

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

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

12
13
14
15

Minutes of Meeting
November 16-17, 2010

16
17

By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6, the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors held a meeting November 16-17, 2010 at 550 West 7th Avenue, Anchorage, AK, in Suite 1270.

18
19

Tuesday November 16, 2010

20
21

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Roll Call

22
23

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:02 a.m.

24
25

Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

- 26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
- Richard Heieren, Land Surveyor, Chair
 - Clifford Baker, Land Surveyor, Secretary
 - Donald Shiesl, Public Member
 - Burdett Lent, Landscape Architect
 - Daniel Walsh, Mining Engineer
 - Brian Hanson, Civil Engineer
 - Craig Fredeen, Mechanical Engineer
 - Eric Eriksen, Electrical Engineer
 - Richard Rearick, Architect

34
35

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

- 36
37
38
39
- Vern Jones, Executive Administrator
 - Alicia Kelly, Licensing Examiner
 - John Savage, Investigator

40
41

Representing the Department of Law was:

- 42
43
- Gayle Horetski, AAG (via telephone)

44
45

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

- 46
47
48
49
50
51
52
- Peter Giessel, PE representing himself
 - Colin Maynard, PE representing himself
 - Dennis Long, PE representing himself
 - Jared Keyser, PE representing himself
 - Tim Mullikin, PS representing himself
 - Craig Bledsoe, representing himself
 - Nick Bakic, representing himself

- 1 • Alan Bolton, representing himself
- 2 • Gregory Latreille, PE representing ASPE
- 3 • Tonya Bratslavsky, PE representing herself
- 4 • Gerry Brown, PE representing himself and ASPE
- 5 • Douglas Warner, representing himself

6
7
8 Chair: At this time I'd like to excuse Harley Hightower formally, please note that in the
9 record. Bert, could you lead us in an invocation and then lead us in the Pledge of
10 Allegiance.

11
12 Lent: Says a short prayer and then leads the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

13
14 **Agenda Item 2 – Review/Amend Agenda**

15
16 Chair: Next item is review and amend the Agenda, item 2 in your packet. Are there any
17 comments? Vern do you have any changes?

18
19 Baker: I passed around a replacement for 11-b-2.

20
21 Eriksen: Just to let you know when we get to legislative committee I got a call from APDC
22 and would like to take a minute to have a discussion about...

23
24 Chair: I'm sorry I didn't hear that.

25
26 Eriksen: Just letting you know they did call and inquire about any legislative issues for the
27 upcoming session when we get to that section I'd like to have a couple of minutes.

28
29 Chair: Any other changes, please note that Mr. Brownfield is late (0805 arrived).

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

32
33 **RESOLVED, to approve the agenda as amended.**

34
35 Hearing no objection the motion passed unanimously.

36
37 **Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Reporting**

38
39 Chair: Item number 3 Ethics reporting? Hearing none we'll move to item 4.

40
41 **Agenda Item 4 – Review and approve minutes of August 5-6, 2010 meeting.**

42
43 Chair: Review and approval of minutes number 4 in your packet. Does Clifford have
44 something he wants to say? Let's see if Cliff read the minutes. Ok we won't alter the
45 minutes.

46
47 Fredeen: I have one item on page 20 and 21. When the term used is Cap Q I think that
48 was Cap cubed – to the third power.

49
50 Chair: Line 51 page 20.

51
52 Fredeen: And it also shows up on page 21.

1 Chair: Any other changes. I guess we should change page 1 under item 9 it should be
2 switched from 29 to 30 that Cliff is Secretary.

3
4 Baker: I was going to mention that on the roster it still shows that Hightower is Secretary.

5
6 Lent: I just have a few minor grammar things.

7
8 Chair: Ok you can submit those. Any other, other than grammatical or punctuation?

9
10 Walsh: Just wanted to thank Vern and Alicia for going back to the summary format.

11
12 Hanson: I had a question on mine, it says mining engineer. I'm not really on the Board as a
13 mining engineer. I am a mining engineer but that's a technicality.

14
15 Jones: You want to remove mining engineer?

16
17 Brownfield: Because his is not that seat.

18
19 Jones: Oh, ok I'll correct that.

20
21 Baker: In reviewing the minutes, because I did go through them in detail. I got to where the
22 Director was here there are some things that I wanted to discuss about travel. I know that
23 will be a different area but wanted t bring that up later.

24
25 Chair: The format of doing the minutes almost verbatim during the public testimony worked
26 out very well. With that are there any other changes, additions or amendments? Hearing
27 none I'd entertain a motion to approve.

28
29 **On a motion duly made by Baker, seconded by Lent, it was**

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

32
33 Chair: All those in favor signify by saying aye. All those opposed nay. Any abstentions?
34 The motion passes.

35
36 We are a little ahead, let's go ahead and hold to the 8:30 schedule in case Carol Olson from
37 the Fire Marshal's Office shows up. Let's move on to item number 7.

38
39 **Agenda item 7 – Board Correspondence sent since August 2010**

40
41 **A)** Letter to Elisabeth Holmgren re PDH's for LEED exam.

42
43 Chair: Do you want to speak to that Craig? It's pretty self explanatory, anybody have any
44 questions?

45
46 **B)** Email to Mr. Jim Campbell re electronic signatures.

47
48 Chair: Do you want to say anything about that? That's pretty self explanatory Vern.

49
50 **C)** Email to Mr Bryce Hamels re electronic Signatures.

51
52 **D)** Letter to registrants re Continuing Education Audit.

53
54 Chair: I did get a lot of response from this ironically. Any comments? We'll be dealing with

1 that issue a little bit later Brian.

2
3 Walsh: Do you want to share some of the comments you got?

4
5 Chair: Explains that they were more neutral than negative and what Brian is doing will
6 better facilitate their understanding of the whole process.

7
8 **E) Email to Mr. Tatom re Continuing Education**

9
10 Chair: Pretty self explanatory, any questions? Am I going too fast?

11
12 **F) Letter to Mr. Ward.**

13
14 Chair: Letter to Michael Ward.

15
16 Brownfield: Is he going to appeal?

17
18 Baker: Did we get any response back?

19
20 Jones: There is a hearing scheduled for sometime in December.

21
22 **G) Letter declining invitation to the APEG-BC annual meeting.**

23
24 Chair: Just noted. And a bit of correspondence regarding all of that. And that brings us to
25 break. No.

26
27 **Agenda item 8 – Correspondence received since August 2010**

28
29 **A) Letter from David Hughes re stamping sprinkler system design.**

30
31 Chair: Do you want to speak to that?

32
33 Fredeen: Explains that this correspondence has been going on for several meetings and
34 that this is Mr. Hughes response to our last letter. That Mr. Hughes is concerned that some
35 engineers are being asked to do things that might be outside their abilities. The board has
36 discussed this before and if an engineer is not comfortable stamping something he shouldn't
37 stamp it.

38
39 Chair: There are two questions there.

40
41 Hanson: The out of state and the delegation.

42
43 Fredeen: Explains how engineering firms deal with these situations. That they handle it one
44 of two ways. One is to have someone with a NICET 3 or 4 Certification stamp the drawings.
45 Some companies require a PE stamp in addition to the NICET stamp and that that is a
46 liability item. If a PE reviews shop drawings they are taking liability for those drawings. And
47 some companies take it a step further and require that the PE be an Alaska PE. Those are
48 contractual requirements not regulation based. The State of Alaska does not require a PE
49 stamp on Fire Protection Drawings. I don't have a problem with the delegation verbiage.

50
51 Hanson: I don't have a problem with the delegation either but if we are going to have
52 engineers stamp drawings for projects in Alaska they have to be an Alaska engineer.

53
54 Baker: Asks for an explanation of the NICET process.

1
2 Fredeen: Explains that in another section of the Alaska Code that has a design stamp for
3 doing fire protection and suppression drawings and installations. And that a NICET 3 or 4 is
4 eligible for the stamp as well as a fire protection engineer. So while they can't use their PE
5 stamp directly they can apply for the permit to do the design work based on their
6 qualifications as an FPE.

7
8 Baker: Remembers prior discussions where FPE's were saying they couldn't work in their
9 field and that if there is an alternate way then that argument is void.

10
11 Walsh: Supports Brian's view that with a NICET Certification they can work in the state but
12 if they are using a PE stamp it has to be an Alaska stamp.

13
14 Brownfield: Reiterates the same stance. It must be an Alaska stamp.

15
16 Lent: Cautions not to confuse Landscape sprinkler systems with fire protection systems.

17
18 Fredeen: Thinks there needs to be a distinction between this situation and other situations
19 like pre-engineered buildings. The difference is that in order to get a set of drawings
20 through the process with the Fire Marshal you need a designated professional to do the
21 design work. The difference is that the NICET stamp is the equivalent of the PE stamp. So
22 there is a person in the State of Alaska who is taking responsibility for that design. The PE
23 is a secondary thing that is not required by the State. He again explains that it is a liability
24 issue that makes some companies require an Alaska PE stamp. He also points out that our
25 Statutes exempt Fire Protection Drawings from the requirement of a PE stamp.

26
27 Walsh: Understands Craig's point but believes that our Statutes prohibit any engineer from
28 using other than an Alaska PE stamp to stamp Alaska drawings.

29
30 Savage: Agrees that we should not be allowing stamps from other States on Alaska
31 Drawings. And that the prefab steel buildings is a perfect example. They are saying well
32 the work was done in another state. It doesn't matter, if you're going to put that building up in
33 Alaska it has to be stamped by an individual licensed in this State.

34
35 Rearick: Explains that when a design is submitted to the Fire Marshall that the requirement
36 is that it has to be designed by someone with a NICET certification, it doesn't have to be an
37 engineer, it has to have that certification. And that comes after you get your permit and the
38 contractor hires a designer. On the front end of the job as an architect we are going to hire
39 an engineer. That engineer is going to do a performance specification, which is usually the
40 case and not sign the sprinkler drawings. The certified sprinkler designer does that. Or we'll
41 hire the engineer to design the sprinkler system but I think they also still have to have that
42 certification.

43
44 Baker: Thinks that Craig was saying if the system was designed outside by a FPE and he
45 stamps it and it comes up to Alaska, his stamp is still on it but then a NICET individual will
46 look at and put his signature and stamp on it but they are not going to remove the other
47 guys stamp. They can have both like with the steel building a civil will stamp over...

48
49 Savage: No they have to have their own title block.

50
51 Brownfield: If something comes here with a stamp from another State it means nothing to
52 us. If it goes to court it has no credence what-so-ever. If we go to a General License all
53 this may become moot in the future.

1 Walsh: Points out that the specific question he asked was if plans stamped by an out of
2 state engineer were acceptable and that his response to that is that it is a violation of state
3 law.

4
5 Fredeen: Asks if he stamps a drawing with his Alaska stamp and someone else stamps it
6 with an out state stamp is that ok?

7
8 Walsh: Says no and cites the prohibited practice statute and notes that FP drawings are
9 exempt.

10
11 The discussion continued for several more minutes with the end result that an out of state
12 stamp was not acceptable in any situation.

13
14 Chair: Asks Eriksen to write an article for APDC news letter re this subject and asks Jones
15 to reply to Mr. Hughes letter.

16
17 **Agenda Item 5 – Investigative Report**

18
19 Chair: John, are you ready? Carol forgot and won't be joining us.

20
21 Savage: Points out that the new software they are using doesn't allow him to print out an
22 investigative report but that they are working on that and hopefully will have it fixed soon.
23 He also notes that they have a new chief investigator. He reports on his observations of the
24 NCEES exams administered in October. He was impressed with the way they administer
25 the exams.

26
27 He advises the board that he is working on some consent agreements and that he is trying
28 to use that avenue as much as possible because of the backlog in the AG's office. He has
29 sent a couple cases over to them but expects it to take several years to resolve the cases.

30
31 Brownfield: States that consent agreements are fine as long as we don't use them on more
32 serious violations. We shouldn't use consent agreements to keep from going to the AG. If
33 we have a problem with the AG we can't address it by not going there.

34
35 Savage: Points out that we have 40+ other boards and they all have cases that have been
36 with the AG for years. He further states that people move on and people forget and that
37 makes it hard to bring these cases to a conclusion after years have passed.

38
39 Rearick: Adds that in an earlier conversation about this Savage stated that he doesn't use a
40 consent agreement to compromise. If he can't come to a resolution that is equitable for the
41 infraction then it's going to the AG's office.

42
43 Savage: Adds that most of the time if it goes to the AG's office it's because the individual
44 has dug in and refused to agree to anything.

45
46 Baker: Points out that when it goes to the AG's office and is held up for years that individual
47 can still be practicing and doing the same thing that got him in trouble to start with.

48
49 Savage: States that In situations where an individual could put people in danger we could
50 go after an injunction or a cease and desist. I don't know that we would be successful but
51 that's an avenue we can use.

52
53 Baker: Asks if they could get together later and talk about his observations with NCEES
54 and his comments on some stuff they were working on for the NCEES Law Enforcement

1 Committee to see if his comments have changed.
2
3 Savage: States that his comments stay the same and goes on to explain that what Cliff is
4 talking about is that when NCEES suspects collusion that his concern was that there is no
5 sense in John opening a case if NCEES isn't willing to come and testify in court. If we are
6 asserting that collusion took place through the analysis then we have to be able to show
7 proof of that. An individual has a right to know who his accuser is and be able to cross
8 examine him. NCEES has said that their people will not testify in any case or elaborate on
9 how their analysis is done. If that is the case then there is no sense in doing a collusion
10 type investigation.
11
12 Chair: That wasn't the impression I got.
13
14 Savage: I talked to the top guy and he said he would come and explain how the analysis
15 was done but that under no circumstances would him or his people testify in a hearing or
16 superior court. I don't know if we want to go there but if they get a subpoena they don't
17 have a choice. That would be interesting. I do know it's a third party contractor doing this
18 for NCEES so maybe that's part of the agreement.
19
20 Chair: Asks how much interaction he has had with the Investigative Advisory Committee
21 and adds that he has assisted 3 or 4 times.
22
23 Savage: Bo and Harley took quite a few.
24
25 Chair: I wouldn't mind hearing a number for the record if you can recall.
26
27 Brownfield: six and a half. (laughter)
28
29 Chair: Anybody else.
30
31 Savage: States that things are going good in his office and he's hopeful that he will get
32 more help at a later date.
33
34 Walsh: Asks if the lack of a written report was due to a change of policy.
35
36 Savage: Explains that it is due to a change in the program they use and that it is his
37 understanding that the IT people are working on it.
38
39 Chair: Asks if he would speculate on the number of open cases in the last....
40
41 Savage: We've gone through, open and closed, ninety in the last quarter. He explains that
42 there is a huge influx of outside talent coming into the state and that's another reason
43 NCEES is a valuable tool because you can see what's going on in other states and
44 sometimes they will start licensing action in their state that and that has been invaluable.
45
46 Lent: Asks if he has gotten access to the CLARB enforcement data base yet that Vern was
47 going to look into that.
48
49 Savage: No but we are working on it and Harley and Richard are working on it and we'll get
50 that worked out.
51
52 Rearick: Talks more about consent agreements and how they should find fault. He relates
53 his experience on the Professional Conduct at NCARB where they had about 30 different
54 investigations submitted by the State of Florida that had a fine but they had no admission of

1 guilt or fault so that makes it difficult for NCARB to do anything about those. If there is an
2 admission of guilt in the consent agreement then you have due process and the
3 organizations can take action on it.

4
5 Savage: Asks if NCARB would take action because that is not our intent when we enter into
6 an agreement with an individual for additional action to be taken. By action do you mean
7 post it and make it public record?

8
9 Rearick: Says he's not sure how the database system works and that he questioned the
10 staff member at the meeting and he didn't have a good handle on it himself.

11
12 Savage: Points out that when an individual enters into an agreement with our state whether
13 or not he admits guilt its public record.

14
15 Rearick: Says NCARB's database is only as good as the info provided by the jurisdictions.
16 If a state sends something in on an individual whether there is fault or not it goes in their
17 certification record and stays there forever. But that he doesn't think it goes into the
18 database.

19
20 Savage: Everyone of our consent agreements have verbiage in them that say it will be
21 reported to the national organization. It's up to the organization whether they post it or not.
22 We are going to post. In our consent agreements we state the facts as we know them and
23 they are agreeing that those are the facts.

24
25 Chair: Any other questions or comments. Thank you, John. Let's go ahead and review
26 item 6.

27 28 **Agenda item 6 – Expenditure Report**

29
30 Chair: Let' look at the report before we get Kathy on the phone.

31
32 Baker: Points out the difference between contractual expenses between 2009 and 2010.
33 Thinks it's a huge jump.

34
35 Chair: That's a question for her. He notes that the Licensing Statistics are attached and
36 that our percentage has dropped a little. 11.66% to 10.92%.

37
38 Walsh: Observes that we had a 865,000 dollar carry forward and that we should have a
39 couple hundred thousand left after the end of the year and we should make another pitch to
40 get more travel funds within this two year cycle.

41
42 Baker: Suggests that since reimbursements are credited as revenue that we see if the
43 National Organizations can pay travel costs direct for funded individuals so the State
44 wouldn't have to front the money and there would be no need for third party reimbursement.

45
46 Jones: Points out that NCEES does that now. NCARB has the State provide travel up front
47 then the traveler has to request reimbursement which is then paid to the State and is
48 credited as revenue instead of going back into our travel fund.

49
50 Brownfield: Points out that even though the State is not paying for it you are representing
51 the State and need their approval for the travel. Also when the Legislature says cut 10%
52 they don't care who is paying they just want a 10% cut in travel.

