

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 **February 9-10, 2012**

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
14 February 9-10, 2012 at 333 Willoughby Avenue, Juneau, AK, in the 9th floor conference
15 room A.

16
17 **Thursday February 9, 2012**

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

20
21 The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. Roll Call.

22
23 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board:

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

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

- 38
- 39 • Don Habeger, Director, CBPL
 - 40 • Vern Jones, Executive Administrator
 - 41 • Alicia Kelly, Licensing Examiner
 - 42 • John Savage, Investigator
 - 43 • Misty Frawley, Administrative Officer
- 44

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

- 46
- 47 • Colin Maynard, P.E., representing himself.
 - 48 • Dale Nelson, P.E., representing ASCE and APDC
 - 49 • Catherine Call, Architect, representing herself.
 - 50 • Jesse Gobeli, PE, representing himself.
 - 51 • Sean Hovors, representing APDC
 - 52 • Tom Gill, representing APDC

- Justin Cannon, representing APDC
- Vlad Irimescu, representing himself.

Agenda Item 2 – Review/Amend Agenda

Chair: We need to review and amend the agenda to include all those attachments that were passed out. Does anyone have any other changes? Richard?

Heieren: Asks to add election of officers to the agenda and at the request of the Chair makes a motion to nominate Brian Hanson as Chair, Richard Rearick as Vice Chair and Eric Eriksen as Secretary.

On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Brownfield and passed unanimously it was resolved to nominate Brian Hanson as Chair, Richard Rearick as Vice Chair and Eric Eriksen as Secretary.

Chair: Gives a couple minutes for everyone to add the amendments to the agenda. He added the syllabus on the arctic engineering course submitted for consideration under new business item 11 c.

Walsh: Where do we want to add Don?

Jones: Offers to go ask him when he would have a few minutes to address the Board.

Rearick: Asks to talk about 12 AAC 36.103.

Chair: It is item 7 A 4.

Jones: Reports that the Director will address the Board at 10 O'clock tomorrow morning. He adds that Jason Hooley would like to visit if the Board is still in session tomorrow afternoon.

On a motion duly made by Baker, seconded by Walsh and passed unanimously it was resolved to approve the agenda as amended.

Agenda item 3 – Ethics reporting

No ethics problems were reported.

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

Lent: Had some grammar and spelling corrections that he forwarded to Jones.

On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Brownfield and passed unanimously it was resolved to approve the minutes from the November 2011 meeting as amended.

Agenda item 7 Regulation Update

A) Regulations filed by the Lt. Governor.

1. 12 AAC 36.990 Definitions.

Chair: 7A is dealing with fire detection and suppression systems; He asks Craig if he has any comments?

1
2 Fredeen: Notes that the Fire Marshall's Office is still working on their side of this subject.
3 They are working on adoption of their codes.

4
5 Walsh: Asks why the AG added "studies and".

6
7 Jones: Responds that it was to be consistent with the other definitions.

8
9 Lent: Notes that he has prepared a brief for the Guidance Manual and will discuss when his
10 turn.

11
12 **2. 12 AAC 36.064 and 12 AAC 36.065 Land Surveying education**
13 **tables.**

14
15 Baker: Advises that the EPS committee is pushing an almost identical change to their
16 Model Law.

17
18 Heieren: Thanks the Board for supporting this change. He notes that the implementation is
19 July 2014 so everyone who felt they would have problems with this will have plenty of time
20 to pursue licensure. He adds that at least half of the States have these requirements and
21 it's the right thing to do.

22
23 **3. 12 AAC 36.103 Architect registration by comity.**

24
25 Rearick: Reviews and explains the changes made by the AAG.

26
27 Chair: Thanks the Board for their assistance on this regulation change. He notes that this
28 allows an alternate path to those who don't qualify for the NCARB Certificate and he has
29 receive positive feedback from his profession and that we are in line with approximately half
30 of the other jurisdictions.

31
32 **B) Status of Statute Changes**

33
34 **1) AS 08.48.055 Executive Secretary of the Board**

35
36 Heieren: Advises that Senator Giessel is sponsoring SB 143 which would give the Board a
37 full time investigator. He adds that Senator Giessel feels this won't get through this session
38 and we will have to deal with this again next year. He further stated that he spoke with the
39 Director and he would support this effort. Senator Giessel needs someone from the House
40 side and I have made contact with a Representative from the Fairbanks area who said he
41 would introduce a bill. There is a chance we will get it through this session but it isn't
42 looking as good as it could.

43
44 Walsh: Asks if individual letters should be sent or one from the Board.

45
46 Heieren: Senator Giessel recommended individual letters of support for this.

47
48 Brownfield: Recommends they be signed as individuals not board members.

49
50 Chair: Asks Heieren if he had sent a copy to Representative Thompson?

51
52 Heieren: Responds that he hasn't but that he would.

53
54 **2) AS 08.48.221 Seals**

1 **3) AS 08.48.281 Prohibitive practice**

2 **4) AS 08.48.341 Definitions**

3 **5) AS 08.48.331 Exemptions**

4
5 Chair: Reports that 2 through 5 will be included under one Senate bill that doesn't have a
6 number yet. He adds that the legal services for Senator Ellis changed it so drastically that it
7 took all of the teeth out of it and I spent yesterday in their office trying to get it redone and
8 that if it gets redone by this afternoon it may make it this year. They said we could still
9 tweak it some.

10
11 Called investigator Savage:

12
13 **Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report**

14
15 Savage: Thanks the departing members for all the help they have provided over the years.
16 He hopes the new members will be of the same caliber. He then reviews the Board report
17 and notes there are a lot of other actions going on other than just investigations. He adds
18 that they have been busy with the “yes block” investigations during the renewal cycle and
19 hopes they can get back to business as usual, site visits etc. in the near future.

20
21 Heieren: Fills Savage in on the Boards efforts regarding SB 143. And that he has a
22 Representative to introduce a House bill also. He asks Savage to convey his thanks for the
23 information he provided in support of this effort to Chief Investigator Warren.

24
25 Savage: Thanks the Board for this effort and adds that he will pass that to CI Warren.

26
27 Lent: Adds that he talked to Senator Menard and she would probably support that as well.

28
29 Savage: Thanks him and adds that the numbers and facts speak for themselves.

30
31 Chair: Thanks Savage for his report. (Call ended)

32
33 Jones: Checks to see if Misty Frawley can do the expenditure report early.

34
35 Baker: Notes that the heavy snows are causing buildings to collapse even though the snow
36 load hasn't reached the minimum 40 pounds per square foot design factor yet so this
37 reinforces the need for investigative visits.

38
39 There was a short discussion regarding the snow load requirements and the situation in
40 Anchorage while waiting for Ms. Frawley.

41
42 Break: 0840 – 0842

43
44 **Agenda item 6 – Expenditure Report**

45
46 Frawley: Reviews the 2nd quarter Board Report she provided. She notes that the Board will
47 probably not end in a deficit as we did last time. She adds that the indirect was larger
48 because of the timing of the billing.

49
50 Brownfield: Asks about the rumor of an additional \$500,000 in travel funds being available.

