didn't want any changes at all, but most of them went 2 year or 2 to 4 year
22 progression. So in my mind it's pretty well supported. But whatever it'll be there will be
23 grandfather rights. Where if he's already in the surveying and he's got some education,
24 when this goes into effect there will be a sunset that locks it down, from this day forward
25 you'll have to have 2 years minimum or from this day forward you will have to have 4 years
26 minimum. It won't be from the time the regulations goes into effect. So that'll probably
27 answer your biggest question.

28
29 Horan: It does, if he can start this fall I believe he can finish in a year, certainly in a year
30 and a half and he has all the calculus.

31
32 Baker: And then the other issue is there's a lot of support for 4 year. But whether or not it's
33 4 years in geomatics or surveying verses a 4 year degree in something else and then have
34 core classes that take it to meet what you would have to have in a 4 year degree which
35 means 30 to 60 credits half needs to be strictly surveying. So he may only have to add
36 another year or two because he's already got a degree. There's a lot of things that come in
37 a 4 year degree that makes you able to think outside the box that are general studies. Like
38 humanities and things like that. We're not clear how we are going to approach that.

39
40 Horan: That sounds like a very enlightened approach and I would certainly agree with that
41 in total. As I said, I've got 9 years of college, mostly in biology but I understand that there's
42 certainly a lot of things that I learned in school outside of engineering and surveying that
43 probably made me a better surveyor. Anyway thank you very much I appreciate it.

44
45 Chair: Thank you for your testimony. Lance Mearig?

46
47 Mearig: Good Afternoon, I'm Lance Mearig, a civil engineer from Anchorage and I have two
48 topics that I'd like to talk about today, if that's ok? I won't take a lot of your time, I appreciate
49 your making some time for this. I am a corresponding member on the American Society of
50 Civil Engineers, ASCE's committee on the academic prerequisites for professional practice
51 often referred to as CAP Q. I'm not speaking for that committee, but I would like to advocate
52 for this Board's support for additional education requirements that are in the current NCEES
53 Model Law and Rules, the Model Law Engineer 2020. I understand the membership of
54 NCEES at the Denver meeting will be taking up a couple, on action for some alternative

1 wording to that and if an Alaska Board Representative's going to be at that meeting I'd like
2 to advocate for continuing this process of requiring additional education and a more
3 structured experience requirement and of the two alternatives I don't know that I have a
4 strong opinion but it seems that alternative 1 offers the best opportunity to continue that
5 process that NCEES has started. That was the first one. Shall I continue on?
6

7 The second item is on the use of an electronic image of a signature in the drawing. And I've
8 been, I think, paying attention to actions the Board's been taking, I review the laws and
9 regulations frequently. It's been my experience that certain entities require or allow the
10 submittal of electronic bid documents. And it's also my experience that printing a plan set,
11 signing it and then scanning it and submitting it doesn't allow the level of quality that I think
12 is appropriate. And so I've used a picture, I call it, of my signature in the drawing and
13 produced an electronic set directly to, well adobe acrobat, and turned those in. And it
14 certainly provides the desired level of quality but it may run counter to the Statutes and
15 Regulations. I understand that the State of Alaska's Commercial Code allows digital
16 signatures but that's, in my understanding, different than a picture of a signature. So if you
17 have an answer now that would be great and I'm not trying to put anyone on the spot. But I
18 would like some clarification on the Board's position of the use of electronic signatures or
19 images.
20

21 Chair: Bo, could you respond to his first inquiry about the expansion on the NCEES level of
22 Model Law, and by the way Bo will be attending the National Conference in Denver.
23

24 Brownfield: Let me ask you a question. You said you view alternative 1 as a better
25 alternative than alternative 2?
26

27 Mearig: Yes.
28

29 Brownfield: Would you refresh my memory on alternative 1, which one is 1 and which is 2?
30

31 Mearig: Ok, I have documents I'll leave, it's an article from IEEE from back in June. So I
32 have run this up the flag pole to see if I could get confirmation of these, now two months
33 later, are still what's out there to be considered. And I didn't get a great response from the
34 committee, I just got an opinion that they don't like it. That was the 2nd one. The 1st one was
35 in the Model Law that lists out a bunch of the requirements for an engineer intern to take the
36 exam. Adds another option, a BS from and EAC/ABET accredited program that has a
37 minimum of 150 credit hours of which at least 115 are in math, science, and at least 75 are
38 in engineering and then a specific record of at least 4 years or more of progressive
39 experience. My understanding is that doesn't really change things a lot. Because from the
40 CAP Q assistant committee chair, that really just reinforces a 5 year degree, and there aren't
41 many of them out there anymore in engineering. There's an architectural engineering 5 year
42 degree meets that, I hate to throw this out there but the B + 30 requirement that we've kind
43 of retracted from using that term. The 2nd one seem a little more convoluted from the IEEE
44 authors who wrote this article, Mitch (?) and a couple other guys, opinion that if that 2nd
45 alternative passes it will require another year of study, not to get a license but by NCEES to
46 determine if they should move forward with this. And this says graduate with a BS degree
47 from an EAC/ABET school and then during a 6 year period of progressive engineering
48 experience before taking the PE exam take courses totaling, and this version says X, so the
49 task force talked about 30, assessed learning days of continuing education in areas
50 germane to the professionals practice. And then participate in a structured mentoring
51 program of at least 36 hours a year for the 3 years prior to sitting for the exam. That's what
52 they're calling alternative 2. And they don't seem like alternatives to me but clearly those
53 two options are going to be voted on.
54

1 Brownfield: First let me tell you that this issue was a matter of very deep discussion at our
2 zone meeting. Western Zone was trying to come to grips with what we in the Western Zone
3 want to support. My recollection is we didn't have a very solid conclusion as to which one of
4 those two we wanted to support. It's going to be a hefty discussion as you know when we
5 get to the National organization. This is going to be hot and heavily discussed. I'm not
6 prepared to tell you whether we agree with alternative 1 or alternative 2. There's a lot of
7 folks, including people at this table here that have dealt with B+30 which you're very familiar
8 with and I know somebody else that is very familiar with it because he championed it for our
9 organization. And he did an outstanding job along with his colleagues in Nevada. I would
10 welcome the guy who is the most experienced in B+ whatever we have, to make a
11 comment. I would say that this Board does support some form of additional education.
12 We're grappling as a Board today with, just exactly what is that? What happened in the
13 Zone meeting was that we were provided two more options. To try to energize the
14 discussion off of this top dead center of half saying B+30 yes, half of NCEES saying no,
15 we've been doing this for years. So it's going to be an effort to try to break that deadlock
16 and to try to come up with something that we can sink our teeth in. I'm not prepared to tell
17 you which one I like better. Brian was there, Brian is a new civil engineer on our Board. I
18 would like for him to comment on it since he was there also and of course our expert here
19 should also comment on it. I know you weren't there at this last meeting. You've probably
20 had some discussion with Patty.

21
22 Fredeen: I was there. I won't be there in Denver.

23
24 Brownfield: Oh, that's right you were there. So he'd be the guy to give you more detail on
25 where we are on these options.

26
27 Fredeen: I'm actually on the NCEES education task force that created both of those options
28 and Craig Musselman and Monte Phillips are both on there and another guy who's cap
29 three. But we've been in long debates. And those two options, and I want to emphasize that
30 it's not one or the other, they both can be approved and they both can be shot down. What
31 it was as you know, the MOE, Masters or Equivalent, a lot of the objection to the MOE is that
32 it is felt that it might hinder some engineers from obtaining licensure with the single track of
33 the +30. So the question was, the engineer who is working full time, has a family and then
34 is trying to get 30 additional credits while working full time would take X number of years to
35 achieve that process. Is there another way that might take longer but would be better fitted
36 into actually getting them towards licensure rather than going down the single track with
37 +30. And that's where those two items came from. Option number 1 there's actually only
38 about a half dozen degrees in the country that would apply to that situation. I know it's fully
39 supported by ASCE but for the people who have the opinion of another route towards
40 licensure. Your familiar with our tables, we have several routes for licensure. There had to
41 be another plausible route and that's where option 2 came from. As you know B+30 or
42 MOE, we're still fine tuning it today. That's one of the topics we constantly talk about each
43 year. What is the clearing house? What is these 30 credits and how does this work? It's
44 taken very many years to develop and so the option 2 is something that was put out there
45 but it is heavily emphasized that we took five years and we're still working on b+30. You
46 know what is the mentorship program? And what is that going to contain? And it's going to
47 take time to develop that. This National meeting is more of, does it pass the red face test?
48 We're still a couple years from Model language.

49
50 Hanson: I'm not going to be at the National meeting. Being a new comer to it, there was a
51 lot of very heated debate. I came away from the Western Zone meeting with, I guess, more
52 questions than answers. It felt like there was support for the 150 but there are not a lot of
53 programs that are offered, as Craig indicated. And then there's support for the Masters
54 program. I guess the bottom line is, what I got out of the meeting, and I think the direction

1 that we're headed, is that there will be a change. And it's going to require a little more
2 education whether that's through mentoring, masters, additional bachelors work, additional
3 continuing education, but change is eminent and its coming and it's going to require more
4 education. I think that's ultimately what's going to happen. How long its going to take and
5 when we end up there, I can't tell you. That's what I got out of it.

