

1 **STATE OF ALASKA**

2
3 **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC**
4 **DEVELOPMENT**
5 **DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING**
6 **BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS & LAND**
7 **SURVEYORS**

8
9 **Minutes of Meeting**
10 **May 5-6, 2011**

11
12 By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6,
13 the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors held a meeting May
14 5-6, 2011 at 550 W. 7th Avenue, Anchorage, AK in Suite 1760.

15
16 **Thursday May 5, 2011**

17
18 **Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Roll Call**

19
20 The Chair called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

21
22 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

- 23
24
- 25 • Richard Heieren, Land Surveyor, Chair
 - 26 • Clifford Baker, Land Surveyor, Secretary
 - 27 • Donald Shiesl, Public Member
 - 28 • Burdett Lent, Landscape Architect
 - 29 • Daniel Walsh, Mining Engineer
 - 30 • Harley Hightower, Architect
 - 31 • Brian Hanson, Civil Engineer
 - 32 • Craig Fredeen, Mechanical Engineer
 - 33 • Eric Eriksen, Electrical Engineer
 - 34 • Richard Rearick, Architect

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

- 36
37
- 38 • Don Habeger, Director, (via telephone).
 - 39 • Cathy Mason, Administrative Officer, (via telephone).
 - 40 • Jun Maiquis, Regulations Specialist, (via telephone).
 - 41 • Vern Jones, Executive Administrator
 - 42 • Alicia Kelly, Licensing Examiner
 - 43 • John Savage, Investigator

44 Representing the Department Law, was:

- 45
46
- 47 • Gayle Horetski, AAG, (via telephone).

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

- 49
50
- 51 • Michael Schoder, P.S., representing himself
 - 52 • Greg Latreille, P.E., representing ASPE
 - Steven Halcomb, representing himself

- Joseph Nelson, PE representing himself
- Colin Maynard, PE representing himself

Roll Call – All present except for Brownfield.

Agenda Item 2 – Review/Amend Agenda

Baker: Passed out a revision for item 7a.

Shiesl: Wants to leave at 6pm.

Fredeen: Handed out a paper with a reg project re fire protection exemption.

Chair: Let's put under 7c.

Jones: Added some more correspondence to add. He adds that the Director wants to be called tomorrow when travel is discussed. Also Karen Wilke wants to be called at 10:45 re CE fines.

Chair: So that will be 16b.

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

RESOLVED to approve the agenda as amended.

Motion passed unanimously

Agenda item 3 – Ethics reporting

Chair: Anyone have anything to report?

Fredeen: Asks if the regulation changes that are going back out for public notice that were adopted last meeting still needed to be reported as probable ethics problems?

Jones: The engineering regulations regarding the new branches are going back out because of edits.

Chair: A declaration and ruling should be made at the time of adoption. You can recuse or whatever, let your conscience be your guide.

Agenda item 4 – Review and approve minutes from February 2011 meeting.

Hanson: Question on page 80 at the top it says verification of education under one of the candidates that was conditional and I thought the board had to approve education.

Jones: It depends, if it's a degree we can approve it but if it's less than a degree we will bring it back to the board.

Hightower: Compliments staff on the minutes. It's a good job.

Hanson: on 84 and 85 we had two abstentions on the consent agreements and I think we should name them.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

Jones: It was Harley and Bo on both.

Lent: States that he was ask by the chair to address environmental engineering and he thought it should be on about page 92.

Jones: Those assignments are on the to-do list in the new agenda. If you look at the to-do list you'll see environmental under your name.

Chair: It's taken care of.

On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Rearick it was

RESOLVED to approve the minutes from the February 2011 meeting as amended.

Motion passed unanimously.

Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report

Savage: Asks if everyone got a Board Report? (laughter) He reports that they are at a standstill as far as the AG goes. If anyone needs anything from them they have to go through Vern or Quinten. There are no shortage of cases coming in. There is a tremendous amount of out of state work coming in and the Fire Marshalls office is helping by cueing him to plans without the proper stamps or out of state stamps.

Lent: Asks about putting a complaint form in the back of the Guidance Manual.

Savage: Asks him not to do that. The only instructions given should be to contact me. I'll sent them a complaint form and instructions.

Walsh: What's up with the AG's office, are they just busy?

Savage: It's due to money, to funding.

Hightower: Does that mean they can't charge time to our projects during this time?

Savage: I certainly hope that's what it means. Notes that he presented his chief with a list of what's over there and the last contact he had with them to ensure there are no more billable hours since they were told no more projects.

Hightower: Is there any way we can track that?

Savage: I believe so, I think the chief gets a quarterly or monthly printout of what we are being billed. I don't know who can be privy to that, Vern to you know?

Jones: We can always get the figures from Cathy Mason. The Director stopped all new projects with Law. She can finish our regulation project that is already being worked on but nothing new until after the end of the FY.

Baker: Asks if there is recourse on cases where no action is taken?

Savage: States that they can file a civil action or FOIA request. These are the only two avenues they have.

1 Chair: Any further questions?
2

3 **Agenda item 7 – Regulation Update**
4

5 A) 12 AAC 36.064/12 AAC 36.065 Eligibility for Surveyor exams.
6

7 Chair: Lets go through these. (The Chair paused for 30 sec or so between each to give the
8 Board time to read and respond if they wanted to) First is Ryan Rencehausen. Next is
9 Roger Imhoff.

10
11 Hanson: Doesn't believe the first sentence is factual based on the amount of time the Board
12 has had this issue on the street.
13

14 Chair: Next is Michael Schoder. Next is Gary Nelson. Anyone stop me if they want to talk
15 about any correspondence we have here. Next is Tim Mullikin. Next is Rickey Bennett.
16 Next is Don Mullikin. Next is Eric Stahlke. Next is Bob Keiner. Next is Eric Fuglestad, he
17 attached the Michael Schoder letter. Next is John Pearson. Next is Kevin Eischens. Next
18 is William Preston. Next is Stan Brown. Next is another email with information and
19 correspondence from Bill Hazelton and Michael Schoder.
20

21 Hanson: Comments that information on page three implies that this individual had access to
22 the Board outside of the public arena.
23

24 Chair: I personally have talked to a lot of people. To me it's never been exclusive. Any
25 other comments. This is information that was sent to me and I forwarded it to Jun (it's an
26 email from Bill Hazelton dated Feb 10, 2011). Next is Max Schillinger. Next is Dave Hale.
27 Next is Thomas Newman. Next is Don Mullikin. Next is James Green. Next is Francis
28 Corning. Next is Kenneth Ayers.
29

30 Walsh: Could we go back to Francis Corning? She states these regulation changes are not
31 supported by the ASPLS as written at this time. Is that accurate?
32

33 There was a short discussion pointing out that there was a group of emails with the same
34 comment asking for postponement of the changes.
35

36 Chair: That is the second Ken Ayers correspondence as ASPLS President with a letter from
37 the State Society. Questions, comments? Next is Gerald Jennings. Next is Gene LeQuire.
38

39 Fredeen: Questions taking the LSIT first then taking a two years course of study. He asks if
40 there is a difference between the way the engineers do it and this?
41

42 Baker: The regulations allow someone with 75% to take the FS just like the engineers.
43

44 Fredeen: But they would not be able to sit for the exam unless they were 75% complete?
45

46 Baker: Yes. I'm not sure we can change that. We are not changing the 75% clause we are
47 just changing the tables.
48

49 Chair: Next is Joe Burch. Next is Richard Gray. Next is Elaine Gray. Next is from Amy
50 Orange-Posma. Next is from Christopher Mullikin. Next is from Mark Hall. Next is from
51 Steve Tolan. Next is from Daniel Clark. Next is from Scott Sexton. Next is from Nils
52 Degerlund. Next is from James Sharp. Next is from Timothy Sprout. Next is from Stan
53 Sears I might add that Stanley Sears and Ken Ayers both gave testimony at our Juneau
54 meeting. Next is from Lindsey Vaughan. Next is from Patrick Kalen. Next is from Claud

1 Hoffman, any comments. With that let's jump back to item 6 and call Cathy Mason.
2
3 Placed a call to Cathy but she was not in her office. We will try again in about 15 min.
4
5 Jones: Draws attention to a letter in new correspondence regarding the Geomatics
6 curriculum at UAA.
7
8 Baker: Not sure that's a comment under the proposed regulation.
9
10 Chair: Any comments or questions?
11
12 Fredeen: Notes that they reduced calculus to one course and he remembers seeing
13 comments about a 3 course requirement. Would this program not be sufficient? Are 3
14 courses in calculus required?
15
16 Chair: Point duly taken.
17
18 There was a short discussion on math and science requirements.
19
20 Baker: Notes that taking the exam at 75% of a degree is not changing. He wants to change
21 the implementation date to two years after the Lt. Gov. signs the regulation. He notes that
22 once the applicant gets an application approved by the Board they have 5 years or 5 exams
23 to pass the exam under the old rules so if they wait until just before the new tables take
24 effect two years from when the Lt. Gov. signs them that, in effect, is seven years under the
25 old tables.
26
27 Break from this discussion to call Cathy Mason for the expenditure report.
28
29 Mason: Reports that we are 9/12 through the year. Revenue so far is \$156,552 and your
30 expenses \$182,210 you have \$35,826 in travel and whatever this board meeting is will be
31 added to that. This report is as of April 21st so we go back a couple weeks. Contractual so
32 far is \$57,544, supplies is \$1,895. It looks like you're doing pretty good. You're right in line
33 with previous years so I think you're doing really well. Your indirect expenses are \$223,675
34 and total expenses so far are \$501,150 of course this is your down year so your annual
35 surplus deficit you're running a deficit of \$344,598. But your cumulative surplus at the
36 beginning of the year was \$952,630 so you still have a cumulative surplus so this year of
37 \$608.062. You're looking good. Are there any questions.
38
39 Walsh: Asks when she wants to complete the fee setting process.
40
41 Mason: Expecting to get started next month.
42
43 Walsh: Tells her she can expect to see something from the Board regarding fees.
44
45 Mason: Advises that if the Board knows of anything coming up next FY to let her know.
46
47 Chair: Tells her that Board travel will be the biggest issue we are dealing with.
48
49 Baker: Asks if we could put travel in the fee structure so it could be identified as for Board
50 travel?
51
52 Mason: Responds that all revenue that comes in from Board fees is AELS revenue. She
53 adds that AELS is not a budgeting unit. The money is allocated to the Division and AELS
54 expenses and the expenses of rest of the Division come out of the allocation.

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

Baker: Repeats the question.

Mason: States that that is a Director question. She then explains the budgeting process and that the Legislature has to authorize spending through allocating funds to the Division. The Division gets the money and then decides where to spend it.

Hanson: So right now we have \$600,000 in the bank but we can't spend it?

Mason: Right.

Jones: Adds that the Director is going to talk with the Board about this tomorrow.

Rearick: Asks if we will have to reduce fees and what is an acceptable overage to maintain.

Mason: Answers that Boards are supposed to meet their expenses through their fees and it should be as close to zero as possible.

Chair: Thanks Cathy for her report.

Break 11:15a.m. – 11:25a.m.

Chair: We were on a review of the regulations 12 AAC 36.064 – 065. We were on page one.

Baker: Asks if anyone had any question on what he had covered earlier.

Hanson: Questions the need for the 5 years or 5 tries language since it's already in 12 AAC 36.040 Simplified Application for Reexamination.

The discussion continued for a few more minutes which resulted in a removal of that verbiage.

Chair: Let's hold the conversation and call Gayle. (Called AAG Gayle Horetski)

Horetski: Introduces herself to the Board and adds that Jun Maiquis is also there. She asks if the Board looked at the three documents. (The Board indicates that all had reviewed them). She then explained her changes, how she split the project and why and the Boards options regarding the regulation changes. She advises the first part can be readopted and since she has already reviewed them if the Board has no changes they can go to law and then on to the Lt. Gov. for signature. The second part (engineering branches) has edits that the Board need to discuss and then can be re-public noticed because there is are two new regulations, 12 AAC 36.106 (grandfathering) and 12 AAC 36.205 (Scope of Practice) that have been added as part of the package. She explains that she is worried that someone coming in under one of the new branches such as structural would contend that a civil engineer could no longer do structural.

Hanson: Interrupts and says that he thought that is exactly what the Board intended.

Horetski: That is exactly the opposite of what I understood.

Hanson: States that his impression was that if a civil wanted to practice structural he had to be grandfathered or take the new exam.

1 Chair: Explains that if a civil wants to continue what he has been doing as a civil he can. If
2 he wants to call himself a structural engineer he has to go through the licensing process to
3 get that title. He points out that the civil engineering branch allows a limited amount of
4 structural engineering.

5
6 Hanson: It allows full structural, I could design a 40 story building and if I'm reading this
7 correct I still can after it goes into effect so we don't need the additional branch.

8
9 Baker: Reiterates that they can advertise as a civil that does structural but not as a
10 structural engineer.