51
52 Frawley: Responds that it is in the Governor's supplemental budget request is in and
53 hopefully it will pass.

1 Heieren: Clarifies that the \$500,000 was for all boards not just AELS.

2
3 Chair: Thanks Misty for her report.

4
5 Walsh: Asks Jones if the revenue for the first half of the FY was new licensees?

6
7 Jones: Responds that it was mostly and adds that we started renewals around December
8 first.

9
10 **Agenda item 9 – Board Correspondence Sent since November 2011**

11
12 A) Email from the Chair to Colin Maynard and Dale Nelson

13
14 Chair: Reports that it is response to 16a. He explains what happened and that it appeared
15 that we had continued the meeting without public notice and that he doesn't feel that we
16 needed to do any additional public notice. All we did was divide up the public responses for
17 review during the night with reports due the next day.

18
19 Brownfield: Notes that sometimes a deviation from normal procedure is required and that
20 he doesn't feel the Chair needs to explain the reasons and that in his opinion the complaint
21 was out of line.

22
23 Fredeen: Concurs with Brownfield. He adds that it's in the public's best interest that the
24 Board use it's time efficiently and that it sets a dangerous precedent notifying one or two
25 groups that we are coming back into session is not necessary.

26
27 Chair: Adds that APDC was here to hear the discussion on the regulation changes to lend
28 support for them and that they thought we continued the discussion without them present.

29
30 Hanson: Wasn't at the meeting but having read both letters thought the response was
31 appropriate.

32
33 Baker: Notes that we just divided up the public responses for homework and didn't discuss
34 anything until the next morning when they were present.

35
36 Walsh: Asks what prompted the letter because the minutes state what happened.

37
38 Chair: At that time no one had the minutes yet. They were upset because they thought we
39 had continued the discussion on the regulation changes without them present when they
40 were here specifically to help us.

41
42 Jones: Reminds the Board that perception is important in cases like this. That if the
43 perception is that the Board did something under the table then that is what everyone
44 believes regardless of what actually happened.

45
46 B) Email from Vernon to Matthew Pinard re not-abet ET degree.

47
48 Jones: That was just a response to the gentleman that had the non-ABET technology
49 degree and what he might do to become eligible.

50
51 C) Email from Chair to Dale Nelson re Statute changes.

52
53 Chair: Explains that the Senate legal services made some changes and he was working
54 with Dale Nelson to get them changed back to his original verbiage.

1
2 **Agenda item 10 – Old Business.**

3
4 A) Procedures for reviewing applicants for grandfathering.

5
6 Brownfield: I don't really have anything to report. He recommends that this be assigned to
7 someone else since this is his last meeting.

8
9 Heieren: Reports that he has been networking with other Boards across the Western states
10 regarding this. He recommends a procedure where the plans and calcs are submitted to
11 licensed individuals in other states. Still work to be done on possible fees and agreements.
12 He recommends a question and answer sheet for oral interview.

13
14 Rearick: Recommends that we establish a set of criteria and a check list for the evaluators
15 to follow to keep personnel differences in design out of it.

16
17 Heieren: Asks Rearick to prepare a check list.

18
19 Rearick: Suggests we wait until Colin is on the Board as he is a structural engineer of
20 course there is the other disciplines as well. He would be happy to work on but thinks other
21 technical input from the other disciplines is needed.

22
23 Chair: Asks how grandfathering is addressed in the regulation.

24
25 Heieren: States that he just gave an outline of what the regulation basically is of it with the
26 caveat of outside evaluation. He adds that that's what we are trying to do is develop a
27 procedure to process these and Richard brings up a good point.

28
29 Chair: Asks if that needs to be in regulation?

30
31 Heieren: Believes that it can be done through a policy or procedure and that a check list is
32 probably the first thing to be done. He would like it before he goes to Western Zone so he
33 can hand it out to prospective evaluators.

34
35 Walsh: Asks if it has been done in other states.

36
37 Heieren: Yes, some of them have been disasters.

38
39 Fredeen: Suggests caution with check lists because someone may be only familiar with one
40 side of a discipline like FP suppression or detection. Designs should be across the
41 discipline.

42
43 Hanson: Thinks check lists is a great idea because ultimately it's up to the Board to decide.
44 He feels a lot of people will continue to work under their present license.

45
46 Baker: Suggests that licensees from other states that are reviewing projects should have
47 the arctic and seismic background that we require.

48
49 Fredeen: That will significantly reduce our pool.

50
51 Baker: That's why I brought it up, I think it's important.

52
53 Heieren: I, on the other hand, don't think it's a problem.

54

1 Brownfield: I agree with Brian. It is a big deal because if we are going to do it we need to
2 do it right the first time. He suggests Colin will be a valuable asset in development of this
3 procedure.
4

5 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it**
6 **was resolved to establish a special committee to bring forward a check list for**
7 **establishing a person's qualifications for licensure through grandfathering.**
8

9 Walsh: Asks if he is talking about one for structural or for all branches?
10

11 Heieren: One check list for all.
12

13 Chair: Asks if he wants to establish a deadline?
14

15 Heieren: By the next meeting.
16

17 Walsh: Recommends that the Board not rush through this.
18

19 Heieren: Thinks if he has it at the Western Zone meeting he may get a lot of feedback on it.
20

21 Baker: Agrees that a trial or rough outline may be a good idea.
22

23 Chair: Notes that the new Board members take effective March 1st and we don't have to
24 wait until the next meeting to assign them to committees. (Laughter)
25

26 **Agenda item 11 – New business.**
27

28 A) Length of time original drawings are held.
29

30 Hanson: Notes that this has come up several times. He doesn't think we need to have a
31 position on this but we could discuss it. He provided a draft response on the second page of
32 the email but doesn't know if it was sent to Design Alaska.
33

34 Lent: Verifies that this isn't in the Guidance Manual.
35

36 Brownfield: Agrees with Brian. It depends on the facility and the engineer. He doesn't think
37 we should get in the business of putting a length of time on it. He feels it depends on what
38 the project is and what the owner wants.
39

40 Eriksen: Points out that firms have different policies on retention of documents and he
41 doesn't think this Board should be setting policy on that.
42

43 Hanson: Agrees. He adds that his company gets about two calls a year for documents that
44 are over 30 years old. They have a retention policy on different types of documents.
45

46 Shiesl: Relates a story of a law suit when he was with the Borough and they had to go to
47 the state archives for engineering information on a bankrupt engineering firm. He asks if
48 anyone knows what the State archives role is.
49

50 Chair: I'm going to interrupt our meeting for a minute; I think Colin may have something on
51 this.
52

53 Maynard: APDC got the Statute of Repose passed about 15 years ago. You can only be
54 sued for six years after substantial completion.

1
2 The discussion continued for a short period and drifted into electronic signatures and
3 software to remove them if the document was altered and the Chair cut the discussion off
4 with the result that the Board should not dictate a specific time for retention. He further
5 stated that if the signature issue needed to be discussed further to submit it to Vern for next
6 the next meeting agenda. Rearick volunteered to research and report at next meeting.