6
7 Chair: Dan did you want to add anything to that?
8

9 Walsh: I guess this Board, at least at one time, was resistant to B+30. We didn't support it
10 at the National level. I don't know at what point in time the Board or future Board might
11 adopt it into these regs. I guess I find it odd that, at least from this Board's perspective, that
12 our real issue was with ABET and that we thought it was up to them to accredit engineering
13 programs to a point where we thought they had an acceptable level of credit hours and
14 covered the important topics. I think that's where we thought the battle should really lie and
15 having that discussion with ABET. Instead it seems like NCEES is saying ok we'll trust
16 ABET, which a lot of member boards really came to the conclusion they didn't trust, we'll
17 now trust them to put an additional 30 credits in and make sure those are acceptable for a
18 complete engineering education. Those are some of the issues that I have a hard time
19 working around with B+30 and I look at this MOE as just a band aid on a bad cut and I think
20 your trying to complicate simplicity. If you really want B+30, go B+30. I don't want B+30.
21

22 Brownfield: I guess to wrap it up. You ask what is our choice or opinion and quite frankly
23 we don't have one. I would emphasize that all along this Board sees that there is a need for
24 something. But even this Board doesn't fully agree with each other as to what that is much
25 less NCEES coming to grips with it. So we don't have an answer. We can't sit here and
26 look you in the eye and say we think alternate 1 is the best or alternate 2. It's an attempt in
27 my view to get us off of top dead center and move to something that most of NCEES can
28 buy into. I'm sorry we can't give you anything better than that.
29

30 Chair: It's as clear as mud, right? Craig could you respond to the electronic signature?
31

32 Fredeen: Yes, we actually spent a very long time this morning, probably longer than most
33 would have wanted, on the topic of signatures. We did receive a couple letters asking about
34 pretty much the same thing. Our regulations weren't clear about the "wet" signature verses
35 the electronic signature, when we have to have each one. And the regulation we voted on
36 earlier to move forward actually puts into the regulations verbiage about needing to have an
37 original hand signature on a set of drawings. Where that kind of came from was our
38 investigator coming out on a site and having a set of drawings there that someone is
39 building from. Then they see it's a digital signature and they don't know who has authority
40 on that. I've seen people who have electronic signatures and it's located on their server.
41 And it's like, when your out at lunch someone just put your stamp on their homes
42 foundation. You have a lot less chance of keeping control of your stamp. So that's kind of
43 the emphasis there for the wet signature so that the investigator can say where's the
44 originals? Let me make sure you're building to what the original designer intended and is
45 taking liability for.
46

47 Understanding that there is a great need to have electronic signatures. Whether its adobe
48 or a cad block or a scan of a signature or the whole sheet. That's something I'm going to be
49 working on. I'm supposed to come back tomorrow with some new verbiage. The intent that
50 we've had in our guide lines is that you have one set that is wet signed and it may be 11X17
51 or something. You hang onto that, that's your set now. After you've got that wet signed set,
52 you can digitally put your stamp in, your signature, and do whatever you want from then on
53 as long as you have the wet signed set that says when I stamped these drawings this is
54 what I intended. Unfortunately that hasn't been very clear in our regulations. So I'm trying

1 to clean that up. But I'm definitely looking for input on how we can better state that to make
2 it more obvious what the intention is.

3
4 Brownfield: What would you recommend?

5
6 Mearig: Well I served on this Board back in the nineties and the early part of 2000. In the
7 late nineties I went to presentation at an NCEES meeting by NAVFAC Atlantic division. And
8 they had this process of using adobe electronic signature that's just a series of 1's and 0's.
9 They would not produce a paper set. You set in front of a terminal, computer screen, review
10 the drawings and the on a tablet you would sign each sheet. You would review this sheet
11 and sign it and they had this complicated electrical engineering check sum process so that
12 the contractor couldn't come back to them and say I've got your drawing here it says this
13 pipe is supposed to be one inch, or it would say one inch and changes the drawing so they
14 had this process to go back and run this check sum feature and say oh no, you've changed
15 our drawing. And no wet ink ever touches paper. No paper's ever produced unless
16 somebody prints one of those drawings. But, the whole design and bid process is electronic.
17 I guess I'm just looking for some additional clarification. I think there is a lot of confusion out
18 there about what an electronic signature is. I think I understand but even people I work with
19 thinks an electronic signature is that image of a signature that, frankly, our cad people apply
20 to drawings. What I try to do at my company is to make sure we have a wet signed copy
21 delivered to the client if they request it or that we have one in the office. Cause I know the
22 investigator goes out and looks at sites and may show up. I don't think it has happened on
23 any projects, but I believe we'll find it there. I think even some clarification that that the
24 process that we consider legal in Alaska would be helpful. I guess I'm still old school enough
25 that I think there should be some paper coming around but I think there are some coming
26 behind us that don't think that.

27
28 Chair: Any other comments, question? We are in the steps of actually advertising for
29 regulation dealing with this. We did pass one regulation for advertisement and that was the
30 registrant shall include the date each time the registrant signs and seals a document by
31 inserting the date within two inches of the seal. And the other one that Craig is going to be
32 struggling with and getting back to us tomorrow is an original of all final drawings,
33 specifications, surveys, plats, plates, reports or similar documents are required to have an
34 original hand signature. Such document may have an electronic seal with date applied
35 electronically or manually. And I think Craig was going to be looking at accommodating
36 some kind of clarification about the electronic signature, digital, picture scan or what have
37 you. I don't know how available you are, because of your background in being on the Board
38 that maybe you could spend 20 minutes with him. We are going to be going into an
39 executive session but we certainly would excuse him to tap your expertise for continuities
40 sake at least to give some input into that if you had the time?

41
42 Mearig: Right now?

43
44 Chair: Yes sir, we would greatly appreciate that. Are there any other questions, comments?
45 We'll go ahead and excuse you two. It would be greatly appreciated Craig if you could do
46 that right now and we'll excuse you from the executive session.

47
48 Chair: I would entertain a motion to move into executive session.

49
50 **On a motion duly made by Brownfield, seconded by Walsh it was**

51
52 **RESOLVED to go into Executive Session under authority of AS 44.62.310 to review**
53 **the continuing education audit and review applicant files.**

1 **Friday August 6, 2010**

2
3 Reconvene in executive session at 8:03am August 6th 2010.

4
5 Roll Call – All present except Rearick and Eriksen.

6
7 Back on record at 10:10am

8
9 Chair: We don't name names when we deny an application do we?

10
11 Walsh: We do.

12
13 Jones: Yes

14
15 Roll Call all present except Rearick, Eriksen and Hightower.

16
17 Chair: We've finished up with everything through old business. We have a regulation
18 change. I'd entertain a motion, we did adopt item (d) of 12 AAC 36.185. I'll entertain a
19 motion to modify that wording.

20
21 Shiesl: So moved.

22
23 Lent: Second.

24
25 Fredeen: I have a motion here.

26
27 Chair: Could you withdraw your motion?

28
29 Shiesl: Yes, I withdraw.

30
31 **On a motion duly made by Fredeen, seconded by Baker it was**

32
33 **RESOLVED to submit for regulation review the attached verbiage that further**
34 **modifies 12 AAC 36.185(d) and adds paragraph 12 AAC 36.185(f)**

35
36 It's been moved and seconded, could you read those into the record?

37
38 Fredeen: Yes and the motion is stated as further defined because I added a sentence onto
39 what we approved yesterday. So yesterday's motion still holds and part of this motion is
40 adding a sentence on to that paragraph (d). So paragraph (d) would read:

41
42 **(d) The registrant shall include the date each time the registrant signs and seals a**
43 **document by inserting the date within two inches of the seal.** The new sentence that
44 this motion would add would be: **The date may be applied electronically or manually.**
45 New paragraph (f) would read:

46
47 **(f) All final drawings, specifications, surveys, plats, plates, reports, or similar**
48 **documents shall have a seal and signature. An electronic image of a signature may**
49 **be used on the seal as long as there is an original copy of the documents, that**
50 **remains accessible for later reference that has either;**

51 **(1) An original hand or "wet" signature over the seal; or**

52 **(2) Software in place that will automatically remove or modify the electronic**
53 **image of the signature if the document is modified.**