53
54 Jones: Advises that Kathy is not available to join the meeting and that anywhere on the

1 report where it says direct it's something that can be tied to the AELS Board. If it says
2 indirect it's something that was for the whole Division and we are paying our portion of it. As
3 far as travel funds we have spent about half of what we have to spend for this year. We
4 need to work up a budget for FY12 and the boss wants a realistic figure. I did a quick work
5 up and came up with around \$94,000 for both in state and out of state travel.

6
7 Chair: Asks Walsh to work up a budget.

8
9 Walsh: States that he has a handout and will discuss during committee reports.

10
11 Chair: Anything further on the expenditure report? We'll go to item 8-B.

12
13 **Agenda item 8 – Correspondence received since August 2010**

14
15 **B) Letter from Josef Silny & Associates re foreign credential evaluations**

16
17 Jones: This is a letter from a credentialing agency that wants to be added to our list.

18
19 **C) Email from Larry Durfee re AKLS exam 2/attachments**

20
21 Chair: Explains that the correspondence is from a member of the ASPLS AKLS committee
22 who provided copies of reports he wrote on the examination that this Board was not an
23 addressee on.

24
25 Baker: Addresses some complaints in the reports regarding reimbursement for travel. He
26 explains that the travel is partially reimbursed through the contractor from fees paid by the
27 State. His point being that the Continuing Education credit they get is well worth any out of
28 pocket expense.

29
30 **D) Comments re meeting minutes.**

31 **1. Email from Michael Schoder re verbatim minutes**

32 **2. Email from Marie Steele re verbatim minutes**

33
34 Chair: Any Comments?

35
36 **E) Comments re CE letter**

37 **1. Email from Bill Tatom re our CE letter**

38
39 Jones: I already answered that one. It was 7 E.

40
41 Chair: 8 E-1 was answered by 7 E.

42
43 **2. Email from Chris Miller re our CE letter**

44
45 Chair: That will be addressed by Brian.

46
47 Hanson: Explains the content of the letter and how Mr. Miller asks the board to revise the
48 form. He says that after review of the form he thinks the form is complete and that it doesn't
49 need any additional information. We have combined regulation out now to combine the land
50 surveyor regulations and engineers, architects etc. all under one group. Hanson goes over
51 the existing regulations and the effort to combine them and recommends that a group get
52 together and look at combining the reporting forms and instructions. He also recommends a
53 documented process for reviewing the CEU's such as a check list a documented process to
54 address carry forward of excess PDH's.

1
2 Chair: It sounds like you are recommending forming a committee. You have stated your
3 mission and I would like to appoint you chair of that committee. Would you like to Richard?
4 Good.

5
6 Brownfield: Asks Jones if he has a method to keep track of PDH's that are carried forward.

7
8 Jones: Responds that judging from the renewal form submitted a lot of registrants are
9 confused on the number that can be carried forward and how to report them and that at
10 present he does not have a system in place.

11
12 Baker: Volunteers for the committee and states that in some cases a registrant may be
13 claiming 30 credits and wants to carry over 6 and the Board only accepts 24 of the 30
14 credits. Somehow we need to inform him that he doesn't have 6 extra credits to carry
15 forward.

16
17 Chair: Wants a letter evaluation report sent to those Audited reporting how many were
18 acceptable and how many are able to be carried forward.

19
20 Lent: Re-iterates that there is a limit of 12 PDH's that can be carried forward.

21
22 Brownfield: Feels that Brian is right, that we need a process so that the registrants are clear
23 on what is required of them.

24
25 Jones: We do send a letter to everyone that was approved and I will revise that letter to say
26 the Board gave you credit for this many hours and you have the following number for carry
27 over to the next period.

28
29 Chair: And add at the bottom that it's your responsibility to submit this letter if you are
30 audited next period.

31
32 Fredeen: Points out that only those audited will get the letter. He further states that some
33 had asked what to do if they renewed in November and had a few to carry over then took a
34 course in December which gave them additional PDH's to carry forward. He recommends
35 that if they carried forward excess PDH's they submit the full 24, including those from last
36 period that were carried forward for review.

37
38 Chair: Asks Brian to have something for review at the next meeting.

39
40 Brian: Does this require a response to Mr. Miller?

41
42 Chair: Yes, Vern can draft a response and advise him the Board is working on the issues
43 he's raised and to be looking at our website for guidance.

44
45 **F) From NCARB**

46 **1. Email from NCARB re rolling clock**

47
48 Chair: Richard did you want to....

49
50 Rearick: Explains the implementation of the rolling clock regarding the ARE exam.

51
52 Chair: Could you give a brief on what the rolling clock is and what ARE means?

53
54 Rearick: Explains that ARE is Architect Registration Examination and that the rolling clock

1 starts when an applicant passes his first exam. He/She has 5 years from that date to
2 complete all 7 divisions of the exam.

3
4 Baker: Asks if all an applicant passed 6 of the 7 exams in 5 years then would they have to
5 retake the exam that was over five years old?

6
7 Rearick: Not sure if they only have to retake those over 5 years or if they have to start over.
8 He explains they used to take all divisions at the same time. Now they can schedule them
9 individually anytime they want to and in any order that they want and that some interns think
10 they have to study for 6 months before each exam and that they can't retake a failed exam
11 for 6 months so if there wasn't a rolling clock they would drag the exams on forever.

12
13 **2. Email from NCARB w/attachment from Ken Naylor**

14
15 Rearick: That's just their notice that they are looking for a FY12 public director position and
16 that it has to be a non-architect.

17
18 **3. Report on NCARB's BOD meeting in August**

19
20 Chair: Noted, any comments?

21
22 **G) From NCEES & WZone:**

- 23 **1. Email from Doug McGuirt re summary of actions at Denver meeting**
24 **2. Email from Doug McGuirt re FE/FS move to computer based format**

25
26 Chair: Complements Don for his excellent report on the Surveyors Forum at the Denver
27 meeting.

28
29 **3. Memo from NCEES re fall examinations**

30
31 Chair: Did you want to speak to that Vern?

32
33 Jones: It's just the fees for the exams.

34
35 Chair: Lets recess for a few minutes.

36
37 0930– 0937 Break

38
39 **4. NCEES Education Standard**

40
41 **5. Email from patty Marmola, WZone**

42
43 Chair: Did you want to speak to that Craig?

44
45 **6. WZone annual meeting minutes**

46
47 Chair: Comments or question?

48
49 **7. NCEES News Release re elections**

50 **8. NCEES Service Awards info**

51 **9. Info re Structural Examination**

52 **10. Info re exams at foreign sites.**

53
54 Chair: MBA you want to say anything about that?

1
2 Jones: States that we are starting to get applications from individuals that took the exams
3 in Egypt and Korea and that verifications of experience and license may be difficult as some
4 countries consider the degree as the license.

5
6 Walsh: Says a letter from NCEES re passing the exam should be ok.

7
8 A short discussion followed on foreign applicants and verifications.

9
10 **H) From CLARB**

11 **1. Email from Veronica Meadows re Task Analysis**

12
13 Lent: Reports on the request from CLARB and what the Task Analysis is for. He explains
14 what we did to get the word out to our registrants.

15
16 **I) Letter from Ronald Pearson re foreign engineers**

17
18 Chair: Did you want to speak to that?

19
20 Jones: To me it was just someone upset with the number of foreign engineers in the
21 country and thinks the board should protect jobs.

22
23 Chair: Does it warrant a response?

24
25 Jones: I'll come up a response.

26
27 **J) Resolution from ASCE re comity with Canada**

28
29 Chair: Notes that this is an email from Dale Nelson regarding ASCE's opposition and the
30 fact that the State of Washington voted it down.

31
32 Fredeen: Asked if we got anything from any other societies re this?

33
34 Chair: States that he thinks this flew under everyone's radar.

35
36 Brownfield: States that at the last national meeting Washington was very upbeat about
37 international comity and my conclusion was that they were going to proceed with it.

38
39 Fredeen: Asks if Texas has reciprocity with them.

40
41 Jones: Points out that even within Canada there isn't reciprocity between all the provinces.

42
43 **K) Letter from Mr. Stielstra re education requirements**

44
45 Chair: Asks Jones to respond that it's a work in progress that will be worked out when we
46 go to general licensure.

47
48 Hanson: Points out that this is no different than his own situation where he was a mining
49 engineer and wanted to get a civil so he needed more experience. He's disagreeing that he
50 needs more experience and that he is as good or better.

51
52 Jones: He said he wasn't aware of the requirements so he evidently didn't read the
53 regulations. Now as soon as someone inquires about licensure we give them a
54 jurisprudence questionnaire to make them read the regulations.

1
2 Chair: Instructs Hanson to make sure multiple disciplines is addressed by his committee.

3
4 **L) Email re Hyatt Skywalk collapse in 1981**

5
6 Chair: Asks if someone would summarize what happened. He thought the contractor made
7 a short cut in the structural drawings and it was not actually a licensing issue. The
8 contractor just made a short cut. Yes Mr. Maynard.

9
10 Maynard: Explains that the collapse was caused by a change in a shop drawing over the
11 weekend that wasn't reviewed by the engineer in responsible charge and the resulting
12 licensing action taken against the unlicensed engineer that approved the change and the
13 engineer in responsible charge.

14
15 **Agenda item 9 – Old Business**

16
17 **A) Building Information Modeling (BIM)**

18
19 Rearick: Doesn't have anything to report at this time. The topic wasn't addressed at the last
20 NCARB meeting. He asks that anyone attending the NCEES meetings if there is any BIM
21 discussions to bring any information forward.

22
23 Fredeen: Addresses design software in general. Who's taking liability for calculations that
24 take place in that black box. Asking if the engineer is responsible for any error caused by
25 someone else's design software?

26
27 **B) Reduction in Travel**

28
29 Jones: Advises that to date the Board has used approximately half of the money allotted for
30 out of State travel and that that will dictate how many members get to travel between now
31 and the end of June 2011.

32
33 Walsh: Points out that while we don't have a budget per se so we have these categories we
34 track for expenses and revenues. We are always told we don't have a budget so when I
35 hears Vern say that we have 30,000 left in travel doesn't make a lot sense to me when we
36 are probably going to have several hundred thousand budget surplus over this two year
37 cycle. I don't think our travel should be restricted by a number in a budget we don't have.

38
39 Jones: Explains that while the license fees we take in is for the use of AELS we don't have
40 them to use until the Legislature appropriates them to us. They have given us
41 approximately 44,000 for travel and we have used approximately 24,000 of it so we have
42 around 20,000 left. Even though we have a large carry over it isn't ours to spend until the
43 Legislature gives it to us.

44
45 Walsh: Is there no way we can request a budget revision?

46
47 Jones: We can't send anything that hasn't been appropriated to us by the Legislature. They
48 tell us how much we can spend. It doesn't matter how much is in the pot we can only spend
49 what they tell us we can. He goes on to explain that for the next fiscal year the Board
50 needs to submit a realistic travel request. If it's going to take \$100,000 for everyone to go to
51 the meetings then we need to request that much. We may not get it but at least we ask for
52 it.

53
54 Walsh: Explains how the University Budget process works.

1
2 Lent: Asks about adding funds to the dues for membership in the National Organizations
3 for travel.

4
5 Jones: We could do that, but this year we didn't allow for that in our budget request so the
6 funds were not there.

7
8 Eriksen: The budget isn't reflecting the needs of the Board, it's reflecting an allocated
9 resource. Asks how we make it clear that we need more if we got by with what was allotted
10 this year. There seems to be a disconnect in the feedback process.

11
12 Jones: Points out that if we were in the position of having extra money at the end of the
13 year that had been allocated to us then we would be in the same situation as the University.
14 We would have to spend it but if it hasn't been appropriated to us we can't touch it.

15
16 Baker: Points out that if all of the monies aren't used, often the next year's budget is cut
17 back because a department didn't use all of its funds this year.

18
19 Jones: Adds that the Board needs to make the point that in the past the amount of funds
20 the Board needed wasn't requested and that's why we are asking for more this year.

21
22 Baker: Asks if there is a way that the Board can see what the Division submits as a budget
23 request?

24
25 Hanson: Recommends that we ask for enough to fund all our travel and request that if the
26 Division reduces our request that they come back to us ahead of time so we can plead our
27 case.

28
29 Fredeen: Questions whether that figure includes in state travel also.

30
31 Chair: We should ignore the amount of funds and request as much as we want. Should we
32 go into executive session, item 10? It shouldn't take very long.

33
34 Jones: We can scratch that.

35
36 Chair: Would you like to explain that without saying anything that would.....

37
38 Jones: Explain that without saying anything? (laughter) It was just something brought
39 forward by the AAG but he has since changed his position. It concerned an offer by the
40 plaintiff but they decided to go ahead and schedule a hearing.

41 42 **Agenda item 11 Regulation Update**

43 44 **A) Board Bylaws become effective 10/28/10.**

45
46 Chair: Board Bylaws became effective on 10/28. They were an insert in your packet and
47 we're following them like they were the Bible. He goes on to explain a little about the bylaws
48 and notes that the Board is supposed to have a code of ethics that is supposed to be
49 published and available to every registrant.

50
51 Jones: Page 29 in your regulations book. Code of Professional Conduct.

52
53 Chair: I apologize.

1 Lent: There was something for all Board members that we were all given when first
2 appointed.

- 3
4 **B) 12 AAC 36.065/12 AAC 36.065 Eligibility for Surveyor exams.**
5 Option 1
6 Option 2.

7
8 Chair: Did you want to discuss 11 B 2 Cliff?

9
10 Baker: Explains that option 2 will provide credit for any 4 year degree. Degrees not in
11 geomatics will receive less credit and require more experience. Applicants would be
12 required to have at least 50 credits in surveying and 30 credits in supplemental courses.
13 Someone with a BS or BT would probably have most if not all of the supplemental credits.
14 With this option those with degree in another field could come in and would not have to start
15 over. They would only have to get the core surveying credits and whatever was missing in
16 the supplemental credits.

17
18 Hanson: Asked about the implementation time frame. If we would allow for those just
19 starting a 2 year degree program would have time to complete it and get through the system
20 before this took place.

21
22 Baker: Admits that he didn't consider that but explains how it was done in the past and
23 that once they apply and they are in the system they have 5 years....

24
25 Jones: There is no limit on pending application like that. As long as they continue to
26 communicate with us at least yearly and let us know they want to continue with this
27 application we keep it active. Once they start taking the exams they have 5 years before
28 they have to reapply.

29
30 Baker: As long as they apply before 2013 they're still under the old regs. He further
31 explains how he arrived at 50 core credits. He originally had 60 credits but started a little
32 high because he knew he would have to negotiate down. He feels there is still a little fudge
33 factor in the 50 credits but wouldn't want to go much lower. He originally was going to leave
34 out the 30 credits in math and basic science since a BS or BT would have most of them.
35 However he felt that a BA might be short so he left the 30 credits in.

36
37 Chair: Adds that this is a culmination of comments received in response to a request we
38 sent out over a year ago asking for input from all licensed surveyors in Alaska and we
39 probably received 10% response with about a 2 to 1 ration in favor of a 4 year program. He
40 further adds that the UAA Geomatics Department sent out a similar survey recently and their
41 responses were almost identical. One note on their responses was that there was not one
42 response allowing a civil engineering degree to be able to take the exam without some kind
43 of surveying education.

44
45 Baker: Feels that since they have already had a year to respond that just going through the
46 normal public notice would be sufficient.

47
48 Jones: Supports just the normal public notice without the mail out.

49
50 Chair: Feels that this is a hot button issue and that we should spend the money and make
51 sure all licensees have an opportunity to comment and also to expand the public comment
52 period to include our Juneau meeting so they can provide oral comment. He re-iterates that
53 this is a huge issue and he doesn't want anyone to feel that the Board is trying to ram
54 something down their throats.

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

Brownfield: Supports the Chairs view.

Hanson: Wants to know what the time is and asks if it's 6 months and restates that he thinks the time frame is a little aggressive and needs to be extended to a year to give people time to react.

Baker: Agrees with Hanson and says it's flexible and we probably won't get it in until the end of next year. He also agrees that it should be open at the Juneau meeting.

Jones: Points out that if they run the public comment through the Juneau meeting they won't be able to adopt it until the May meeting anyway.

Shiesl: Points out that his notes from the Surveyor Forum in Denver showed that all states are going this way so we are not ahead of the curve in any fashion.

Chair: I think it's around 24, almost half.

Shiesl: I counted 32.

Baker: That's half of the jurisdictions not half of the states.

Lent: Should you mention that in the letter that goes out?

The discussion continues for a short period and the Chair clarifies that the public notice will be mailed to all licensed surveyors so that everyone can see the format and maybe understand it a little better and asks for a motion to put it out for public notice.

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

Resolved to put 12 AAC 36.064 and 12 AAC 36.065 Eligibility for the Surveyor Examination as proposed in option 11-b-2 out to public notice through February 5, 2011 and mail to all licensed surveyors in the State of Alaska.

Chair: All those in favor signify by saying aye, all those opposed say nay. Any abstentions? Anyone want to reconsider their vote? Hearing none it is going out to public notice.

Motion passed unanimously.

Break 1035 – 1045

Chair: Please move over Don and give Mr. Dennis Long a seat so he can give a report on his application for reciprocity with Canada, Alberta in particular. Are you ready Mr. Long? Again this is APEGGA and they've offered many times that if your licensed and have been licensed in Alaska for 10 years it's a very quick and easy process to become licensed in Alberta. Am I correct Craig?

Fredeen: That's about it.

Chair: So, Dennis please give us a little background on your qualifications and then give us your experience dealing with APEGGA in Alberta.