11
12 The conversation continues along this lines for a short time.

13
14 Fredeen: Adds that this ensures that people can continue to do what they are doing today
15 with the license they have today. What this does is open the door for comity applicants that
16 have taken the structural or environmental exams to be licensed in their chosen field.

17
18 The discussion continued for a few more minutes along the same lines.

19
20 Chair: Asks the AAG for clarification on what the Board's options are.

21
22 Horetski: Reiterates that the section one can be readopted and go via the Dept of Law to
23 the Lt. Gov for signature. But that since there are new regulations included in the part two it
24 needs to go out as a package for public notice. She then asks about whether or not the
25 Board is ready with a regulation on incidental practice that could be added to this. She then
26 points out that AS 08.48.281 doesn't say anything about specific branches. It says if you're
27 not an engineer you can't say you are but that's all. We have to be careful about advertising
28 because it raises a lot of 1st amendment issues. This new project can go out to public
29 comment once the Board is happy with it. You can change things or reword it. It doesn't
30 have to go out now you can work on it and wait until next meeting, it's up to the Board.

31
32 Chair: Thank you Gayle.

33
34 Fredeen: States that he thought we were going to get the branches approved and then do
35 separate regulation projects for the grandfathering and implementation issues. He
36 disagrees that the part that was previously adopted has to go out to the public again as one
37 big package. He wants to know why we can't send what we adopted at last meeting to the
38 Lt. Gov. for signature if law has approved it.

39
40 Horetski: The Dept of Law has approved the first part of that regulation dated 4/27/11. I
41 have not approved the regulations dated 4/28/11 in that revised draft. She states that in her
42 view it's not appropriate for the Board to create new branches without addressing these
43 issues we are discussing this morning. This is an important public policy decision and
44 needs to be clear when the new branches take effect.

45
46 Baker: Asks if the public should have another opportunity to address the architectural
47 engineer issue since he has had several engineers object to its removal.

48
49 Chair: Informs him he could offer it as an amendment if he likes. He then thanks Gayle for
50 all her help on this project and her timely review of the changes the board submitted. He
51 thanks Jun for his input.

52
53 Walsh: Questions her previous comments on advertising and uses the example of an
54 electrical engineer advertising as something else.

1
2 Horetski: In general I would agree because a person can't falsely claim to hold credentials
3 that he doesn't in fact have. She points out that the question was about a civil engineer
4 advertising as a structural engineer and that it would be ok because it was within the scope
5 of their practice.

6
7 Chair: Again thanks Gayle and Jun for their participation.

8
9 Horetski: Offers to be available later today and tomorrow if any additional changes are
10 needed.

11
12 Chair: Asks if they want to go to lunch at noon or wait a while. Let's revert back to the
13 surveying change.

14
15 A short discussion regarding the effective date of 2012 for the new tables continued. It was
16 decided to make it at the end of the FY in the year it becomes effective.

17
18 Chair: Points out that if you apply under the existing tables that they could be conditionally
19 approved and thinks it appropriate that people understand that. He asks if there is language
20 that could be put in the regulation that would clarify that?

21
22 A discussion followed on conditional approval for the examination to remain under the old
23 regulations while they obtain the necessary credits.

24
25 Fredeen: Points out that the five year clock starts as soon as conditionally approved.

26
27 The discussion continued centered on if the FS application counted as getting them under
28 the wire for the old tables. It was decided that the FS and PS applications are separate
29 applications and they should apply for both exams at the same time.

30
31 Fredeen: Asks what portion of the applicants file the Board has to review and couldn't be
32 conditionally approved.

33
34 Jones: It's the same as the engineers. The Board has to see and approve experience and
35 transcripts that are less than a degree.

36
37 Discussion continued on what could be conditionally approved and if something
38 conditionally approved would have to be brought back to the board. The result was that it
39 could be brought back to the Board even if conditionally approved in cases where course
40 work was the issue.

41
42 Chair: Go to page two.

43
44 Baker: Thinks that any four year surveying course should get full credit even if not ABET
45 accredited. He also feels that is someone has a four year degree in something like civil
46 engineering and then goes and gets the core surveying credits so he added some credit and
47 lowered the number years of experience required.

48
49 Chair: Clears up some confusion on which table is presently effective and the
50 implementation dates.

51
52 Baker: Notes that on page three he is trying to address some of the comments received.

53
54 Discussion followed on the number of credits for math and science in the geomatics degree

1 and which courses would count under the regulation change. This discussion centered
2 around the wording “first year” courses and the difference between surveying degrees and
3 course work to supplement a non-surveying degree. The result of the discussion was that
4 12 AAC 36.064 (d)(1) was changed to read “(1) at least 12 semester credits or equivalent for
5 mathematics and basic college level science courses: must include calculus physics and
6 statistics;”.

7
8 The discussion then shifted to (d)(2). Cliff had lowered the number of credits from 50 to 48.
9 Some thought 24 would be the correct number. It was determined that with a 4 year degree
10 and associates in surveying would qualify. Also someone with a degree in engineering with
11 a minor in surveying would qualify for the exam. There was a lot of discussion on whether it
12 should be 24 or more. In subparagraph (d)(2) the number of credits required was reduced
13 to 30 from 50. These same changes were applied to 12 AAC 36.065 (h)(1) and (2).

14
15 On page four the same changes were made in the implementation date.

16
17 On page five the graduate of a 4 yr degree with approved courses in LS was left at 2 and 6
18 because of the decrease in number of credits to 30.

19
20 Break 1:10p.m. – 1:15p.m.

21
22 **Agenda item 8 – Public Comment.**

23
24 Chair: The first on the list is Mr. Michael Schoder.

25
26 Mr. Schoder. Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, my name is Michael
27 Schoder. I’m here today representing myself solely not my Federal survey authority,
28 employer or past relationships with professional societies. I just came today to watch some
29 of the deliberations on the Statute or the Regulations you were recently deliberating on.
30 And also maybe to provide some concerns I have and explanation on emails introduced in
31 the packet since your last board meeting. It causes me great concern in some of the
32 background on that. On Thursday February 4th you were deliberating on these regulations.
33 I received personally a phone call late that night, maybe 10 o’clock from a representative of
34 the University of Alaska lambasting me personally, obviously tainted toward the testimony
35 that I brought to you, and I should have as a member of the public and a licensee, towards
36 the regulations. And when the public can’t have the opportunity to make their comments and
37 have someone that it looks like have a vested interest in this, that represents the University
38 lambast me that I’m against these regulations, I’m against the University of Alaska, and I
39 won’t provide you anymore details, I did not forward those. And then a week later when it
40 started that my testimony was what was distributed and there was a campaign that looked
41 like it was going to attack me personally, my professional credibility. It’s of great concern
42 that that comes out of the deliberations of this board. I know it wasn’t in your control but,
43 something becomes a mess when we have this perception that there’s other non-public
44 perceived workings of people outside the board that seem to have a vested interest in these
45 regulation changes. And it’s not only I. I have my personal experience and I didn’t want a
46 ball of emails. I finally had a discussion with professor Hazleton and I understand their
47 points and that’s good but we should all be doing it in a public forum and through this board.
48 I don’t know if other registrants that wrote letters into the board got similar calls lobbying
49 against our positions in opposition to a regulation change, that shouldn’t be happening so I
50 just wanted to present that and I do really feel strongly about my positions. You can tell that
51 in my emotions, probably, here today. I think they’re well documented and I’m open to the
52 other side as well. You can tell by the testimony among the registrants. The last thing I
53 would like to say is if you’re putting your eggs in a basket of education only, look at the
54 educators. I brought that up AS 08.48.341 (13) defines the practice of land surveying

1 teaching at an institute of higher education. You're talking about credit hours taught by non-
2 licensees. This current curriculum that comes today has got 78 hours that's not math,
3 science, general education. Out of that there's 8 hours, two courses, that are boundary
4 surveying but it is teaching surveying in higher education without licensed people. Where is
5 the tutorage, the equivalent of the supervision by a supervising land surveyor? And that's
6 what the regulations prevent. I encourage, and I talked to professor Hanson, he had a
7 thousand reasons why he couldn't get registered. I said, did you put in an application for the
8 board? No. I said how can you tell you're judged. And I think they should and we have had
9 it in the past. There has been at least one registrant. Here you've got a University that's got
10 no registrants. And you're talking about what they will teaching to our people and with that
11 I'll end my testimony. I hope you work out the right deliberations, there are a lot of eyes
12 watching and there's a lot of concern and I guess I would like to see what comes out of
13 ASPLS, if they can build a consensus there, it's a difficult task so with that I'll end and if
14 there's any questions I'll be glad to answer them.

15
16 Chair: Thank you Michael. Greg Latreille.

17
18 Mr. Latreille: I'm here representing the Alaska Society of Professional Engineers, I'm the
19 immediate past president of the organization. I'm here to voice some comments and some
20 questions basically that have been developed among the current board of directors
21 specifically the President, Michael Dean, who's not able to be here today. I'm basically
22 going to be voicing some highlights of this letter that I'll be submitting to this board
23 afterwards on his behalf. I think he's sending it separately but I figure I'm here so I can just
24 hand it over. This deal's with the recently passed regulation that changed some of the
25 definitions of professional engineering registration in the State of Alaska specifically adding
26 the definitions of several new branches of engineering that go outside the traditional six. So
27 what we would like to voice as the Alaska Society of Professional Engineers is the fact that
28 none of those regulations have been passed. The method in which those regulations are
29 implemented is every bit as important as the regulations themselves. So going through and
30 figuring out the questions of how people who are practicing, in specific cases of a branch of
31 engineering that fell under a different more broad branch that previously was recognized.
32 We all know the examples, environmental engineering falling under civil etc. How do the
33 new regulations cause changes in the way engineering is practiced within the State? And
34 so what we would like to see is we would like to see a process that involves public
35 conversation, public opinion and works that into the approval process of the implementation
36 of these regulations as opposed to coming up with a method of putting those regulation into
37 effect without consulting what people's opinions are and how it should be put into effect.
38 Some of the issues that we feel that it should address of course how new registrants are
39 going to be able to obtain their licenses. But, also how people that have been practicing
40 these fields for years and years get to be able to advertise themselves, what they use as
41 their title, if there is some sort of grandfathering process or if there is just some
42 recertification process. However it works out, we would just like the chance to be able
43 comment on what the board comes up with as a proposed way of putting this into effect
44 before, all of a sudden it basically hits the streets and people have to deal with it. And so we
45 all know that there is unintended and unforeseen consequences of things that are difficult to
46 pinpoint until it comes up. But I think going to a public comment period on this would be one
47 of the better ways to try and catch those before they occur. Public health and welfare is the
48 top priority but it's also very important to insure that these regulation changes don't hinder or
49 hurt people from practicing within their area of expertise. Because I don't think that was the
50 intended effect of any of it. So even if it comes to a point what somebody can use as a title,
51 that could potentially have a very large effect on what kind of work they're able to get and
52 how they're able to make their livelihood. So we would just like to be involved in the
53 conversation.