1 Chair: Any discussion?
2
3 Baker: Asks for clarification on how item number (f)(2) satisfies the requirement of the hand
4 or wet signature.
5
6 Fredeen: Explains that there is software available that the Navy has used for years that
7 applies a seal with a signature and then if the document is modified in any way the signature
8 disappears. The reason for the wet signature was so that you could tell if original
9 documents were altered and this would accomplish that.
10
11 Baker: I'm not sure that satisfies the requirement that there has to be a document
12 somewhere that retains a wet signature.
13
14 A short discussion followed on whether or not this would meet the requirements and how to
15 implement the use of this software.
16
17 Hanson: States that he likes this language better than previous language and even though
18 the whole Board may not agree with every word it's important enough that we should get
19 public comment on it and try to move the issue forward.
20
21 Shiesl: The "or" makes sense to me because you're not required to have an electronic
22 signature.
23
24 Jones: The "or" removes the requirement for a wet signature.
25
26 Baker: Restates that that is his concern, the "or" takes out the requirement to retain a wet
27 signature and adds that maybe you could have both or that (2) could be an option in addition
28 to (1).
29
30 Fredeen: Would leave it up to the Board whether to have both or just the wet signature. He
31 wasn't sure if the Board absolutely wanted that wet signature or not.
32
33 Shiesl: Asks if we have that electronic signature do we want that requirement that it's
34 automatically removed?
35
36 Hanson: Points out that requiring a wet signature requires that someone maintain that
37 document forever and that the same requirement would be on the electronic file.
38
39 Lent: Offers wording that gives option number two in addition to the wet signature
40 documents.
41
42 Fredeen: Doesn't think we should require the software that has the signature removed
43 because it would be opposed by the registrants.
44
45 Lent: Again suggests that it be stated as in addition to the wet signature.
46
47 Chair: Agrees with Hanson that this needs to get out to the public for comment and that the
48 Board could word smith it to death.
49
50 Jones: Asks if Fredeen is leaning toward accepting electronic signatures and suggests that
51 a period be placed after reference and delete all after.
52
53 Chair: That doesn't meet the policy that we had implemented and that John has been
54 following. Again let's go ahead and vote. I don't see any problem with not having originals

1 with wet signature. Even the recorder's office is destroying originals and going with the
2 photo copy. That's eventually what's going to happen. Nobody is going to keep all this
3 paperwork. That's the reality of it. So on that basis All in favor of the motion on the table
4 say aye. Those opposed say nay. Any abstentions? Two say nay. Any reconsiderations
5 on that basis the motion passes and we'll go out to public notice with that regulation.
6

7 Fredeen: Notes that the issue of archiving and scanning isn't really addressed in our
8 regulations. He looked at the chapter 9.80 that was in the letter and doesn't think it's the
9 silver bullet that would allow someone to scan the original and say that's my original copy.
10 The Board might want to think about putting something out in the future that says you can
11 scan your documents and use as originals.
12

13 Lent: Ask if we should send Mr. Campbell a note that this is being public noticed?
14

15 Brownfield: Thinks we should respond.
16

17 Chair: We'll leave that up to Vern.
18

19 Chair: Asks if these regulations will be public noticed together and if it will be 30 days and
20 the general licensure will be longer.
21

22 Jones: Yes. If you want the General longer we can do that.
23

24 Brownfield: It should probably be longer just because it's like continuing education.
25

26 Chair: Bo, do whichever one you want to do first.
27

28 Brownfield: Before we get into general licensure we want to deal with the packet.
29

30 Chair: Could you make a motion?
31

32 **On a motion duly made by Brownfield, seconded by Baker it was**
33

34 **RESOLVED to deny the application of Michael Ward for registration by comity**
35 **regarding good character and reputation as defined by AS 08.48.171**
36

37 Chair: Discussion?
38

39 Lent: I cannot vote but I certainly support a positive vote for this particular item.
40

41 Chair: Further discussion for the record, Bo would you like to do a short synopsis, is that
42 warranted, advisor Vern?
43

44 Jones: You have already discussed it pretty much. I don't think any further discussion is
45 necessary.
46

47 Brownfield: Does anybody have any questions?
48

49 Shiesl: I'm hung up on the good character. Your citing the section but I don't see good
50 character in there. Is there something else in there that we should mention. Page three the
51 power to revoke or suspend, I don't see good character in there.
52

53 Brownfield: Points out that its section 08.48.171.
54

1 Shies: Oh, you're refereeing to another section.
2
3 Brownfield: No, that's the one I referred to.
4
5 Shies: Ok, I'm alright with that.
6
7 Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. Any
8 abstentions? Do we have any reconsideration vote? On that basis the motion passes.
9
10 Motion passed unanimously.
11
12 Brownfield: Mr. Chair I'd like to make another motion.
13
14 **On a motion made by Brownfield, seconded by Baker it was**
15
16 **RESOLVED, that for those registrants failing to meet the continuing education**
17 **requirements the submittals be forwarded to the Division Para-legal for disposition**
18 **with the Board recommendation that the license be suspended until full compliance**
19 **with the 2008-2009 continuing education requirements.**
20
21 Chair: Any discussion?
22
23 Walsh: Just for the record we had a fairly extensive discussion of these files in executive
24 session and I'm comfortable with the motion.
25
26 Hanson: for the record I think that overall everyone did a very good job of documenting their
27 continuing education and there was just a handful of these types of cases where the proof
28 just didn't rise to meet the Board requirements. I hope that we can pursue either a letter or
29 further research why people were denied and maybe some steps that registrants can take to
30 make our job easier and their job easier in complying with the requirements.
31
32 Lent: Asks what the percentage of suspensions is.
33
34 Chair: These are not suspensions, they are recommendations for suspension and it is
35 probably less than 1%.
36
37 Chair: Do you need the motion read again? All those in favor signify by saying aye.
38 Anyone opposed say nay. Any abstentions? Anyone wish to change their vote? On that
39 basis the motion passes.
40
41 Motion passed unanimously.
42
43 Baker: Suggests that all members write down their observations of the review process and
44 results and provide to Vern and Bo so they can produce a more informative letter to the
45 registrants.
46
47 Brownfield: That would be very useful.
48
49 Hanson: I would be happy to compile that.
50
51 Chair: Let's move to special committees. Is a report on General Licensure ready?
52
53 **Agenda item 15 – Special Committees**
54

1 **General Licensure.**

2
3 Chair: Brian did hand out a minor rewrite to the General Licensure change, would you like
4 to introduce that Bo?

5
6 Brownfield: Comments on the hard work the committee has done and offers to go through
7 the changes Hanson passed out and to review the regulation change and where they fit into
8 the overall regulation.

9
10 Chair: Doesn't think that is necessary since the Board has had them for a while should
11 have read them. He asks if anyone wishes to have them read.

12
13 Brownfield: Asks if anyone has any questions on the new definition of "Branches".

14
15 Walsh: Thinks that there is some broad language in the definitions we presently have and
16 that the new definitions don't have that. He reads the last three lines of the present
17 definition of mechanical engineering. "It is concerned with the research, design, production,
18 operational, organizational and economic aspects of these studies and activities." He thinks
19 that should be in all the definitions and believes it's in all the current definitions.

20
21 Baker: Asks if it could be done separately instead of repeating in each one.

22
23 Walsh: I guess it could be done under the definition of engineering but it's now in each one.
24 He then moves on to Metallurgical Engineering and points out that the statement "mining
25 and mineral beneficiation" is identical to Mining and Mineral Processing Engineering and
26 shouldn't be there.

27
28 Brownfield: Points out that there is overlap in all the branches and is not sure of the need to
29 eliminate that from the other. If it's a false statement it should be taken out but if it's a minor
30 repetition with another branch your going to find that throughout this, especially with civil.
31 Brian you looked that, what are your comments.

32
33 Hanson: Agrees with Dan and thinks it should be removed.

34
35 Shiesl: Asks what beneficiation means and is told it's the extraction of the mineral from the
36 host.

37
38 Brownfield: States that the fact that it is repeated is not good reason to remove from one or
39 the other but if it doesn't fit then that a good reason to remove. So you're saying it doesn't fit
40 in Materials Engineering but it does fit in Mining Engineering?

41
42 Hanson: Responds that it is Mineral Processing Engineering.

43
44 Chair: So mining and mineral beneficiation should be struck?

45
46 Walsh: Responds that it's just too broad and nearly identical.

47
48 Chair: Dan did you have any others?

49
50 Walsh: Thinks that extraction should be added to the definition of Mining Engineering
51 between location and recovery.