Mr. Long: First I want to say thank you for letting me come in on short notice and sitting and presenting my case. I've been talking to Vern for a year and a half since I made

1 application about this and I said, hey, I could probably be your beta tester on this
2 application since he had expressed to me they wanted to do a reciprocity or comity,
3 sanctioned agreement from Canada to Alaska.
4

5 So with all that, my history is currently I'm an engineering project manager at ASRC Energy
6 Services and I'm working on the Green Field for any petroleum products at the North Slope
7 and we're just designing work packages for their modules systems up there. Anybody that's
8 familiar with the oil and gas industry knows what's going on up there. I've got a Bachelors in
9 physics, I got a Masters in engineering and I continued a Civil Engineering Masters program
10 at UAA but I didn't finish up, I had the credits and it just got to be a debacle on the
11 application process like a lot of things and then the cost too. 20 plus years in designing and
12 construction in the oil and gas industry and the Department of Defense for 5 years within
13 this agency here in Alaska and I'm a license civil engineer. I've had it since 2001/2002 can't
14 remember exactly.
15

16 Previously I worked in Canada in Edmonton for a Canadian firm off and on and they pretty
17 much had a standing offer if things slow down come over here and work. I always wanted to
18 take the opportunity to go to Fort McMurray and see what that was all about. Kind of the
19 adventurer just to see what else is going on in the big industrial projects in North America.
20 I'm not too interested in going overseas.
21

22 Mr. Long continued explaining the application process and the steps the application goes
23 through such as the academic examiner, experience examiner and then the review. He was
24 a little disappointed with the length of time it was taking (over a year so far) but felt that part
25 of the problem was that he had forgotten to include one of his transcripts and wasn't notified
26 in a timely manner. He called Mr. Windsor who explained that the academic examiner had
27 surgery and moved on and that he should have been notified right away. He also noted that
28 APEGGA is a private organization and does not have to answer to any government
29 regulatory body. He mentioned that others had told him that the process of getting licensed
30 in Canada was a long one but that he would continue to work with APEGGA in good faith.
31

32 Walsh: I really appreciate your comments and all your information. I guess hearing about
33 this ethics exam that's new to me, I didn't realize that that was part of this reciprocity
34 process. I understood, like you noted, that if you're licensed here it's a relatively simple
35 process. But you actually have to take their ethics exam?
36

37 Mr. Long: Correct. And the way that I did this ethics exam first is that right after I make
38 application in May of 09, I signed up for the ethics exam. Now, the way that it works is that
39 a licensed engineer in another country can administer that. Now, it's better if you got an
40 APEGGA licensed engineer. There is a couple of them over where I work that have
41 administered it. They charge you \$500.00 to do it there. There are some real fees
42 associated with APEGGA too. But you can take it in Whitehorse if you can find somebody
43 that will administer it there and that costs about \$300 or \$250 or something like that. Or you
44 can go to Alberta and take it for \$120.00. So, they don't make that part user friendly but that
45 has always been instilled in their application. I knew about that right on the front end. I had
46 made application to take the exam that summer of 09 and then I declined to go there. I said
47 I was going to go there for the oil show. I declined to go so I lost that money. And then I
48 said well, because of this process that I'm going through, I'm not going to make application
49 until I'm clean
50

51 Hanson: Did you get any feedback on that at all on that reviewing?
52

53 Mr. Long: Oh yes. They've got seminars, they got books, they've got everything and they
54 rotate the books around about every couple of years. I borrowed the books for the most

1 current bylaws and I gave them all back and I'm going to have to buy them here. That's if I
2 get notice pretty soon.

3
4 Brownfield: What expense have you been through up to this point?

5
6 Mr. Long: Explains that the application process costs about \$400 and the ethics exam runs
7 from \$120 to \$500 depending on where you take it.

8
9 Fredeen: Asks what the time frame would have been like if he hadn't forgotten to include
10 one of his transcripts.

11
12 Mr. Long: Ok, it says here if your file needs to be reviewed by the academic examiner this
13 will generally take 1 to 2 months although it may take longer due to the high volume of
14 applications we are receiving. Then it says down here, if your file needs to be reviewed by
15 both the academic examiner and the experience examiner the review may generally take 2
16 to 4 months, although it may take longer due to the volume. My academic took basically 11
17 months.

18
19 Fredeen: Then the other question I had is do they require experience under a P.Eng, a
20 Canadian P.Eng?

21
22 Mr. Long: No. That was kind of interesting, is that they don't. Now that was a good
23 question because when you look at their application process it kind of sounds like they kind
24 of want that. But it's not required. Now one of the things that was told to me when I filled
25 out my application, I called up and talked to one of the admin persons and they said put the
26 minimum experience on there that you have. So, if the minimum experience is 4 years, only
27 put 4 years. Cause I could have put a whole laundry list of stuff on there. They said
28 because that will be less stuff for them to look at.

29
30 Baker: I find it interesting, it's not really a question, just an observation, I find it interesting
31 that their coming to us and wanting to get comity or reciprocity without taking the NCEES
32 exam but yet we have to take an ethics exam to get it there. Is that what I'm understanding,
33 nobody can get it there without taking an ethics exam? They're not saying you can get it
34 straight across you still have to sit for an exam.

35
36 Mr. Long; Explains that you have to do their province ethics exam and that he thinks their
37 ethics exam is good for all of Canada. My game plan was to make sure that I could get my
38 license in the Yukon. And what I foresee is, if it ever happens in my career, but I doubt if it
39 will, the gas line, that if they need somebody to cross over from Alaska to the Yukon, then I
40 could be the first person standing in line for that. But the way that the Yukon works is that
41 they don't have enough business to drum up a Board, an engineering Board. So what they
42 do, is they say if you're licensed in Alberta then your automatically in the Yukon. They just
43 carry it over. And I thought that was pretty interesting because they don't really touch
44 Alberta like British Columbia does.

45
46 Walsh: Asks if they have a practice exam on their website.

47
48 Mr. Long: I would say yes. They're real big on continuing education one of the things they
49 go into is for the continuing education is mentoring. Now I've been a real proponent on
50 coaching and mentoring young engineers coming up. Because that's something that I feel
51 that a lot of these bigger companies are falling down on. I know that smaller companies,
52 because they want to hang on to employees longer because they understand the cost of
53 losing employees or trading them out just hits them hard. Especially after training them on
54 their system and all. So that's something I'm big on myself. But I know that APEGGA is big

1 on that too. So they have a lot of good continuing education. But again their continuing
2 education is something like, I associate it with the PMP program. It costs a lot of money to
3 attend those.

4
5 Chair: I was wondering if you'd be interested in providing us with a written evaluation?

6
7 Mr. Long: Sure, that's no problem at all. This 10 year thing, I never hear about this before.

8
9 Chair: Every time they talked' and they are asked, that is one of the marks, unless I'm
10 missing something, and I'm prone to do that on occasion. Does anyone agree with what I
11 just said or refute that?

12
13 Chair: Asks if Mr. Long could provide Vern a copy of his written evaluation.

14
15 Mr. Long: Sure, I can do that. Your next meeting is in February? Beginning or end? If
16 everything goes according to plan I'll be license by then.

17
18 Chair: If you could give us the evaluation before that and then you can just do a follow-up
19 email and say you were successful. It would be very beneficial, not only for this Board but
20 for the State of Alaska to understand that process.

21
22 Mr. Long: Now in conclusion I'd just like to say that I believe that they work in good faith.
23 Their communication isn't quite where I was hoping it was going to be and their timeliness.
24 But again I have to go back and say I believe they work in good faith. But as far as a State
25 regulated licensing Board verses what they have there, these are the kind of hard questions
26 you need to look at. And I think you're asking just the perfect questions. It may get
27 complicated but you're asking good questions.

28
29 Chair: Thank you very much for taking the time to come down and talk to us.

30
31 Mr. Long: Thank you for allowing me to come down and talk about this.

32
33 Chair: Notes that we have 7 regulations presently out for public notice. We will move this
34 until after public comment.

35
36 **Agenda item 16 – Meeting Reports.**

37
38 **a. NCARB National in San Francisco**

39
40 Rearick: I didn't prepare anything, Harley probably reported last time on that.

41
42 **b. NCEES National in Denver**

43
44 Chair: Asked everyone that attended to make comments.

45
46 Eriksen: Explains how the delegation discussed the items that were brought up for a vote
47 and decided on a position. Met a lot of people and the LE forum was interesting. It was a
48 good meeting.

49
50 Walsh: Reports that the faculty licensure issue was a hotly debated topic and that the final
51 decision was that it went down in defeat. He felt that it was being pushed by several that
52 had academic backgrounds but that it didn't have any grassroots support and he was glad to
53 see it go down in defeat. He thinks NCEES should be pushing faculty licensure but not
54 providing an alternate path to get licensed.

1
2 Eriksen: Says that it was a benefit to have a faculty member as part of the delegation
3 because he brought up a lot of good points.
4
5 Fredeen: Did you testify?
6
7 Walsh: Not in the main discussion. I spoke against it in the engineering forum and in
8 Western Zone.
9
10 Shiesl: Notes that there was a lot of controversy in the discussions and refers the Board to
11 his notes on the surveyor's forum.
12
13 Chair: Complements Shiesl on his written report on the surveyor's forum.
14
15 Brownfield: Reports that he really enjoyed the hot discussions regarding the faculty
16 licensure and a report from an engineer that was very familiar with the Gulf oil rig disaster.
17 This engineer said that if the people on the rig had been monitoring their equipment and
18 gages they would have known something was about to happen and could have stopped it.
19 That it wasn't something that was beyond our expertise but that it was a failure of the people
20 on scene to do their job. And that reinforces something that the leadership of NCEES is
21 pushing that there needs to be a professional engineer stamp on those types of things. That
22 some of the entities such as the Corps of Engineers and the oil industry that have exemption
23 from licensure should not be exempted.
24
25 Chair: Adds that the son of a friend of his was involved in positioning the robotics that were
26 being used in sealing that well.
27
28 Jones: Reported that the MBE training session was on time management. And that during
29 the MBE open forum he brought up the problem with Indiana and getting verifications and
30 that the Board Administrator swore that it wasn't her that was causing the problem but the
31 umbrella agency that refuses to keep the information on exam discipline. Further that
32 starting with the 2010 exams NCEES will be keeping records and can provide exam
33 discipline verification.
34
35 Brownfield: Reports on two new options regarding the B+30 issue to get it moving again.
36 He asks Dan for some help on the specifics.
37
38 Walsh: One set a minimum for what B was in B+30, it was like 125 credits. The other was
39 Masters or equivalent. Craig probably remembers more about that than either of us.
40
41 Fredeen: One was a 150 credit bachelors degree number 2 was another alternative to the
42 MOE and it has to do with the addition of mentorship. Rather than 4 years experience you
43 would need 6 years of experience and also continuing education that would recognize short
44 one week courses. He continues explaining that the committee that was supposed to
45 investigate option 2 was discontinued and those that attend the zone meeting this year
46 would find that NCEES didn't do what the Boards had requested.
47
48 Chair: We will stop right here to accommodate Gayle. We're going to give her a phone call.
49
50 Jones: Good Morning Gayle this is Vernon.
51
52 Horetski: Hi how is everything going?
53
54 Jones: Good so far. You were going to talk to us about former Board members mis-

1 representing themselves.

2
3 Horetski: Good morning members of the board this is Gayle Horetski from the Department
4 of Law speaking to you from my office in Juneau. Gayle explains that during a conversation
5 with Vern about the Bylaws the question of emeritus status came up and why the Board felt
6 they had to clarify who could have emeritus status. She explained to Vern that the Board
7 doesn't have the authority to make that designation although you could certainly in your
8 Bylaws clarify that a Board member who's term has ended could serve out any committee
9 appointments or terms as officers on National Organizations. That led to a discussion of
10 why was the Board even concerned about this and that revealed that there was some
11 concern that some former Board members were continuing to assert that they were
12 speaking for the Board when they really weren't. She recommended that if that was the
13 case that the Board write a letter to the individual telling them they were not authorized to
14 speak for the Board and write to any National organization where they had misrepresented
15 themselves and attach a list of Board members and explain that anyone not on that list
16 could not speak on behalf of the Board.

17
18 Chair: Thank you Gayle that does clarify the issue. He goes on to explain that there was a
19 former Board member who after giving qualifiers that he was no longer on the Board went
20 on to speak in behalf of the Board. So a letter to the individual and to the organization
21 would be appropriate?

22
23 Horetski: Absolutely. Everyone has a first amendment right to speak his or her mind on any
24 subject they want to but they don't have a right to falsely represent or speak on behalf of an
25 official governmental body.

26
27 Chair: Thank you Gayle that clears that up. We currently don't have anyone on any
28 National committees so that isn't presently an issue and we understand that we don't grant
29 emeritus status, that it is kind of automatic, is that the way that you read it?

30
31 Horetski: Reads the Bylaws and explains that it recognizes the National Organization allow
32 for committee members and officers to serve out their terms after their terms on the Board
33 are finished. So by putting it in your Bylaws you are acknowledging that this is ok with you
34 based on the National bodies policy.

35
36 Chair: Thank you Gayle that's a fast phone call.

37
38 Jones: Explains that what brought this up is that when reviewing the Bylaws Gayle noted
39 that there is nothing in Statutes that gives this Board the authority to grant emeritus status to
40 anybody. It has to be in Statute. You don't have authority to appoint members to the Board,
41 emeritus or any other way.

42
43 Fredeen: How does that work with NCEES.

44
45 Jones: NCEES Bylaws say you can serve out your term.

46
47 A short discussion continued regarding the length of terms and requirements for serving as
48 officers of a National Organization or on their committees.

49
50 Chair: Asks Fredeen to check out the NCEES Bylaws regarding committee appointments
51 and emeritus status and report back. Rearick volunteers to check the NCARB rules.

52
53 Hanson: Just to clarify if the Board allows someone to serve on a committee they are
54 speaking for the Board.

1
2 Chair: Yes. Again this is her interpretation.
3
4 Fredeen: Recommends that we add verbiage in the Bylaws that if you're not a current
5 active member of the Board you can't speak for the Board.
6
7 Eriksen: Maybe if you're not on the roster you can't speak for the Board.
8
9 Hanson: That's my point, if we allow them to continue to set on a committee then they are
10 speaking for the Board.
11
12 Chair: Explains that the problem that brought this up is a former member who attends
13 Society and National meetings and qualifies his position as not being on the Board then
14 proceeds to fill them in on everything that is happening at the Board level giving the
15 impression that he is speaking for the Board. He was self appointed emeritus status for at
16 least one year after he was off the Board then he started using the term quasi-emeritus
17 status.
18
19 Hanson: That is a whole different situation.
20
21 Fredeen: Agrees and explains how the Board granted emeritus status in the past and the
22 requirements.
23
24 Chair: Thinks our only option now is a Regulation or Statute change.
25
26 Rearick: If you are in emeritus status and on a committee how does the whole travel thing
27 work?
28
29 Chair: Committee work is paid for by the National Organization.
30
31 Jones: Explains that for the Regional and National meetings the State pays up front and
32 then the attendee submits a claim to NCARB and they then reimburse the State. Committee
33 travel is funded up front by NCARB and it's just between the committee member and
34 NCARB. The State is not involved.
35
36 Eriksen: States that Bo received a committee appointment at the Denver meeting.
37
38 The discussion continues for a few more minutes stressing the same points.
39
40 Chair: Do we want to break for lunch early?
41
42 Break for Lunch 1150 – 1250
43
44 Chair: We are on item 16 C are we on record Alicia?
45
46 Alicia: We are on record.
47
48 **c. CLARB National in Baltimore**
49
50 Jones: Gives a brief report on the Baltimore CLARB meeting. Explains the walking tour that
51 is a part of each meeting and passes on the CLARB definition of public welfare. He ends
52 with comments on the historic ships in the inner harbor.
53
54 Lent: Starts by mentioning that one of the ships is the USCGC Taney, the last remaining

1 survivor of the Pearl Harbor attack. He expands on Vern's remarks about the walking tour
2 saying that it was an excellent example of urban renewal changing a slum into an up-scale
3 neighborhood and cleaning up the inner harbor and making it a first class tourist attraction.
4 He continues reporting on a seminar on sustainable sites. He continued with an overview of
5 each day of the meeting.

6
7 Chair: Comments on and explains the differences between a Practice Act and a Title Act
8 using California as an example where they removed a person's title of Chemical Engineer
9 but he could still practice Chemical Engineering.

10
11 Lent: Adds that he was involved in changing California's Landscape Architect act from a
12 Title Act to a Practice Act. He notes that Alaska's is clearly a Practice Act.

13
14 Chair: Adds that it comes into play when it's a discipline specific state.

15
16 **d. NCARB MBC/MBE conference in New Orleans**

17
18 Chair: Harley attended that one and I excused him from this meeting so he will report at the
19 next meeting.

20
21 **Agenda item 17 – Special Committees.**

22
23 **a. General Licensure.**

24
25 Chair: We are on 17 special committees General Licensure. We have a 12 AAC 36.015
26 branches of professional engineering would you like to speak to that committee chair
27 Brownfield?

28
29 Brownfield: Gives an update and explanation of the project and where it is at in the public
30 comment period.

31
32 Lent: Asks if he should put the different branches in the Guidance Manual.

33
34 Brownfield: Explains that it isn't at that stage yet and that he is working on the two letter id
35 for each branch.

36
37 Chair: We will go ahead and let each member of the committee speak, Brian.

38
39 Hanson: Adds that as it's public noticed it doesn't have the two letter identifier and that will
40 depend on the results of the public comments.

41
42 Eriksen: Wonders if the public will be going to their Legislators with comments regarding
43 these regulation changes.

44
45 Brownfield: Adds that there is some thought of a minor course change in that they could just
46 add the other disciplines to the present regulations and still call it a General License.

47
48 Baker: Points out that if we change our regulation to add everything NCEES has an exam
49 for then if they added a new one we would have to change our regulation again.

50
51 Brownfield: It doesn't mean we have to accept it.

52
53 Fredeen: We are proposing to remove the verbiage that says "and must reflect the branch
54 of engineering authorized by the Board". Is there any objection to people who want to

1 continue to have their branch of engineering on their stamp? He continues explaining he
2 wants to continue to have ME on his stamp and asks if there is an issue with him doing that?