1 Chair: Thank you Greg. I wouldn't mind Brian or Craig if you addressed that very quickly or
2 would you like me to do that? I'll do it. We are going to be re-advertising this for public input
3 and dealing with exactly the issues you're speaking too. So I just thought I'd make that
4 clear. It will be out for public notice again. Steven Holcomb, are you just observing or
5 testifying?
6

7 Mr. Holcomb: I would like to just observe. I just took the PE and you guys have my
8 application and everything but I talked to Alicia, it's nice see a face not just on the telephone.
9 I was just curious about the process and what goes on with this board. I'm very new to the
10 game.
11

12 Chair: Thank you Steven. Joseph Nelson.
13

14 Mr. Nelson: I'm not testifying per se, sir's, I'm a practicing engineer with Flint Hills Resources
15 Alaska up in North Pole. And Mr. Jones kindly allowed me to come here and make a brief
16 appeal on my own behalf. I brought copies of what I'm going to say. It's only one page with
17 attachment. Please if you have a chance, look at them. As I said I'm an engineer, I live in
18 Fairbanks, I'm an Alaska resident, Alaska voter, I'm a student at the Alaska University a
19 member of the Alaska work force and a professional engineer. I'm registered in eleven
20 states as a professional engineer. I maintain active registration in seven of those states.
21 Four have lapsed over the years because of lack of work I guess. I'm registered in Iowa as
22 an environmental engineer by examination, I'm registered in Nebraska as a chemical
23 engineer I'm registered in Arizona as a petroleum engineer. I've been seeking registration
24 as an engineer in Alaska and I wish to publicly thank Alicia for all of the help she's been to
25 me in helping me through this process but I did feel that it wasn't going quite the way I was
26 hoping so I thought if I could indulge the board for just a few minutes I could at least plead
27 my case to you. I have 42 years of engineering experience. I've had 26 years post PE in
28 responsible charge including as Vice President of Black and Veatch, as an employee of
29 CH2M Hill, as an employee of Shaw Group, all in the lower 48 by the way. Now I am now a
30 permanent resident of Alaska work in Alaska as an engineer for Flint Hills up at the refinery
31 in North Pole. I believe that in reviewing the regulations, and I've brought my annotated
32 copy for anyone's reference, though I'm sure you're well versed in those yourselves, that I
33 meet all the requirements for registration in Alaska by comity. I believe that I have submitted
34 and provided documentation of all of the necessary paperwork including taking the arctic
35 engineering class up at UAF and passing the course, providing professional references,
36 providing copies of transcripts of my degree and such as well as previous registrations by
37 the NCEES examination in Indiana where I took my professional engineers exam consisting
38 of 8 hours of written, EIT we called it then and FE I guess it is today, and the PE to follow.
39 The point that I'm making by appeal to the board is one of the sections under the comity
40 regulations specifically 36.105(d) which says that in the event that the applicant meets all
41 the other requirements but it may be in the judgment of the board that the examination that I
42 took didn't meet Alaska requirements, that there are two other tests, one is that I must have
43 passed the PE exam in a state, which I did, Indiana. And also that I must have at least 10
44 years of post registration experience in my profession and documented that, which I have.
45 Based on those two items alone I believe I have met the requirements for registration in my
46 adopted state I know I'm not a regular attendee of the ASPE meetings up in Fairbanks. I
47 understand from that group that the board has been very adamant with the new regulations
48 which don't necessarily effect my case in making sure that working engineers are not
49 disenfranchised and that working engineers are not excluded from practicing their livelihood.
50 So I guess in summary and conclusion, gentlemen I would appeal to the board that I do
51 meet all of the requirements in the State of Alaska for registration as a professional engineer
52 by comity. My 42 years of engineering experience and 26 years of professional registered
53 responsible charge for major corporations and my continuing practice of professional
54 engineering in this state make me to request that the board reconsider my application for

1 registration by comity and grant me registration as an Alaska professional engineer. I
2 appreciate your time, I appreciate your indulgence, I brought various copies of what I just
3 said for your leisurely look or disposal as you see fit and I look forward to a favorable
4 decision and again I thank you for your time and your indulgence.

5
6 Chair: Thank you Joseph. Colin Maynard.

7
8 Mr. Maynard: I'm here representing myself. I'm not representing SEAA who I represent on
9 the APDC Board. I wanted to just come and express that I'm glad to hear that you didn't put
10 out the regulations. I wasn't sure about that until a few minutes ago. APDC has endorsed
11 ASPE's position about an hour ago so they haven't got you a letter yet but they will soon. I
12 urge you to on the structural engineering side, which is what I do for a profession and have
13 for the last 30 years, to make that supplemental to a civil PE as SEAA and APDC has urged
14 you to do before as well as a lot of other individuals. For a couple of reasons, one, it seems
15 odd that you would have an entry level test that's 8 hours for everybody except structural
16 engineers who have 16. Also, comity with the West Coast is more likely to be something
17 that somebody who is licensed in Alaska would want to do and if it's an entry level license
18 it's not going to do them any good in California, Washington, Oregon or Nevada. So if we
19 model our structural license after the West Coast it will much better for structural engineers
20 in this state. And I think it also represents what we as Alaskans need for the public safety,
21 recognizing that this is the state that has 52% of the US's earth quakes. We need people
22 who are designing larger building that have a little higher bar to jump over before they can
23 practice in this state. That's all I have to say.

24
25 Chair: Thank you Colin. Are there any others to testify? I don't see anybody, so with that
26 we'll close the public testimony period. Does anybody want to make a motion to go to
27 lunch?

28
29 Lunch – 1:32p.m. – 2.15p.m.

30
31 1:45 p.m. Boyd Brownfield arrived.

32
33 2:15p.m. called to order – all present.

34
35 **On a motion duly made by Brownfield, seconded by Hightower it was**

36
37 **Resolved to go into executive session under authority of AS 44.62.310 to review the**
38 **ALJ's recommendation in the Michael J. Ward case.**

39
40 Motion passed unanimously.

41
42 2:55 p.m. back on record.

43
44 **On a motion duly made by Brownfield, seconded by Shiesl it was**

45
46 **Resolved to grant a license to Michael J. Ward.**

47
48 Motion failed on a roll call vote. Fredeen, Heieren, Hightower and Rearick abstained. All
49 others voted no.

50
51 Chair: Thanks the ALJ.

52
53 Baker: Do we want to make a motion for the surveyors thing or do that tomorrow?
54

1 Chair: We can do that tomorrow.

2
3 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Baker it was**

4
5 **Resolved to go into executive session under authority of AS 44.62.310 to review**
6 **applicant files.**

7
8 Motion passed unanimously.

9
10 **Friday May 6, 2011**

11
12 8:10 a.m. The meeting was called to order. Roll call, all present.

13
14 Chair: Thank you Vern.

15
16 **On a motion duly made by Shiesl, seconded by Hanson it was**

17
18 **Resolved to reconsider the vote in the Michael J. Ward case.**

19
20 Chair: We can vote or go into executive session to discuss.

21
22 **On a motion duly made by Fredeen, seconded by Eriksen it was**

23
24 **Resolved to go into executive session under AS 44.62.310 to discuss the Michael J.**
25 **Ward Case.**

26
27 Motion passed unanimously.

28
29 8:30 a.m. back on record.

30
31 Chair: The reconsider vote on Michael Ward, please call the roll.

32
33 Motion failed on a roll call vote with 3 votes of yes and 6 votes of no. Baker abstained.

34
35 Chair: We were evaluating 12 AAC 36.064 and 065.

36
37 Hanson: And you passed out a new version this morning?

38
39 Baker: Informs the Board that the new version is a result of the discussions yesterday.

40
41 **On a motion duly made by Baker, seconded by Shiesl it was**

42
43 **Resolved to adopt 12 AAC 36.064 and 12 AAC 36.065 as amended.**

44
45 Baker: Goes on to point out the changes made in this new version. I changed the date of
46 implementation to the end of the fiscal year after being signed by the Lt. Gov. for both FS
47 and PS. Change table B of the FE to graduate of a board approved 4 year course = 4 for
48 education and 0 for experience. And in (d)(1) change the number of credits to 12 semester
49 credits or equivalent for math and basic college level science courses; must include
50 calculus, statistics and physics. And change (d)(2) to 30 credits.

51
52 Walsh: Points out that the comments received from the public were about split. One of the
53 recommendations was from ASPLS asking the board not move forward with these
54 regulation changes until they had a chance to draft their recommendations. And asked what

1 the surveyors thought of that?

2
3 Baker: First off, reading all the comments, and I put for, against and postpone. And then I
4 look at the survey that was done by UAA and I look at the survey that we did and the
5 percentages came out almost exactly the same as all the other surveys, basically this is a
6 survey we put out to public comment. I feel it's still supported we had, we had 13 against,
7 we had 16 for and we had 9 postpone. Out of the 9 that wanted to postpone 2 of them
8 wanted to postpone strictly because they wanted to see the implementation date extended.
9 So basically we're extending it because we're going two years after the signature and we're
10 going another 5 years after that basically. So I felt that that was met. The big thing with
11 waiting for ASPLS is that ASPLS started their first conversation on this back in the late 80's.
12 They started really talking about in 2000. ASPLS twice in the past has approved the 4 year
13 degree requirement and it's just with the recent officers that because of the direction this
14 was going specifically became officers because they were against it. The letter that we got
15 from the board was really a board position and anything to do with ASPLS because if you
16 went to the annual meeting the majority of the conversation basically supported, was
17 exactly the same number for and against as on the surveys. One of the things that they're,
18 some of the comments were that there was such a low percentage of responses. Well, I'm
19 sorry but we sent it out to every registrant out there, 400 and some odd. And we got, I think
20 UAA got a 100 responses back total. We got 48 or 50 back and this time around we got 39
21 back and the percentages are the same. I feel that there's a real loud silent voice out there
22 that is saying that they look at this, I see it coming, it doesn't bother me, I'm not going to
23 respond. I would say that most of the people that didn't respond, well over 50% of them
24 won't have a problem with it otherwise if they did they would have responded. I can't see
25 any reason why I would expect anything to come back from ASPLS just because they say
26 postpone it. Postponing and not coming back for several years. They've been working on
27 this longer than we have.

28
29 Chair: I don't have any problem going on record saying that the Board of Directors, same
30 board entity, not the same individuals, has gone on record three times actually approving
31 and recommending that there be a 4 year degree requirement.

32
33 Shiesl: Which board?

34
35 Chair: The ASPLS Board of Directors, different individuals, the same entity have voted on
36 this same issue three times and recommended to this board that we adopt a 4 year degree
37 requirement. That is of record. Individuals have changed, so the plan has change and
38 everything that Cliff said is accurate.

39
40 Hanson: Points out that if the intent is to require a 4 year degree this regulation doesn't do
41 that, there is still a loop hole that allows two years of course work.

42
43 Chair: Point well taken. Sometimes it's better to take a small step, incrementally than to
44 jump on everything all at once. This actually represents what's prevalent on the National
45 stage. And it is a little bit more than what it is right now because again you are required to
46 have a 4 year degree, number one and number two, it jumps from 30 semester credit hour
47 to a 42 hour semester credit requirement that includes higher mathematics, statistics and
48 physics. So incrementally it's more and a lot of time it's better when you're going through a
49 process like this rather than to slam the door shut it's better to do it incrementally. That's the
50 reason I think this is a good compromise.

51
52 Hanson: Thinks that the written comments were more like 3 to 1 against and you had it
53 fairly even. He asks if anyone else got that impression. He points out that people that are
54 opposed to an activity are more likely to write in.

1
2 Rearick: Adds that his impression was that important issues was the implementation date
3 and math requirement for higher calculus and the number of credits. And those that were
4 against were for specific reasons and that modified as it is, it addresses those issues.
5

6 Chair: Stops the discussion to allow Investigator Savage to introduce the new Chief
7 Investigator.
8

9 Savage: Introduces Chief Investigator Quinton Warren to the board.
10

11 Warren: Acknowledges the work the Board and Investigator Savage does. He realizes that
12 it's a big job and that the Board is pushing for more help in this area and encourages the
13 Board to continue pushing and that he will push from his side and see if together we can get
14 John the help he needs to do the job the Board expects of him.
15

16 Savage: Adds that things are getting worse, not better. There are 1 and ½ slots empty right
17 now and the Director has imposed a hiring freeze and another investigator retired yesterday.
18

19 Fredeen: Gives John accolades on the job he is doing and that if we had input on his
20 performance review we would give him top marks.
21

22 Warren: Points out that the AELS Board is the most complicated to work for. Not because
23 of the members but because of the different professions and complicated Statutes and
24 Regulations and adds that John is really good at what he does, he is one of the top
25 investigators and gets a lot more leeway in deciding enforcement actions because of the
26 complications involved. He will tell me what needs to be done and that's what we do. I
27 don't have the expertise to question him, it's a tough position and you guys got a good guy
28 and I hope he doesn't leave for a long time. It would be very hard to replace him.
29

30 Chair: Expresses the Board's gratitude for Investigator's Savages expertise and work with
31 this Board and to Chief Warren for taking the time to talk to the Board. He adds that the
32 Board will be in a transition next year, we will lose 4 excellent Board members. He offers
33 the assistance of the Board in any way needed.
34

35 Warren: You are one of the more supportive boards and we appreciate the support you
36 guys give us. We couldn't do our job without the support this Board gives us.
37

38 Chair: Thank you. There is a motion on the floor to adopt changes to 12 AAC 36.064 and
39 065 we were in the middle of a discussion, we were discussing the correspondence
40 received and oral testimony regarding those changes. Is there any further discussion or
41 comments?
42

43 Fredeen: Notes the comments asking for a delay and doesn't see the need to rush anything
44 however, he feels that the changes do address most of the negative comments. He asks if
45 we move forward with it would ASPLS have the option of recommending an and additional
46 path for a future change?
47

48 Eriksen: Asks if going back out to public notice is an option to give more time?
49

50 Baker: Doesn't have a problem with tabling it but doesn't see where there is a need to do
51 that with the changes that have been made.
52

53 Fredeen: Asks if Law considers these significant changes and requires they be public
54 noticed that will eat up some of the time we added so should we get Law's approval first?