52
53 Brownfield: Repeats Dan's first change and agrees to make it consistent throughout the
54 definitions. He went on to explain the difficulty of writing the definitions and recognizes the

1 committee for their efforts.
2
3 Hanson: Talks about his concerns with foundations in the structural definition being overlap
4 with the civil geotechnical engineers and that a structural may design a foundation. He also
5 points out the overlaps with environmental engineering with civil engineering in the areas of
6 waste water and storm water.
7
8 Brownfield: Explains that the definitions were taken from the content of the examinations
9 and points out again that there is overlap in all the branches.
10
11 Baker: Points out that the wording in the first change that Dan mentioned could be inserted
12 into the general definition of engineering and then would not have to be in each definition.
13
14 Shiesl: Mentions the need for punctuation in the civil definition.
15
16 Fredeen: Points out that we are not trying to limit the things now being done by a specific
17 branch and that some of the definitions need to be expanded such as the definition of civil
18 engineering. For example foundations is included in structural but not in civil and also things
19 covered under environmental that aren't completely covered under civil and this needs to be
20 corrected so as not to limit anyone from doing something they are presently doing.
21
22 Baker: Gives Bo and the committee a lot of credit for the work they put into this and that we,
23 like on an earlier regulation, could word smith it forever and we need to get it out as is and
24 get the public's comments.
25
26 Lent: Asks that the word irrigation in the civil definition causes some municipalities to say a
27 landscape architect can't do irrigation. Need to specify that it's major irrigation under civil.
28
29 Baker: Points out that both regulations say irrigation so the investigator can't say the
30 landscape architect can't do irrigation.
31
32 Hanson: Asks if everyone has a copy of the changes with the red printing.
33
34 Brownfield: Explains Hanson's task on the committee and turns the floor over to him to
35 explain his changes.
36
37 Hanson: Explaining that he tried to stay out of the definitions and goes on to say he would
38 delete all the requirements of the proposed 12 AAC 36.020 because it may be covered
39 under AS 08.48.071. But if it was changed it should be changed to Branch(s) of Professional
40 Engineering.
41
42 Brownfield: Points out that 08.48.071 is a statute and this is a regulations that implements
43 the requirements of the statute.
44
45 Walsh: Asks what 48.071 says.
46
47 Hanson: Responds that it's about other information and after talking to Bo he believes that
48 (a) should remain as written by Bo. He continues that he is not sure that the language
49 under (b) is necessary because there are already procedures for becoming registered in
50 additional branches. He then recommends moving the language under c to 12 AAC 36.210
51 or 12 AAC 36.185.
52
53 Brownfield: Responds that the authority is section 08.48.071 which is records and reports
54 so they are the same thing. Whether or we need it or not is a different story. It doesn't hurt

1 to emphasize that you can expand beyond your basic branch. It may not add anything but it
2 won't subtract anything and we could eliminate it but I wanted to make a point. It's up to the
3 Board. Vern chime in, do you like or don't like it?

4
5 Jones: The branch's?

6
7 Brownfield: That 12 AAC 36.020 with some of the changes that Brian had. While Jones is
8 looking at the regulation, he goes on to explain how he come up with it.

9
10 Walsh: Reads this that it's meant to give guidance on what a person is allowed to practice
11 and that all the definitions will apply whether we go to general licensure or individual
12 licensure of all these disciplines, so he agrees with Cliff that we should get it out to the
13 public and see how they feel and that he isn't sure which route he wants to go yet but he is
14 willing to put it out to public comment and get some more information.

15
16 Fredeen: On that note we might as well make this discussion official.

17
18 **On a motion duly made by Fredeen, seconded by Hightower it was**

19
20 **RESOLVED to submit the General Licensure regulation for public notice.**

21
22 Chair: Further discussion? Have you taken notes, Vern, of all the requested changes and
23 does the motion intend to leave 12 AAC 36.220 as it was submitted by the committee?

24
25 Fredeen: Responds that his motion is based on what we have in our packets.

26
27 Hanson: Friendly amendment. I would propose that we remove the use of the word "basic".
28 So the title of 12 AAC 220 would read Branches of Professional Engineering. (a) would
29 remain the same. (b) at the end of the second line add initial between the and scope and
30 strike out basic. (c) I would strike out basic and change the word encompassing to "for".

31
32 Jones: Which one are we correcting? The one in the packet or the handout?

33
34 Brownfield: I'll give you an update of that. Because I already have it down.

35
36 Both the motion maker and the second ok the changes as a friendly amendment.

37
38 Hanson: Proposes that we amend the continuing education regulations as we add branch's.
39 He recommends modifying 12 AAC 36.510 (c) to read "must attain a minimum of 24
40 professional development hours. And after "holding multiple registrations" add and or
41 branches in the state is required to etc. and after registration I would add and or branch
42 held. And then add a sentence "if multiple registrations and/or branches are held
43 professional development hours beyond the minimum may be required to satisfy the
44 requirements of this section.

45
46 Chair: Is that a friendly amendment to you? (both fine with it). Let's finish if Brian has any
47 other.

48
49 Hanson: We haven't discussed this but I would strike through the change to 12 AAC 36.990
50 (xx). I believe those definitions are the definitions we provided above.

51
52 Walsh: Thinks that we should let the registrant who is registered in multiple
53 disciplines/branches to decide how to partition his professional development hours instead
54 of specifying that he get 8 hours in each.

1
2 Baker: Believe that since some courses like ethics would apply to all branches an individual
3 should need some in each branch but not necessarily 8 in each.
4
5 Lent: ditto
6
7 Chair: I would be looking at this as a 60 day advertisement so there may be some oral
8 presentation at the Anchorage meeting in the fall.
9
10 Jones: You can, when you go out for public comment specify that oral comment will be
11 taken.
12
13 Chair: Asks if the change to 990 (xx) is considered friendly. (the answer was yes from
14 both). Do we have further discussion?
15
16 Jones: I was just curious if you guys were going to provide any type of grandfathering for
17 those civil engineers that presently practice environmental and structural engineering and
18 those mechanical and electrical that presently practice control systems?
19
20 Brownfield: My question back to you is I don't think we need to grandfather anything unless
21 they're doing something now that's not also included in what we are proposing. Is there
22 something when you go to civil engineering that their doing now that they can't do under the
23 new rules?
24
25 Jones: Well if you go into these branches here you're saying that if you're going to, you
26 have to specify what branches you're doing. The guy's been doing this for 30 years. Are
27 you going to tell him he can't do it any longer unless he provides more....
28
29 Brownfield: Tell me under civil engineering where he's doing something now that's not
30 included in the new one. I mean that's the basic question.
31
32 Jones: Ok.
33
34 Brownfield: It's still there, they can still practice...
35
36 Chair: Craig?
37
38 Brownfield: Well, let me finish, even if it's not there and they can demonstrate that they
39 have the expertise and the foundation and all that stuff they can still do it under general
40 engineering, under general licensure.
41
42 Chair: I would request that this little discussion actually be almost verbatim in the minutes.
43 Go ahead Craig.
44
45 Fredeen: I think what Vern's getting at is once this becomes regulation. If you are a civil
46 engineer who does a little bit of structural, a little bit of environmental how, are you then –
47 we talked about some of this grandfathering before when we were just doing the structural
48 and environmental and fire protection and how that was going to be approved. Does that
49 mean, are we just going, how are we going to give out the license of environmental as a
50 branch? Is this individual going to have a civil license that is all of a sudden going to have
51 three branches under their name? And how do we determine, yes they can have the
52 environmental branch under their name, they can have a structural branch under their name
53 because the only test they took was a civil test. Who's going to decide that and I know the
54 structural engineers are going have a say in that.

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
51
52
53
54

Hanson: As an example we have several civils that are practicing structural engineering and we don't require a structural test up here and that's all they've done. Are we going to move them into that branch or are we going to....?

Hightower: I think we're still border lining on word smithing here. This thing is going to get so much public input that it may not even look like this when we're done. So I think I would call for the question.

Chair: Ok, calling for the question means that two thirds of us need to vote for voting. So on that basis does everyone understand what I just said? On that basis all those in favor, and please call roll on this.

Baker: In favor of the question?

Chair: In favor of the question.

Jones:

Baker: Yes

Brownfield: Yes

Eriksen: - absent

Fredeen: Yes

Hanson: Yes

Heieren: Yes

Hightower: Yes

Shiesl: Yes

Walsh: Yes

Chair: On that basis all those in favor of the motion on the floor as amended signify by saying aye. Opposed, 1 opposed. Any abstention? Anyone care to change their vote? Seeing none the motion passes and it will go to public notice clarifying that we do request that the notification period will last into the next meeting so that we can take public testimony.

Lent: Thinks that the board is moving in the right direction. And suggests that we put a statement on the request for public comment explaining what we mean by general licensure and why we are going that way.

Brownfield: Explains that we did that in the original letter we sent out.

Chair: Bert is suggesting that we do it again with the public notice.

Brownfield: Explains that we didn't use "everybody else does it" as a reason but that it would do no harm to say there is a trend toward this, something like 81% now and every Board has it's own definition of general licensure.

As Built/Record Drawings.

Chair: Do you have anything to report?