7
8 B) Regulation change for early approval to take LARE.
9

10 Lent: Updates the Board on the proposal from CLARB that students be allowed to start the
11 LARE while in college. A study showed that taking the exam fresh out of college produced
12 the highest scores on the exam. He supports the idea and suggested language for a
13 regulation change.

14
15 Baker: Notes that for surveyors and engineers they can take the fundamentals early and
16 architects allow certain divisions of the ARE to be taken early but that he doesn't see
17 anything in the LARE divisions on whether they are fundamentals or professional.

18
19 Lent: Responds that CLARB is currently restructuring the examination divisions and that
20 they will be computer based and CLARB will determine which divisions can be taken early.

21
22 Rearick: Clarifies that some of the ARE divisions are geared toward the student but that
23 once approved you can take anyone of them when you want. Some of them you will do
24 better after working in the profession.

25
26 Hanson: Asks if we are going to follow the way that the A.R.E. is done?
27

28 Lent: CLARB is looking at that right now. They are looking at the architect's exam because
29 they are allowed to take portions early and so are engineers.

30
31 Hanson: Asks if it would be possible for someone to take and pass all of the divisions
32 before they met the experience requirements.

33
34 Lent: Doubts that CLARB would allow all the divisions to be taken before the experience
35 requirements were met. I just wanted to get this discussion started.

36
37 Baker: Believes we are jumping the gun. We should wait until CLARB presents their plan.
38

39 Brownfield: Is against allowing someone to take an examination that is supposed to
40 measure experience before they get that experience.

41
42 **On a motion duly made by Hanson, seconded by Lent and passed with Baker**
43 **abstaining it was resolved to form a special committee to investigate changes to 12**
44 **AAC 36.068 and timing of such changes.**

45
46 C) Review of Arctic engineering course syllabus.
47

48 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Baker and passed unanimously it**
49 **was resolved to form a special committee to review the arctic engineering course**
50 **syllabus.**

51
52 Fredeen: Asks if this was the gentleman that asked for a waiver of the approved course
53 and approval of the cold weather course he had taken?
54

1 Jones: No this is a company out of Texas that wants to have their course approved as
2 meeting the requirements for the arctic engineering course.

3
4 Break 0953 – 1010

5
6 **Agenda item 16 – Correspondence received since November 2011.**

- 7
8 A) Email from Colin Maynard re November Board meeting.
9 B) Email from Chris Miller re Board Packet.

10
11 Rearick: Is not sure if it's appropriate to publish the draft minutes ahead of time and it
12 seems like that is what he's asking for.

13
14 Jones: Is against publishing the entire Board packet online. If someone sees reference to
15 something they do not have available they can contact me and I will provide it.

16
17 Shiesl: References Roberts Rules and that it isn't appropriate to publish things that haven't
18 been approved by the Board.

19
20 Baker: Doesn't think it appropriate to publish the entire packet online.

21
22 Fredeen: Points out that public correspondence is just that, public.

23
24 Jones: Explains further what brought up the question: In the last minutes Heieren had
25 referred to an email saying that "it speaks for itself" and didn't read it. Mr. Miller wanted to
26 know what the email said. In a case like that I will provide a copy upon request but I don't
27 want to get in the habit of publishing the entire Board Packet online.

28
29 Heieren: Doesn't think this warrant's a motion. It's a procedural thing, if anyone wants
30 something they can ask for it and it will be provided.

31
32 Brownfield: Adds that the costs should be passed on to the recipient.

- 33
34 C) Email from Mark Lentz re CE credit

35
36 Jones: Explains that in the past we had been requiring CE after two full years of licensure
37 but that the regulation reads that you are exempt from CE your first renewal so we changed
38 the policy to conform to the regulation.

- 39
40 D) Email from David Pacheco re 9/11 disaster.

41
42 Brownfield: No response necessary.

- 43
44 E) Letter from Chris Kammerer re Civil/Structural licensing by comity.

45
46 Hanson: Doesn't think we should be discussing individual applications. But in this case I
47 believe we made an appropriate decision and he is just presenting his argument. We
48 require an NCEES exam and one was not presented.

49
50 Jones: I explained the Board's position on this that when you receive a civil license you are
51 able to do anything a civil is allowed to do and in order to get the license you have to pass
52 the civil exam.

53
54 Fredeen: Brings up the issue of the structural exams. Whether or not we are going to

1 accept the structural I and II exams.

2
3 Baker: Believes that the individual is licensed and should be able to come in with the
4 structural exam he was licensed under since if we had offered the structural exam at that
5 time it would have been the structural that was available then.

6
7 Hanson: Points out that the discussion has wandered and that the question is that he is
8 requesting we accept an exam that we don't presently recognize and that our decision was
9 appropriate and that there is no avenue for him to be licensed without taking the civil exam.

10
11 Chair: We answered this already? Is there a means for him to participate in the Public
12 Comment session without being in Juneau?

13
14 Jones: No.

15
16 F) Email from Don Habeger re Financial disclosure for Board Members.

17
18 Hanson: Noted, we don't have to fill out disclosers.

19
20 Chair: That's for information only.

21
22 G) NCEES

23 1) Report of Nov. 11-12, 2011 BOD meeting from Jean Boline.

24
25 Fredeen: Asks that the delegates that go to the NCEES meeting inform them of the
26 geographical limitations in Alaska regarding computer test sites and that they establish test
27 sites in Anchorage, Fairbanks and Juneau.

28
29 Rearick: NCARB is looking for a new provider for electronic exams and I wrote a letter to
30 them asking that they provide more than one location in Alaska promoting Fairbanks and
31 Juneau as alternate locations because of the distances involved. He thinks the Board
32 should write a letter to NCEES and NCARB regarding this.

33
34 Jones: Is not sure of the cost to establish a test site but thinks that Fairbanks would be a
35 good choice because UAF requires the FE to graduate but Juneau usually only has a few if
36 any examinees.

37
38 Rearick: Suggests that APDC may write a letter as well.

39
40 Walsh: Will talk with the Dean and maybe he can help.

41
42 Heieren: Notes that the Nursing Board is CBT and asks where their exams are.

43
44 Fredeen: Adds that there is an electronic testing agency in Fairbanks.

45
46 Heieren: Adds that the FS is going to CBT also and that even though the State Society is
47 resisting this idea, the AKLS should be moving to CBT also. He then goes into a
48 presentation on the TwiST program and the endorsement by the EPS committee.

49
50 Fredeen: Recommends a motion at the WZ meeting to support this and that the Board
51 establish a TF to write a letter of support.