3
4 Brownfield: Again points out that it is something that will be considered after public input
5 and that right now nothing is certain. The committee will decide after public comments are
6 received whether or not to make a small course change. If we make a major course change
7 we will be back to putting it out for public comment.

8
9 Chair: And I think from the beginning we have said this change wouldn't require a new
10 stamp for any individual. This Board has no intention of keeping anyone from practicing in
11 their area of expertise and licensure that they are presently practicing in. It's imperative that
12 we not step into that realm and that we're trying to be as cautious as we can to make sure
13 that everyone that's qualified to practice in a given branch is still able to do that. There is
14 going to be some overlap that's just inherent with the licensing process. Any further
15 comments or questions about General Licensure?

16
17 Brownfield: Points out that in 50 States and 5 other jurisdictions, even though we have 81%
18 going to General Licensure, each State calls it General Licensure but every State has their
19 own opinion on what that means. We can call it what we want to but we are going to form it
20 the way we feel is best for the State of Alaska. And it does not necessarily have to look like
21 what New Jersey or California does.

22
23 Eriksen: Richard can you summarize again the timeline of the public period and what the
24 next step is?

25
26 Chair: I'll refer that to Vern.

27
28 Jones: Explains that the public comment period ends on January 7th unless extended, and
29 there was talk earlier of extending it until February 5th, by the Board. The Board can take
30 oral comments at this meeting but any written comments must be sent to the Regulation
31 Specialist (Jun) because has a process he has to follow for them.

32
33 Eriksen: How long ago did the public receive these packets?

34
35 Jones: They went out on either the 4th or 7th.

36
37 Several members voiced concerns that the public may not have received the information in
38 time to make this meeting and that we should extend the comment period through the
39 February meeting.

40
41 Rearick: Asks if we will be just taking comments or if we will allow questions.

42
43 Chair: Judging on the number of people signed up we will allow 3 minutes for comment
44 followed by a short question/answer period.

45
46 Brownfield: Points out that this comment period today is not for the Board to question the
47 public but for them to give the Board feedback.

48
49 **Agenda item 12 – Public Comment.**

50
51 Chair: I apologize if I butcher the name but Peter Giessel.

52
53 Mr. Giessel: As Bo mentioned General Licensure is such a general term it's hard to
54 understand what you guys, the thought process you initially went through. So if I get the

1 thought process and your intention wrong forgive me, I'm basing it just off the provided
2 packet. In my opinion General Licensure obscures the area of expertise and makes it easier
3 for someone to practice outside their area of expertise, to push the boundary, so to speak
4 between their area of expertise and practices outside their area of expertise. With virtually
5 all the Western States specifically recognizing and providing a specific licensure for
6 structural engineering, which is my field, the move away from specific licensure to a General
7 Licensure puts Alaska residents at a competitive disadvantage. Washington, Oregon, Idaho
8 and California all provide some form of specific licensure for structural engineering. As
9 Alaska does not provide structural licensure it's impossible to obtain licensure by comity with
10 these other States. So licensure by testing essentially requires that many of the States that
11 we work under a structural engineer which would mean we would have to live there and
12 work there for a period of time is disadvantageous to staying in Alaska. Engineers in those
13 other States do not face the same obstacle when trying to practice here as we will accept
14 their SE for CE licensure by comity or at least appear to have in the past. Essentially you're
15 putting us at a competitive disadvantage and your allowing outside engineers to practice
16 here but not allowing us the licensure needed to practice in virtually every other Western
17 State for specific SE requirement projects. The need for a specific structural engineer
18 license instead of a move to a more general licensure goes beyond mere economics for
19 Alaskan engineers. As the Chair of the National Council of Structural Engineers Association
20 points out, the primary reason for licensing structural engineers separately is to help ensure
21 the Health, Safety and Well Being of the public. By making the licensing requirements for
22 structural engineers more rigorous than other engineering disciplines we are striving to
23 make sure that those responsible for designing the bones of structures understand the
24 complex behavior of materials as well as extensive and ever expanding codes and
25 standards to which we are required to adhere. I don't know if you've noticed but the IBC
26 gets thicker and the ASCE 7 gets thicker every year and it becomes more complex and
27 more specific information needed to practice structural engineering. Finally, General
28 Licensure will allow those with less specific experience to work in more areas where they do
29 not fully understand the increasingly complex codes leading to more mistakes that will cost
30 lives. In addition, the lack of specific licensure puts Alaskans in competitive disadvantage
31 with respect to engineers from the rest of the Western States. Thanks.

32
33 Chair: Thank you Peter. Next we have Colin Maynard.

34
35 Mr. Maynard: Hi, my name is Colin Maynard and while I'm the President of Alaska
36 Professional Design Council I'm not speaking on behalf of them as they have not taken a
37 stance on this issue yet, I'm speaking for myself. In general I'm in favor of General
38 Licensure. However, the devil is in the details. On the seal I don't mind if you get rid of the
39 designation. I think that would actually be cleaner because trying to put CE – S and CE – E
40 and CE – G in front of the stamp would get to be crazy. Which leads to the next point which
41 is, are you going to have in the list of licensees on the web when somebody goes, what test
42 they took? If you do, how are you going to deal with all the existing licensees who have
43 taken a myriad of types of tests that may not fit into CE – S? How are you going to deal with
44 someone who comes from a General Licensure State who took the structural 1 which is an 8
45 hour test and then wants to be an SE in the State of Alaska? I have concerns that under the
46 system that's proposed you could have a civil engineer who takes the CE – S test and ends
47 up with just under 5 hours of structural questions. You'll have someone who takes the SE
48 test which is 16 hours and then you'll have an architectural engineer who will have 2 hours
49 of structural engineering questions and they'll all be able to do structures in the State of
50 Alaska. And they'll have widely different expertise and testing requirements. Which is why I
51 would suggest that, like most of the Western States, the SE be after the CE or architectural
52 engineering PE. But an SE is something beyond that. It's not an entry level into the PE. It
53 would be in addition to. Whether you require an SE for certain types of buildings you may
54 leave up to the Building Departments. In the State of Washington I think in Seattle it

1 requires an SE for certain buildings but in Bellingham they do not. In California certain cities
2 require an SE for certain buildings but the State only requires it for hospitals and schools.
3 So that could be left to others to determine when an SE is required or not or, you can say
4 when an SE is require if you desire. But I think an SE has to be in addition to. It's not
5 geared towards being an entry level test. And that's all I have to say about it. How you
6 implement it is going to make a big difference. One other issue, I think would have helped, if
7 there had been a cover letter that was not just a list of the sections that were changing.
8 Why are changing this, what ramifications it would have. And if you did that for future
9 regulation changes like the continuing Ed or change the tables for the land surveyors it
10 would probably resolve a lot of the concerns that people have cause they'd have a clue of
11 where you're coming from. With this, it just hit the street and everybody's going, what's this?
12 I think having an explanation attached to it would help.

13
14 Chair: Thank you Colin. Jared Keyser.

15
16 Mr. Keyser: My names Jared Keyser, I'm senior structural engineer at Umiak, previously
17 LCMF. I've been licensed here in Alaska since 1999. I practice in the structural engineering
18 field since 1997. I'm currently the President of SEAAK the Structural Engineers Association
19 of Alaska and I'm here speaking on behalf of myself today. We had quite a spirited
20 discussion yesterday amongst the SEAAK Board over this proposal. And we are working
21 towards providing you a written comment at a future date. I'd like to kind of start off where
22 Colin left off. When I first looked at the regulations, I kind of flipped to the back like you do
23 in the code looking for the commentary to figure out what's the intent of the proposal. And it
24 was really clear in our discussions yesterday that people aren't sure where the Board is
25 going. And because of that uncertainty and the simplicity in what's changed in the
26 regulations people take opposite ends of the spectrum on Board intent and that creates
27 quite an interesting discussion. I think it's really important for the regulations to be clear. In
28 the end I have a couple of concerns that with the regulations, the way they are presented.
29 And in the end whether we go General or Discipline Specific I think it needs to be clear that
30 the authorized areas of practice which is the term that's used in the proposed regulations is
31 clearly defined by the Board. It's clear to the registrants what areas of practice they're
32 authorized to practice in. And most importantly it needs to be clear to the public. So they
33 have access to this information either on the stamp or on your webpage so they can look up
34 and know the qualifications of their engineer. Without that the public is uncertain of the
35 qualifications of their respective professionals. One of the things that is stated in both the
36 authorized area of practice, branches of engineering in paragraph B where they talk about
37 the additional areas of expertise which isn't defined in the regulation what that is meant to
38 be. There are 16 branches that are clearly defined. And the regulations state that your
39 qualifications are based on education, experience and examination which seem to limit it to
40 those 16 tests. So, then my first question, after that, is what is an additional area of
41 expertise? If it's not one of those 16 branches, what is it? We need to be clear to both the
42 practicing engineers and the public. Colin mentioned the civil exam. There are five different
43 options to take on the civil exam. How you assign those disciplines is going to be
44 challenging, especially to existing engineers. And that brings me to the last point. The
45 proposed regulation that are out in front of us do not address how existing engineers are
46 going to be treated. I look across our office and we have several civil engineers who one
47 day working on a road project. Next week the working on a sewer project. And if they're
48 given a one or the other discipline specific designation they're going to have a problem with
49 continuing their practice the way they practice right now. So, in the end, I guess, whether
50 you go discipline or general my main concern is making sure the applicant are clear what
51 the authorized area of practice is and making sure the Board relates that information to the
52 public. If you do that we really have a discipline specific license because you've defined
53 what the area that they're authorized to practice. In doing so we're really no different than
54 what we are today except you've added these branches. Which is fine and the simpler route

1 may be to just add the branches and continue down the path where we are today.

2
3 Chair: Thank you Jared. Tim Mullikin.

4
5 Mr. Mullikin: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. My name is Tim Mullikin I'm a licensed
6 surveyor in the State of Alaska. I'm here today to talk to you about some of my observations
7 and opinions on the State test to become a license surveyor, the State ALS test. I've been
8 licensed myself since 1988. It must have been about 15 years ago the procedure for writing
9 the exam was changed dramatically where we bring the testing experts up and we drafted a
10 whole new exam. I was part of that first meeting in which the first exam was drafted and the
11 blue print was determined at that time and I've also participated in many test workshops
12 since then. I'm here basically because I'm not very happy with the test we have in the end.
13 Thinking back to when the original thing was drafted, you know, we're tasked with testing on
14 State specific laws, you know the general practice of surveying is tested on the National
15 level with a National test and this was only for State specific things. And I think we were
16 grasping at things to test for. You know we looked at all the statutes available to us and our
17 standards of practice for the Surveyors Association. And in the end we came up with what I
18 consider a lot of trivial areas, areas that the only time I look at those statutes is when I come
19 to the test workshop. And I feel that a lot of the current test is a test of looking up statutes.
20 And while I think that that is a great skill to have and a necessary skill I don't think it should
21 be a major part of the test. One thing I did, I moved outside Alaska for two years in 2006
22 and became licensed in the States of California and Nevada for land surveying. I was
23 favorably impressed by the California test. It's a very difficult test. It's a four hour test for
24 multipart questions and it's very difficult. It had very poor pass rates in the past, I think,
25 because of the way they graded it. But, it's very involved and I favored that test because it's
26 a true test. When you pass that test there's not much doubt that you know a lot about the
27 types of land surveying and law and I think that is good. It kind of makes education
28 requirements a moot point because their test does all of it. They don't have an education
29 requirement currently. You don't need one, if you can pass the test you can do it. You only
30 need about 50 or 55% to pass it and again it has a pretty low pass rate. The last two years
31 they finally crept into the 20% and low 30% in think this last one. So I'm asking the Board to
32 do two things.

33
34 One is to take a poll somehow and get feedback from the licensed surveyors in the State or
35 the businesses asking what the surveyors feel is critical to the practice of land surveying in
36 Alaska. That could be on different skill areas. You could distribute the blue print and have
37 them write back or have some open ended questions. I feel that would be a valuable tool for
38 a group of subject material experts who create the blue print and give them some feedback
39 on what to change. My opinion, I would like to see much of what I consider the trivial
40 aspects junked or put in a broad category and not have very many test questions on that.
41 And add questions on the legal aspects of surveying. Which I feel is the most important
42 aspect to protect the public safety. And the natural reply against that is, that's tested by the
43 National test. And I guess I disagree, it's been a while since I've taken the National test but
44 I understand it's going more and more to an academic test and by the same token years ago
45 there use to be an Eastern United States National Survey Test and a Western and when
46 that was combined into one most of the Western States, Alaska included, beefed up our
47 exam to have more questions on the public land survey system because that's such an
48 integral part of the practice of surveying. By the same token I think that you can add
49 questions to the State test on the legal aspects and not detract from the fact that you are
50 testing for the State of Alaska.

51
52 The second thing I would request of the Board is to consider making writing a legal
53 description a separate part of the testing process. I believe that licensed surveyors should
54 be the professionals who are able to write legal descriptions. I'm licensed in three states, in

1 two of those three you have to be a license surveyor to write a description. There are
2 provisions in those states that when you have a record description you are able to copy it or
3 to continue that description but basically you have to have a stamp and seal to make a legal
4 description in both of those states. Against that, it's often said, well how are we going to
5 grade it? I actually think it is not as difficult as you might imagine at first. I talked to the
6 Warner brothers at the last test workshop and they assist one of the states where they do
7 the survey test. That state has a legal descriptions requirement and because it doesn't lend
8 itself to the multiple choice and statistical analysis at which they base and will back up the
9 test, they don't endorse that part of the test but they did help that state develop grading
10 criteria. And they said that actually the grading of that portion of the test, the legal
11 description, was fairly consistent. And I believe that is possible. I would volunteer to help
12 grade that part of the test should the Board include that as a part of the testing process.
13

14 Chair: Thank you Tim. I apologize, Nick Bakic?
15

16 Mr. Bakic: My name is Nick Bakic, I'm with Excel Fire Systems. I'm here kind of
17 representing the Fire Protection Industry. I've dealt with the Board here for about 5 years
18 now. I'm here today to speak out against some of the proposed changes coming up in the
19 AELS proposed regulation changes, specifically the addition of the fire protection
20 engineering classification. This will pretty much be a rehash of what we talked about 5
21 years ago when the NCEES policy 25 was tried to push through. Generally we got a NICET
22 based system for fire protection in the State of Alaska that's been ongoing for about 20
23 years and that's worked very successfully. We've got a lot of trained individuals that take
24 care of the oversight of the drawings, the review of them, the stamping of them for permits
25 for the State and different Municipalities. I see now they are trying again to wrap this into all
26 these other disciplines that are also being shown there. The problem with the fire protection
27 one is that it has the potential of costing a lot of jobs in our opinion within the State of
28 Alaska. I think this is just a first step once the FPE gets recognized more and more power
29 will be tried to grab for them based on the way the rules are written currently for the
30 architects, engineers and mechanical engineers in this State when it comes to permitting.
31 They have to oversee most aspects of it and stamp them. If we do that with the FPE
32 discipline given the limited number of FPE's within the State we're going to run into the kinds
33 of problems we spoke about 5 years ago where you only have so many people. I know that
34 Dave Hughes has written a few letters, he's an FPE and he is, of course, pushing for this.
35 He's used a few examples of reasons why the discipline should be included. One being that
36 right now if a contractor requires or asks for a licensed professional engineer to stamp fire
37 protection drawings that that professional engineer is going out on a limb. Perhaps going
38 into an area where they don't have expertise. The Board's own regulations cover that very
39 thing now. It's very specific in your rules and regulations that you're not allowed to work on
40 anything that you're not legally qualified to do and anybody that does so is supposed to be
41 turned into the Board and supposed to be taken care of. In the past the Corps of Engineers
42 uses fire protection engineers on most jobs. Of course they don't run through the State
43 regulations they've got their own set of regulations. I just did a large project with the Alaska
44 Housing Finance Corp. where they wanted a professional engineer even though they
45 wanted it overseen by a fire protection engineer which we used out of Washington to do so.
46 It was over a one year contract and it worked just fine. So all the other projects that are out
47 there when done, all these NICET trained individuals out here. The system has worked
48 really well. I've worked extensive with getting people trained in the State. The State Fire
49 Marshall backs it, the Representatives back it. I've got Representative letters, I got, you
50 know, the Congressman, I got the Governor, I got everybody to jump onboard with me 5
51 years ago when this tried to come through as NCEES Policy 25 and everybody said wait a
52 minute guys. Don't do this, you're going to cost us a bunch of money and we already got a
53 workforce in place. Well now it seems like it's coming through slipped in with a whole bunch
54 of other items and I just want to remind everybody of the negatives that were received 5

1 years ago from all these individuals. I provided anybody that was on the Board at the time
2 with letters. I'd be happy to provide them again or get new ones from those individuals. We
3 really don't want that discipline pushed through. We don't want to lose the NICET oversight
4 of all the fire protection work that's going on in the State. We don't want to put anybody out
5 of work. So, that's pretty much it. I appreciate you taking the time to listen to me. I will be
6 providing the written commentary per the statement here that we can't pass anything out
7 today but I will be providing that and I would like to know, this is all proposed right now.
8 What will I hear as far as follow-up? Whether this is being pushed through of if my
9 comments have any effect on any of you?

10
11 Chair: We're actually not in a position to answer questions right now. We're in the
12 information gathering stage and we will answer questions, there will be follow-up for all of
13 this.

14
15 Mr. Bakic: OK, will there be another public comment period at the next Board meeting?

16
17 Chair: It sounds like there will be oral comments but the written comment period is until
18 January 7th. But again we're not in a question/answer mode do to the expediency of time.

19
20 Mr. Bakic: I understand, thank you for your time.