1
2 Jones: I went through this with Jun on the engineering regulations. He said if the change
3 isn't outside the subject matter of the original public notice you're ok.
4

5 Baker: Points out that the implementation date will move according to when the regulation
6 is signed into law.
7

8 Jones: Another thing is that the public notice has language in it that says the final version
9 may not be exactly the same as what is public noticed.
10

11 Shiesl: Thinks we should go ahead and vote because the professional society is for it and it
12 has gone out to public notice and the Board has other things we need to work on. We've
13 gone through the reiteration plenty of times and it's bad to get hung up on this, when we
14 have clear direction.
15

16 Chair: Notes that he has asked ASPLS from the beginning for guidance and has received
17 noting in writing on what the regulation should be. He adds that the Statute that ASPLS has
18 heart ach with is the one that limits education and experience to 8 years. They are
19 attempting to change that then they feel they could modify these tables further. I agree with
20 Don, you should vote, I think you have enough information, we went through a long period of
21 asking for input, again, this didn't happen overnight. I'm not telling you how to vote just that
22 you should vote because this has gone through a process. Any other discussion,
23 comments, questions? Please call the roll.
24

25 Motion passed on a roll call vote of 8 for and 2 against.
26

27 Chair: Who would like to make the motion? It's not that complicated. Lets open the
28 discussion up while he's doing that. Does anyone have any points they want to make on the
29 ones dated 4/27/11. It involves 36.061, 36.185 article 4. Is there any comments.
30

31 Wash: Comments on the CE regulations an how they effect HSW. He fells that looking at
32 item 1 very little of it applies to his branch.
33

34 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Fredeen it was**
35

36 **Resolved to adopt 12 AAC 36.061, 12 AAC 36.185, 12 AAC 36.500-550 and to repeal 12**
37 **AAC 36.400-450 as amended.**
38

39 Lent: Thinks we may need to re-design the seal to allow room for the date inside the seal.
40

41 Several Board members note that they do it all the time and don't have any problem.
42

43 Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.
44

45 Jones: You voted on the adopting the surveyor regulations but never voted on the changes.
46

47 Chair: The vote was on the amended version. It should have said as amended.
48

49 Chair: So not we're on 12 AAC 36.106. That's the registration of additional branches of
50 engineering. Go ahead and write it out and we will discuss it.
51

52 Baker: Wants to give people another change to voice their opinions on architectural
53 engineering. He has received requests from engineers that have architectural engineering
54 degrees and are working under civil licenses that are interested in that being added.

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

Chair: Are you making a motion?

Baker: No, I'm amending that motion to add....

Hanson: I think we are in a discussion period.

Rearick: Thinks that we should let what we did stand. We hashed this out to death, I think we should let it stand, if somebody wants to comment on they have the opportunity to comment. If we start tweaking it we are back to square one.

Hanson: Thinks we are already back to square one. When we discussed this before I felt the implementation was going to be the big issue. He adds that if the Board isn't going to make a structural get a structural license to do structural engineering he can't support any of these changes if we aren't going to make people follow the rules. He asks what's to stop a mining engineer from stamping a set of civil plans? We are still going to let people do what they've done they just have to get the appropriate license in their branch. If we are not going to make them get that new branch designation I don't see what the point of any of the regulation changes is.

Lent: Voices his concerns about environmental engineering.

Walsh: Agrees with Brian about being at square one. He feels that the regulation is taking us away from our three legged stool concept. He gives the example of a structural engineer being licensed without taking the exam and maybe without the education but has the experience and wants more discussion on the subject.

Hanson: Explains that 36.106 is a grandfather clause. To get individuals that are doing something now that we are going to license and recognize and because we didn't allow them to take a test in that license previously, but they have taken an NCEES test, if they can prove to us that they've been doing work in that field then we would allow them to get licensed without taking a test specific to that discipline. That was the intent when we finalized this, that no they are not going to take a test in structural if they were originally licensed in Alaska. But they have to prove to us that they've been doing structural engineering by virtue of documenting their experience. I and I always thought we were going to make civil's if they were doing structural go get an SE if they wanted to continue. It doesn't help John or anybody if all he see's is a high rise with a CE stamp.

Baker: He believes that someone who has been doing structural engineering under a civil license and wants to continue doing structural under his civil license, to the extent that he has been doing it, should be able to. That's one issue. Then he goes into a new applicant coming in under civil, are we going to allow him to do structural like the old licensees or are we going to make the new people take the structural? He feels that the time line is too short for those in smaller communities to be able to meet. But, other than that he likes the way this is presented and that we need to accommodate people that have been doing this for 30 years.

Eriksen: Doesn't believe we have returned to page one. Agrees that implementation is a very important aspect. Agrees with Richard on the architectural engineering issue. Offers the idea that the interview could be considered the test and that continuing education credits could be considered the education leg of the stool. So using this thinking the three legged stool education, examination and experience, has been met.

Walsh: Remembers the conversations early on where we were considering leaving it up to

1 the individual's ethics to decide what they were qualified to practice and thinks that this
2 should still be a consideration. They've been doing something for a long time they know
3 their capabilities. He doesn't see where we need a lot of the grandfather language. He
4 asks if we are concerned about structural engineering filing complaints with John look for
5 enforcement action against civils?

6
7 Hanson: Believes that the new 36.205 does away with the need for a grandfather clause.

8
9 Jones: Explains his discussions with the AAG regarding these regulations. You can't take
10 someone's lively hood away from them. If they've been doing this for 30 years you can't just
11 arbitrarily say "you can't do that anymore". But, if you don't make it clear in regulation that
12 they can continue you're going to have what you just said, people are going to have
13 structural engineering companies coming in and saying "he can't do that, he's a civil
14 engineer" or an environmental company saying he can't practice environmental engineering
15 he doesn't have an environmental license. Even though we've split these out, if you look at
16 the civil engineering branch structural and environmental are still sub-disciplines of civil
17 engineering.

18
19 Eriksen: Thinks the public is going to be confused, as we are here today, and it's important
20 to have something like this grandfathering clause to protect people's lively hood.

21
22 **On a motion duly made by Fredeen, seconded by Eriksen it was**

23
24 **Resolved to send out for public comment 12 AAC 36.106, 36.180(b), 36.205 and**
25 **36.990(a).**

26
27 Lent: Asks where the language that would eliminate the grandfathering?

28
29 Walsh: On page 5.

30
31 Lent: Argues that environmental engineering is practiced by almost all the professions and
32 disciplines of engineering. Just about everyone does things that are part of environmental
33 engineering and they should be able to continue to do so if they've been doing it in the past.

34
35 Hanson: Can we call Gayle?

36
37 Chair: Yes, he then goes on to explain the evolution of this regulation change from a
38 general license to adding specific branches and that is where we are today and Gayle
39 reviewed this from a grandfather standpoint because she realized that we needed to protect
40 those practicing under our current system from losing their lively hood when the new
41 regulations took effect.

42
43 Walsh: Likes the approach taken on page 5 much better than the first 4 pages. I think what
44 starts on page 5 needs to be expanded greatly but I think Gayle made a good first stab at
45 what she was attempting to do.

46
47 Fredeen: I actually have the complete opposite opinion of 205. He thinks it gives a branch,
48 he uses mechanical as an example, the authority to do anything they want to.

49
50 Baker: You missed one part, it says right after mechanical engineering it says as defined in
51 12 AAC 990 (a)(9). So you can only practice that if it's defined under mechanical
52 engineering.

53
54 Fredeen: Doesn't like 205 at all. Nowhere in civil does it say environmental. If we are

1 going to say civil can do environmental and structural then that's what we should say. We
2 shouldn't use the broad verbiage of "any other definition". I totally disagree with 205.

3
4 Jones: Points out that some things are in more than one definition. He reads the definition
5 of civil engineering and states that you're going to find some of those things in the definition
6 of environmental and some of them in the definition of structural. What she is trying to say
7 there is if it's in your definition you can do it even if it's in another definition.

8
9 Hanson: Agrees with Craig. He thinks structural is a pretty broad term and that the intent is
10 that we are going to license structural engineers as structural engineers not civil. Likewise
11 he doesn't see anything in mechanical that would let them do fire protection. I thought the
12 intent was to get people to get licensed in their branch that they were going to perform work
13 in and if they wanted to keep their old one that was up to them.

14
15 Fredeen: Asks if the board has to discuss 205 at the same time as 106 or can we start with
16 106 and get through it first?

17
18 Chair: You're the motion maker. You can do what you want.

19
20 Fredeen: Doesn't think 205 (scope of practice) eliminates the need for 106 (grandfathering)
21 so he wants to return to discussing 106. He has reservations on a mechanical engineer
22 being able to get a fire protection license or a control systems license because they have
23 areas of knowledge that are outside of a standard mechanical engineer and those fields are
24 very broad. But he supports giving them a chance to say they know the mechanical,
25 electrical and life safety side of the FP branch. He points out that the FP branch crosses
26 over into the mechanical, electrical and also into architecture, life safety and other areas that
27 no discipline goes into. So he worries about a mechanical engineer saying he can do
28 sprinkle systems and all of a sudden he can do life safety and smoke and the psychology of
29 people in a fire. Just because he does sprinkler systems, that's no reason to get licensed as
30 a FP. So though I have hesitation, I think they should be able to show that they have the
31 knowledge and experience necessary. He asks how to get verbiage in there to say that the
32 person has a deep knowledge or a broad knowledge of the discipline to get a license.

33
34 Hanson: Reads the requirements in the regulation that covers that aspect.

35
36 Fredeen: Ok so the interview process could be the area that weeds that out.

37
38 Chair: Gives an example of how this could end up if the Board can't figure it out. He uses
39 the example of the Utah Legislature making it possible for a civil engineer to get a structural
40 license for a fee of \$10 and nothing else. So if we leave it up to other people to do this
41 process we could end up in that kind of a situation. We should be proactive in this, every
42 Legislator I talked to was shocked that the State of Alaska did not license structural
43 engineers. So we have to do this and I would like to see it happen before Bo goes off this
44 board.

45
46 Brownfield: Explains what his thought processes were while he was working on this project.
47 That structural engineering was the only one that required a significant amount of additional
48 education in seismic and a world of other things that a civil engineer would not have the
49 basic education to for. And at that time he wasn't even thinking about grandfathering. But
50 when it came up it made sense for the engineers that are here be able to continue to do
51 what they previously were doing with the assumption, we always have to make the
52 assumption that they were doing it within engineering to begin with and more than likely
53 some of them weren't. He pulled up the NCEES examination for civil engineer and explains
54 that there are five sub-disciplines, construction, geotechnical, structural, transportation and

1 water resources and environmental. He then looked at all them except the structural and
2 found that the morning portion had a very, very basic introduction to structural. The
3 structural afternoon portion provided a limited base for structural engineering. When it
4 comes to grandfathering it shouldn't be that as a civil you automatically can get a structural.
5 We need to discriminate between their education and what they have been doing and not all
6 civil engineers are equal because of what their choice was. He felt the language in the
7 grandfather clause was good and covers the loop hole in that the applicant would have to
8 show the board they had, in fact, been doing structural. He liked the requirements to
9 provide proof of the work completed, providing drawings etc. He agrees that grandfathering
10 is needed but the applicant has to prove to the board that they are qualified to do the work.
11 He feels that an engineer that wants to get his SE should have a MS in structural.

12
13 Chair: I would add that this was modeled after Australia, by the way.

14
15 Baker: Wants to change the part where work must be done 48 months prior to application to
16 10 years prior to application and that they have taken CE within that period. Wants to put a
17 date on when some can come in as structural can do so as a civil. The reason for the
18 change to 10 years is so people in small communities who do structural work can still qualify
19 because they might not have enough projects in a 4 year period to qualify.

20
21 Hanson: So the months is based on the comity application, it matches what is required on
22 the comity application. He then offers his opinion that if you only get a building every 10
23 years, you shouldn't be doing buildings. He would like to see these individuals have to meet
24 the same as a comity applicant, prove 24 months of responsible charge. He then repeats
25 his belief that the Scope of Practice regulation muddies the Grandfathering regulation. He
26 feels that we should delete one or the other, that we don't need both. He then agrees with
27 Cliff that there needs to be a date on 36.205.

28
29 Jones: Explains that these are two different regulations 106 is grandfathering and 205 is to
30 address cross over between disciplines and to ensure that someone that has been doing
31 something for the last 20 or 30 years aren't suddenly out in the cold.

32
33 Hanson: I don't interpret it that way and that is the problem, I think it's confusing.

34
35 Walsh: Supports Bert's view that environmental could be a problem and uses his discipline,
36 mining engineering as an example. He feels that we have a huge problem here and are
37 trying to address it with two cases. He sees it growing hugely if we go down this road, a
38 chemical engineer for example can do lots of things that overlap with these disciplines. He
39 points out the pages 1 through 4 are laying out what NCEES is supposed to do, measure
40 minimum competency and he wonders if we could get into some sort of legal issues with
41 that. You know if you deny somebody or if you approve somebody.

42
43 Lent: Reiterates his argument on environmental engineering being done by several
44 disciplines and several professions.

45
46 Eriksen: Thinks that this involves a lot of what we call incidental practice, and that we can't
47 address every situation that might come up and we need to rely on people's ethics.

48
49 Jones: Suggests that that's a good tact to take. Ethics has to come into play somewhere.

50
51 Fredeen: Think that if it's in the definition we don't need 205 to say that. He thinks 205
52 muddies up the waters.