52
53 Heieren: Advises that he already has a white paper and will provide to the Board this
54 afternoon

1
2 **On a motion duly made by Fredeen, seconded by Baker and passed unanimously it**
3 **was resolved to create a special task force, chaired by Richard Heieren, with the**
4 **intent of writing a letter of endorsement for the program and support funding of the**
5 **TwIST program by NCEES.**
6

7 Baker: Notes that this is targeted at and high school and junior high teachers and that he
8 can't think of a better program to present the field of surveying.
9

10 2) Memo from Tim Miller re changes to exams.
11

12 Chair: This is information only.
13

14 3) Email from Peggy Abshagen re Investigator training.
15

16 No comments
17

18 4) Western Distinguished Service Award request for nomination.
19

20 No comments
21

22 5) ANSI recognizes NCEES Model Law Structural Engineer Standard
23

24 No comments
25

26 H) CLARB
27

28 1) CLARB E-News November 2011
29

30 Lent: Reviews CLARB's welfare report and the need for a welfare representative.
31

32 Chair: You can take care of that.
33

34 2) CLARB E-News December 2011
35

36 3) CLARB E-News January 2012
37

38 No comments.
39

40 I) NCARB
41

42 1) Fast Facts 29 November 2011
43

44 2) News Clips 29 November 2011
45

46 3) Email from NCARB CEO of 7 December 2011
47

48 4) IDP e-news December 2011
49

50 5) IDP supervisor e-news December 2011
51

52 6) News Clips 19 December 2011
53

54 7) Fast Facts 21 December 2011
55

8) ARE 3-news December 2011
56

9) Letter from Jon Alan Baker re candidate for Secretary
57

10) Nominations for NCARB officers
58

11) NCARB BOD Brief
59

12) CEO update
60

13) Fast Facts January 2012
61

62 Rearick: Asks to summarize instead of going through all 13 items. He mentions that the
63 Practice Analysis of 80,000 architects will start in April. NCARB is in the final phase of the
64 implementation of IDP which goes into effect April 3, 2012. The final item of significance is
65 that AIA has modified its CE requirements. They are requiring 12 hours of HSW annually to
66 come into alignment with NCARB's efforts to standardize CE requirements.
67

1
2 Chair: The last item is Jon Baker's candidacy for Secretary and we support him. He is part
3 of Western Region.

4
5 J) Email from Larry Huling re work qualification for the PE exam.

6
7 Jones: Explains the writer's complaint with the wording of the regulation.

8
9 Baker: Points out that it refers to the table and that this is just a word game.

10
11 Jones: Agrees and suggests that in a future regulation change maybe change the "or" to
12 "and".

13
14 Hanson: Notes that all the regulations pretty much say the same thing and that he didn't like
15 the tone of the email. He doesn't see a problem and doesn't think we need to change
16 anything.

17
18 Chair: No action required. He asks Vern if he thinks a change is warranted.

19
20 Jones: I believe at the time that was written we did allow experience only applicants.

21
22 Hanson: Agrees but still doesn't see a problem with it as written.

23
24 Walsh: Points out that when we review an application we review their education and
25 experience separately.

26
27 K) Governors Board Appointments.
28 No comments.

29
30 L) Email from Vlad Irimescuc re applicants by comity.

31
32 Chair: Responded letting him know he could address the Board and that the regulation is
33 being changed.

34
35 **Agenda item 17 – Special Committees.**

36
37 General Licensure:

38
39 Brownfield: Thinks we are done with that one.

40
41 Heieren: Suggests that instead of a special committee we just put it under the General
42 Licensure committee.

43
44 Hanson: Recommends deleting it.

45
46 Walsh: Notes that there will be plenty of things come up that could be assigned to that
47 committee and doesn't see any problem keeping it. Maybe change the name of it.

48
49 Jones: Just take the word General off.

50
51 Baker: Licensure Implementation.

52
53 Chair: We are losing Boyd and Craig. He asks Rearick if he is familiar enough with the
54 subject writing a white paper on the check list.

1
2 Rearick: I think the engineers need to be pretty involved in this. I'm happy to help but don't
3 think I should be point on it.
4

5 Chair: Don, Brian and you are on this committee and I think I'm going to add Maynard in
6 parenthesis, I don't think I can assign him yet.
7

8 Brownfield: Recommends Hanson for chair of the committee until he takes over as Board
9 Chair. Maybe keep it where it is until the new people arrive and make a decision then.
10

11 Chair: Since you and Craig are not off the board yet you can both keep going until March 1
12 and we will sort it out next meeting. He asks Boyd to continue as chair until March 1st and
13 stresses that we need to keep this going and get the implementation correct. He adds that
14 he is somewhat confused in that it seems all other paths to licensure are in regulation and
15 we are talking about doing this by policy. Does that make sense?
16

17 Brownfield: Explains that these are done in Statue, Regulation and Policy. The policy
18 would support what is in the Statute and Regulation.
19

20 Incidental Practice:

21
22 Chair: Incidental practice has never been the correct name for this committee. It's basically
23 all of these issues, sealing documents, exemptions, incidental practice and it's still active
24 because it doesn't look like we are going to get these things through this year.
25

26 Brownfield: We could call it accidental practice.
27

28 After a short discussion it was decided to change it to Registration and Practice Committee.
29

30 Licensure Mobility:

31
32 Walsh: Reports that there isn't much going on.
33

34 Eriksen: Reports on a meeting with the Legislature, BC, PINWER regarding the status of
35 licensure mobility between Alaska and Canada. The BC rep was going to follow up on
36 getting us a copy of their ethic exam.
37

38 Jones: Expands on the report in that they were told that the hang up at present was the fact
39 that they want us to waive our PE exam but they don't want to waive their ethics exam. He
40 reported on Mr. Windsor's health situation and his recovery.
41

42 There was a short discussion on where the discussion on this has gone over the years and
43 which states have signed agreements with them. It was noted that the architects and
44 landscape architects are also working on this.
45

46 Walsh: Sees this negotiation as a means to remove unreasonable impediments to licensure
47 and he doesn't see examination as an impediment. He doesn't think all requirements
48 should be waived.
49

50 Brownfield: Cautions that whatever we decide with Canada will open the door to all other
51 countries, so we need to be careful.
52

53 Chair: Adds that there are Canadians on the exam committees and they alter some
54 question to fit their codes.

1
2 Chair: Decides not to make any committee assignment changes until next meeting when
3 our new members are present.

4
5 Mining Engineers/Geologists:

6
7 Walsh: Draws attention to the testimony in the minutes of last meeting and recommends
8 that they be pulled and put in a file for this committee. He adds that once we get
9 environmental engineers license there may be more conflict between what engineers do and
10 what geologists do the Registration and Practice committee may need to write an exemption
11 for geologists.

12
13 Land Surveyor Education Committee:

14
15 Heieren: Dissolve it.

16
17 The discussion turned to new special committees and it was brought up that a motion had
18 been made earlier to form a special committee. The Board then decided a motion wasn't
19 needed to form a committee so a motion was made to rescind the earlier action.

20
21 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Baker and passed unanimously it**
22 **was resolved to rescind the earlier motion to form a committee for grandfathering.**

23
24 A short discussion followed renaming the committees where needed.

25
26 Chair: Interrupted the meeting to answer a phone call with the Lt Governors office regarding
27 signing of the regulation changes via teleconference. It was decided to do it Friday morning
28 at 10 a.m. in his Juneau office.

29
30 Break: 11:36 – 11:45

31
32 Chair: Added the special committee for the syllabus and assigned all engineers to it and
33 ask them all to review it and decide if it meets the requirements.