21
22 Chair: Thank you Nick. I neglected to mention Craig Bledsoe.

23
24 Mr. Bledsoe: I realize we don't have written submissions so we're going to call these
25 handouts. Just look at them and throw them away when you're done with them. I do want
26 to refer to them as we go along on some of the things we're talking about. I'm Craig
27 Bledsoe and I'm a registered professional engineer in the State of California but not in
28 Alaska. And in fact if you go to the 4th page you'll see a copy of my registration as a
29 professional engineer. I just left the American Society of Safety Engineers meeting, in fact, I
30 had to ditch the speaker to get over here on time some of the rest of us stayed for the whole
31 presentation, I hope it was good. What I'd like to talk about is the fact that, as we in ASSE
32 have addressed before, that safety engineering has been left off this list and we would hope
33 that it would be added. One thing that we're looking for initially is in addition to the
34 professional engineering branches listed under sub-paragraph 17 which is on page 3 in your
35 handout and to add a CSP in. The American Society of Safety Engineers is not the Society
36 of Safety Professionals, it's Safety Engineers, and we have approximately 240 members in
37 the State of Alaska. Many of whom have national registration as certified safety
38 professionals, I have both, I have that PE and also the CSP as well. And that would be a
39 point to bring up for future consideration is that several states, 3 I believe, have a provision
40 to bring on certified safety professional who have passed a national credentialing and
41 testing procedure as PE's in their states with additional testing, like in the case of Alaska, it
42 would be something like arctic engineering, the sort of things that we've done for people that
43 come in from other states. So, that's one aspect, is that there are provisions to do that. The
44 other is, if we go to General Licensure and I, having worked in the state for many years in
45 the areas of aviation safety and construction safety, would like to become registered as a
46 professional engineer in the State of Alaska and I present a license from another state and
47 yet it's not on your list then what's the reaction of the Board going to be at that point. I think
48 that this is something that's a lot better to talk about beforehand than to talk about after the
49 fact. So that's one of the reasons that I wanted to bring this up to you. I did brief this
50 package to the ASSE meeting over at the Coast International Inn just before coming here
51 and I had a lot of interest in proceeding under one or the other of these provisions that we
52 were talking about. And those of you who have been on the Board for awhile will know that I
53 have had a chance to talk to you here and down in Juneau and different places on this topic
54 previously. We were all really hoping that once the General Licensure process got really

1 underway that we would see safety engineering being brought in under the fold. In
2 particular my sub-discipline, aviation safety as we all know, Alaska is the preeminent state in
3 the nation as far as aircraft operations are concerned military and long range civil and bush
4 flying and everything else. The folks who do that are safety engineers and are CSP's or
5 typically licensed in other states yet they are working in an area that has a very high
6 emphases in Alaska. Now this isn't exactly your charter but I want to talk to you about
7 something else. The sub-division of safety engineers that does aviation work is called
8 ISASI, International Society of Air Safety Investigators and I'm the chapter president for that
9 as well at the present time. In 1997 we had a large convention here in Anchorage. We had
10 people from 26 countries. We completely filled up the Hilton Hotel. We had a lot of
11 representation from all over and the net worth to the community was over \$200,000 from
12 that particular convention and the Convention and Visitors Bureau multiplies that times 10, 2
13 million dollars impact on the community. The reason I mention that is, we are going around
14 in a circle and we are about to have another ISASI convention of which Anchorage is one of
15 the candidates to have the convention, approximately 2 ½ times the size of the other one.
16 This is for the year 2013, it will fill the Denina Center if this happens. I'm already getting
17 queries right now because what you all are deliberating is being watched Nation wide
18 because the question is, we're a bunch of safety engineers coming to a state which does not
19 recognize safety engineering as a licensed profession to spend time, money and contribute
20 to the economy of the State and yet we are not recognized or appreciated by the authorities
21 of the State. Why are we doing this? And so as our team is making the pitch, it's like
22 pitching for the Olympics, you've got other groups out there that are pitching because they
23 want the economic benefit too. And they're saying well, we're from Texas, we're from
24 California, we recognize safety engineering and we'd be happy to have you there. So, I'm
25 on thin ice because of the situation that you all have an opportunity to address. I realize that
26 you all come to it from a different point of view of protecting the public, which is certainly
27 what we do. And appropriate licensure and examination and testing and education and that
28 is fine. However, in the whole mix there's a big economic mix too. Our last calculation of
29 this is that the benefit to the community if the ISASI 2013 happens will be between 5 and 10
30 million dollars. So, that is something that concerns me and I just want to relay it on to you.
31 That I would kindly ask you to consider adding safety engineering in, as we have discussed
32 on several occasions in the past, to your list of disciplines under the tent of General
33 Licensure. Thank you very much.

34
35 Chair: Thank you Craig. Next is Gregory Latreille.

36
37 Mr. Latreille: Hello, my name is Gregory Latreille, I'm the President of the Alaska Society of
38 Professional Engineers. Thanks for allowing public comment today. It's wonderful to come
39 and be able to share some ideas. I am speaking on behalf of the Alaska Society of
40 Professional Engineers today but we do not yet have a formalized opinion on behalf of our
41 membership to present to this Board. I guess the biggest thing I would like to bring up is
42 something that is going to echo what Colin and Jared said earlier, that we are getting more
43 people to ask us questions such as why, what is the intent, what is the background of these
44 proposed regulation changes? And we have people commenting on how they feel about it.
45 And so, we can ask people that have been involved in the discussion for years, what they
46 feel, or what they know as the background but it seems like it would be more appropriate to
47 have the formalized background and justification for these regulation changes put forth by
48 the AELS Board. I don't know what the timeline is or what the possibilities are but we are
49 definitely going to be putting forth a position paper with a statement from the Alaska Society
50 of Professional Engineers and we would like some time to have to get people to comment
51 and so however we can most rapidly get a statement from the Board that gives us all of the
52 background. Because we all know that this has been discussed for several years and that
53 there is a lot that has happened leading up to these changes. But, as other people have
54 voiced it basically just hit the street last week and there are a lot of people that are in the

1 dark as far as what everything was leading up to these changes. Other than that, it's worth
2 noting that it's been the official position of the National Society of Professional Engineers
3 over the past several years to support a General License. That being said the State of
4 Alaska Society of Professional Engineers would like to wait until we receive more comment
5 from our membership to make a formal statement. We will be doing so in written form and
6 we really hope that you will consider it strongly. We consider ourselves the unified voice of
7 all professional engineers in the State of Alaska. Thank you for your time.
8

9 Chair: Thank you Gregory. Tanya does not want to testify?

10
11 Ms. Bratslavsky: I didn't sign up for that but maybe I can.
12

13 Chair: I didn't know if you had forgotten to check the testify or.....go ahead please.
14

15 Ms. Bratslavsky: Good Afternoon, my name is Tanya Bratslavsky I am a civil engineer with
16 structural education and a lot of structural background. I've done design over my 30 some
17 years of practice. I've done design of multiple structures in this State as well as in the
18 Pacific Northwest and my main interest is structural registration that's proposed for Alaska. I
19 do not have a firm position to present here and that's why I didn't sign-up. I listened to prior
20 presentations and I agree with their concerns. When this was proposed I looked into the
21 rules for getting grandfathered in this structural discipline because I've got over 30 years of
22 experience and because I didn't feel like taking another exam. I understood, and my staff
23 has checked on for me that in order to get grandfathered you had to have significant
24 structures within the last several years under your belt. And that's the reason I did not try to
25 get grandfathered in structural engineer. Because I don't get to design significant structures
26 regularly, I do design structures. I do study codes. I am reviewing designs. But I'm not
27 designing major hospitals or major school structural designs, my company does not provide
28 currently. This is one of the things I would recommend. I'm in agreement with Colin
29 Maynard. I would recommend to provide structural registration as a secondary after civil
30 because these two disciplines are intertwined. We do get to design a lot of civil projects as
31 well as structural projects. I don't think structural registration is required for minor projects,
32 for small projects and I think whatever was the requirement for grandfathering, I think it
33 should be the limitation for an engineer to get structural registration or to be able to practice
34 structural engineering without one. Unless this happens I think there's going to be a very
35 significant impact on many engineers practicing civil and structural engineering in the State.
36 And a very significant detriment and they won't be able to do their work. That's probably all I
37 can say right now. Thank you very much.
38

39 Chair: Thank you Tanya. Gerry did you want to....
40

41 Mr. Brown: Not at this time. I think I'll save my comments for a later time.
42

43 Chair: Ok. Alan Bolton.
44

45 Mr. Bolton: First of all, I apologize because I didn't know I was going to be here today.
46 Craig invited me at lunch. I'm an active member of the American Society of Safety
47 Engineers, have been since, I believe, 2003 or 4. I've been in the safety profession for 38
48 years, that's all I've ever done. And when Craig mentioned that they were talking about this
49 and the importance of recognizing the ASSE or American Society of Safety Engineers as an
50 engineering group in Alaska. First of all I want to say a couple of things about that. Those
51 of us that are not PE's but are professional safety people, we definitely recognize the
52 difference. When we go out on a project and help people to discern what's safe and what's
53 not safe, from an engineering standpoint even, we don't make those final decisions. We
54 bring in a structural engineer or a PE to help us discern that. Our job as professional safety

1 people is to get the 2 groups together, and normally it's manufacturers of equipment, Safe
2 All protection Gear is a good example. We can do everything possible to come up with the
3 right systems for you but it comes back down to, what's an engineered anchor point? What
4 will hold 5000 lbs minimum strength that a person can tie off to, to save their life? So we
5 don't make those decisions at that point unless we are also a PE. So we understand the
6 difference. American Society of Safety Engineers is the oldest organization in America.
7 This year, in 2011, it will be 100 years old. They are comprised of Certified Safety
8 Professionals, that's the highest rank that you can attain in that organization. There's also
9 Certified Industrial Hygienist which is what we call the doctors of industry. They do all the
10 medical, the studies and what-not. Safety persons, as a profession, have to make a lot of
11 decisions when it comes down to what's safe for people to do and not do. Being recognized
12 as an engineer even though we're technically not engineers, it's more of a term than
13 anything else, goes a long way for getting credibility as a safety person. If we don't have
14 that, if we don't have something like that, we don't call ourselves engineers from that
15 standpoint. We don't always get the respect that we actually deserve. And when I say
16 respect our job is protecting lives, that's what we do. So, again, I think it's in the best
17 interests of the State of Alaska to certainly recognize the credentials that American Society
18 of Safety Engineer professionals attain. That said, I am not a Certified Safety Professional, I
19 do belong to the ASSE. I currently work for Exxon Mobile, I'm their training advisor in
20 Alaska but I'm here speaking on my behalf not Exxon's behalf, just so you know. I have a
21 training business and one of the things that I do in my training business is to take people
22 new to the profession or that have been working in the field for many years that do not have
23 certification and put them through study groups to get them certifications. The goal is to
24 work all the way up to a CSP. But we ask them not to stop there. If their duty is to really go
25 out there and design structures that are safer for people to occupy or work on we ask them
26 to continue and to get their PE certification, or structural engineering certification, whatever it
27 requires. I just want the Board to know we certainly know the difference between a
28 registered engineer, structural or PE, and what we do as safety professionals. So I
29 appreciate the opportunity to speak here today. Thank you.

30
31 Chair: Thank you Alan. Is there any other party that wishes to speak in the public comment
32 period? Ok, with that I guess we close the public comment period at this time.

33
34 **On a motion duly made by Brownfield, seconded by Eriksen it was**

35
36 **Resolved to extend the public comment period for the General Licensure issue until**
37 **February 7, 2011.**

38
39 Chair: All those in favor signify by saying aye. All those opposed say nay. Any
40 abstentions? Anyone want to change their vote?

41
42 Motion passed unanimously

43
44 Chair: The oral and written comment period will be extended through, as a minimum, the
45 Juneau meeting. Thank you all for participating in this process. I would like to have a 10
46 minute break.

47
48 Break 1400 – 1415.

49
50 1415 back on record.

51 Chair: I would encourage, and the ASPE President left already, that not only public
52 comments I would encourage alternatives to the regulations being proposed.

53
54 Walsh: Asks members of the public still in the room if they got the white paper the Board

1 sent out seeking comments.
2
3 Members of the public acknowledged getting the paper. A short discussion followed
4 between the Board and the public members present about the paper, who it went to and
5 comments received.
6
7 Chair: Comments about several regulations changes being grouped together in the public
8 notice and asks Brownfield to reread the motion.
9
10 Brownfield: I move that the public comment period for the General Licensure issue be
11 extended until 7 February 2011.
12
13 Jones: Doesn't think that will be a problem because we grouped them together to save
14 money.
15
16 Fredeen: Suggests we make another motion to hold back the other regulations changes.
17
18 Brownfield: I don't think we can change a motion we just finished.
19
20 Fredeen: We can reconsider can't we?
21
22 Chair: Yes, anyone can reconsider their vote for a motion. I think we should just leave it the
23 way it is. I'm not sure Jun will allow this. He asks if anyone wanted to address any
24 concerns raised during the public comment period.
25
26 Baker: Isn't sure how to address the safety engineer. He doesn't think there is a separate
27 exam at NCEES for them.
28
29 Brownfield: Isn't sure this is the place to discuss it but adds that he hears what they said
30 and that safety engineer is a well established organization and clearly has the HSW of the
31 public in mind. He then points out that there must be an examination and the cost to
32 develop one and the costs of maintaining the security of the exam and administering it.
33
34 Rearick: Thinks that most of what was heard today has to do with the public not being able
35 to read between the lines and not knowing how it will affect those presently licensed. He
36 points out that we haven't addressed the corporate issue. He adds that he thinks the term
37 architectural engineer is going to cause a lot of confusion and suggests building systems
38 engineer which is actually used in the definition of architectural engineer just to get rid of the
39 term architectural.
40
41 Brownfield: Reminds the Board that they decided not to get into breaking down the
42 Branches into disciplines. A civil engineer is a civil engineer. That it is up to the individual
43 where they place their emphasis in the multi-discipline branches. It comes down to personal
44 ethics.
45
46 Rearick: If I have a company that doesn't have a structural engineer that has taken the
47 structural engineering exam can I advertise as a structural engineering company or do I
48 advertise my company as an engineering company?
49
50 Brownfield: Points out that the engineer would have to have the three legged stool for
51 structural engineering.
52
53 Rearick: Points out that we are adding a structural engineering exam.
54

1 Brownfield: Responds that civil is a multi-discipline branch and that if they had the
2 education, experience, and exam they can do any of the different disciplines. Because we
3 add a structural exam doesn't mean that a civil that has been doing structural for years can't
4 continue to do what he has done in the past. He acknowledges that he sees Rearick's
5 problem with the word architectural but doesn't think changing it to something else will make
6 any difference.

7
8 Rearick: Would rather just eliminate it completely instead of just changing it.

9
10 Brownfield: And we heard folks that don't want us to have fire protection engineer for the
11 same reason you don't want architectural.

12
13 Eriksen: States that nothing is changing in that the responsibility still lies with the practicing
14 engineer. If their practice comes into question they must defend their ability to do that work.

15
16 Hanson: Thinks the point Rearick was trying to make is that the Board hasn't dealt with the
17 corporate aspect of the change.

18
19 Rearick: I think we do need to address the corporate aspect. Can you advertise as just an
20 engineer or can you advertise in the discipline you do.

21
22 Brownfield: Thinks we do the same as we do now.

23
24 Rearick: Thinks everyone is misinterpreting what I'm trying to say. That they think he is
25 against General Licensure and he's not. What he is concerned with is the details. How
26 individuals now licensed can determine what they can do now and how a corporation can
27 present its credentials. They are details that can be worked out but we must be aware of
28 them. He believes that when the written comments come in those things will come out.

29
30 Fredeen: He believes that the corporation issue needs to be addressed and he reads 12
31 AAC 36.185(c) and thinks it helps in this situation. He also thinks the group has a lot of
32 homework to do on this because there are a lot of details that need to be worked out.

33
34 Brownfield: Comments that some of the remarks heard today concerned turf protection and
35 he thinks everyone agrees that the mission of the Board is to protect the Health, Safety and
36 Welfare of the public not someone's job.

37
38 Baker: Thinks the corporate issue won't be any different than what we now have, we will
39 just have more branches.

40
41 Walsh: Notes that looking at the minutes he noticed that it said to submit the General
42 Licensure for public notice but what we submitted was definitions. We didn't submit a
43 General Licensure regulation we just submitted a narrow part of it. We asked for comment
44 on the definitions and didn't intend to release broad regulations on General Licensure.

45
46 Chair: Thinks it's a work in progress, a first step, and if you look at the evolution of the
47 process in other states General Licensure came before structural. Thinks we are probably
48 on the same track. He further states that individuals that practice outside their area of
49 expertise will be caught and that we have to rely on an individual's professional ethics.

50
51 Baker: Thinks that by expanding the number of disciplines that can be licensed we may be
52 better able to protect the HSW of the public. Having people that specialize in a narrower
53 area will be better.

1 Chair: I'm embarrassed to not be able to license structural engineers in this state.

2
3 Fredeen: Asks if there are action items.

4
5 Chair: You have a list, that's a start. He also expects some input from ASPE and that can
6 be made directly to the chair of the committee. Don't presume that this is a finished product
7 by any stretch. We're not the last word on this. It goes through the AG and Regulations
8 Specialist.

9
10 Brownfield: Walks through the process from start to finish.

11
12 Chair: I would entertain a motion to move into executive session.

13
14 **On a motion duly made by Shiesl, seconded by Baker it was**

15
16 **RESOLVED to go into Executive Session under authority of AS 44.62.310 to review**
17 **the continuing education audit and review applicant files.**

18
19 1745 adjourned for the night.

20
21 **Wednesday November 17, 2010**

22
23 0800 Meeting called to order, roll call, all present except Hightower.