53
54 Baker: Feels that Dan's statement about minimum competency supports his argument for

1 changing the time to 10 years. Thinks that if we get rid of 205 we need a date in 106 where
2 going forward, new applicants can continue to qualify for grandfathering.

3
4 Hanson: Thinks we need to talk to Gayle on 205, what's the basis of her thoughts on it. My
5 friendly amendment would be to eliminate 205 but we need to talk to Gayle first.

6
7 Walsh: Would like to consider the ethics avenue with this instead of going to this level of
8 specificity. He likes the approach of 205 better than 106 but if we go to the ethics arena
9 then we could probably do away with both.

10
11 Fredeen: Is against putting a date on when the disciplines can no longer apply to the sub-
12 set.

13
14 Baker: Explains that he feels the date is necessary to keep new civil applicants from doing
15 structural.

16
17 Chair: The civil branch does allow structural to a limited degree and that will never change.

18
19 Fredeen: That's what I'm saying, even in the future the branches should be able to continue
20 to do what they do and not compartmentalize it so much.

21
22 Chair: I agree and think that is what Gayle is trying to do with 205. She wants to make sure
23 it's clear that anybody that is practicing in their area of expertise can continue to do that.

24
25 Hanson: Asks if the structural is going to be an additional endorsement or test that you
26 have to take to get your SE. You know, you have to take a civil PE then you can take the
27 SE. It doesn't mention that at all.

28
29 Chair: Vern and I attended a presidents conference and that issue was brought up and
30 boards will have to make that determination. It's something we need to look at but doesn't
31 have to be decided right now. This April is the first time the 16 hour exam has been offered.

32
33 Hanson: Suggests that we say that an engineer that holds a current registration in, and list
34 all the 6 disciplines we license now, may apply for additional registrations. That opens it up
35 to everyone, we don't limit it to civil/structural and we have that review. Because there is no
36 three legged stool under the grandfather clause because we didn't allow them to take that
37 test when they were licensed.

38
39 Chair: Asks Brian to draw up a friendly amendment with that language.

40
41 Walsh: Asks if the Board would be issuing new licenses? He receives a yes from several
42 members and goes on to use mining engineering as an example where someone may be
43 left out of doing environmental even though he is qualified to but he can't provide site plans
44 to prove it. He would include all professionals and say if they are practicing within their area
45 of competence by education, experience, and examination they may continue to do so.
46 Have the grandfather very short but not get into the business of issuing new licenses.

47
48 Chair: That's what I thought this would do, if they wanted to do environmental then they
49 could go through the process but it wouldn't preclude them from doing what they are
50 qualified to do.

51
52 Baker: Relates what happened when they started licensing surveyors. How they allowed
53 any civil engineer that wanted to have a survey license to get one for \$10 and the problems
54 it caused because people that weren't qualified were suddenly licensed to do surveys and a

1 lot of bad surveys were done. He feels we need that mechanism in there to evaluate
2 whether or not they have been doing these things in the past and evaluation their
3 qualifications.
4
5 Walsh: Asks what license they could get for \$10.
6
7 Chair: He's trying to make the point that we need a mechanism to evaluate them.
8
9 Walsh: The mechanism we have is education, experience and examination right now and
10 that would continue to be the standard, right?
11
12 Hightower: The examination isn't always there.
13
14 Walsh: It wasn't in the past but will be in the future.
15
16 The discussion continues reiterating past arguments and suggestions.
17
18 Break 10:15a.m. – 10:25a.m.
19
20 Chair: Brian did you have the written amendment for the motion or Craig?
21
22 Hanson: I can write it up, it's going to be two separate ones since there are two sections. It
23 doesn't have to be written up right now, I wanted to talk to Gayle first. Just so everyone's
24 aware it would read a change to 12 AAC 36.106 that's page one of your document. It would
25 read, Registration in Additional Branches of Engineering. (a) A person who holds a current
26 registration as an engineer in the state on (effective date) may apply under this section for
27 additional registration(s) based on experience. And (b) would be struck through at that point
28 and re-letter the follow-on sections. And we want to talk to Gayle and find out if she would
29 be comfortable with that. The next change is on page 5 and that would be 12 AAC 36.205
30 Scope of Practice for Engineers. (a) would stay the same. (b) would be modified to, a
31 person holding a current registration as an engineer (strike through civil) in the state may
32 practice engineering (again strike through civil) and the rest would stay the same and I
33 would propose deleting (c) and (d) from that section.
34
35 Chair: Does everyone understand?
36
37 Baker: Do you need seconds for those?
38
39 Chair: No, if it's a friendly amendment. Do you accept that?
40
41 Walsh: There would have to be changes in the body of that.
42
43 Fredeen: I would say 106 is a friendly amendment but 205 I want to have more debate on it
44 would have to be a separate motion that we could debate.
45
46 Hanson: Again asks to talk to Gayle before going further.
47
48 Chair: Did this address your questions for Gayle?
49
50 Hanson: Yes.
51
52 Called Gayle Horetski in the Dept of Law.
53
54 Chair asks Brian to address his questions to Gayle.

1
2 Hanson: Informs Gayle that the Board wants to make some changes to 106 and 205 and
3 also find out what her thoughts were on the basis for 205. He reads the proposed changes.
4 It wouldn't limit anyone from doing what they're doing now and would base it on their
5 experience and their ethics.

6
7 Horetski: Here is what I see as a problem with that potentially. She reads AS 08.48.191
8 and concludes that unless an applicant is coming in under comity they have to take and
9 pass and examination. She isn't sure the Board has the authority to grant a license to
10 someone who hasn't passed the appropriate exam at the NCEES level. I think your saying
11 you can get an environmental or industrial registration without taking the exam.

12
13 Hanson: Yes that is what we are saying.

14
15 Horetski: She explains that it was written that way because environmental and structural
16 were sub-set's of civil engineering. That you're not giving a license someone who hasn't
17 tested for it, you're allow them to get a license in a sub-set of their existing license. Same
18 thing with electrical and mechanical in (b) made sense because you're getting specialty in
19 an area you're already doing under your broader registration as an electrical or mechanical
20 engineer. Does that make sense?

21
22 Hanson: But by adding the branches I think we're saying they are no longer sub-sets. He
23 then states that he thinks that the language in 191 (b) that says "in the opinion of the board"
24 gives the board authority to grant the license.

25
26 Horetski: Argues that that applies to someone already licensed in that branch in another
27 jurisdiction such as a FP licensed in another state can be licensed in Alaska as a FP but
28 we're talking about a civil being licensed in another branch that they haven't tested for.

29
30 The discussion continue along these lines for a few minutes. The end result being a change
31 to 12 AAC 106 (a) to read "(a) A person who holds a current registration as an engineer in
32 the state on (effective date) may apply under this section for additional registration(s) by
33 meeting the requirements of this section."

34
35 Horetski: You has some question on 205?

36
37 Hanson: Reads his proposed changes.

38
39 Horetski: Why not just keep a? So telescope (a) and (b) together so it's only one sentence?
40 She then goes on to explain that this section was written to make it clear to the public that
41 an engineer holding a civil license can do environmental or structural work. Otherwise
42 people who come in with an environmental license are going to say you can't do this
43 because you're a civil. If that's not the board's intent we need to say that.

44
45 The conversation continues with the result that the regulation was written to include all
46 branches. If it's in your definition you can do it even if it's in another definition.

47
48 Chair: He thanks Gayle for her help.

49
50 Horetski: Asks if the board has anything on incidental practice yet?

51
52 Chair: Notes that we are working on it and are close.

53
54 Short conversation on why we need 205. It is decide to public notice it and see what

1 happens.
2
3 Chair: We have a motion on the floor. Is there further discussion on these?
4
5 Baker: Just a comment, I can't support this unless we go to 10 years other than that I agree
6 with everything else.
7
8 Walsh: Isn't sure we should rush this out to public notice if we aren't comfortable with the
9 language.
10
11 Lent: Reiterates his view that other professions that are doing environmental need to be
12 accommodated.
13
14 Fredeen: Wants to change the definition of mechanical engineering.
15
16 Eriksen: Wants to change the definition of electrical engineering.
17
18 Chair: Point of clarification on this, it has gone out to public notice, we have altered it so it
19 needs to go out again. There is a motion on the floor but I'll wait until Craig comes up to
20 another one.
21
22 Fredeen: Explains that the change would just make sure that mechanical and electrical can
23 still do what they are doing today in the areas of control systems and fire protection.
24
25 Chair: That is what Gayle was attempting to do with 205.
26
27 Eriksen: I think this is different than what she was speaking to. What she was speaking to
28 was if someone was dealing with overlap.
29
30 Chair: Reads a comment submitted by Mark Morris of Morris Engineering. "Please add the
31 following sentence to the definition of electrical engineering. Electrical monitoring and
32 control systems are included in both electrical engineering and control engineering work" he
33 goes on to say he would recommend similar sentences be added to the other branches that
34 now have overlapping areas of practice with the new branches.
35
36 Hanson: Understands what Gayle said to mean that a civil could continue to do minor
37 structural but not major buildings because now we have that branch.
38
39 Brownfield: Put verbiage in there that allows mechanical and electrical to do that. It won't
40 be overlapping it will be what they do. There is always going to be overlap but if you identify
41 it you are not doing overlap you're doing what the definition says you can do. He then
42 explains what incidental practice is.
43
44 Hightower: Thinks the incidental practice regulation explains that.
45
46 Chair: Asks if we want to discuss that or vote on the motion on the floor:
47
48 Jones: Explains that of the three items concerning incidental practice only one is a
49 regulation, the other two are statutes and must go through the legislative process.
50
51 Walsh: If we are going to vote on this I think we should clean up the language in 36.205 so
52 it has the meaning we want. So the first section (a) would stay there with the (a) coming out.
53 The period remains after State. Because all that sentence says is a person can practice
54 within the definition of engineering that they are licensed to practice. It has nothing to do

1 with overlap. Then I would go on to say removing B and have the capital A come after the
2 period. A person holding a registration as a professional engineer in the state may practice
3 that branch of engineering as defined in that statement less the parens, or that comes out
4 and then including the original language.

5
6 Rearick: Can you just read that sentence?

7
8 Walsh: I'll read the whole thing. A professional engineer may practice in the branch or
9 branches of engineering listed in 12 AAC 36.990(a)(17) for which the engineer holds a
10 current registration in the state. A person holding a current registration as a professional
11 engineer in the state may practice that branch of engineering as defined in 12 AAC
12 36.990(a) even if that engineering practice includes activities that are also included in the
13 definition of another branch of engineering included in 12 AAC 36.990(a)(17).

14
15 Brownfield: I don't object to that but it's already there. I'm going to do what my definition
16 says.

17
18 Walsh: I agree we can do away with all of this.

19
20 Chair: The point that Gayle made putting it in there was stating the obvious. It seemed that
21 there was a lot of confusion and she does not want to have to defend someone practicing in
22 the branch their registered because of a new branch that came along and says you can't do
23 that anymore.

24
25 Hanson: Thinks we are trying to wordsmith this specifically to address what you're
26 proposing. He thinks there is a restatement in reverse order of the previous sentence.

27
28 Discussion continues on getting the correct wording.

29
30 Chair: Do you feel comfortable with the wording now?

31
32 Walsh: I'll write it down, it will take me five minutes.

33
34 Chair: There is a motion on the floor to modify 106 and 205. Is it the pleasure of the Board
35 that we vote on that now? Does everyone understand the modification from Dan?

36
37 Hanson: I'll restate 106 if you like.

38
39 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Shiesl it was**

40
41 **Resolved to modify 12 AAC 36.106 as follows: 12 AAC 36.106 Registration in the**
42 **Additional Branches of Engineering. (a) A person who holds a current registration as**
43 **an engineer in the state on (fill in the effective date of the regulation) may apply under**
44 **this section for additional registrations by meeting the requirements of this section.**
45 **We will delete (b) as part of the modification and re-letter the remainder of the section.**

46
47 Chair: Does everyone understand the motion?

48
49 Walsh: Doesn't understand why the Board wants a separate path to licensure when we
50 have the NCEES path. The board shouldn't give a structural license without the applicant
51 passing the NCEES structural exam.

52
53 Brownfield: Even grandfathering?