34
35 Heieren: Asks if maybe the people that present the other arctic courses shouldn't be the
36 ones to evaluate this.

37
38 Walsh: Thinks that since all the other courses are offered by Universities that maybe that
39 should be our standard and that this one wouldn't qualify because of that.

40
41 Fredeen: Agreed

42
43 Chair: He asks Heieren about the TwiST program.

44
45 Heieren: Yes, just a committee of one.

46
47 Chair: We are adding one committee as a special TF.

48
49 Hanson: This arctic course is a big decision and I would rather not make it this afternoon.
50 Can we take it up later?

51
52 Chair: Let's break for lunch now.

53
54 11:50 Lunch

1
2 12:03 Back on record.

3
4 Chair: Standing committees.

5
6 Investigative Advisory Committee:

7
8 Chair: Boyd and I have been doing that for some time. Brian has helped out some. I will
9 continue for as long as needed.

10
11 Heieren: John does contact others on some surveying issues. I think he enlists all of us as
12 his needs dictate.

13
14 Guidance Manual:

15
16 Lent: Asks for help because he is confused on the exemption in AS 08.48.331 (14) and the
17 definition that just became effective defining what those who are exempt can do.

18
19 Fredeen: Explains the exemption and the regulation to Lent.

20
21 Lent: Reads his change to the Guidance Manual regarding this new definition.

22
23 Fredeen: Volunteers to work with Bert on the wording for the manual.

24
25 Chair: Craig will help you with that and you can report at the next meeting.

26
27 It was decided to hold the revision of the manual until after the new regulations were
28 effective and then put out a major revision.

29
30 Emeritus Status:

31
32 Nothing to report.

33
34 Budget Committee:

35
36 Walsh: requests we put that off until later because he has a few things to report.

37
38 **Agenda item 12 – Public Comment.**

39
40 Catherine Call: My name is Catherine Call and I'm an architect licensed in the State of
41 Alaska and I got my license in 1989. I went through NCARB, the IDP and arctic engineering
42 class and northern design and I am now self employed and design mostly houses. That's a
43 little bit about my background. I served on the AIA Board for many years; I'm now past, past
44 president. I'm here speaking to from the trenches about some of the licensing requirements
45 for architects. I would like to thank the Board for the amendments to regulation are being
46 signed by the Lt Governor which addressed licensure by comity for architects. I think that
47 was a great move and I wrote the Board in support of that move in September of last year
48 and I appreciate your efforts on our behalf. I'm here today to open up discussion about
49 further amending 12 AAC 36.060 and 061 so that it's more in line with the requirements for
50 engineering licensure as outlined in the Statute. I'd like to say that when the architecture
51 community lobbied for the adoption of an NCARB certificate and the corollary NAAB
52 accredited degree as the sole qualification for sitting for the ARE which is the Architectural
53 Registration Exam and getting licensed in Alaska I think the prevailing sentiment at the time
54 was that we should meet a National Standard and that it would benefit architects to give

1 them a license that would give them mobility. I firmly believe that meeting a National
2 Standard is a great idea; I've done so personally, I enrolled in the IDP before it was adopted
3 as a National Standard. So I think it's a great idea but I think there is a big, however, and
4 the however is that we are very remote. Individuals who move to Alaska without a NAAB
5 accredited degree are placed in licensing purgatory. They can't meet the licensing standards
6 without leaving the State for further education. They had an option of commuting with the
7 Boston Architectural Center with at considerable expense and obtain a professional degree
8 that way; it's about \$50,000 and takes a few years. They do have two options right now.
9 One is to apply for licensure in another state which does not require a NAAB degree and
10 then apply to Alaska by comity. The other is to go through NCARB to obtain a certificate
11 through the Broadly Experienced Architect Program. To do so you, first of all, have to be
12 registered in another state. I looked up the requirement this morning. Then you have to
13 have three options, if you have a pre-professional degree you need 6 years of experience.
14 If you have a non-architectural degree you need 8 years of experience. If you have no
15 degree what so ever you need 10 years of experience. We are a remote state, people come
16 here and want to stay, they become competent professionals through their on the job
17 experience. They become knowledgeable in the particulars of designing and building in the
18 many rigorous climates that Alaska provides. It seems to me short sighted that the state will
19 license a person straight out of school with IDP experience and one class in northern design
20 but won't license a seasoned professional with years of Alaska specific project experience
21 purely on the basis of the nature of their degree. I don't think this standard serves the public
22 welfare or the State and I encourage the Board to consider the model of the licensing board
23 of the State of Hawaii. Hawaii has a more flexible path to licensure, one more in keeping
24 with Alaska's requirements for engineers which present a range of education and
25 experience combinations. I'd also mention that Hawaii does have an accredited degree
26 program for individuals who need to obtain a professional degree, Alaska has neither. I
27 hope the Board will consider addressing these shortcomings as an accredited school of
28 architecture is going to be a long, long time coming in the State of Alaska. So, I've said my
29 piece and will entertain questions, I just wanted to put this forward for consideration in the
30 future.

31
32 Chair: Does the Board have any questions or comments?

33
34 Rearick: Do you know how Hawaii evaluates potential licensees that don't have a NAAB
35 accredited degree? Do they use EESA to evaluate individuals?

36
37 Call: Let me explain what EESA is. EESA is a program for people who have a license
38 outside the United States. My employee of seven years just got her German degree EESA
39 approved and now she is able to proceed through NCARB, she has completed the IDP
40 program and is eligible to sit for the exam. But that is for people whose degree is not in
41 America. You must have a foreign degree.

42
43 Rearick: Thought that is who NCARB used to evaluate degrees, I don't think it is
44 necessarily foreign. If it's not EESA, it's another organization.

45
46 Call: Actually Ann did apply through Hawaii before she, uh because Hawaii is like a \$250
47 fee to have your degree evaluated and EESA 3 to 5 thousand if I remember correctly.
48 Hawaii basically has set up their own Broadly Experienced Architect Program. So it's very
49 similar to a BEA regs. that I just read to you. So they use that as a way to ascertain how
50 much education you have and then decide how many years of experience you need to
51 balance it.

52
53 Rearick: I have looked at it a little bit; I've actually looked at quite a few states. There are a
54 couple states out there that will allow you to, based on the Board review and approval of

1 education, but then they articulate that the board will use a certain method to evaluate it and
2 the applicant will pay for that. So there is still going to be some sort of process in there that
3 may be less expensive than the BEA but still some sort of outside process that we would
4 have to use professionals to have a system in place for evaluating that. This Board doesn't
5 have the capacity or the money to do that evaluation.

6
7 Call: I would be very happy to bring those regulations in to the next meeting which I think is
8 in Anchorage. Ann did go through that process and paid that fee and got the necessary
9 evaluation of her degree from Hawaii and I think that would be good information for you to
10 have as you consider this. I can't speak to it today, I didn't print out all the paperwork before
11 I came, which I regret.

12
13 Rearick: We are actually meeting in Fairbanks in May.

14
15 Call: Well maybe I need to go to Fairbanks.