24
25 Chair: John could you go ahead?

26
27 Savage: Ok, and you just wanted me to speak of General Licensure and what it means to
28 me? Savage states that he hopes General Licensure fails. He explains how difficult it will
29 be to work in the field if the stamp doesn't have the branch of engineering on it. It would be
30 very cumbersome to go back to the office and look up the engineers online or to call Juneau
31 to have Vern or Alicia check the database. He adds that other states have separate
32 investigative units for each branch such as just investigating structural engineering etc.

33
34 Baker: Asks if he is hearing that going to General Licensure would be a good way to
35 increase his staff? (laughter)

36
37 Savage: Explains the evolution of the AELS investigative staff over the last few years.
38 Went from 2 ½ investigators to 1 and he still has 6 other boards.

39
40 Hanson: Asks if having an endorsement on the web or on the stamp would help?

41
42 Savage: Explains the drawback to having to return to the office to check disciplines. It is
43 best to stick with the present system where it is on the stamp and he can tell right away if a
44 mechanical is stamping electrical or architectural drawings etc. He asks that the Board keep
45 in mind how difficult his job will be with a General Stamp. Recommends the Board talk to
46 other states on how they are handling this.

47
48 Eriksen: Asks if a budget item to provide some administrative tools like new software or a
49 file he could take into the field or a PDA or some type of portable system so he could access
50 the date base from the field would be feasible?

51
52 Savage: If we go to this, those are the types of things we will have to look at.

53
54 Eriksen: Asks if the addition of so many exams will create more gray areas and if it will be

1 any different if we stayed discipline specific?
2
3 Baker: Points out that we do not currently have a structural stamp, that structural is done
4 by civil engineers and asks if he checks to see what exam he took in this type of situation?
5
6 Savage: States that it all depends, if a complaint has been filed then you have to dig a little
7 deeper. In the past I would call Ginger or have the Board member take a look at it and see
8 if he tested in structural or whatever.
9
10 Baker: That my comment. In civil you already have that scenario. How much do you do to
11 find out what a civils specialty is? That's what we are talking about in expanding that.
12
13 Savage: States that is he had his druthers he would have an investigator for each major
14 branch.
15
16 Brownfield: Points out that the Branch of civil engineer covers several disciplines and that
17 because a civil engineer tested in structural doesn't mean he can't do any of the other
18 disciplines. He's a civil and can do any of those disciplines that come under civil
19 engineering. He explains how the examination is laid out.
20
21 Savage: Asks how the stamp will read.
22
23 Brownfield: It will be the same as it is now, civil will say civil, electrical will say electrical etc.
24 He points out that three of the major branches have sub-disciplines, civil, electrical and
25 mechanical and everyone should not get all tied up in this because they will be able to do
26 the same as they do today within their branch.
27
28 Walsh: Asks the Chair of the committee to give the Board an idea of where we are and
29 where we are going because in his mind the Board didn't present General Licensure
30 regulations comprehensively. That we started down the path with a very limited amount of
31 material to get public input and that a lot of the things being discussed are to be determined
32 but aren't out for public comment yet. So if we get favorable comment on these definitions,
33 where do we go from there? Because as a Board we haven't grappled with whether we are
34 going discipline specific or general licensure.
35
36 Hanson: Before you answer that Bo. As public noticed right now the stamp would remove
37 all the CE, ME etc. That's what's out for public notice right now. If you had a stamp that
38 said CE that would probably be ok but we wouldn't require that under the current proposal.
39
40 Eriksen: Wonders if having more exams will make people more aware of their areas of
41 expertise and less likely to practice outside their area? Would taking the environmental
42 exam make a civil more likely to practice environmental exclusively? Thinks there will be
43 many more questions from people trying to understand where we are going.
44
45 Don: Echo's the concern about how will people know if someone is qualified in a certain
46 field.
47
48 Baker: Acknowledges that there will be more questions but hopes that before this goes
49 through we will have more answers. He would hate to see it pass with more questions than
50 answers.
51
52 Fredeen: Suggests that however we proceed in February we put something in the
53 Guidance Manual to answer some of these questions.
54

1 Lent: Agrees with Craig, and intended to bring that up during his committee report.

2
3 Rearick: I think it would be redundant for me to launch into the architectural engineering
4 thing again but I would like to. (laughter). He then brings up an analogy of doctors and how
5 they go through years of residency to determine a specialty. They earn that distinction by
6 their experience and training to put that specialty after their name. And when you look for a
7 doctor you look for one with that specialty who has gone through that residency and can
8 legally call himself that. He uses the parallel of a doctor of optometry and an
9 ophthalmologist. He states that he has been to both for eye issues and guarantees that the
10 doctor of optometry thinks he's qualified to do everything the ophthalmologist is except
11 certain surgeries and the ophthalmologist thinks the doctor of optometry is a quack. So you
12 get different opinions within those specialties as to what they can do but they are bound by
13 law as to what they can do. A doctor of optometry can't, by law, do those surgeries. And I
14 thought I was going to an ophthalmologist because it said doctor in front of his name. I
15 didn't know there was a difference. And with General Licensure the public, the investigator
16 and contractors aren't going to know what their specialties are.

17
18 Brownfield: Explains how applicants chose their examinations and that it's the same as we
19 have today. There are only three that have multiple disciplines and nothing is going to
20 change. What we are doing is adding branches. The three that have multiple disciplines
21 are that way today, we are dealing with them already and that won't change.

22
23 Jones: So far the two major concerns in the written comments are the architectural engineer
24 issue and most are against taking the branches off the stamp.

25
26 Rearick: Asks why we are adding architectural engineering when the testing for
27 architectural engineer includes building systems for mechanical, electrical, structural, etc. He
28 points out that we already test for those branches and that another pseudo civil will only
29 confuse people.

30
31 Brownfield: Responds, it's already there. When they take their examinations they choose
32 which way they want to go.

33
34 Fredeen: Compares the architectural engineering branch to mining engineering in that
35 mining engineers can pretty much do everything. He feels we will have to put some
36 limitations on what an architectural engineer can do. He also asks the Board for guidance
37 on whether to put some discipline identification on the stamps.

38
39 Brownfield: We already discussed this and we called it endorsements and this Board shot it
40 down.

41
42 Fredeen: He reminds the Board of the input from Investigator Savage and asks the Board
43 to direct the committee to reconsider it.

44
45 Lent: Offers that the Guidance Manual might be a good place for short descriptions of what
46 each branch can do.

47
48 Eriksen: Points out that Idaho is a general licensure state and they put a specialty on their
49 stamp. He adds that he has been reading the architectural exam contents and is impressed
50 with their expanse of knowledge and feels that they should be allowed to practice. He adds
51 that it is difficult to regulate ethics.

52
53 Hanson: Agrees that the mining PE is the closest thing to general licensure that we have. A
54 mining engineer can do electrical, mechanical, chemical if qualified. He states that the

1 proposal that we have out right now is not general licensure. We are adding branches and
2 modifying the seal. If we were to put out a proposal for general licensure we would remove
3 all these branches and say an engineer is an engineer and these are the exams that are
4 available.

5
6 Baker: Comments on Lent's proposal to use the Guidance Manual for the definitions and
7 agrees that it would be good for the layperson but points out that unless something is in
8 statute or regulation it can't be enforced so it would have to be in regulation as well as the
9 Guidance Manual.

10
11 Walsh: Echo's what one of the public said the previous day about NICET and FP
12 engineering. That the system is working now why change it? He believes that that also
13 applies to architecture and architectural engineering. He adds that where the HSW of the
14 public is adequately protected then the Board needs to consider the impact on individual
15 careers and professions. If we are not adding anything to the HSW but we are impacting
16 peoples lively hood and professions I think that is a consideration we have to think about.
17 He adds that mining engineers for the most part work in an exempt environment so that is
18 different than working in the public environment.

19
20 Brownfield: Restates that we aren't adding anything new. There is presently a civil
21 architectural discipline. He agrees with Hanson about the general licensure issue. Every
22 state has a different interpretation of what general licensure is. None of them have a true
23 general license. He thinks we need to name the branches on the stamp. As far as
24 architectural we are not changing it. It is presently there in the civil branch. What we are
25 doing is giving the State of Alaska more options, nuclear, marine but with architectural what
26 is different than what we are doing now?

27
28 Walsh: If we bring in a bunch of architectural engineers, that's a whole new bunch of people
29 you're bringing into the state to compete with the architects. If the HSW of the public is
30 already well protected under the current system then we are impacting people's lively hood.

31
32 Rearick: I want to make it clear that I'm not arguing protecting our lively hood I'm arguing
33 the confusion that's going to be out there.

34
35 Brownfield: I stand corrected, architectural is a specific branch.

36
37 Chair: This is a great discussion but we need to start homing in on decisions. He passes
38 out some blank motion sheets.

39
40 Eriksen: Points out that this is about bringing people that are highly qualified more than
41 what we already have such as structural engineers into the state. That it will benefit the
42 State. I sympathize and think it does warrant careful consideration but I'm not sure the
43 argument whether we bring 50 architectural engineers to compete with architects, and
44 excuse me for the example, it's just one that we are caught up on a little bit, is a valid
45 argument if really you're bring in more qualified people to build things in the State.

46
47 Rearick: Points out that we've only had one day of public testimony and we shouldn't take
48 any action until we've received more comments from the public.

49
50 Brownfield: Reinforces what Eriksen said about expanding the available branches to benefit
51 the State. He points out that we are very backward in that we force structural, agricultural,
52 nuclear etc to become civil engineers to practice in Alaska.

53
54 Fredeen: In order to get one of these items up or down I'd like to make a motion.

1
2 **On a motion duly made by Fredeen, seconded by Lent it was**

3
4 **Resolved to direct the committee to bring back to the Board in February options for**
5 **adding specific specializations to the engineering stamp.**

6
7 Brownfield: What do you mean by specializations?

8
9 Fredeen: Explains that most of the feedback so far has been how is the public going to
10 identify the branch by looking at a stamp? Let us bring back options because there are
11 several ways this could go. He explains various options such as providing a two letter
12 designation for each branch and license according to which exam they took or let them
13 choose which specialization how do we determine that. How do we grandfather if a civil
14 wants to be a structural? Let's map out pro's and con's and put in front of the Board. Let's
15 get this issue off the table because it comes up every time.

16
17 Rearick: It's just exploring options to bring to the Board is what you're saying? Not trying to
18 change direction. If we get a lot of comments then we have a path?

19
20 Fredeen: Correct, so when the comments come in we are prepared to say we looked into
21 that and this is how it looks.

22
23 Baker: Suggests a blank on the stamp and the engineer puts in his specialty he is qualified
24 in when he stamps something.

25
26 Eriksen: Is not against an identifier but thinks we need to decide if we want them or not
27 before we go down the path of deciding what they are.

28
29 Fredeen: Just wants to put together a comprehensive plan of pro and con. He does not
30 want to look like we are going down this path.

31
32 Hanson: Echo's that we just started the comment period and shouldn't be making decisions
33 yet.

34
35 Jones: Points out that not only are we just getting into it but the Board just voted to extend
36 the comment period another month. Also points out that if they go this route braking it down
37 farther than the branch. Going into specific specializations would just cause more
38 confusion.

39
40 Rearick: Suggests that we leave it to the committee to look at the responses and decide on
41 a path.

42
43 Chair: I think the committee was looking for direction and I think they've got that now to
44 some degree.

45
46 Fredeen: I don't see any action right now. Aside from public testimony what you've got is
47 what you've got. Every meeting we talk about this but nothing ever gets put to an action
48 item we have to bring back. Provide some actions to the committee on what you would like
49 the committee to do.

50
51 Brownfield: As the chairman doesn't see a problem in using specialties.

52
53 Chair: States that he has talked to many engineers in his community and once he
54 explained what the Board was trying to do, no one had a problem with it. Some already

1 thought we were a general licensure state. He thinks we are going in the right direction and
2 adds that it is unconscionable that we aren't licensing structural engineers in this state.

3
4 Brownfield: Points out that when we got the initial feedback we only queried registered
5 engineers and the majority wanted general engineering. In second place was those that
6 didn't have enough information and last was those that didn't want change.

7
8 Walsh: Thought that the main theme from the oral comments yesterday was that it wasn't
9 clear what we were proposing. The second thing he heard was turf protection. The NICET
10 people didn't want fire protection in here and the civil's that are practicing structural didn't
11 want structural's in here. And finally there was the safety people saying broaden what
12 you're adding.

13
14 Chair: Question's been called so I'll do this in two phases. There's a motion on the floor
15 that reads to direct the committee to bring back to the board in February options for adding
16 specific specializations to the engineering stamp. We have to vote on the question first.
17 Two thirds have to vote in favor of voting on the motion. So all those in favor of voting on
18 the motion please raise your hand. Those opposed raise your hand. Ok, we're going to
19 vote on the motion so those in favor of the motion, does anyone need me to restate it?

20
21 Brownfield: Restate it.

22
23 Chair: Re-reads the motion. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed say
24 nay. Roll call.

25
26 The motion failed to pass by a roll call vote of 5 to 4. Brownfield changed his original yes to
27 a no.

28
29 Chair: Advises the Board that written comments have to go through the regulations
30 specialist, Jun Maiquis

31
32 Jones: Asks if the committee wants the comments forwarded by mail or electronically.

33
34 Hanson: Electronic but not one at a time.

35
36 Brownfield: Would prefer in a packet.

37
38 Chair: Asks if anyone else wants to be on the committee?

39
40 Brownfield: Asks if there is limit on the number of members in the committee.

41
42 Chair: States that it could be a committee of the whole but not doing that yet. He adds that
43 even though the motion failed at his discretion he would like to be able to answer that
44 question because it's detail that needs to be an option that needs to be pursued.

45
46 Fredeen: Presents a list of FAQ questions that he came up with after yesterday's public
47 comment.

48
49 Chair: We will come back to that. Let's continue with special committees under 17.

50
51 **As build and record drawings.**

52
53 Chair: Harley Hightower is absent, Richard did you have anything?

54

1 Lent: Reports that Harley gave him two descriptions to include in the Guidance Manual and
2 he will report when we get to the Guidance Manual.

3
4 **Incidental Practice.**

5
6 Chair: Incidental practice is Harleys again, is there anything to report?
7

8 Walsh: He reports that the committee thinks the problem in the exemption statute is that the
9 lead in language is too broad and proposes a couple of options for changing it. They also
10 think some tweaking to the exemptions themselves may be in order and offers a specific
11 recommendation to revise (a)(7) along with some recommendations for the definition of
12 shop drawings. He provided the Board with a handout explaining the findings of the
13 committee and explaining the discussions that lead to the findings.
14

15 Fredeen: Asks if they are leaning towards either one of them.
16

17 Walsh: No, just two possibilities. But the emphasis is to get away from that broad language
18 and make it very specific.
19

20 Fredeen: Likes the concept but is concerned that would put the contractors under our
21 regulations.
22

23 Walsh: This wouldn't apply to Regulations, this is just Statute. But the Board needs to
24 consider, do we want to go the route of a Statute change?
25

26 Eriksen: Says it's not clear what the intentions of the exemptions are. Are they to allow
27 specialty contractors to modify buildings they were working on or was it not clear that the
28 exemption was to allow them to perform work in accordance with stamped drawings?
29

30 Walsh: it's in the process. Harley's still looking for input. This only meant to be an update
31 and give you some insight into our thinking.
32

33 Hanson: Thinks there may be a problem where an engineer delegates his design by
34 specification and a specialty contractor gets on board and says hey you required an
35 engineer but I'm a specialty contractor so I don't have to follow that rule.
36

37 Walsh: Thinks we want to be very careful how we define the exemptions. Points out his
38 thoughts on the last page of the handout that deal with people who are exempt because
39 they teach in a post secondary education institution.
40

41 Brownfield: What do we want to do with this?
42

43 Walsh: Study it and give any comments to Harley.
44

45 Chair: Asks if anyone wants to make a motion.
46

47 Walsh: Maybe by February Harley may have something to address that section and maybe
48 not put before the Board but ask for comments and suggested language. Finalize in May if
49 we want to make a Statute change.
50

51 Chair: Does anyone want to discuss, we don't have to go back to General Licensure but
52 these FAQ's from yesterday. You want to take a minute or two to read through these?
53

54 Brownfield: Some of these have answers?

1
2 Fredeen: It was late last night when I put these together so some of them that were really
3 simple and I could say this is where the Board is going I put answers to.
4
5 Baker: Thinks this is more for the committee than the Board and doesn't need further
6 discussion.
7
8 Fredeen: Asks if everyone could read through it and if they can think of any questions or
9 ideas on wording, communicate them to the committee.
10
11 Brownfield: Thinks the committee should go through the FAQ's and fill in the blanks and
12 have something by next meeting.
13
14 Eriksen: Suggests the committee add a mission statement, or goals or some simple rules to
15 keep them on track.
16
17 Chair: Take five minutes and read through the FAQ's. Craig went to the trouble to do this
18 and I think it warrants our purview.
19
20 Hanson: Thinks that we should be able to answer these questions through existing Statutes
21 and Regulations or the proposed ones. Otherwise we shouldn't be making assumptions.
22
23 Chair: Again to make clear what I wanted was to make sure yesterday's oral testimony was
24 represented by Craig's FAQ's.
25
26 Fredeen: This is a tool for the committee to look at and see if we need to add regs.
27
28 Rearick: Adds that this is a good tool and will dog us to justify and clarify the regulation.
29
30 Eriksen: Recommends a question about fire protection engineer similar to the one about
31 architectural engineer and one regarding the safety engineer explaining why we are limited
32 to the NCEES exams.
33
34 Chair: Asks if any of the questions dealt with grandfathering.
35
36 Eriksen: Like what will happen to my license as a civil engineer after today?
37
38 Chair: Create a question that goes around that grandfathering term so that they know
39 where their coming from there.
40
41 Hanson: Is this going to go out as FAQ's?
42
43 Chair: No it is going to the committee so they don't forget to address any concerns. He
44 notes that one of the observations is how will we disseminate the information. Maybe it will
45 require another mail out.
46
47 Eriksen: Suggests that after the February they come out with a more concise cover letter.
48
49 Chair: Thinks this has all been productive and we are moving forward.
50
51 **Continuing Education.**
52
53 Chair: Brian that's a newly formed committee.
54