Hightower: Reports that he was going to report on asbuilt/record drawings and incidental practice and that at the last meeting he was given a new task to write a position paper on exemptions and that they are all related. But that he got sidetracked on exemptions and

1 ignored the other two. He went solo on it because he didn't get it to other members of the
2 committee in time to get their input. He asks if everyone has had a chance to read the
3 position paper and if they want to speak on it. He thinks he needs to get the committee
4 involved, get it cleaned up and re-present it. He states that as he worked on this the
5 specialty contractor part of it became more absurd to him on how it's been interpreted and
6 enforced or not enforced. It needs some work, he got input from Craig and Dan so he
7 needs to make a few changes and asks if anyone has any comments for the committee.
8

9 Chair: Excellent job Harley. I think you are prioritizing it correctly. If anybody has any
10 comments now we can go ahead and take those but for the sake of time, review this and get
11 back to Harley directly.
12

13 **Licensure Mobility.**

14
15 Walsh: Handed out a two page summary and gave a report on Australian engineering
16 practice. Stating that except in Queensland it really isn't licensure. It is more engineering
17 societies with an emphasis to get on National Registers and list your requirements. Not
18 much enforcement except in Queensland. He recommends that all read his summary and
19 bring any questions directly to him. He will put together a slide show on his Australian trip
20 for next meeting.
21

22 Chair: Thank you Dan and we will probably do that at lunch.
23

24 **Mining Engineering/Geologists.**

25
26 Walsh: I've started looking into the definitions from the different States and will try to come
27 up with one for next meeting.
28

29 Chair: Remarks that on the licensure mobility we had been waiting on Mark to test the
30 waters and asks if there is anyone else we could get to do that. Maybe ask your friends and
31 see if anyone is interested.
32

33 Jones: I have an individual that has been reporting back to me that has been trying to get a
34 license in Canada and he said that once he gets licensed he'll let us know how it went.
35

36 Hightower: States that NCARB is pretty far along with an agreement with Mexico and
37 Canada and that he isn't really interested in being licensed in Canada but is thinking about a
38 test run just to see how it works.
39

40 Lent: Reports that CLARB has been administering exams in two Canadian provinces and is
41 talking with Mexico. Offers to ask a colleague who he thinks is practicing in Canada for a
42 report.
43

44 **Land Surveyor Education Committee.**

45
46 Baker: Apologizes for not having Mr. Horan's letter and reports that he has only received
47 one additional letter since last meeting and that this meeting is the end of the comment
48 period and he will put a table together and confer with Heieren and have something for next
49 meeting.
50

51 Walsh: Asks if the surveyors on the Board agreed with the public testimony that mostly all
52 the college that surveyors needed was the legal aspects of the profession.
53

54 Baker: Responds in the negative and explains the different make up of some of the 2 year

1 and 4 year programs and that Mr. Horan addressed it pretty well but explains that there is a
2 big difference in some of the programs. Some of the 2 year programs are very technical
3 and some are just lead-in's to a 4 year program.

4 5 **Investigative Advisory Committee.**

6
7 Chair: Have you met with John?

8
9 Brownfield: We have, sometimes it's we, sometimes it's me sometimes it's Harley,
10 sometimes it's other folks. I've met at least 4 times since last meeting and have nothing to
11 report other than the fact that it's alive and very healthy. I continue to think that our program
12 with him is worth its weight in gold. It eliminates a lot of time consuming things. He goes on
13 to explain how the system works and that he would like to get others on the Board involved.

14
15 Hightower: Thinks that him and Bo have been on it from the beginning and that he will be
16 getting Rearick involved because he will be leaving the Board in a little over a year.

17
18 Lent: Volunteers his services.

19
20 Brownfield: If issues come up that have to do with landscape architecture your services
21 should be sought. If John calls with something I'll let you know, it usually only lasts a couple
22 hours.

23
24 Chair: Recaps that the reason we didn't have an investigative report this time was due to a
25 software issue within the Investigations Section.

26 27 **Guidance Manual.**

28
29 Chair: The Guidance Manual is ongoing and you have started to collect some additions and
30 deletions.

31
32 Lent: Reiterates that the disclaimer be strengthened and goes over the changes that were
33 made after the February meeting, several new subject to add and asks the board to email
34 him with anything they think of that should go into the Manual.

35
36 Chair: Why don't you include all this in a package and we will discuss in February.

37 38 **Legislative Liaison.**

39
40 Chair: We have some pending legislation that you want to endorse, is that right Vern?

41
42 Jones: States that there are a couple of things but can't think of what they are at this time.

43
44 Brownfield: Asks if they are carried over from last year. And that one of them is specialty
45 contracting and the point to be made is that are two and that we need to start working with
46 John Walsh.

47
48 Chair: Can you draw those out of the Annual Report and submit to Eric?

49
50 Jones: Yes.

51 52 **Emeritus Status.**

53
54 Brownfield: We have none. We don't have anybody who's applied so it's dormant.

1
2 Lent: Brings up the issue of getting a permanent seat and a vote for the landscape
3 architect. Should we be going on record every year saying we want this?
4

5 Brownfield: I think we've already made that and don't think we want to do it every year.
6

7 Jones: Advises that the division is going to remain neutral and that APDC or someone will
8 have to seek a sponsor for the legislation.
9

10 Shiesl: Thinks that the Board should keep pressure on to let them know we are still
11 interested in getting this done. We should have a resolution every year.
12

13 Jones: Want to put that one to Eric too?
14

15 Chair: Yes. We will forward it to the chair of the Legislative Committee.
16

17 **Budget Committee.** 18

19 Chair: The only thing I have noticed, Dan, is someone made a comment that when we did
20 the spread sheet for our travel budget we neglected to include in State travel. And another
21 aspect of it is that we should add the reimbursement thing too because that gets
22 misunderstood or miscounted. Cathy should be able to give some insight about that.
23

24 Walsh: Thinks Vern may be able to give some insight.
25

26 Jones: All I know about it is that instead of these reimbursements being counted as
27 reimbursements they are coming in as revenue. The result is that when we think we are
28 only paying part of a trip we are actually paying the full cost of it.
29

30 Walsh: Thinks that the travel is going to be diminished for the rest of this fiscal year and that
31 we should start planning next year's budget and if we can come up with a good
32 recommendation in the new fee structure that would give us some ammunition to use with
33 the legislators for support.
34

35 Chair: Advises that the individual in charge of our travel budget is Curtis Thayer and that he
36 committed to cooperate with us in the future if we get it in the budget.
37

38 Baker: Is confused over this whole issue because we asked for \$87,000 in the budget and
39 they said it was \$30,000 over last years and reduced it. So we asked for it but they didn't
40 give it to us. So I'm confused, is our request not the budget?
41

42 Hanson: Explains that it has to go to the Legislature for approval. We might ask for it but
43 they may not approve all of it.
44

45 Walsh: Is the appropriation that detailed?
46

47 Hanson: No it's at the department or division level.
48

49 Jones: That is what Ginger meant when she said you do not have a budget. Your fees
50 come in but that is not a pot of money that you are free to spend. You are free to spend
51 what the Legislature says you can spend. So what we have to do is make sure the division
52 requests the amount of money we want for travel.
53

54 Chair: I don't think Don was opposed to that.

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
51
52
53
54

Jones: No, and I don't think Mr. Thayer is either, in fact I think that's what Mr. Thayer is saying, you've got to get it appropriated then I'll approve it.

Shiesl: Adds that he Just read the constitution of the State and it says you're right. He explains that the incoming monies are counted as revenue and have to be appropriated by the Legislature and that yes we have to get it in the budget but it's really a political issue and we have to lobby the Legislature to get the appropriation.

Chair: It would be helpful Dan if we could summarize all of this so when we meet in Juneau we can actually, and I don't care whether we call it lobbying or not, but make it clear to the legislature that in fact what's happening to us as a Board is not fair. If we can put all this on a piece of paper and go around to all the Legislators and make sure the Staff person gets a copy of it.

Hanson: Wants to make sure that our allocation from the division is 12% or that we receive our appropriate share.

Baker: Thinks we are in a catch-22 where we request it and they don't appropriate it and say, well it's not in the budget.

Hightower: The fact that this is a constitutional issue doesn't mean that they can't consider the fact that money is coming from somewhere else. Points out that having all the meetings in Anchorage except the Juneau one would save some money and a cost analysis should be done.

Jones: I will do what I can to get the division to request what we want. And you guys have to do your part with the Legislators.

Chair: Wants something in writing that consolidates all these thoughts about the benefits of the travel.

Walsh: Asks if our indirect expenses are tied to the number of licensees.

Jones: Yes and our present figure is 11.66%.

Walsh: Just wanted to compare that with the 12% figure and it's real close.

There was a short discussion on the meaning of the 12% figure.

Brownfield: States that we are a donor not a recipient, we take in more than we spend.

Chair: Thinks that that would be a good thing to able to show a balance sheet to a Legislator.

Hanson: Recommends that before we put numbers together on meeting consolidation that we consider that there is certain intangible benefits to holding meetings throughout the state, as we saw yesterday during the public testimony, that we can't put a dollar amount to.

Hightower: I was happy to hear that gentleman say that but the last meeting we had here people drove from Anchorage to attend it. Does that make sense?

Brownfield: Points out that most of the time we don't get a lot of participation except in Anchorage and the same few people attend at each meeting in each location. Juneau is

1 different because of the fly-in and it's our chance to get with the Legislators. Most of the
2 meaningful input is in Anchorage and Juneau because people are in Juneau at that time.

3
4 Jones: The Board is free to hold it's meetings wherever it wants to. What I recommend is
5 that the next meeting is going to be in Anchorage in November and that we hold next May's
6 meeting in Anchorage just to save a little travel money for this fiscal year so that it may allow
7 someone to attend a National meeting. Once we get a budget approved that is more to our
8 advantage then go back to having our meeting like we normally do.

9
10 Chair: It is 12:05 do you want to continue and try to wrap this up?

11
12 Baker: Could we take a short restroom break?

13
14 Chair: Do I hear a second.

15
16 Break: 12:05 to 12:15

17
18 12:15: Back in session

19
20 **Agenda item 17 – New Business.**

21
22 a. Government exemptions for licensure.

23
24 Chair: That was a handout, APDC published, this doesn't warrant any motion, maybe just a
25 point of discussion or notice. Everyone should have received a handout from Vern, APDC's
26 publication of NCEES report by David Whitman and Jerry Carter. Any comments? Did we
27 have a 17 (b) There's ethics.