16
17 Rearick: You can also send stuff in to the Board.

18
19 Call: Ok, I will do so.

20
21 Chair: I would like to thank you for the presentation. I also sympathize with some very
22 qualified individuals who are here in the State who are prevented from being registered. We
23 will look into that.

24
25 Call: Thank you for your time and enjoy the rest of your day.

26
27 Heieren: Asks to move back to special committee number 5 because he handed out a
28 paper on the TWiST program and wanted to get a vote of confidence so he could move
29 forward with it. He explains that it's Teaching with Spatial Technology, a program that
30 introduces the surveying profession and the software that surveyors use on a regular basis.
31 It's a one week program sponsored by the Oregon Institute of Technology and it's going to
32 be presented in Vancouver at Clark Community College for 25 to 50 teachers. The EPS
33 committee at NCEES has endorsed the program and is looking for matching money from
34 NCEES BOD/Western Zone/Central Zone. He continues explaining some of the charges
35 from the EPS committee. He would like a motion to endorse NCEES support for the TWiST
36 program on a Nation Level.

37
38 Walsh: Thinks it's more for the professional societies but wouldn't oppose it.

39
40 The discussion continued for a few more minutes it was noted that NCEES has outreach
41 information packages (speaker kits) for individuals to use when they have an opportunity to
42 promote the profession.

43
44 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Brownfield and passed unanimously**
45 **it was resolved that the Alaska Board advocates that NCEES support the TWiST**
46 **Program.**

47
48 Chair: goes back to Public comment due to the arrival of several new speakers.

49
50 Jesse Gobeli: I apologize for being late. I'm a structural engineer; I've been practicing since
51 about 1984 based out of Anchorage. I just wanted to speak up for the change in licensing
52 recognizing structural engineer. I just wanted to make sure that grandfathering provisions
53 are very liberal in that, engineers such as me who have been practicing for a number of
54 years and don't want to necessarily go back and take another exam and have to go through

1 that whole process. Also engineers such as me work for bigger corporations design projects
2 but don't necessarily stamp them. It's a little bit difficult sometimes to have those projects on
3 the resume if that's what you're looking for is projects that you've actually stamped even
4 though you've been the engineer in responsible charge. Those are my comments toward a
5 liberal grandfathering policy for those who are structural engineers but up until now have
6 been civil.

7
8 Heieren: Suggests that if the engineer was the responsible charge and feels comfortable
9 signing the project after the fact even though the company has another engineer stamp it.
10 That would be acceptable.

11
12 Brownfield: Adds that civil engineers will still be able to practice structural engineering as
13 long as they stay within their education and experience even if they don't get the SE stamp.

14
15 Gobeli: Adds that he understands the intent of the regulation but is afraid that some of the
16 companies will start requiring an SE stamp and won't understand that a licensed civil can
17 practice structural. He has seen that happen in other states such as California even though
18 it's not state law they will ask for a licensed structural engineer in their proposals.

19
20 Dale Nelson: John Walsh who is our lobbyist, both of us were on the phone with Lt.
21 Governor Mead Treadwell and tomorrow is the signing of your, I haven't even looked at it, I
22 just opened it up. It will be by Skype, he is in Anchorage, so you'll be connected
23 electronically. As you all know I'm with the Alaska Professional Design Council, the
24 legislative part of it. We are here in Juneau and there will be three students follow me, two
25 are here from the University Alaska Anchorage and one from the University Alaska
26 Fairbanks. The other one is a little bit on the ill side. Anyway let me first talk to our position
27 paper that we have. It's expanding the QBS to cover recipients of State funds. Vern, I'll
28 drop a copy of this off to you. And then the University of Alaska engineering program and
29 funding we are supporting that and the one that's out is the construction of engineering
30 facilities at UAF and UAA. Senator Ellis is the one that has the funding bill in place and we
31 are working on supporting that. And of course, we are supporting the transportation
32 programs and the funding of infrastructure and so forth. Now, to yours, there is the bill 143
33 that Senator Kathy Giessel has drafted. There is ping ponging back and forth. John Walsh
34 and myself met with Bill Stoltz, uh excuse me, Bob Lynn and she is pushing that thing to get
35 a hearing on it so we get it moving forward on it and that's the investigator. We need to get
36 that moving forward and the reason we were late we were also sat in Senator Stevens office
37 to just bring this information out so we get that visibility. Then the other one and Harley you
38 can help with this because this is five items on this one. Senator Ellis's office, and I was
39 hoping to have a re-draft of those five Statute amendments but it hasn't come back yet so I
40 wasn't able to bring the re-draft with me for you to take a look at. We are looking to get a
41 sponsor both in the House and Senate for you folks. It's a work in progress I guess is the
42 short term of where we are at. That's the things we are doing. We've been busy and the
43 amendments that you have are well received. John is getting some information packets
44 from Kathy Giessel' office and we will get information out so others understand it. It's hard
45 for us to talk if we don't have all the background. You sent some information, its public
46 record so it's all out in the open. It's just so we get tuned up. It's not that APDC doesn't
47 support it's just to give it a shove, or is someone has questions, we answer it right there or
48 make a call to someone who can say help. I look at you Vern and one is, how many cases,
49 what is the workload and then it's the funding and of course you guys deal with that.

50
51 Chair: Thanks Dale and asks the student to introduce themselves.

52
53 Sean Hovors: My name is Sean Hovors; I'm a third year civil engineering student at
54 University Alaska Anchorage. I'm the current president of Engineers Without Borders. We

1 are doing great things over in Cameroon Africa and looking to branch out into some of the
2 bush villages a bit more, try to come up with some student engineered solutions out there as
3 well. I'm here in Juneau today supporting the new engineering buildings as was mentioned
4 earlier by Dale. My first time in Juneau but having a blast talking to a lot of important people
5 trying to get my voice out there. Any question on the building or anything?
6

7 Chair: I think we are well versed on that and we support it. Thank you, we like to see
8 students and young practitioners.
9

10 Lent: Complements Sean on his testimony in Senator Menard's office yesterday.
11

12 Tom Gill: My name is Tom Gill; I'm an engineering student like Sean, third year. I'm
13 interested in structural so it's interesting that the timing was good in that the discussion was
14 structural licensing. I'm a Marine veteran here of course to support Senator Ellis's Senate
15 Bill 107 and we've talk to lots and lots of people. Most support of but it was more interesting
16 to talk to the Representatives and Senators who were skeptical. It helped to sharpen and
17 hone our argument.
18

19 Justin Cannon: I'm Justin Cannon; I'm a third year petroleum engineering student at UAF.
20 I'm also here to vouch for the need for building on UAF and UAA. I'm a member of the
21 (unintelligible) engineering society and also the petroleum engineering society.
22

23 Chair: Thanks Justin and the rest for their participation and help with the bills.
24

25 Baker: Comments on the presentation by Mr. Gobeli in that if someone came into Alaska by
26 comity and was licensed as a structural in another jurisdiction they don't have to do the
27 grandfathering they can apply by comity and he thinks a lot of them are missing that.
28