1 Hanson: I have nothing to report as of yesterday. (laughter)
2
3 **Licensure Mobility.**
4
5 Walsh: Nothing to report. We had an excellent report on Canadian licensure yesterday.
6
7 Lent: Reports that the landscape architect he was checking on is not licensed in Canada.
8
9 Eriksen: Recommends that since APEGGA representatives will be at the February meeting
10 we should make our position clear regarding Licensure Mobility.
11
12 Baker: Noted that in the testimony yesterday the individual indicated that even the
13 applicants within Canada were experiencing delays so it would be interesting to find out
14 what they consider a reasonable amount of time.
15
16 Brownfield: Thinks that the key issue is that APEGGA is a private entity not a government
17 agency. They don't have a government behind them setting deadlines. They do their own
18 thing.
19
20 Baker: Adds that his point was that there wasn't a difference between the time frame for a
21 Canadian applicant and a foreign applicant. However, if there was then that's what we
22 should explore.
23
24 Eriksen: Cautions making a judgment based on one sample.
25
26 Chair: Asks Dan to put together a package of questions that are diplomatic in nature.
27
28 Walsh: I think what Neil is going to ask is why they have to take the PE exam.
29
30 Chair: We need to ask what that ethics exam is.
31
32 Jones: Doesn't think the Board should give Canadians an easier path to licensure than we
33 give any other State. That's what Neil is asking, can they come in without taking the exam.
34 We require the exam from anybody coming from anywhere else and I don't think we should
35 be making an exception for the Canadians.
36
37 Hanson: Notes that we just reviewed an application from a Canadian and he didn't have
38 any problems meeting our requirements. He thinks that individuals that want to get a
39 license will do what it takes.
40
41 Eriksen: Adds that they are always telling us how good their education system is and if
42 that's true then they should have no problem with the examination.
43
44 Brownfield: Explains that in the six years he has been involved with discussions with
45 APEGGA he has stressed that it has to be a level playing field. We can't give them
46 something we don't give everyone. He reminded the Board that Washington has voted
47 against reciprocity recently.
48
49 Eriksen: Brings up the issue of an applicants experience being under a P-Eng verses a U.S.
50 engineer and how to recognize that or not.
51
52 Fredeen: Thought we had addressed that.
53
54 Jones: For examination it has to be a U.S. engineer for comity it can be foreign.

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

Mining Engineers.

Walsh: Nothing to report. I'm still gathering information on geology definitions. I don't think this something that is urgent but the board might want to eventually include a definition of geology in their regulations.

Land Surveyor Education Committee.

Baker: Thinks we pretty much addressed that yesterday when we put the education tables out for public notice.

Chair: Thinks, based on the testimony yesterday, that we should put out a paper or cover letter with an explanation.

Baker: We could reiterate with the same letter we sent out a year ago.

Chair: Asks what the cost would be and adds that the letter should contain the results of both our study and that of UAA.

Standing Committees.

Investigative Advisory Committee.

Chair: We had a mini report on the Investigative Advisory Committee. It was interesting that in the last three months John had dealt with 90 cases. He notes that he is still working on how to get more assistance for John.

Break 0940 - 0953

Guidance Manual.

Lent: Recaps the changes made to the guidance manual in February. He then updates the Board on changes pending for February 2011 including information on as built drawings and record drawings. Some of them are dependent upon regulation changes that are presently out for public comment and may not be ready for this February. He adds that some are encouraging listing more Statutes and Regulations as references in the Manual. He is opposed to this.

Baker: Thinks that having the reference to the applicable statutes in the Guidance Manual would be useful and points out that the Statutes and Regulations can be accessed by anyone on the Web. He addresses when and what kind of a stamp is required on as built surveys.

Chair: Asks Lent to confer with Baker on the wording for the change.

Eriksen: Comments on the Electrical System entry on page 19 and some new requirements that should be added.

Fredeen: Would like to see the additional verbiage regarding preliminary drawings. He adds that they are always being asked to stamp/seal as built drawings and wants to make sure that the verbiage does not imply that the Board wants as built drawings to be sealed.

Lent: Asks if he is referring to as built or record drawings then explains the difference as an

1 as built is a survey and record is a red line on top of an existing print as to what changes
2 made in the field.

3
4 Hanson: Comments that an as built survey is different than an as built and we are asked to
5 stamp as built drawings all the time and we do not do it. We are sometimes ask to stamp
6 record drawings and I will not do that either. I will sign a record document as this is a record
7 document but will not put my stamp on it. He then asks to see the language also to review it
8 because they are asked to stamp as built and record drawings a lot and if they didn't witness
9 the construction they can't stamp it. Also there is a lot of reference to building permits. We
10 do a lot of plans that don't go through any building permitting officials. They may go through
11 a State agency or something. Maybe this is just a building officials Guidance Manual but it
12 just says Guidance Manual and people may read it as more than just a building officials
13 Guidance Manual which is really what this is geared towards.

14
15 Rearick: Adds that there are a couple of agencies require things a little differently. DEC
16 requires a stamped set of record documents and Muni of Anchorage and that as built survey
17 be done that shows improvements that aren't there yet and needs to be stamped by a
18 surveyor.

19
20 Chair: Asks Brian to go through the Manual and address permits and other agencies and
21 make a distinction between an as built drawing and an as built survey. He then asks Bert if
22 he has a section on reporting investigations.

23
24 Lent: Responds that it is on page 10.

25
26 Chair: Thinks that is a strange place to put it.

27
28 Lent: I can put it wherever you want it. I think this is where the investigators focus most.

29
30 Baker: Asks about a separate section about how to fill out a complaint and including it
31 there.

32
33 Brownfield: It's stuck in with stamping and signing and if you could put a different paragraph
34 it would be easier to focus on that particular issue.

35
36 Hanson: Adds that he didn't see anything about specifications and thinks that sometimes
37 they are more important than the drawings.

38
39 Rearick: Points out that the specifications usually have multiple disciplines scattered
40 throughout the spec and each discipline would have to stamp and identify which sections
41 they were taking responsibility for.

42
43 Hanson: The regulation right now says that once you stamp the plan the associated
44 specifications are hereby stamped. Is that in the Guidance Manual is my question? I'm not
45 proposing that we have 5 disciplines stamp the specs.

46
47 Brownfield: Explains how he interprets the rule which is that unless an individual specifies
48 which parts he is accepting responsibility for he accepts responsibility for all on that page
49 that pertains to his discipline or profession and asks if that is correct?

50
51 Hanson: It's more a statement than a question. I just think it needs to be addressed in
52 some way.

53
54 Chair: One of the FAQ's eludes to it.

1
2 Lent: Reads the entry for Soils and other reports. Item 2 on page 10 and adds that
3 specifications could be added to that one.

4
5 Hanson: I'll work with you on that.

6
7 Chair: Any other comments?

8
9 Baker: Reads item 12, page 12 and states that he disagrees with it in that surveyors can do
10 drainage and grading plans.

11
12 **Legislative Liaison Committee.**

13
14 Chair: Eric, do we have any pending priorities.

15
16 Eriksen: Asks for feedback from the Board and maybe some discussions on where we are
17 and what we want. He mentions specialty contractors as a possible issue and whether
18 emeritus status would be a Statute change or Regulation.

19
20 Jones: Thinks it would have to be a Statute. The Legislature would have to give the Board
21 authority to extend someone's service past their end date.

22
23 Fredeen: Will look at the NCEES rules to see if it just means a past board member and
24 maybe Richard could look at NCARB. He thinks we need to do some homework before any
25 Statute change.

26
27 Eriksen: Just wanted to see what's out there as possible issues. He continues, adding as
28 built and record drawings. He then mentions possible letters regarding FP engineering and
29 NICET and also one on continuing education for the APDC news letter.

30
31 Colin Maynard: It is already in Statute that there is nothing about our licensure law that
32 precludes the NICET people from doing what they are doing. So this just means there will
33 be more people that will be able to do that. The only other issue out there that I know of is
34 people modifying drawing that have been stamped like giving the owner a plat plan that the
35 municipality has and then marking it up and giving it back. We were awaiting direction from
36 you guys on how you want to deal with that.

37
38 Walsh: Thinks there are some budget issues we could use some lobbying help with,
39 particularly out travel budget. Getting it through and making sure we have the ability to
40 access it. He continues with the investigator issue and asks if we build it into our fee's can
41 we provide another investigator position to help John?

42
43 Jones: Responds that it is up to the Division how investigator are assigned and offers to ask
44 the Director if we could work hiring another investigator into our fee structure and budget.

45
46 Hanson: Asks if we still have a non-voting member and if we are going to continue to
47 pursue permanent voting status for him.

48
49 Lent: States that he is working on it, but that it may take a few years.

50
51 Eriksen: Adds that Dale asked about that issue the other day and what the status of it was.
52 He notes that people may use the Legislature as a path for feedback on the General
53 Licensure issue. He reminds the Board that Canada will be in Juneau in February talking to
54 the Board about mobility and they may go to some of the Legislators.

1
2 Jones: Neil has been work with Senator Dyson.
3
4 Baker: Refers back to Maynard's comments on plot plans and thinks that we passed
5 something to take care of that in regulation.
6
7 Maynard: Responds that they also thought that the board had done a regulation change
8 and that it was no longer needed but learned about 6 months later that a Statute change
9 was needed and they are waiting for the Board to tell them how to proceed.
10
11 Baker: I thought we got a regulation change. I'm not sure where we are on that.
12
13 Chair: Harley's not here to answer and I apologize, I'm not up to...my recollection too was
14 that the regulation had changed and there wasn't any need for a Statute change. He adds
15 that there is something in the works that he can't speak to because of an investigation
16 regarding as built's and alteration thereof.
17
18 Eriksen: Notes that the General Licensure issue is a Regulation change not a Statute
19 change.
20
21 Chair: Adds that putting together an article for the APDC news letter by the next Board
22 meeting would be a good avenue to address all of the questions and asks the committed to
23 do that.
24
25 Brownfield: Responds that they have an issue each month and that he doesn't know if we
26 will be ready by next issue.
27
28 Fredeen: Asks Maynard if there is any articles coming out in their news letter regarding our
29 regulations?
30
31 Maynard: Not that I know of. I will probably put in my report that the commentary is open
32 and that this is ongoing.
33
34 Chair: Tells Brownfield that the report he did before could be edited and submitted to
35 APDC.
36
37 Brownfield: Responds that they received it but didn't read it and we can revise and resubmit
38 or whatever. But that the information is out there it just wasn't acknowledged.
39
40 Chair: So maybe just do some selective editing and submit to APDC for December' issue.
41
42 **Emeritus Status.**
43
44 Chair: That may end up being a Statute change or we kind of turned it over to Craig to look
45 into.
46
47 Brownfield: If I'm still on it Craig and I need to work together on it. Is Craig on there?
48
49 Chair: You're the Chair. The full Board is and Staff is on it.
50 **Budget committee.**
51
52 Walsh: Passes out a handout and gives the Board time to read it. He recommends we call
53 it regulatory costs instead of a budget. He explains the budget cycle and adds that the
54 general costs excluding travel over the last few cycles are about 1.4 million. Current travel

1 costs run about a hundred thousand for two years. This was based on the operations
2 managers estimate for out of state costs, it didn't include instate travel. Vern threw out an
3 estimate last night at dinner of about \$90,000 per year for both in state and out of state
4 travel. He explains that our present estimate is about double what we've had in the past
5 and that it may be because more was not included in the budget request sent to the
6 Legislature. He estimates a roll forward about \$200,000 and estimates that our fees will
7 increase to about \$250.00 for the next cycle. Very little of it will be because of travel. We
8 had a large roll forward to burn and we've done that now we've got to pay for the next cycle.
9 Of the \$250 the additional travel we are requesting is less than \$20 per registrant.

10
11 Eriksen: Asks if the increase in the travel budget is because of an increase in costs or an
12 increase in the number of people traveling?

13
14 Walsh: Explains that it is to send more people and allow for architects to attend NCEES
15 meetings and vice versa so that eventually everyone will have attended meetings of the
16 other professions and can be more involved on what the board does on a broader scale. He
17 suggests a discussion on this before the next meeting to decide on the numbers.

18
19 Eriksen: How would you summarize the benefit to the State?

20
21 Walsh: That was summarized in the memo Richard sent forward. That makes all our
22 arguments.

23
24 Eriksen: Would rather see an accurate figure than just \$100,000.

25
26 Walsh: Yes and we should get there by the February meeting. He requests anyone with
27 input get it to Vern.

28
29 Jones: Adds that we will have about \$20,000 for dues for the National Organizations and
30 about \$10,000 for exams. The only exams we have to worry about are the AKLS and two
31 divisions of the LARE. Not sure when the NCEES contract comes up next.

32
33 Baker: Would like to see it put forward with the additional cost to the licensees instead of
34 just \$100,000. He thinks it's important to show that the increase in fees is not because of
35 travel as much as because of the reduction in fees last time which was a result of an
36 accounting error that caused a large roll forward from the previous cycle.

37
38 Walsh: Thinks that we shouldn't make our pitch by saying we are expanding travel. We
39 should point out that we have been severely restricted to the point that we can't do what we
40 need to do as a Board and we need to get to that level.

41
42 Hanson: Supports Walsh's view. He points out that a lot of the Board members are on
43 National or Regional committees and the need to attend these meetings and participate to
44 get appointed to the committees. Soon they will be off the Board with no one following to
45 carry on for our Board.

46
47 Walsh: Brings up something said yesterday by Richard that we should request the
48 maximum attendance for each meeting.

49
50 Baker: Brings up supplemental appropriations and the possibility of getting more funding
51 during the Legislative session.

52
53 Chair: Adds that the Deputy Commissioner is supportive of asking the Legislature for more
54 money. I don't know what guidance to give, do you ask for 10 to get 8?

1
2 Jones: The guidance I've been given so far is to ask for what we want.

3
4 Break 1045 – 1050

5
6 Chair: Additional new business item 19

7
8 **b. Licensee failure to notify of address change.**

9
10 Chair: Could you speak to that Vern?

11
12 Jones: Explains that John was having problems tracking someone down and their address
13 was incorrect in our database. It is in Statute or Regulation that you will keep the Board
14 informed of your address and he's asking us to start enforcing it.

15
16 Chair: We'll bring that up when he comes back, if he does. Let's move to item 20.

17
18 **Agenda item 20 – Licensing Examiner Report.**

19
20 Fredeen: Points out that if we are planning to ask for a supplemental appropriation we will
21 need to do that before next meeting.

22
23 Chair: I think Dan understood that.

24
25 Walsh: No I didn't. I think the Board would benefit from hearing more about the process
26 and when we need to get some input into it.

27
28 Maynard: Explains that the supplemental is submitted in January so if the Board wants
29 another 20 thousand appropriated out of what they think is going to be roll over then they
30 need to be talking to Mr. Thayer to get it in the supplemental request.

31
32 Chair: After my conversations with Mr. Thayer I wouldn't hesitate to send him an email for
33 more appropriations.

34
35 There was a short discussion on whether to go directly to the Legislature or not. The
36 consensus was to follow the chain of command and go up through the Division.

37
38 Walsh: Who is going to be responsible for that process?

39
40 Chair: We put together an appropriations analysis together or budget whatever you want to
41 call it and submit it to Vern and have him pass it on to his superior and I can do a personnel
42 follow-up phone call to Curtis to let him know.

43
44 Jones: I'll try to figure out how much additional funds we will need to travel the way we want
45 to for the rest of this year.

46
47 Eriksen: Asks if we are going to include enforcement in the budget?

48
49 Walsh: Doesn't know yet if that is an appropriate item for us to put in our request.

50
51 Chair: Examiners report is included in your packets as item 20.

52
53 Jones: Walks through the report mentioning that in a few years the FE/FS exams will be
54 computer based and that only about 20% of engineering graduates ever obtain a license.

1 NCARB is looking at ways to extend the rolling clock. He mentions the “fun factoids”.
2
3 Kelly: Asks how useful the statistics are because of the time consuming methods required
4 to obtain them.
5
6 Hanson: Suggests there might be easier ways the Board could look into.
7
8 Jones: The program we use has been around a long time but one thing we don’t want to do
9 is what investigations did and put a new program in place that we can’t get anything out of.
10 What she is really asking is are these statistics useful?
11
12 Walsh: Finds them very useful and thinks they are worth the time spent.
13
14 Baker: Likes the fun factoids.
15
16 **Agenda item 21 – Board travel.**
17
18 Chair: CLARB spring meeting, you’re going to attend that?
19
20 Lent: Yes, I’m already ticketed.
21
22 Jones: I don’t know, I’ll have to talk to the boss about it.
23
24 Chair: Item 21 c. is Harley going to be able to attend that?
25
26 Rearick: We’re both in for the WCARB meeting. I don’t know what’s budgeted.
27
28 Jones: We have a little over \$20,000 left in out of state travel. Where these meetings are
29 dictates what it costs to get there so that’s going to determine how many people get to go to
30 each one.
31
32 Walsh: Thinks that part of when we put together the supplemental budget request we
33 should find out who would like to go.
34
35 Brownfield: Thinks we need to consider the fact that the LSA gets to attend all his meetings
36 and the architects get to attend all theirs and the engineers and surveyors get what’s left
37 over. He suggests that we submit an architect and an engineer to WCARB and NCARB
38 and an architect and engineer to the NCEES etc. He feels that it is unfair that the
39 professions with fewer members get to attend all their meetings and the engineers and
40 surveyors don’t and it should be more equitable.
41
42 Jones: We are working toward that. If we get the money we want everyone will be to go to
43 them meeting they want to attend.
44
45 Brownfield: Feels that we should make the necessity to cross over in these meetings to the
46 Legislature. He points out that we always talk of sending architects to engineer meeting and
47 vice versa but we never do it.
48
49 Walsh: Asks again for everyone to look at the table he passed out and give input on
50 whether it is adequate for cross over between the professions and if it isn’t then to make
51 recommendations.
52
53 Lent: Recommends that on the CLARB meetings, instead of saying one staff, you could say
54 one staff or one member.