28
29 b. Email from Julia Bockman re Revised Proposed Changes to Ethics Regulations
30 for Comment

31
32 Chair: Does this require any action?

33
34 Jones: Explains that it's a request for comments regarding proposed changes to the Ethics
35 Regulations and that Jenny asked for it to be passed to all board Chairs and they are due by
36 August 31st.

37
38 Chair: Doesn't know if this is an ethics issue or not but is still having problems with the
39 restrictions on emails between board members and everything has to go through Vern.

40
41 Jones: That's not ethics is an interpretation of the Open Meetings Act.

42
43 Chair: If you have any comments get them to Vern prior to August 31st. Is Jenny's
44 notification in here? She's retiring.

45
46 Jones: No it's not in here but she's retiring effective August 27th, that will be her last day.
47 She had intended to retire at the end of the year but due to personal reasons she decided to
48 accelerate that.

49
50 Chair: She has had a big impact on this Board in a positive way.

51
52 Jones: She's my direct supervisor.

53
54 **Agenda item 18 – Examiners Report.**

1
2 The Examiners Report was handed out. Alicia?
3
4 Kelly: Happy to read it to you but I know we're pressed for time. Scan it and I'll answer any
5 questions.
6
7 **Agenda item 19 – Board Travel.**
8
9 Chair: We talked at length about that.
10
11 Jones: Can we hold up just one second? There is one thing on the Examiners Report I
12 wanted to mention. Of 24 candidates for the AKLS, 20 of them passed. That's probably the
13 best pass percentage we've ever had.
14
15 Chair: Board travel priorities, the list is under item 19.
16
17 Jones: Trying to get it right as a continuation from last time. If you see errors let me know.
18
19 Chair: That's after the Annual conference in Denver.
20
21 Lent: Vern you should be under CLARB there.
22
23 Jones: My names under all of them.
24
25 **Agenda item 20 – To do List.**
26
27 Chair: Bo supplemental work on incidental practice. I think you have some minor things
28 with general licensure to do and submit to Vern submit for advertisement. Brian I'm drawing
29 a blank for you.
30
31 Jones: He's got the CE instructions for next time.
32
33 Chair: And come back to us, whether we need a committee or not. Something else I would
34 like to have done Brian, if you would be willing to do it, is at our last meeting we committed
35 to do something in assisting the Fire Marshall. It was indicated that we would do a little one
36 page, something we could put in our corrections letter about common mistakes. 4 or 5
37 common mistakes and I would refer you to our meeting minutes, page 4 line 46. I think it's
38 going to take a couple phone calls maybe and Tim Fischer is the one that requested it.
39 Would that be alright?
40
41 Hanson: Yes.
42
43 Chair: And I think a phone call to him would be appropriate, I don't know if you have his
44 phone number?
45
46 Jones: I can provide that, I have his business card back at the office.
47
48 Chair: Dan, item one is ongoing, item 2 can be deleted.
49
50 Walsh: Still working with Harley and I'll add to that some sort of a, probably one page
51 budget discussion. I'll work with Don and Vern and get something to you in draft for next
52 meeting.
53
54 Chair: Ok, and number 4 is a presentation. Don, Bylaws, do you have anything?

1
2 Shiesl: They are in review but I have couple things for Vern. Harley was going to give
3 something, I forgot what it was though. I'll give this to Vern, there's a couple of minor things.
4 We're waiting on Legal I guess.
5
6 Jones: Jun was out of the office so they haven't been submitted to Law yet. They are on
7 his desk.
8
9 Chair: Richard Rearick isn't here, did the letter to Mr. Cooper go out? So we can eliminate
10 that. He still was going to contact Anchorage AAG, is that inappropriate Vern?
11
12 Jones: Yes it is.
13
14 Chair: Because we don't have the authority to do that on our own?
15
16 Jones: In order to talk to an AG we have to get the Divisions permission first, which would
17 have been Jenny. Then we have to submit a request to the head of the Division of Law
18 (Commercial & Fair Business) which is Signe Anderson she assigns whoever she wants to
19 help us. 7 (a) is the letter to Mr. Cooper.
20
21 Chair: Harley, you have the paper submitted.
22
23 Hightower: I need to do some work on it with Dan and others. And then this Incidental
24 Practice and as built will fall in to place after that. There are enough common issues there I
25 wanted to get them all at the same time so they are coordinated.
26
27 Chair: So we should put under Dan's, its already there and it's under Eric's. Did anything
28 come up during the meeting this time that needed to be added to your list?
29
30 Hightower: I made a note to look into this NCARB data base that excludes disciplinary
31 action that John Savage brought up.
32
33 Chair: I forgot something with Bo, he's supposed to network with Indiana and Illinois about
34 why.
35
36 Brownfield: About their responses to us.
37
38 Chair: About exam records. You're going to contact NCEES too.
39
40 Jones: Right, I'm going to suggest to NCEES that they take that over as a central clearing
41 house, it's their exam.
42
43 Chair: Eric's stuff stands where it is. Craig the letter to Dave Hughes, you've done that and
44 contractors, and you're going to write a letter to Ms. Holmgren was there something else you
45 were going to do?
46
47 Fredeen: I have that IEEE document that Lance had with him yesterday. I'll make a scan of
48 that send it out to the Board. Do you want me to me to write a response to the 8(b) and 8(j)
49 letters?
50
51 Jones: If you want to give me some material.
52
53 Fredeen: I don't have anything else on my notes. I was also supposed to provide Brian
54 feedback on continuing education FAQ type material which I can hand over to him right now.

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
51
52
53

Chair: Cliff you've got the spread sheet complete just follow up on the committee. Is there anything else? Vern?

Jones: I didn't do nothing.

Chair: You didn't update the enforcement exchange?

Jones: No, I didn't, but I will.

Chair: Get with Bo regarding CE disciplinary actions.

Jones: We were going to get together and decide what we wanted to do, but she's actually got a list and I think we'll just adopt what she has. The para-legal has been working on CE with other Boards for a long time and they already have sanctions for these things. She gives them so long to comply and if they don't she hits them with a fine or consent agreement up to pulling their license.

Brownfield: We have that, it's already in our sanctions.

Chair: And the Indiana problem?

Jones: I will get with Bo on that.

Brownfield: Indiana, Illinois and what other state?

Jones: Maine. Actually I did do something, I did number 4.

Chair: Don would like to help a little bit with that and give some input into that specialty contractors.

Hanson: What's the issue on it.

Chair: It's an enforcement issue that they're avoiding hiring licensed professionals. The loop hole is being abused by contractors and I'm just asking Don to assist on that and give a public perspective is he already on the committee?

Hightower: He's on one of my committees. Yes, in fact Don's on the committee anyway.

Jones passes out copies of the specialty contractors and Mechanical and Electrical Administrator regulations to those who wanted them.

Agenda item 22 – Read applicants into the record.

Chair: Cliff?

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

RESOLVED to approve the following list of applicants for registration by comity and examination with the stipulation that the information in the applicant's files will take precedence over the information in the minutes:

1 *The subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*
 2 *meanings:*

3 'FE': refers to the NCEES Fundamentals of Engineering Examination

4 'PE exam': refers to the NCEES Practices and Principles of Engineering Examination

5 'AKLS' refers to the Alaska Land Surveyors Examination

6 The title of 'Professional' is understood to precede the designation of engineer,
 7 surveyor, or architect.

8 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

9 'Arctic course' denotes a Board-approved arctic engineering course.

10

Brown, David J.	Architect	Comity	Approved
Satterwhite, Randall G.	Architect	Comity	Approved - conditional upon JQ
Schopf, Anne	Architect	Comity	Approved - conditional upon JQ
Guenther, Cary H.	Architect	Comity	Approved- conditional upon JQ
Shiner, Diane G.	Architect	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Stellmacher, Allyn	Architect	Comity	Approved - conditional upon JQ & Arctic course
Castro, Michael J.	Architect	Comity	Approved - conditional upon one additional Architect reference; JQ & Arctic course
Gamache, Jason Anthony	Architect	Exam	Approved
Bingham, Curtis	Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional upon completing IDP; passing A.R.E; Arctic course; &JQ
Thomas, Leslie E.	Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing A.R.E
Long, Linyi	Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing A.R.E. & JQ
Freier, Cynthia M.	Architect	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing A.R.E.; & JQ
Tran, Tuan Anh	Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing A.R.E; &JQ