29 Heieren: Clarifies that he understands that and was speaking for other practitioners in the
30 state.
31

32 Chair: Back to Standing Committees:
33

34 Legislative Liaison:
35

36 Eriksen: Reports that during the meeting with the Canadians re mobility in addition to the
37 representative from PINWER there were a couple of Senators and staff from the Governor's
38 office and one of them had some experience with the Nursing Board and brought up that
39 there are other boards within the state that have agreements with Canada and recommend
40 we look into how some of the other boards approached this.
41

42 Budget Committee:
43

44 Walsh: Reports that it looks like we are making some progress on travel money. He
45 encourages the Board to keep an eye on the possible increase of applicants due to the
46 addition of the other branches of engineering as it may become necessary to ask for a third
47 staff member if it significantly increases.
48

49 Chair: Advises that he had a conversation with a previous Board member who said that
50 during the pipeline days the conference table would be covered with application files during
51 the review and it really worked the Board hard.
52

53 Walsh: Adds that we've been lucky that the staff has taken such good care of us I would
54 hate to see their work load dramatically rise with no additional help.

1
2 Chair: Asks how long it would take for an additional staff once the request was made.

3
4 Jones: Don't know.

5
6 Walsh: Asks how long we have been a two staff office vs. a three staff office? He thinks the
7 number of applicants has probably increased since that time.

8
9 Jones: Responds that when he first got the job as Licensing Examiner there were two
10 examiners assigned to the Board. Then for whatever reason Eleanor chose to move to
11 another board that was more in line with her education and Ginger felt that I could handle
12 the workload and opted to let the PCN go to the Game Board. He adds that the increase
13 has been a slow increase and hasn't been a problem yet. He feels that with the new
14 branches that there will not be a huge surge, possible over time if a large project gets
15 started like the gas pipeline we will see an increase.

16
17 Hanson: Asks for an update on the travel budget.

18
19 Jones: Explains the history of this FY's travel funds and that the Division has requested a
20 supplemental appropriation and they are reasonably sure it will be approved which will give
21 us the amount that we requested in the annual report which was around \$75K.

22
23 Heieren: Asks if it would be appropriate to send the new appointees to Western Zone?

24
25 Jones: I was going to bring that up during the travel discussion tomorrow.

26
27 Walsh: Asks when the Director will be available and if there is anything we should be asking
28 him about?

29
30 Jones: Tomorrow at 10a.m. and you might ask him about next FY's travel.

31
32 Continuing Education:

33
34 Nothing to report.

35
36 IDP Liaison:

37
38 Chair: Reports that he and Rearick are responding to AIA coordinator as necessary to keep
39 them up to speed on new regulations for IDP. That's a continuing effort.

40
41 **On a motion duly made by Baker, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it**
42 **was resolved to go into executive session under authority of AS 44.62.310 to review**
43 **applicant files.**

44
45 2:00p.m. The Board went into executive session.

46
47 6:20p.m. Adjourned for the day.

48
49
50
51 **Friday February 10, 2012**

52
53 8:00 a.m. Back in Session in executive session.

1 8:09 a.m. Back on record. Roll Call, All present.

2

3 Chair: We are on the subject of multiple failures, who wants to start?

4

5 Jones: Reports on emails received from several states on their requirements to continue
6 testing after multiple failures. Requirements vary from additional education to a waiting
7 period and continuing education to Board interviews.

8

9 Baker: Thinks that our hands are tied in the particular case we looked and doesn't see a
10 need to rush into anything. He suggest we get more responses from other states and take
11 this up at the next meeting and since our statutes say five failure we should tie any
12 requirement to five failures.

13

14 Fredeen: Notes those applicants that are found lacking and have to come back to the Board
15 multiple times for review are not charged any additional fees. He feels that the Board and
16 staff should be reimbursed for the additional time and effort with additional fees in those
17 cases.

18

19 Baker: Questions whether or not that would do us any good since the money goes into the
20 General Fund.

21

22 Jones: Reminds him that the money belongs to AELS and even though we have to wait for
23 the Legislature to appropriate it to us it can't be spent by other agencies or Boards. He
24 advises that the Division sets the fees and that he would check on how we would go about
25 adding a review fee for the exam applicants.

26

27 Chair: Please report on that at the next meet as an agenda item.

28

29 Hanson: Points out that the applicants that have to be reviewed multiple times are the ones
30 that take the most time and effort and suggests that all applicants be charged a review fee
31 each time their file comes before the Board.

32

33 Chair: Adds that the additional fees may result in more complete applicant files the first
34 review.

35

36 Baker: Takes issue with this because they have been telling the surveyor candidates to get
37 their applications in and the Board will advise them how many credits they need to qualify
38 and so we are telling them to submit an incomplete application and now we want to charge
39 them for having to look at it twice.

40

41 Chair: Notes that it takes time for this kind of change and that may not be a problem when
42 this becomes effective.

43

44 Hanson: Asks if there are any statistics on how many repeat exam takers there are.

45

46 Jones: We can probably come up with something for next meeting.

47

48 **Agenda item 19 – Licensing Examiner Report**

49

50 Kelly: I don't have a report due to the large number of FE applicants. You're going to have
51 to live without the trivia this time but I'll make up for it next time.

52

53 **Agenda item 20 – Board Travel**

54

1 Jones: Reports that Lent is going to Florida for the CLARB spring meeting. In March
2 Harley, Richard and myself will go to Seattle for the Region 6 meeting. This hasn't been
3 approved by the Deputy Commissioner but Don is reasonable sure it will be. He then asks
4 who wants to go to the NCEES Western Zone meeting in Jackson Hole WY. He adds that
5 he will check with the new appointees and add them and probably all the engineers and
6 surveyors. He adds that Heieren was the only response to the email query so he got the
7 funded slot for Western Zone. After that it's NCARB Annual in Minneapolis on June 20-23.
8 I was look at Harley, Richard and Alicia. She hasn't been to an NCARB meeting yet. That's
9 it for this FY. Next year the NCEES annual will be in St. Louis and the CLARB annual will
10 be in San Francisco.

11
12 Lent: Advises that someone other than him should be assigned to the CLARB spring
13 meeting next February because his term will be up the following June.

14
15 Jones: Adds that if the travel situation continues to improve he will request himself or Alicia
16 for every meeting. He suggests Don might be a good candidate.

17
18 Shiesl: Says he would like to go and also might be able to make the NCEES annual.

19
20 Heieren: Asks the Board for permission to endorse one of the candidates for Western Zone
21 VP. Von Hill and Gilbert Chavez are running for VP. He wants permission to endorse Von
22 Hill.

23
24 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it**
25 **was resolved that the Alaska Board endorses Von Hill for Western Zone VP.**

26
27 Fredeen: Asks if the President Elect position is up this time?

28
29 **On a motion duly made by Fredeen, seconded by Shiesl and passed unanimously it**
30 **was resolved that the Alaska Board endorse Patty Momella for President Elect.**

31
32 **Agenda item 21 – Board Tasks**

33
34 Chair: Write letter to NCEES re CBT exam locations.