1
2 Chair: NCEES Western Zone.
3
4 Hanson: The list hasn't changed since August but we had an NCEES meeting in between
5 there right? I don't understand how the list works. Do people move after they go to a
6 meeting?
7
8 Chair: They don't lose their position on the list. The list just rolls over.
9
10 Walsh: The bottom list is just a list of names the top list is the travel priority list.
11
12 Jones: The 1 through 12 are the travel priorities. 8 through 12 are those that went to
13 Denver. 7 through 12, I'm sorry.
14
15 Chair: Craig is going to WZONE because he's on top of the list. One engineer, the next
16 engineer on the list is Brian.
17
18 Jones: I put one engineer because we are going to be short on money, if you want to add
19 more...
20
21 Chair: Asks who is interested in going to Spokane? So we have 4 additional people, are
22 you interested.....
23
24 Eriksen: Would like to be on the list for one of the NCEES meetings.
25
26 Baker: Asks again about the two lists.
27
28 Chair: Explains and asks if he is interested in going?
29
30 Baker: Yes
31
32 Chair: Ok, I'm interested in going.
33
34 Walsh: If this is a wish list for the appropriation then I'm interested.
35
36 Chair: Goes around the room making a list of those interested. All engineers and
37 surveyors are interested in going. NCARB do you want to go?
38
39 Rearick: I certainly do and I'm sure Harley wants to also.
40
41 Jones: Both architects are on committees.
42
43 Chair: NCEES annual in Providence? Is there anybody that doesn't want to go? So
44 everybody wants to go to that too? Wow!
45
46 Brownfield: You asked who is available. If I had a choice I want to go to the NCEES
47 Annual not the divisional, I don't know if I have that choice.
48
49 Chair: You don't have that choice.
50
51 Eriksen: Could go to one but probably not both.
52
53 Chair: Doesn't see any reason Don couldn't put in for both meetings if he wants to.
54

1 Lent: Mentions that CLARB always wants the MBE to attend every meeting.
2
3 Chair: Again, we're just asking for availability. Let's go back to John and address updates.
4 Could you speak to that?
5
6 Savage: If the Board could remind the licensees that it's a violation not to keep their
7 address updated. Also if he sends something that is time sensitive and they don't respond
8 because we don't have their current address it's in their hands. He cites a couple cases that
9 went to the AG because the licensee didn't respond in the allotted time due to not updating
10 his address.
11
12 Chair: Suggests a brief article to APDC.
13
14 Hanson: Asks how big a problem this is.
15
16 Chair: It could be a big problem. He has already heard of a couple of instances.
17
18 Lent: Suggests we require email addresses.
19
20 Jones: Adds that the reminder could be placed on the webpage also and that it should
21 include verbiage that on time sensitive information not receiving it due to not keeping your
22 address current is not an acceptable excuse.
23
24 Kelly: Adds that we add that they can change their address by email and maybe get more
25 compliance.
26
27 Baker: Cites problems he had getting his address changed after a recent move.
28
29 Jones: Excepts part of the responsibility for that and explained that there are several
30 different places that have to be changed. I failed to change it in the CBP portal for Board
31 members and that is the one Jun uses for his mail outs to Board members.
32
33 **Agenda item 22 – Board Tasks (to do list)**
34
35 Hanson: Responds yes on the first one, I think Richard and Cliff have volunteered to be on
36 that one also. He also tried to contact Mr. Fisher and will continue to do so.
37
38 Chair: Recommends working through Carol Olson.
39
40 Walsh: First item continuing. Second item, I'm continuing to work with Harley and the rest
41 of the committee. Several to do items on the budget. I'll work with Vern to try and finalize
42 the travel budget for FY13. Do you need anything from me on this supplemental request?
43
44 Jones: I'll get together with you later.
45
46 Walsh: Adds that he will have another written recommendation at the next meeting. Asks
47 Vern to let him know if we have the ability to add funding for an investigator position.
48
49 Chair: Would modify that and try to accomplish something within the next 30 days so we
50 could we could turn that in to Vern so he can put it into the additional appropriations that the
51 Governor may approve. I don't think we need to make it a motion.
52
53 Baker: Asks when we have to have any budget request in for the following year.
54

1 Jones: By May at the latest.
2
3 Chair: Bylaws. No changes, no additions, no alterations, it's brand spanking new. The
4 Guidance Manual, we've gone over that. No comments or changes on the enforcement
5 exchanges?
6
7 Rearick: I did discuss that with some members at NCARB but I need to peel back the layers
8 now and dig a little bit deeper and John had mentioned that he doesn't have access to the
9 NCARB disciplinary database. Vern is the only one and John would like to have access so
10 I've got more work to do. My new task is to look at the definition NCARB has for emeritus
11 status. I'm on the committee with Brian to look at CEU's specifically the carry over tracking.
12 Then look at Craig's list on the general engineering.
13
14 Chair: It would be good to come up with some kind of resolution on the overlap whether
15 you call it engineer architect or something different. Harley, we don't need to go into that.
16 Eric we talked about Legislative liaison you've got a track on that.
17
18 Eriksen: Yes I talked to Dale. I did talk to Mark, he had not applied. He says it's on his to
19 do list. I have a notice to get together with John and draft some letter on fire protection.
20
21 Chair: Dan were you going to be the focal point of questions after Dennis's.... is that
22 something you would compile?
23
24 Walsh: I'll try to get some general questions.
25
26 Chair: I'm 90% certain that every time Neil brought that up the criteria was that you would
27 have to be licensed and practicing for 10 years. And as you know Dennis noted that he had
28 only been licensed for 6 years. That might have been an issue.
29
30 Walsh: Probably all of should go to their website, pull up the application form and look at it.
31
32 Chair: Input on specialty contractors?
33
34 Fredeen: That's going to continue on.
35
36 Chair: The letter to Ms. Holmgren is done. The Statute change.
37
38 Fredeen: I have new items, working with the General Licensure Task Force regarding the
39 FAQ questions as well as discipline specific identification on stamps. I also am going to be
40 looking into NCEES's definition of emeritus status. And the Guidance Manual Verbiage for
41 sealing as built permits.
42
43 Chair: Brian was going to look at that too as I recall. OK, I think Cliff the update is done on
44 the spread sheet. You need to prepare a cover letter and maybe you could submit that to
45 APDC also.
46
47 Baker: I'll be working with Brian on the CEU's and then also I want to review the
48 terminology on the as built description that you have for survey as built in the Manual. I was
49 also going to get a copy of UAA's survey and address their results as well.
50
51 Chair: Vern did we miss anything?
52
53 Jones: The Indiana thing I've talked about. The enforcement exchange, I haven't altered it
54 yet but I have print outs theirs and ours and know which ones need to be added. I have to

1 make sure the individuals were notified that it would be placed on the National exchange.
2 Then I have four letters to answer. I need to revise our letter we send out regarding
3 continuing education. Update our enforcement webpage. Check with Director about
4 funding an investigator position and work with him on the supplemental appropriation. If you
5 remember the certificate we did for Ginger, we are going to do one for Jenny.

6
7 Chair: She was a strong advocate for this Board through the years so recognition would be
8 appropriate.

9
10 Chair: Add to Bo's list a cover letter to APDC regarding General Licensure as soon as
11 possible. Maybe that's a misnomer, calling it General Licensure. Anything else? Do we
12 want to go over the Calendar before I entertain a motion?

13
14 Jones: Do we want to set a date for the May meeting?

15
16 Baker: I need to be excused from the February meeting because I'll be in Thailand.

17
18 Jones: Actually we've already set a date for the May meeting, how about August?

19
20 Chair: Cliff do you need some formal action? You're excused. August we have the 11th how
21 does the 11th and 12th sound?

22
23 Eriksen: I have a board meeting the first week or two in August it isn't scheduled yet so it
24 may be a conflict again. It should be scheduled shortly after the December meeting.

25
26 Lent: Is there extra expense to have the meeting in Wasilla?

27
28 Chair: Yes. Cliff are you ready?

29
30 **Agenda item 24 – Read applicants into the record.**

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

33
34 **RESOLVED to approve the following list of applicants for registration by comity and**
35 **examination with the stipulation that the information in the applicant's files will take**
36 **precedence over the information in the minutes:**

37
38 *The subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*
39 *meanings:*

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

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

42 'AKLS' refers to the Alaska Land Surveyors Examination

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

45 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

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

47

Johnson, Brian Pelton	Architect	Comity	Approved
Kurtz, Daniel A.	Architect	Comity	Approved
Lewis, Reed Evan	Architect	Comity	Approved
Jaleski, Thomas M.	Architect	Comity	Approved – conditional upon 2 more architect references
Lucking, James B.	Architect	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Semling, Gary M.	Architect	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Petter, Tara A.	Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional upon NCARB green book; passing the A.R.E.; JQ & Arctic course
Incarnato, Kathryn E.	Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing ncarb green book; passing the A.R.E.; JQ & Arctic course
Pfau, Sara Marie	Architect	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing the A.R.E.
Chaudhury, Emily Camille	Architect	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing the A.R.E.; JQ & Arctic course
Prouty, Matthew Steven	Architect	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing the A.R.E.; JQ & Arctic course
Manhire, Suzanne E.	Architect	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing the ARE & JQ
Goodfriend, Erik	Architect	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verifying reference's reg #
Jarvi, George Albert	Chemical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Becker, Herbert L.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Behrent, Darrel C.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Hill, Richard D.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Kovacs, John William	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved

Krums, Arthur J.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Mills, Scott Vincent	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Quire, Robert Scott	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Spencer, Michael Austin	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Stone, David Michael	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Turner, Daniel P.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Wilson, Edward O.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
McCormick, David	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic course
Mueller, Keith Michael	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic course
Shine, Michael E.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic course
Storch, Craig Werner	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic course
Ungerer, Joseph Donald	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic course
Applegate, Russell Evans	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic course
McAlpin, Angela Parker	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic course
Sommer, Brockton C.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Broadhead, Brett R.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Chibber, Paramjit	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Dillow, David M.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Duryea, Peter Douglas	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Hyland, Michael Paul	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Kropelnicki, Jesse J.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ

Robert Lund	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Sergeant, Pamela McMath	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Steputat, Christian C.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Zhao, Zhongliang	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Esho, Luay	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ & Arctic course
Cochrane, Eugene S.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ & Arctic course
Liegl, Jason A.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ & Arctic course
Miller, Nicholas	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ & Arctic course
Tizard, Geoffrey A.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of current licensure; & Arctic course
Moyers, Sarah S.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE
Dent, Michael C.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE & PE – Civil
Cuffle, Clint Ryan	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE & PE; 2 additional mos responsible charge experience; current licensure; JQ & Arctic course
Maddox, Richard Allen	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE & PE; current licensure; & Arctic course
Nepf, Hans J.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE & PE-Civil; verification of registration; degree transcripts; & JQ
Neuffer, Daniel Paul	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE; & JQ
Templeton, James C.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE; JQ & Arctic course
Morales, Enrique J.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of reference’s current

			licensure; JQ & Arctic course
Walker, Peter Lorentzo	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – pending verification that license remains current
Adamczak, Daniel S.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon 4.5 mos additional experience; passing PE – Civil; & JQ
Schwiesow, Hanni J.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Reichardt, Daniel Aaron	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing PE – Civil
Oshnack, Jeffrey William	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing PE – Civil; JQ & Arctic course
Voorhees, Eric M.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing PE – Civil; JQ & verification of Arctic
Nedom, Matthew N.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon transcripts; verification of FE; passing PE – Civil; & JQ
Cheesbrough, Kyle S.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE; passing PE – Civil; & JQ
Farneski, Robert B.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE; passing PE – Civil; & JQ
Cotton, Jr., David C.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Nguyen, Quan Thanh	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Cizek, Joseph A.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Singaraju, Trivkram Srinivas	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Amini, Ali	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic course
Robbins, Todd E.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Morris, III, Melvan E.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon JQ & Arctic course
Gemayel, Michelle G.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon transcripts; verification of FE & PE

			exams; current licensure; JQ & Arctic course
Day, Scott C.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE & PE exams; current licensure; & JQ & Arctic course
Ralphs, Dean C.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of PE exam; current licensure; & JQ
Helms, Sheldon J.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon; verification of PE exam & current licensure; JQ & Arctic course
Busch-Vold, Aaron James	Electrical Engineer	<u>Exam</u>	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Electrical; & JQ
Helms, Sheldon J.	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Electrical; & JQ
Sharp, Dennis P.	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing PE-Electrical; & JQ
Kelly, Shannon Marie	FE	Exam	Approved
Pike, Kevin William	FE	Exam	Approved
Siok, Christopher Neal	FE	Exam	Approved
Scanlon, Dennis P.	Mechanical Comity	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE
Fetterly, Robert S.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Robinson, Keith D.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Arellano, Renato Hidalgo	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon FE; & JQ
Naess, Oyvind	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Bunton, Roger D.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Mullinex, William J.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Hernandez, Sandra E.	Mechanical Engineer	<u>Exam</u>	Approved – conditional upon passing PE-Mechanical; & JQ
Krzykowski, Brian J.	Mechanical	Exam	Approved - conditional upon passing

	Engineer		the PE-Mech
Huandra, Rusli	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE & PE- Mechanical exams; current licensure; & JQ
Fetterly, Robert S.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE & PE-Mechanical exams; degree transcripts; current licensure; & JQ

1
2 Chair: Having read those into the record, any further discussion? All those in favor signify
3 by saying aye. Opposed? Abstentions? It's so moved.

4
5 Motion passed unanimously.

6
7 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Fredeen it was**

8
9 **RESOLVED to find the following list of applicants for registration by comity and**
10 **examination incomplete**

Elliott, Lynn Edward	Architect	Comity	Incomplete – NCARB blue book; 2 more references; JQ; education
Kozodoy, Yuriy P.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Incomplete – per 12AAC.36.105 (b)1, does not meet educational requirement
Ross, Robert A.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Incomplete – requires 24 mos responsible charge experience verified on AK form
Agrimis, Paul D.	Landscape Architect	Comity	Incomplete – requires 48 mos experience under an LA & 3 references for LA; JQ & LARE
Stielstra, Matthew Clark	Civil Engineer	Exam	Incomplete – requires additional 25 mos experience.
Cheesbrough, Julie M.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Incomplete? – requires 3 mos add'l experience thru July 2011; degree transcripts; verification of FE; passing PE – Mech; & JQ

11
12
13 Chair: Having read those into the record is there any further discussion? All those in favor
14 signify by saying aye. Opposed, abstentions? Hearing none the motion passes.

15
16 Motion passed unanimously.

17
18 Chair: Is there anything left on the agenda that I've missed. We need to collect any travel
19 receipts if you have those available right now.

1 Jones: If you have your itineraries I need the copy with the total cost on it. If I submit an
2 itinerary that doesn't have the cost on it, that's what they are going to give you, nothing.
3
4 Chair: Let's start with staff comments just because I want to be different.
5
6 Jones: Was surprised and relieved at how smooth this meeting went. I was expecting the
7 public comment to take considerably longer than it did. He felt it was a good meeting and a
8 lot was accomplished.
9
10 Kelly: Looks forward to being able to tell structural engineers that they can apply and that
11 trying to explain why they can't is tough.
12
13 Walsh: Thanks the staff for their support. Thanks everyone for a good discussion.
14
15 Lent: Thanks the chair for keeping things moving and the staff for their help.
16
17 Rearick: Felt the meeting was as spirited as he thought it would be and he appreciated
18 everyone passion and honesty and he felt it was an especially good meeting.
19
20 Shiesl: Also felt it was a great meeting and he learned a lot about the problems with
21 General Licensure. He also thanks staff for their support.
22
23 Eriksen: Is impressed with the dedication and respect of everyone here in dealing with
24 these passionate items and hopefully this reflects on our commitment to the HSW of the
25 public.
26
27 Hanson: I think it was a good meeting and I'll leave it at that.
28
29 Chair: Cliff was excused earlier, he had meeting he had to attend.
30
31 Fredeen: He thinks it was a great meeting and glad to see we are moving forward and
32 responsive to the concerns of the public about what the Board is doing. He hopes the public
33 sees that also.
34
35 Brownfield: Ditto.
36
37 Chair: Apologizes for any mental lapses he may have had during the meeting. He feels we
38 are on the right track and is not discouraged, especially with General Licensure which is
39 being called that for lack of a better term but the Board is moving in a direction that is
40 appropriate. Hopefully the regulation we are proposing as far as the table change for
41 becoming a licensed land surveyor might end up being a fire storm all to itself so I guess if
42 we've got one forest fire going we might as well start another one and see how things burn
43 out. I enjoy these meetings and it is exhausting.
44
45 Brownfield: Offers a ride to the airport to anyone needing one.
46
47 Chair: Thank you Bo and with that I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
48
49 **On a motion duly made by Brownfield, seconded by Walsh it was**
50
51 **Resolved to adjourn.**
52
53 Motion passed unanimously.
54

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

1200 Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

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

Date: _____