1 Walsh: Notes that they have that right but the board shouldn't give them a structural
2 license.
3
4 Rearick: Explains that many structural engineers were forced to come in as civil's and that
5 they should have a equal footing with those coming in with the structural.
6
7 Chair: Lets vote:
8
9 Motion passed on a roll call vote with two nay votes and no abstentions.
10
11 Fredeen makes a motion to modify the definition of mechanical engineering, as attached,
12 seconded by Brownfield. The attachment was not the latest copy of the definition so the
13 motion was withdrawn.
14
15 Chair: Does anyone want to make a motion on incidental practice as submitted?
16
17 Hightower: I'll make a motion for approval so we can at least talk about it.
18
19 Chair: Do you have a motion blank you can fill out? Who was the second? Brian!
20
21 Hightower: States that incidental practice has been an ongoing project for the last two
22 years. He found that it had an effect on exemptions so he has been working on exemptions.
23 He couldn't find the term incidental practice in any statutes the term should be design of
24 minor importance and it falls under several statutes and regulations and that is what he has
25 revised. He feels that AS 08.48.221 needs to be revised. It allows for a registrant to certify
26 the extent of the registrants responsibility and he feels that if you stamp it you're responsible
27 for all if it. He also included under definitions (AS 08.48.341) what design of minor
28 importance is.
29
30 Hanson: Thinks this change will help people when they stamp drawing so they don't get
31 themselves into trouble by stating, for example, I've reviewed this for code only. If it meets
32 code but there is something else wrong they are still responsible. It will even work for those
33 instances when two disciplines stamp the same sheet. It's obvious who is taking
34 responsibility for what.
35
36 Hightower: Clarifies that it reads that drawings containing multiple disciplines are not
37 acceptable without the seal of all relevant disciplines and a registrant making designs of
38 minor importance shall identify that work.
39
40 Chair: For clarification the motion would be just for 12 AAC 36.185, use of seals?
41
42 Hightower: No it pertains to seals, prohibitive practice adding some definitions and
43 regulations for use of seals.
44
45 Chair: Point of clarification, Harley, are we talking about statutes or regulations?
46
47 Hightower: Both
48
49 Chair: We can't deal with statutes here we can only deal with regulations.
50
51 Hightower: Thinks that there may be some conflicting language if we just do the regulation.
52
53 Chair: We have to do the statutes first. We can't submit anything for regulation unless we
54 have the statute to back it up. He recommends they be submitted to APDC for their lobbyist

1 to submit to the Legislature. We can vote on doing that I guess.
2
3 Rearick: Asks if the Board can, as a body, submit statute changes to the Legislature.
4
5 Chair: I suppose we could.
6
7 Jones: You would have to find a Legislator to sponsor.
8
9 Baker: Asks if it could be introduced by the Governor?
10
11 Jones: The Division doesn't normally get involved in that unless it is something that involves
12 all boards.
13
14 Chair: It's just easier to get a sponsor for a statute change. So is it the sub-committees
15 recommendation that we get these statute changes? Do you want to make that kind of a
16 motion?
17
18 Both motion maker and second agree to this tact.
19
20 A short discussion followed on the difference between a statute and a regulation and the
21 process for each. Hightower withdrew his motion.
22
23 At this point a call was made to the Division Director.
24
25 Habeger: Explains the budget process regarding travel and that the Divisions request for
26 more funds was cut from the Governors budget request. He acknowledges that he has had
27 queries from Legislators regarding our travel as a result of the Boards contact with them. He
28 reports that HB 108 looks like it will pass and that our travel funds were reduced from
29 116,000 to 106,000.
30
31 Baker: Asks if an increase in license fees could be designated as for travel when it's
32 presented to the Governor?
33
34 Habeger: Indicates that it would depend on whether the Legislature would add that into the
35 final spending bill and that unless the Legislature gives us the authority to spend more, we
36 just can't. He adds that even though the Board has a healthy roll forward that it can't be
37 spent without Legislative authority and that most likely it will be returned to licensees in the
38 form of reduced fees.
39
40 Hanson: Asks if the Division is ensuring that each board stays within their allotted budget.
41
42 Habeger: Explains the formula used to divide up the funds. It's based on number of
43 licensees. AELS funds are based on 10.92 percent and comes to \$34,500.
44
45 Walsh: Asks when the Division will be submitting the FY13 budget.
46
47 Habeger: It will be done in mid-summer.
48
49 Walsh: Asks how he would integrate a request from the Board into the budget cycle?
50
51 Habeger: Feels that as he gets more experience and more information from the boards he
52 will be able to offer better arguments to the OMB but can't guarantee the outcome.
53
54 Chair: Thanks the director and asks him to keep pitching for us.

1
2 **On a motion duly made by Walsh, seconded by Baker it was**

3
4 **Resolved to modify 12 AAC 36.205 as follows:** 12 AAC 36.205 Scope of Practice for
5 Engineers. A person holding a current registration as a professional engineer in the state
6 may practice that branch of engineering, as defined in 12 AAC 36.990(a), even if the
7 engineering practice includes activities that are also included in the definition of another
8 branch of engineering listed in 12 AAC 36.990(a).

9
10 Motion passed on a roll call vote with one nay vote and no abstentions.

11
12 Chair: Asks for a motion to public notice 12 AAC 36.106 as modified, 12 AAC 36.180 and
13 12 AAC 36.205 as modified.

14
15 Fredeen: Asks to make a motion to modify the definition of mechanical engineering.

16
17 **On a motion duly made by Fredeen, seconded by Eriksen it was**

18
19 **Resolved to modify 12 AAC 36.990(a)(9) as attached:** The attachment reads:
20 (9) “mechanical engineering” means the [THAT] branch of professional engineering that
21 embraces studies and activities relating to the [WHICH DEALS WITH ENGINEERING
22 PROBLEMS RELATING TO] generation, transmission and utilization of energy in the
23 thermal and [OR] mechanical form; engineering issues [,AND ALSO WITH ENGINEERING
24 PROBLEMS] relating to the production of tools, machinery and their products; [AND TO]
25 mechanical processes, heating, air conditioning, refrigeration, [AND] plumbing, product
26 transport, fire and smoke suppression; and [IT IS CONCERNED WITH] the research,
27 design, production, operation [OPERATIONAL], control, and the organizational and
28 economic aspects of these studies and activities;

29
30 Motion passed on a roll call vote with 2 nay’s and no abstentions.

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

33
34 **Resolved to modify 12 AAC 36.990(a)(8) as follows:** (8) “electrical engineering” means
35 the [THAT] branch of professional engineering that [WHICH] embraces studies and
36 activities relating to generation, transmission and utilization of electrical energy, fire
37 detection and alarm systems, control systems, electronic systems, and to
38 telecommunications systems and facilities, including the design of electrical, electronic and
39 magnetic circuits and components, and the technical control of their operation and of the
40 design of electrical, fire alarm gear, electronic, control, and telecommunications gear, and
41 the [;IT IS CONCERNED WITH THE RESEARCH,] organizational and economic aspects of
42 these studies and activities;

43
44 Motion passed on a roll call vote with 2 nay’s and no abstentions.

45
46 Chair: Craig you made the motion.

47
48 Fredeen: The overall motion is still on the floor.

49
50 Chair: Erik you agree with that? Any further discussion?

51
52 Hanson: States that for clarification it is 12 AAC 36.106, 12 AAC 36.180, 12 AAC 36.205
53 and 12 AAC 36.990 as amended.

1 Motion passed on a roll call vote with 2 nay's and no abstentions.

2
3 Chair: Asks if everyone wants to go to lunch or continue working. It's decided to take a 10
4 minute break.

5
6 1210 – 1224 Break

7
8 Chair: Back on record.

9
10 **On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Walsh it was**

11
12 **Resolved to repeal the existing 12 AAC 36.103 and replace with a new version of 12**
13 **AAC 36.103 as follows:** 12 AAC 36.103 Architect Registration by Comity. (a) Under AS
14 08.48.191(a) the board may issue a certificate of registration as an architect to an applicant
15 who

- 16 (1) documents education and passage of NCARB Architect Registration Exam;
17 (2) documents work experience that satisfies the requirements of (b) of this section;
18 (3) has completed the arctic engineering and seismic requirements of 12 AAC
19 36.110; and
20 (4) has completed a jurisprudence questionnaire prepared by the board covering,
21 the provisions of AS 08.48 and this chapter.

22 (b) An applicant for registration as an architect by comity must

23 (1) submit verification of current registration to practice architecture in a state,
24 territory, or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, or a foreign country
25 that was based on education, experience, and examination requirements that, in the opinion
26 of the board, were at least equivalent to the requirements of AS 08.48 and this chapter at
27 the time the applicant's out-of-state registration was issued; and

28 (2) have at least 24 months of responsible charge experience as an architect as
29 defined under Sec. 08.48.341. (1), or as verified by the signature and seal, except as
30 provided in (d) of this section, of the architect who has supervised the applicant and who, at
31 the time of providing the supervision, was legally registered as a professional architect in a
32 state, territory, or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, or a foreign
33 country; and

34 (3) if the applicant has been practicing architecture as a registered architect for 5
35 years or more in a state, territory, or possession of the United States, the District of
36 Columbia, or a foreign country, provide two letters of reference verifying that experience;
37 each letter must be signed and sealed, except as provided in (d) of this section, by an
38 architect who is legally registered in a state, territory, or possession of the United States, the
39 District of Columbia, or a foreign country.

40 (c) An applicant for registration as an architect by comity may submit a council record
41 issued by NCARB to verify the applicant's qualifications, including

- 42 (1) examination results;
43 (2) education; and
44 (3) registration in another licensing jurisdiction

45 (d) If an architect who provides a work experience verification under (b)(2) of this section
46 or a reference letter under (b)(3) of this section does not possess a seal, the applicant must
47 provide the board a statement from that architect,

- 48 (1) providing that architect's registration number; and
49 (2) if the architect is providing a reference letter, certifying that the registration of that
50 architect is current.

51
52 Rearick: Explains that this gives an architect applying by comity an alternate path other
53 than an NCARB certificate, which is now required. This process is more in line with the
54 process for engineers, land surveyors and landscape architects.

1
2 Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

3
4 Chair: We will go through Board correspondence

5
6 **Agenda item 12 – Board Correspondence Sent Since February 2011**

- 7 A) Letter from the Chair to six Legislators regarding Board travel.
8 B) Response to Patty Mamola from Craig Fredeen re MOE
9 C) Response to Rep Craig Johnson from Vern re FPE

10
11
12 **Agenda item 13 – Correspondence Received Since February 2011**

- 13 A) E-mail from Scott Kawasaki re Board Travel
14 B) Query from Joe Paskvan re Board Travel
15 C) Letter from the Society for Mining, Metallurgy & Exploration re MOE
16 D) Stamping of water and sewer plans
17 1. Letter from Fosdick & Hilmer, Inc.
18 2. Letter from AK DEC of march 4, 2011
19 3. E-mail between Jones and AK DEC
20 4. E-mail string between Partick Mechanical and Eielson AFB
21 5. Letter from AK DEC of March 21, 2011
22 6. Letter from EDC Inc. w/response from DEC
23 7. E-mails between Jones and Chris Miller
24 E) E-mail from Stan Sears re Certificate presented by the Board.
25 F) E-mail from Nick Rodes re Non ABET degrees
26 G) E-mail from Julia Lent re Licensure Laws Under Attack
27 H) E-mail from Matt Arnold re IDP
28 I) Misc. Correspondence from NCARB
29 J) Misc. Correspondence from NCEES
30 K) Misc. Correspondence from CLARB
31 L) E-mail from Neil Windsor re PNWER news release
32 M) E-mail from the Director re boards.

33
34 Chair: Recommends that Craig respond to 13-d-7.

35
36 Jones: Reads the letter.

37
38 Baker: Sees waste distribution as being civil not mechanical.

39
40 A short discussion continued regarding the proper way to address this issue. It was decided
41 that Board members had already addressed it in previous correspondence prior to the
42 meeting and no further response was needed.

43
44 Chair: So it's the pleasure of the board not to respond to the letter?

45
46 Fredeen: I think our previous responses are adequate.

47
48 Chair: Any further questions or comments on item 13?

49
50 Lent: Refers to the email from Julia Lent and notes that licensing laws are under attack
51 nationwide.

52
53 Chair: Hearing no further comments on all the correspondence lets go to special
54 committees:

1
2 **Agenda item 14 – Special Committees**

3
4 General Licensure:

5
6 Chair: We've spend most of the morning talking about that.

7
8 As built/Record Drawings:

9
10 Hightower: You can take that off. I got that definition to Bert.

11
12 Incidental Practice:

13
14 Chair: That needs to go through a statute change and you'll have that for the next meeting?

15
16 Hightower: Explains that the relationship between incidental practice and the exemptions is
17 very close and he will have something for the next meeting to address both. He asks the
18 Board to look at what he submitted and give input.

19
20 Chair: Suggests that Harley give his changes to Eric and he, being the legislative liaison
21 can petition the Legislature for support.

22
23 Licensure Mobility:

24
25 Walsh: Nothing that has to be discussed today.

26
27 Eriksen: Asks if we got anything back from the Canadians?

28
29 Walsh: No, Brian asked for the power point presentation and I emailed them and never got
30 a response.

31
32 Rearick: Reports that NCARB has nothing going at the present re licensure mobility.

33
34 Mining Engineers and Geologists:

35
36 Walsh: Nothing to discuss at this time.

37
38 Land Surveying Education Committee:

39
40 Chair: That has been taken care of.

41
42 Investigative Advisory Committee:

43
44 Chair: Brian have you participated in that?

45
46 Hanson: Yes, we met as a group once and then I met with John last week.