Wellner, Anne Alease	Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing A.R.E; &JQ
VanderWeele, Jared T.	Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing A.R.E; Arctic course; &JQ
Arnold, Leonard E., Jr.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Clayton, Robert John	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Grassman, Jeffrey Edward	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Leonard, Michael S.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Preli, Thomas Anthony	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Richmond, Joseph Brady	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Riley, John H.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon JQ
Bradley, John Forsyth	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Slagle, Charles Brian	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ & Arctic course.
Taha, Nabil M.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved –conditional upon JQ & Arctic course
Chin, King H.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon official transcripts; verification of exams; JQ; Arctic course
Starr, Benjamin Isadore	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon transcripts; verification of exams; JQ; & Arctic course
Beehler, David	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon passing PE- Civil
Nelson, Joseph Randall	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil; & Arctic course
Griggs, Lucas C.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon PE-Civil; JQ & Arctic course
Paudel, Subash	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved conditional upon verification of current licensure
Nichols, Karolynne D.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon

			verification of current licensure; JQ & Arctic course.
Kropelnicki, Jesse J.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of education; 6 additional months experiences; & JQ
Fry, Timothy James	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon verification of education; FE & PE exams; current licensure; JQ & Arctic course
Moyers, Jonathan Ryan	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon verification of FE, PE, & current licensure; & JQ
Belsick, Todd W.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon verification of FE; & JQ
Zerges, Stephen M.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon verification of FE; JQ; & Arctic course
Kampen, Matthew A.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved
Moriarty, John H.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved
Vockner, Max B.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved
Caswell, Adam James	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing FE & PE-Civil; JQ & Arctic course
Johnson, Brian P.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil & JQ
Zwiefel, James F.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil & JQ
Besing, Christa Anne	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE- Civil; & JQ
Jefferies, Jay	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil; JQ; & Arctic course
Thompson, Franklin Simon	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon JQ
Miller, Joseph T.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon JQ
Wallender, Michelle L.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon JQ

Bentz, Christopher Lucas	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE- Civil
Squier, David E.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil
White, Andrew E.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil & Arctic course
Lee, Ming S.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil; JQ; & Arctic course
Lamson, Brian C.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil; JQ; & Arctic course
Courtright, Charles Denver	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil; & JQ
Ervice, Anne M.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil; & JQ
Hall, Ivett	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil; & JQ
Kornegay, Joseph Kent	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil; & JQ
Rosston, Ryan C.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil; & JQ
Groeschel, Virginia J.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil & JQ
Wimmer, Todd Micheal	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil; & JQ
Grgich, Christopher Anton	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil; JQ
Roadifer, Carol Jean	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Civil; JQ; & payment of fees
Bredlie, Phoebe R.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon verification of education & passing PE-Civil; & JQ
Tucker, Logan R.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon verification of education; passing PE-Civil; JQ & Arctic course
Hebnes, Nicholas T.J.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon verification of education; passing PE-Civil; Arctic course; & JQ
Zacharski, Robert A.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon JQ

Foley, Todd M.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved– conditional upon JQ
Seidel, Darin T.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved– conditional upon JQ
Bean, Faron D.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved– conditional upon JQ & Arctic course
Grube, Todd R.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved– conditional upon JQ & Arctic course
McKinney, Paul C.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved– conditional upon JQ & Arctic course
Rieger, Scott J.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved– conditional upon JQ & Arctic course
Carleton, Jeffrey Scott	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing PE-Electrical exam & Arctic course.
Lang-Gillming, Kellin M.	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing PE-Electrical exam & JQ
Pietrak, Dariusz	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon verification of education; passing PE-Electrical exam; & JQ
Bare, Charity May	FE	Exam	Approved
Barkshire, Brittany Dawn	FE	Exam	Approved
Brehm, Nicholas	FE	Exam	Approved
Brown, Timothy James	FE	Exam	Approved
Budzyn-McAleenan, Magdalena	FE	Exam	Approved
Camahuali, Ossip Ivan	FE	Exam	Approved
Chaparro, Sandra P.	FE	Exam	Approved
Coolidge, Dustin Robert	FE	Exam	Approved
Craig, Jessie Anne	FE	Exam	Approved
Croan, Andrew Michael	FE	Exam	Approved
Daniels, Boone Craig	FE	Exam	Approved

DeRaeve, Matthew Zachary	FE	Exam	Approved
Dilley, Jacob Aron	FE	Exam	Approved
Dillon, Christopher James	FE	Exam	Approved
Eckhoff, Travis Warren	FE	Exam	Approved
Ellis, Gary Michael	FE	Exam	Approved
Ferntheil, Anna	FE	Exam	Approved
Fusco, Pauline Elizabeth	FE	Exam	Approved
Gorski, Jacob	FE	Exam	Approved
Hart, James Dio	FE	Exam	Approved
Hebert, Isaac	FE	Exam	Approved
Hogins, Travis Garrett	FE	Exam	Approved
Holland, Andrew Keith	FE	Exam	Approved
Hoosier, Patrick Edward	FE	Exam	Approved
Jones, Jeromy	FE	Exam	Approved
Kidwell, Rachel Brittny	FE	Exam	Approved
Kroh, Jovy Elizabeth	FE	Exam	Approved
Kulkarni, Aditya Sunil	FE	Exam	Approved
Lee, Sean Timothy	FE	Exam	Approved
Li, Qiang	FE	Exam	Approved
Malveaux, Chloe Shani	FE	Exam	Approved
Matarrese, Maia	FE	Exam	Approved
McConkey, Anthony Daniel	FE	Exam	Approved
Menendez, Dana Leigh	FE	Exam	Approved
Mukaigawara, Hiroshi	FE	Exam	Approved
Neal, Heather Elizabeth	FE	Exam	Approved
Nyland, Colton B.	FE	Exam	Approved
Oldfield, John	FE	Exam	Approved

Phillips, John Christopher	FE	Exam	Approved
Pilch, Stephanie Ruth	FE	Exam	Approved
Raabe, Charles Aaron	FE	Exam	Approved
Ray, Dustin Russell	FE	Exam	Approved
Realon, Kevin G.	FE	Exam	Approved
Roche, Corey James	FE	Exam	Approved
Sheu, Michael Warren	FE	Exam	Approved
Smiley, Ryan Darrell	FE	Exam	Approved
Soe, Kyi	FE	Exam	Approved
Takak, Shawn Allen	FE	Exam	Approved
Tallant, Carolyn Anne	FE	Exam	Approved
Tun, Zin Ohnmar	FE	Exam	Approved
Ulmgren, Nils Michael	FE	Exam	Approved
VanDerMeer, Matthew John	FE	Exam	Approved
Walker, Benjamin Shawn	FE	Exam	Approved
Weekley, Brad Allen	FE	Exam	Approved
Wendler, Kyle D.	FE	Exam	Approved
Wild, Logan Philip	FE	Exam	Approved
Wilfong, David Louis	FE	Exam	Approved
Young, Stephanie	FE	Exam	Approved
Snyder, Travis Wade	FE	Exam	Approved - conditional upon degree transcripts
Revells, Christopher L.	FE & PE- Electrical	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing FE & PE-Electrical
Bass, Tommy Roy	FS	Exam	Approved
Hayden, John D,	FS	Exam	Approved
Maxwell, Jake L.	FS	Exam	Approved

Sorenson, Ryan Emil	FS	Exam	Approved
Stark, Jeremy D.	FS	Exam	Approved
Tams, Gary L.	FS	Exam	Approved
Mason, Corey Daniel	Landscape Architect	Comity	Approved
Clemen, Timothy Joseph	Landscape Architect	Comity	Approved - conditional upon JQ
Spoth-Torres, Holly J.	Landscape Architect	Exam	Approved – conditional upon JQ & Arctic course
Elfers, Michele E.	Landscape Architect	Exam	Approved– conditional upon JQ
Gridley, Steven J.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Reynolds, Bradley	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Spotto, Michael A.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon Arctic course.
Maniccia, Peter M.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon degree transcripts; JQ & Arctic course
White, Justin George	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon fees; degree transcripts; JQ & Arctic course
Curry, Robert W.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon JQ
Whelan, Jeffrey L.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon JQ
Peterman, Karl L.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Vissat, Kirk J.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Busby, Michael Ray	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon JQ & Arctic course
Fetterly, Robert S.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of education & licensure; FE, PE-Mechanical; JQ; & Arctic course
Gornik, Andrey	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon verification of PE-Mechanical;

			discipline of references; JQ; & Arctic course
Howell, Wayne B.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of reference’s discipline; JQ & Arctic course.
Tagge, Frank W.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon verification of verifiers discipline; & JQ
Daniel, Thomas Hunter	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification that verifiers discipline; & JQ
Hewitt, Daniel Wayne	Mining Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon verification of PE exam; & current licensure
Hill, Eric Mathew	Mining Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Mechanical exam; & JQ
Dennis, Alan R.	Petroleum Engineer	Exam	Approved

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

Chair: Having read those into the record, any further discussion? All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? Abstentions? It's so moved.

Motion passed unanimously.

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

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

Sageagak, Willie P.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - conditional upon clarification of concurrent education/experience dates; passing PE-Civil; & JQ
Gormley, David Reid	Civil Engineer	Comity	Incomplete – conditional upon verification of completed Master’s; one month additional experience; & Arctic course.
Venechuk, Alec Mikhail	FS	Exam	Incomplete – requires 15 additional semester credit hours surveying.