47
48 Guidance Manual:

49
50 Chair: The Guidance Manual is ongoing.

51
52 Lent: Will have a finished product for August. He hopes the new regulations are ready by
53 then. Then need to be effective before being included in the Guidance Manual.

54

1 Legislative Liaison:

2

3 Eriksen: Nothing to report.

4

5 Emeritus Status:

6

7 Chair: We have a sample letter that was submitted by Craig as a guideline for future
8 endorsement by the Board for emeritus status.

9

10 Rearick: Reports that there is nothing in the NCARB bylaws that address emeritus status.
11 He talked with Ken Naylor the president and he saw no need for language in the bylaws
12 regarding this. Once your board term ends you have no affiliation with that board and are
13 not representing them so you could continue with NCARB in a committee or officer position
14 you would just not have any affiliation with the Alaska Board.

15

16 Lent: Ditto for CLARB. If you're an officer or on a committee you can continue.

17

18 Hightower: We should let people know that if they do that they are not representing the
19 Board.

20

21 Chair: Excellent suggestion because that has been a major problem at NCEES.

22

23 Budget Committee:

24

25 Walsh: Notes that we need to get our fee setting figures in to the Division soon for the FY13
26 year.

27

28 Hanson: Adds that the Director was not asking for a budget he was going to use the roll
29 forward.

30

31 Chair: Responds that in the past we have been doing that and asks for a motion to forward
32 the budget request to the Director.

33

34 Walsh: Has a memo to pass to Cathy Mason for the fee setting. He suggests that the
35 Board keep on this for the future travel needs.

36

37 Eriksen: Asks if we want to also talk about fees associated with funding a full time
38 investigator?

39

40 Walsh: Suggests that we work on travel and then work on from there. He doesn't know how
41 much success we will have. We are in a state that's running a 2, 3, 4, 5 billion dollar surplus
42 every year for the last, what, 5 to 10 years and we can't even get a decent travel budget. I
43 don't see any way to deal with that.

44

45 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Baker it was**

46

47 **Resolved to forward Dan's letter along with his recommendations for travel through**
48 **the Chair to the Division.**

49

50 Eriksen: With a cc to the Legislature too?

51

52 Chair: What would be appropriate Vern?

53

54 Jones: The budget goes from the Division to the Commissioner then to the Governor then

1 the Legislature.

2
3 Baker: Would like to include APDC to get them lobbying for the board.

4
5 Eriksen: Asks if we get feedback on any changes after each step in the budget process?

6
7 Jones: I'll have to check with Don.

8
9 Walsh: Recommends that the board work through the Legislative liaison committee but
10 doesn't know if it will matter because we are pretty much out of the budgeting process.

11
12 Jones: Explains the Annual Report and that it contains budget recommendations.

13
14 Rearick: Asks that if we requested and got \$100,000 for travel would it just go into the
15 Divisions travel pot for all boards?

16
17 Walsh: That's the way it is now but that could change, he could earmark it for us.

18
19 Brian: Question

20
21 Chair: The question has been called all those in favor of voting on this signify by saying
22 aye. Those opposed say nay. Abstentions? Hearing none lets call the roll.

23
24 Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

25
26 Continuing Education:

27
28 Hanson: I have some stuff to forward to Richard and Cliff.

29
30 Rearick: Advises that NCARB is trying to get all jurisdictions to agree to one set of CE
31 requirements and how different all jurisdictions are and how hard it would be for licensees in
32 multiple jurisdictions to meet the requirements for all their licenses.

33
34 Hightower: Asks to add IDP (intern development program) to the standing committees.

35
36 Hanson: There is some IDP correspondence under 13 I 9.

37
38 Attempted to call Karen Wilke re CE.

39
40 **Agenda item 15 – Old Business.**

41
42 A) Reduction in Travel

43
44 Chair: We've already discussed that.

45
46 B) Masters or Equivalent

47
48 Fredeen: Explains the query from Western Zone regarding MOE and his response and that
49 the Board has not voted on this in a number of years and that we should have an official
50 position on this.

51
52 Chair: Advises the Board that this issue comes up at every national meeting and that he is
53 tired of discussing it at every meeting. It has gone through a process, a decision has been
54 made, it has been approved, it's in place to be adopted as a recommended direction in

1 2020. I think we should leave it alone. He invites anyone to make a motion if they want a
2 vote on it.

3
4 Brownfield: Asks if we have changed our position since last vote and if we haven't, why
5 would we want to vote again?

6
7 Chair: Because it has gone through a process on a national level and there has been a
8 policy adopted. There are a lot of people that don't think it's right and they want it retracted
9 but it is taking up a lot of time at national meetings and I'm tired of dealing with the issue.

10
11 Walsh: The B+30 thing is there as a foundation but at the last meeting we dealt with the
12 equivalency part of it and NCEES passed two alternate paths. NCEES is going to continue
13 with implementation of this and it's going to keep coming up.

14
15 Chair: In that regard I'm not against that. If we vote I'm telling how I'm going to vote.

16
17 Walsh: Is this something we have to do?

18
19 Chair: He represented that we are against MOE and I'm not against it.

20
21 Fredeen: Agrees that a lot of time is spent on this but that if a vote on the alternatives
22 comes the Board should have a position on it.

23
24 Chair: Asks for a motion.

25
26 Fredeen: I could craft one for the next meeting.

27
28 Chair: We have a Western Zone meeting coming up and I would like some direction for that.

29
30 Fredeen: Explains the issue concerning B+30 and the alternative of the 150 credit hour BS
31 but isn't sure about the second alternative.

32
33 Chair: On that basis we will wait until August

34
35 **Agenda item 16 – New Business**

36
37 A) Implementation project for 12 AAC 36.990

38
39 Jones: We pretty much already did that.

40
41 B) Report from Lent re environmental engineering

42
43 Lent: Presents the scope of practice that landscape architects provide and how it relates to
44 environmental engineering. He also introduces the Board to the study done by CLARB
45 regarding the definition of public welfare. He points out how it pertains to the environment.
46 He expressed serious concerns about how the addition of environmental engineering would
47 affect all the branches of engineering and other professions regulated by this Board. He
48 offers two solutions, one would be to eliminate environmental engineering from the
49 regulation project. The other one would be to make sure the regulations are specific enough
50 to protect all professions by making sure the word environmental is in each definition. He
51 suggests that all professions be grandfathered to do environmental engineering.

52
53 **On a motion duly made by Lent, seconded by Shiesl it was**

1 **Resolved to start a regulation project to accommodate all professions that the board**
2 **regulates to include environmental studies and planning in their scopes of services.**

3
4 Baker: Thinks it's already covered in the other regulations we did today.

5
6 Brownfield: Points out that all professions are concerned with environmental issues but
7 doesn't think it needs to be in each definition.

8
9 Walsh: When we public notice those definitions again I'll take a close look at this.

10
11 Chair: Believes that with the modification we've made to the regulations that will be going
12 out to public notice that this has been dealt with. I feel comfortable that the overlap is
13 covered.

14
15 Motion failed on a roll call vote with 9 no's and one yes.

16
17 Placed a call to Karen Wilke to discuss a CE fine structure.

18
19 Chair: We appreciate you being available to us to discuss non-compliance fines.

20
21 Wilke: Explains that the Board has implemented CE regulations under the authority of AS
22 08.48.101(a)(6). Under 36.410(b) and 36.510 (b) applicants certify their compliance with
23 their renewal application. She goes into the requirements for audits and that it's verified by
24 the Division. She gives a quick overview of what happens when an audit gets sent to her
25 because of non-compliance. There are a couple of avenues we can take. One of them
26 being voluntary surrender of a license the other option is a consent agreement. She is the
27 lead staff person that negotiates the consent agreement and works out the terms with the
28 Director and the Board would have the final authority to adopt or reject the agreement. If the
29 Division cannot resolve the issue they could impose other disciplinary actions. She informs
30 the Board that she has a couple cases that she needs some guidance on. She points out
31 that the board has the authority to impose disciplinary sanctions. She then refers to a chart
32 she provided for the board packet outlining the disciplinary sanctions of some of the other
33 boards and explains the various columns in the chart and that this is to let the Board know
34 what other Boards have done and that the Board is free to develop their own set of guideline
35 if they want. She requested guidance from the Board on what they feel is appropriate in
36 cases where the applicant is non-compliant.

37
38 Walsh: Asks why we would need a fine structure since their license is tied to their license so
39 if they don't comply they lose their license. The Board doesn't benefit by a fine structure.

40
41 Brownfield: Asks if there is a mandatory audit for the next two renewals?

42
43 Chair: Clarifies that Karen is asking for guidance from the Board on how to handle non-
44 compliant licensees and he recommends that the Board adopt another Boards
45 recommendations and that he thinks the Nursing Boards guidelines would be appropriate.

46
47 Rearick: Points out that the State does have administrative costs in dealing with people that
48 don't comply.

49
50 Baker: Notes that looking at the tables it isn't clear if the license is revoked or if the licensee
51 is just getting fined.

52
53 Hanson: It's up to us to tell her whether we want the license suspended etc.

1 Chair: Is that correct Karen?

2

3 Wilke: Yes, I would like some guidance if the Board is ready to provide it. I don't want to
4 force you to make a decision before you are ready.

5

6 Chair: States that the Nursing Board guidelines are probably the closest to what we could
7 use.

8

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

10

11 **Resolved to follow the Registered Nurses RN/LPN Guidelines for sanctions of**
12 **registrants not meeting the continuing education requirements.**

13

14 Chair: Any further discussion? Would that suite you Karen?

15

16 Wilke: That would be fine.

17

18 Chair: All in favor say aye. All opposed say nay. Any abstentions?

19

20 Motion passed unanimously

21

22 Phone call ended.

23

24 **On a motion duly made by Fredeen, seconded by Eriksen it was**

25

26 **Resolved to start a regulation project to add section 12 AAC 36.996 entitled Design of**
27 **Fire Detection or Suppression Systems Exemption as attached.**

28

29 The attachment reads "12 AAC 36.995. Design of Fire Detection or Suppression Systems
30 Exemption. The design of fire detection or suppression systems, as noted under
31 08.48.321(14), includes those activities related to the installation, maintenance, and
32 inspection of said systems including the direction of or the performance of fire protection
33 system surveys, consultation, investigation, evaluation, planning, and observations of
34 construction and the organizational and economic aspects of these studies and activities."

35

36 Fredeen: Gives the Board some history regarding how the FP contractors brought to the
37 Boards attention during the public testimony that the exemptions on page 8 of the
38 regulations only exempted design of those systems. They were worried that the other
39 services that their permits allow them to provide would, with the inclusion of fire protection
40 engineer to the regulations, fall under the definition of engineering and would affect their
41 livelihood. Looking at the definition of engineering, they are right. He got together with the
42 Fire Marshall's Office and worked with them to come up with the verbiage in the motion. He
43 points out that the verbiage is almost identical to what they are putting in their regulation
44 project. This will allow the FP Contractors that are permitted by the Fire Marshall to
45 continue to do what they do today after the FPE is added to our regulations.

46

47 A short discussion followed and it was decided to include this in the regulation package for
48 public notice.

49

50 Motion passed on a roll call vote with no nays and no abstentions.

51

52 **Agenda item 17 – Licensing Examiner Report**

53

54 Kelly: Reads portions of her report.

1
2 **Agenda item 18 – Meeting Reports**

3
4 A) NCEES Presidents Assembly

5
6 Jones: That's my report, it's kind of wordy, sorry.

7
8 Chair: It has some good information about structural engineering and I think it should be
9 referred to the General Licensing committee because of the transition from an 8 hour to 16
10 hour exam. It's already happened so we have to do something about it.

11
12 Jones: They also have new Speakers Kits out. If any of you are inclined to go to out and
13 promote the engineering or surveying trades at high schools or where ever. They can be
14 downloaded online.

15
16 Chair: NCEES is going to provide a service to help people track their continuing education.
17 They actually evaluate courses and all of those will be on their website.

18
19 Rearick: NCARB is establishing some model law criteria but it isn't done yet. AIA has had
20 electronic tracking for a number of years for it's membership.

21
22 Jones: You don't have to take the courses from NCEES you can take them from anywhere
23 and enter them into the system.

24
25 It was suggested that this info and a link be put on the webpage and sent to APDC for their
26 newsletter.

27
28 B) CLARB spring meeting

29
30 Lent: The report is there are there any questions?

31
32 C) NCARB Regional meeting

33
34 Rearick: Reports that one of the most important things discussed was CE and that AIA has
35 had electronic tracking for its membership for about 8 years. He says the membership of
36 NCARB and AIA is approximately 100,000 and about a third of those have an NCARB
37 record. He adds that NCARB and AIA are trying to establish a CE standard that all boards
38 would adopt. They are looking at 12 CEH (continuing education hour) per year and they
39 have developed 10 HSW categories that they would like to see implemented right now. AIA
40 has 29 categories. This is what's being proposed for Model Law and right now NCARB is
41 not making it a requirement for a NCARB Certification but it could be in the future. He adds
42 that the BEFA program requires an interview and that there was a resolution to eliminate the
43 interview. They are also increasing dues for 2013 to 2017. They are funding a second
44 delegate so both Harley and I will be attending the National. The next Regional meeting will
45 be in Seattle March 9-10, 2012.

46
47 Hightower: Adds that both Richard and he were encouraged to seek offices in WCARB and
48 that he had decided not to but was trying encouraging Richard to do so.

49
50 **Agenda item 21 – To Do List.**

51
52 Chair: The only thing I would add for me is the Statute project to add an investigator to the
53 Board.

1 It was noted that item 19 had been skipped and the Chair decided to go back to it.

2
3 **Agenda item 19 – Board Travel**

4
5 A) NCEES Western Zone Meeting

6
7 Chair: Cliff is going as the funded delegate. I'm paying my own way.

8
9 B) NCARB National

10
11 Chair: Harley and Richard are going to Washington D.C. in June. He then goes into the
12 NCEES Annual meeting in Providence RI in August. Let's start out by asking who is able to
13 go? All raised their hands except Shiesl. He asks the Board to approve Brownfield to be
14 the funded delegate even though he is at the bottom of the list because this will be his last
15 opportunity.

16
17 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Hightower it was**

18
19 **Resolved to send Brownfield to the NCEES National as the funded delegate.**

20
21 Walsh: Thinks that the Board should follow the policy in place and that sending someone
22 new to the Board would be more beneficial than sending someone that is leaving. He
23 acknowledges Bo's contributions to the Board and that he should go if money is available
24 but shouldn't get preference.

25
26 Baker: Agrees with Dan

27
28 Chair: Speaks in favor of the motion. He acknowledges the policy regarding travel but feels
29 that Brownfield has been the most active member during his time on the Board and that that
30 warrant's some kind of recognition.

31
32 Motion passed on a show of hands with 4 yes, 3 no and 3 abstentions.

33
34 Shiesl: I have been to NCEES and NCARB and would like to attend a CLARB meeting to
35 round out my education.

36
37 Walsh: Notes that this meeting is after the beginning of the new FY and that we don't seem
38 to be doing ourselves any favors by saving travel money so we should spend as much as
39 possible while saving enough to send someone to CLARB and NCARB.

40
41 There was a short discussion on who was available to go and what order they are on the
42 list.

43
44 Jones: Asks the Chair to send an email to the Chief Investigator asking that John Savage
45 attend.

46
47 Lent: Advises that the CLARB Fall Annual meeting is in Chicago and that they want the
48 Member Board Executive to attend.

49
50 Chair: Asks if CLARB funds travel for a delegate?

51
52 Jones: No, the way CLARB does it is they allow boards to add funds to the annual dues
53 which is kept in a separate account for the boards to use to fund travel. We didn't do that for
54 the last couple years because we didn't have the funds. I'll see if I can add a couple

1 thousand dollars to the next dues.

2
3 Fredeen: Points out that NCEES has started a program to fund new members that have
4 never attended a meeting and that next year we will have four new members.

5
6 It was decided to request funding for Hanson since he has not attended a National
7 Conference yet.

8
9 Chair: Asks if Lent would be ok with Shiesl or Baker going in his place. They both said they
10 felt it would be more beneficial for Lent to go if there wasn't funding for him also.

11
12 Chair: Let's go back to item 21. To-do list.

13 Bo. 1. Assist with specialty contractors, incidental practice and exemptions.

14
15 Brian. 1. CE instructions - this is ongoing.
16 2. Paper for the Fire Marshal – will handle with Guidance Manual

17
18 Dan. 1. Proposal on Mining Engineers/Geologists – on going.
19 2. Review Harleys paper on specialty contractors, incidental practice and
20 exemptions.
21 3. Budget.
22 4. Geologists and environmental engineering.

23
24 Don. 1. Guidance Manual
25 2. Proposed regulation for guidance on disciplinary action regarding
26 probation. It's in AS 08.01.075

27
28 Bert. 1. Guidance Manual

29
30 Richard R. 1. Liaison with NCARB

31
32 Harley. 1. Exemptions
33 2. Incidental practice and specialty contractors

34
35 Eric. 1. Legislative Liaison
36 2. Review Harley's work on exemptions, incidental practice and specialty
37 contractors.
38 3. Mark Morris application to Canada

39
40 Craig. 1. Regulation project re fire protection exemptions

41
42 Richard H. 1. Statute change re investigator
43 2. Email to Chief Investigator re NCEES national

44
45 Cliff. 1. Specialty contractors, incidental practice and exemptions.

46
47 Vern. 1. Update Enforcement Exchange
48 2. Info on CE tracking by NCEES

49
50
51 **Agenda item 22 – Read applications into the record.**

52
53 **On a motion duly made by Baker seconded by Hanson it was**

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

4
 5 *The subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*
 6 *meanings:*

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

8 'FS': refers to the Fundamentals of Surveying Examination

9 'PE': exam': refers to the NCEES Principals and Practice of Engineering Examination

10 'PS': exam: refers to the NCEES Principals and Practice of Surveying Examination

11 'AKLS': refers to the Alaska Land Surveyors Examination

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

14 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

15 'Arctic course' denotes a Board-approved arctic engineering course

16

Clark, Adam B.	Architect	Comity	Approved
Hurley, Edward David	Architect	Comity	Approved
Romero, Rocco Carl	Architect	Comity	Approved
Bailey, Jack	Architect	Comity	Approved
Radisic, Nenad	Architect	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic
Holme, Kevin C.	Architect	Comity	Approved - conditional upon Arctic & JQ
Swift, Jason W.	Architect	Comity	Approved - conditional upon JQ
Shaffer, Rebecca J.	Architect	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing ARE
Fowler, Jack Edward	Architect	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing ARE; IDP; Arctic & JQ
Wong, Silas Y.	Chemical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic
Omnik, Suege A.	Chemical Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing PE – Chemical; & JQ
Ward, Michael J.	Civil Engineer	Comity	????

Apodaca, III, Victor J.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Brubaker, Simeon R.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Creger, William F.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Fortney, Maurice E.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Karpstein, Keith D.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Lucas, Warren K.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Venot, Rebecca A.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Wariner, Michael K.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Elwood, Noah J.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Ekhalikar, Rajendra	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Hendrick, Matthew W.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic
Younger, John A.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic
Czajkowski, Maciej	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic & JQ
Heikens, Michael C.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic & JQ
Watters, Gary Robert	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic & JQ
Doyle, Edward J.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic & JQ
Straub, Christopher M.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Buscemi, Brian A.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Jakes, Duncan C.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Blitz , Thomas A.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ

Newcomen, Henry Warren	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Rollins, Christopher	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Hadj Karim Kharrazi, Mehdi	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon PE – Civil
Foster, Kathryn Irene	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon transcripts
Phillips, Donald S.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon transcripts; & JQ
Burd, John Charles	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE
Johnston, Deborah A.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE
Hill, Gregory G.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE; & JQ
Bowie, Jeanne Marie	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE; & JQ
Brodahl, Erik Leif	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE; & JQ
Schock, Jeff W.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE; payment of all fees
Raybourne, Brandon M.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE; transcripts; Arctic & JQ
O'Malley, Willie B.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of PE-Civil; & JQ
Huang, Austin X.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved – pending verification of FE & Arctic
O'Mullane, Megan	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon 60 mos experience at time of exam; passing FE & PE- Civil; Arctic & JQ
Lance, Craig B.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon PE – Civil
Dusel, Janie G.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon PE – Civil; & JQ
Trasky, Trevor R.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon PE – Civil; & JQ
Backman, Carita A.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon PE – Civil; & JQ

Halcomb, Steven M.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon PE – Civil; & JQ
McPherson, Iain	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE; PE – Civil; & JQ
Katalenich, Scott M.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE; PE-Civil
Chesley, David N.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Doyle, Thomas L.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Bronfield, Jefferson D.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Blitz, Murray	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic
Correa, Raynaldo	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic
Conway, Steven J.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic & JQ
Patel, Dinesh P.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic & JQ
Bennett, Alberto	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - conditional upon JQ
Kovach, John A.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Hills, James R.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of FE & PE exams; current licensure; & JQ
Herrera, Miguel Angel	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon FE; PE-Electr; payment of all fees
Palchikoff, Keith	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing PE- Electrical; Arctic & JQ
Graff, Craig John	FE	Exam	Approved
O'Mullane, Megan	FE	Exam	Approved
Traylor, Helen Ann	FE	Exam	Approved
Weinburger, Jamie Marie	FE	Exam	Approved

Wilbur, Cory M.	FE	Exam	Approved
Zhang, Ziru	FE	Exam	Approved
Manser, Stephen P.	FS	Exam	Approved
Young, Jody	FS	Exam	Approved
Ekren, Winston D.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Huang, Victor Wei	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Reeves, Clinton J.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Wysuph, William B.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic
Henry, Kim Raeburn	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic & JQ
VanderBeek, Nathan P.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic & JQ
Cross, Thomas F.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon Arctic & JQ
Caron, William E.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Edmonds, Keith	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon JQ
Pingree, Harold C.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved – conditional upon verification of PE-Mech; Arctic & JQ
Cheesebrough, Julie M.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon PE – Mech & JQ
Earls, Nathaniel G.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon PE – Mech & JQ
Miller, Jennifer M.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon PE – Mech & JQ
Rowland, Jason R.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon; PE – Mech & JQ
West, Taylor L.	Petroleum Engineer	Exam	Approved – conditional upon verification of PE – Petroluem & JQ

Nakamura, T. Jason	Surveyor	Comity	Approved – conditional upon AKLS
Wolf, Timothy J.	Surveyor	Comity	Approved – conditional upon AKLS
Roudebush, Michael A.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved – conditional upon passing PS & AKLS;

1
2 Chair: All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed say nay.

3
4 Motion passed unanimously.

5
6 **On a motion duly made by Baker, seconded by Hanson it was**

7
8 **RESOLVED to find the following list of applicants for registration by comity and**
9 **examination incomplete**

10

duSaint, Robin A.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Incomplete – needs transcripts; Arctic & JQ
Williams, David T.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Incomplete – requires 24 mos RC under a Mechanical PE; or 2 letters from same; Arctic & JQ
O'Neill, Kelly J.	FS	Exam	Incomplete – need official transcripts
Saunders, Adam J.	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Incomplete – needs additional 7 months professional experience; & JQ
Nelson, John P.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Incomplete – conditional upon NCEES FE & PE- Elec; & JQ
McEntyre, Scott Ryan	Chemical Engineer	Exam	Incomplete – requires another months responsible charge experience

11
12 Chair: All those in favor signify by saying aye. All those opposed say nay.

13
14 Motion passed unanimously.

15
16 **Agenda item 23 – Review calendar of events**

17
18 The August meeting date was confirmed for August 11-12, 2011 in Anchorage.

19 The November meeting date was set for November 3-4, 2011 in Anchorage.

20
21 **Agenda item 24 – Comments.**

22
23 Brownfield: Thinks we made a lot of progress today. Thanks the staff for their work. He is
24 impressed with the professionalism of the Board and Staff.

25
26 Hanson: Great meeting, a lot of debate. Looking forward to some great debate at the next
27 meeting.

28
29 Fredeen: Feels that it was a good meeting and thinks we are making great progress.

1 Eriksen: Good meeting
2
3 Baker: Thinks the board has made great strides in the last few years.
4
5 Lent: Thanks Staff for their help and the Chair for keeping the meeting going.
6
7 Shiesl: Thanks the staff and believes the Board has accomplished a lot and hopes that as
8 the board composition turns over that the good work continues.
9
10 Hightower: Impressed how the members can disagree without fighting and appreciates how
11 everyone works together.
12
13 Rearick: These meetings are never easy, I think I was lied to. (Laughter) They are
14 rewarding, he appreciates the staffs work.
15
16 Walsh: Good Meeting, enjoyed working with everyone and thinks we are making good
17 progress but that we have a ways to go. Thanks all
18
19 Jones: Informs the Board that Alicia routinely gets kudos from the applicants and does a
20 great job. He asks them to return any supplies they don't need that can be used again to
21 save money. Feels it was a great meeting and apologizes for the small meeting room and
22 will reserve 1270 for August as soon as we are finished here.
23
24 Brownfield: Notes that this is Richard's last meeting as chairman and compliments him on a
25 bang-up job. (applause)
26
27 Heieren: Thanks the board. Compliments Alicia and Vern on the job they do. He considers
28 it a pleasure to be associated with the Board and feels the Board has made a lot of progress
29 in the 6 years he has been a part of it. He then turns the meeting over to Harley Hightower
30 the new Board Chair.
31
32 2:58 p.m. Hightower adjourns the meeting.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

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

Date: _____