Ladegard, Jillian Diane	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Incomplete – requires additional 10 months experience; JQ & Arctic course
Lagoda, Natalia V.	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Incomplete – requires additional 20 years experience verified by PE for FE waiver; or, passing FE; plus passing PE–Electrical exam; & JQ
Hernandez, Sandra E.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Incomplete – requires additional 8 mos experience under PE; & JQ
Lund, Robert	Civil Engineer	Comity	Incomplete – requires an additional 3 mos experience;& JQ
Stielstra, Matthew Clark	Civil Engineer	Exam	Incomplete – requires an additional upon 25months additional experience; passing PE; & JQ
Freeman, Jared Robert	FE	Exam	Incomplete – requires degree in a discipline acceptable to board in 12AAC 36.990(17)
Kozodoy, Yuriy P.	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Incomplete – requires foreign degree evaluation & transcripts; Arctic course; & JQ

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

Chair: Having read those into the record is there any further discussion? All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed, abstentions? It is so moved.

Motion passed unanimously.

Baker: There was one incomplete that needs 20 year of experience?

Kelly: To get the FE waiver, she has two routes.

Baker: But she needs 20 years does that mean she has no experience?

Chair: She hasn't submitted any documentation.

Agenda item 23 – Calendar of Events.

We will be in Wasilla August 5th and 6th – that's a joke. November 19th and 20th in Anchorage. February we'll set a date right now.

Baker: I'll be in Thailand from the 1st to the 19th of February. If you can work around that great otherwise I'll have to ask for an excused absence.

Chair: Licensure mobility I hear? We have a National meeting so we're probably looking at the 9th, 10th and 11th.

1 Craig: That's the National or the Juneau?

2

3 Chair: That's the Juneau, the Anchorage meeting is November 19th and 20th. Do we want
4 to set the May meeting now. Craig when is the Spokane meeting?

5

6 Baker: It's on the travel thing in the back. May 26 to the 28th.

7

8 Chair: It would be nice to have the meeting before and we're going to tentatively meet in
9 Anchorage. So the 12th and 13th in Anchorage, tentative. Is that good enough.

10

11 Walsh: If we had it earlier would we get better hotel rates because that's the beginning of
12 the tourist season.

13

14 Chair: The 5th and 6th then, would that be ok? With that I don't think we need to project
15 more than a year. Richard Rearick did request, he's attending a committee meeting as we
16 speak, I would entertain a motion to grant that.

17

18 **On a motion duly made by Hightower, seconded by Brownfield it was**

19

20 **RESOLVED to excuse Richard Rearick from this meeting.**

21

22 Motion passed unanimously.

23

24 Chair: Eric Eriksen's work commitments kept him from, he had a company board meeting. I
25 would further entertain a motion for formal excuse for Eric.

26

27 **On a motion duly made by Brownfield, seconded by Hightower it was**

28

29 **RESOLVED to excuse Eric Eriksen from this meeting.**

30

31 Motion passed unanimously.

32

33 Chair: We do have all the wall certificates signed, the minutes are signed any travel
34 certificates to Vern.

35

36 Chair: Board comments Bo?

37

38 Brownfield: Another good meeting, hard charging, got a lot done. As usual our support
39 team out shined the Board.

40

41 Fredeen: I would echo and many thanks to Vern and Alicia for all the hard work it takes to
42 get ready for these meetings, our packets and following up with continuing education files. It
43 is greatly appreciated. Good meeting, very productive, we moved a few things forward the
44 big project of general licensure moving forward.

45

46 Hanson: I appreciate it. This was a good meeting I believe. I think we moved a lot of good
47 things forward, the general licensure as well as the electronic signature. I think the best is
48 yet to come on those issues and I'm excited and hope I can help out. Thanks for all your
49 hard work Vern and Alicia. I appreciate the opportunity to be on the Board.

50

51 Baker: I want to really commend the general licensure committee. I think you did an
52 outstanding job on a very difficult task and the support staff. I want to remind everybody to
53 write down your observations on reviewing the continuing education and those to Brian, Bo
54 and Vern. I think we really need to get that out in a general letter because we were pretty

1 lax. It was a great visit to Wasilla.
2
3 Shiesl: A question on the Denver meeting, the dress up's are those just a suit and tie? It's
4 not a tux like the NCARB thing is it?
5
6 Jones: It's black tie optional.
7
8 Brownfield: I have never wore anything other than a sport coat, slacks, tie, shirt and it has
9 been ok. The black tie is primarily for the president, vice president, the upcoming president
10 and anybody who wants to.
11
12 Chair: I have to interject here, he is lying, he wore a penguin suit in Anchorage when the
13 National Conference was in session.
14
15 Shiesl: It was a good meeting, glad you came to Wasilla, I thought the rain would be
16 appropriate for you guys.
17
18 Lent: Thanks to Vern and Alicia, especially on the long minutes, I know he labored on those
19 a lot. I think a couple major milestones here that I see. The General Licensure, I'm really
20 happy that we've brought it to this point. I complement the committee on that. I think it'll be
21 a big improvement to have that implemented. Thanks Bo for your leadership on that. The
22 other milestone which comes as a surprise to a lot of you. We got approval for our first
23 mentored candidate. And this mentoring problem is unique to the landscape field. So we've
24 got Michelle Elfers who was tutored by Terry Schoenthal and she is now approved for
25 licensure. She's the first one to be processed under those opportunities. The end of the
26 month Vern and I are headed for CLARB. It's their 40th anniversary, they may have some
27 penguin suites there, I don't know, I'm wearing a sport coat and tie. It's going to be a very
28 comprehensive meeting and one of the subjects I'm going to ask who I make comments to.
29 When I was proctoring for CLARB here in Anchorage I noticed that people can't draw
30 anymore and I'm getting concerned about that. You walk around and you can see what
31 people are doing and they're having difficulty with drawing. I don't think the capability to
32 draw is being given the same emphasis as CAD. I'm really concerned about that because
33 our profession is a design profession. So I'm going to mention that to the people working
34 with the Landscape Architecture Accreditation Board. And make sure that that is a subject
35 that is discussed. I think you should give a nice thank you to Julie Dickerson. Did you pay
36 the rent, by the way.
37
38 Jones: They will bill us.
39
40 Lent: I have one request. The airlines are packing planes full. We need to have some lead
41 time in order to get onto the plane. So if we can get a little bit earlier approval for travel it
42 would be helpful. And I would like to hear a round of applause for those who made the
43 baked goods here today.
44
45 Hightower: Thank the staff and the Board for all the hard work and it's been a good
46 meeting. We are making progress and NCARB is black tie optional also.
47
48 Walsh: Thank our Wasilla host's here. It's been a great meeting. I particularly enjoyed
49 dinner last night. Meeting your wife Don and your wife Vern was a real pleasure. It's been a
50 good meeting, thank everybody for the hard work.
51
52 Kelly: I had a good time, you're all a pleasure to work with and I did my part to speed this
53 meeting along.
54

1 Jones: it was a great meeting thanks to Don and Bert for their hospitality here, we got a lot
2 done and it was good. On the travel thing Bert. That delay was totally due to our new boss.
3 He was so wrapped up in working on the budget he kind of let it slide. Once I reminded him
4 he got it out right away. Normally travel will be done a minimum of a month in advance so
5 we can make the 14 day advance ticketing. It's important that as soon as I tell you travel
6 has been approved you make your reservation as soon as possible to get the best possible
7 price.
8

9 Chair: We have a guest in our audience, would you like to introduce yourself.

10
11 I'm Dalton Benson, I'm with Senator Menard's office. She sent me down here to get a feel
12 on what you guys are doing and get a little information. Because we've seen you here for
13 two days now and wondered.

14
15 Chair: Let her know we're the hardest working Board in the State of Alaska.

16
17 Brownfield: Were you here yesterday? You would have gotten a better idea of what we do.
18 Near the end we are kind of tired, exhausted.

19
20 Benson: I didn't know it was about to end when I came in.

21
22 Lent: Would you give the Senator our fondest regards? She's a very fine lady.

23
24 Chair: I actually wanted to say I appreciated the minutes from the last meeting Vern. I do
25 think I sound like that when I talk so I'm a little surprised because I do not remember things
26 that I say. And I did appreciate those minutes and I probably would have endorsed
27 continuing that but it's the will of the Board that they be summarized and that's fine too.
28 People who were questioning, like it or not, you sound like that. (laughter – Brownfield –
29 why did you look at me?) So when you are speaking, my eyes were floating around the
30 room. Anyway I appreciate the effort in those minutes and they are actually, to me, very
31 effective when I was trying to go over, and I did read through them all. And I don't know
32 why, I probably had a boring evening or something when I went ahead and read them but I
33 relived the moment. Anyway I did appreciate that.
34

35 It's been nearly six years and general licensure was being discussed the first meeting I
36 attended and it's a huge sigh of relief that we've actually done something about that and
37 moved Alaska into the present century. I think it's unconscionable that we can't register a
38 structural engineer or environmental engineer in these times. I'm just very pleased and
39 proud that I'm part of this Board. Thank you Vern for all the work you're doing. I think
40 you're doing an excellent job. Don't tell Ginger but you are easily on par with her efforts in
41 my opinion. And Alicia you're a lot prettier than your predecessor and with that again I thank
42 for everyone for their efforts and work. With that I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
43

44 Brownfield: So moved. Shiesl: Second.

45
46 Meeting adjourned at 1:15pm
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
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

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

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

Date: _____