35
36 Brownfield: Check list for evaluating engineering projects re 12 AAC 36.106 applications.

37
38 Lent: Guidance manual

39
40 Rearick: Assist with engineering check list.
41 Write a letter on Signed drawings retention.

42
43 Walsh: Encourage the UAF Dean to write a letter to NCEES re CBT exam locations.

44
45 Hanson: Assist with engineering check list.

46
47 Jones: Respond to request to evaluate arctic engineering course syllabus.
48 Try to get a list of repeat exam takers.
49 Check with Board states re mobility with Canada (report to committee)
50 Check with NCARB re what each state requires for licensure by exam/comity.

51
52 There was a discussion on putting together a check list to evaluate submissions in
53 accordance with 12 AAC 36.106 regarding the timing and who would do it. Hanson and
54 Rearick would work on the check list.

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

Jones: Suggests that Alaska licensed could be the subject matter experts.

Heieren: Suggests that Fredeen and Brownfield could still give feedback on a check list after they are off the Board.

Lent: Asks for input from an engineer regarding additions to the Guidance Manual once the new regulations go into effect. Eriksen volunteers.

Walsh: Suggests that if the Board really wants to pursue the mobility issue that Eriksen take over the committee.

Baker: Suggests changes to the order of reading the application into the record.

Agenda item 23 – Calendar of Events.

Jones: Need a date for November meeting, August is tentatively scheduled for the 2nd and 3rd.

Heieren: Suggests 8th and 9th of November.

Agenda item 24 – Read applications into the record.

On a motion duly made by Baker, seconded by Hanson and passed unanimously it was resolved to find the following list of applicants for registration by comity and examination incomplete

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

‘FE’: refers to the NCEES Fundamentals of Engineering Examination

‘FS’: refers to the Fundamentals of Surveying Examination

‘PE’: exam’: refers to the NCEES Principals and Practice of Engineering Examination

‘PS’: exam: refers to the NCEES Principals and Practice of Surveying Examination

‘AKLS’: refers to the Alaska Land Surveyors Examination

The title of ‘Professional’ is understood to precede the designation of engineer, surveyor, or architect.

JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

‘Arctic course’ denotes a Board-approved arctic engineering course

Graff, Craig J.	Chemical Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending 24 mos resp chg under PE Chemical; exam & transcripts; Arctic & JQ
Grey, Delenora May	FS	Exam	Incomplete pending an additional 4 mos experience & official transcripts
Hall, James A.	Surveyor	Comity	Incomplete - pending 18 credit hours in Surveying, of which 6 hrs must be

			boundary law & 12 hrs math; & AKLS
Hardy, David B.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending add'l 8 mos exper; PE-Civil; Arctic & JQ
Hipsak, Stacy Michelle	FS	Exam	Incomplete - pending an additional 11 mos experience.
James, Joshua Ian	Civil Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending additional 2 months resp charge experience; transcripts; PE-Civil; Arctic & JQ
James, Timothy Philip	Civil Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending add'l 6 mos rc exper; PE -Civil; Arctic & JQ
Kenny, Tait	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending work verification from a PE-Mech who supervised his work; PE exam & JQ
Kovacevich, Jeremy C.	Chemical Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending 24 mos responsible charge under PE-Chemical; PE exam; Arctic & JQ
Mollenkopf, Mathew D.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending additional month of experience; PE-Civil & JQ
Odom, William J.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Incomplete - general non-Abet degree does not meet requirements
Oliveira, Nickolas Matthew	Civil Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - Needs 1month experience, PE -Civil & JQ
Ooms, Andrew W.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending additional 15 months responsible charge; PE -Civil; Arctic & JQ
Paley, Norman	Mining Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending additional 21 months experience for FE waiver
Russell, Paul David	FS	Exam	Incomplete

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

On a motion duly made by Baker seconded by Lent and passed unanimously it was resolved to approve the following list of applicants for registration by comity and examination with the stipulation that the information in the applicant's files will take precedence over the information in the minutes:

Adams, David M.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE-Civil
Agbayani, Nestor	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Albers, David P.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved

Anthes, Joel Oliver	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Arnold, Jason R.	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending IDP; A.R.E.; Arctic & JQ
Ayala, Glenn	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending FS, PS & AKLS
Baker, Grant C.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil & JQ
Baker, Joseph W.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Bannister, John Wm.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE-Civil; & JQ
Bazi, Gabriel M.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Bhartiya, Himanshu Kishore	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Bowman, Christopher J.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE-Civil; Arctic & JQ
Chen, Kenneth Q.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Chi, Kyungyun	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending transcripts; PE-Civil; & JQ
Conrad, Timothy Jordan	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending IDP; A.R.E; Arctic & JQ
Crouse, Shawn Laray	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending verification of FE; PE-Civil; Arctic & JQ
Crowe, Joshua	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil & JQ
Daniel, Clifford Allen	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved pending verification of exams; current registration; Arctic & JQ
Eggleston, Travis M.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE-Civil; & JQ
Epps, Lewis Nathan	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE-Civil; & JQ
Evernham, Kevin Todd	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Faulkner, Matthew J.	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending AKLS
Fehrman, Christopher	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending verification of FE;

T.			PE-Civil; & JQ
Fehrman, Sayward H.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending verification of FE; PE-Civil; & JQ
Fente, Javier	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE
Folcik, Neil James	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil & JQ
Frenier, Heather Nicole	Chemical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE; & JQ
Gaida, Ryan Marcus	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Garigliano, Anthony Michael	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending verification of FE; PE-Civil; & JQ
Gay, Harold M.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Geise, Brian Lowell	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil & JQ
Gervalis, Gwendolyn Michelle	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FS; AKLS & \$100 in fees
Griffith, Michael Chad	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved- pending Arctic & JQ
Hake, Bradley R.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Hamel, Ellen E.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved pending verification of FE; PE - Civil; & JQ
Hammond, Travis Jeffrey	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam & JQ
Harrison, Edsel	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending clearance from Investigations & 5 th reference
Heilman, Daniel Jon	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Hemphill, Michael Phillip	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Hibbs, Anthony S.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved pending verification of current registration; Arctic & JQ
Hoffman, Jeffrey M.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Holiman, Reynolds C.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams; current registration; & JQ
Hood, John E.	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved pending PE exam & JQ

Houtary, Leora	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Irving, William Henry	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS
Jaynes, Michael E.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil & JQ
Johnson, Katherine May	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending transcripts; PE exam & JQ
Jones, Ilza	Landscape Architect	Comity	Approved- pending JQ
Kelley, Debra	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Keshavarzi, Firooz	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved pending Arctic
Kirdendall, John M.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE-Civil & JQ
Knutelski, James P.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Koning, Paul W.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE-Civil & JQ
Krogman, Glen Thomas	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending FE & JQ
Kumar, Sushil	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Lackey, John D.	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE - Elec; Arctic & JQ
Law, Hubert K.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Leiter, Christopher J.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Leppala, Ross W.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil; & JQ
Lucas, Georginna Marie	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending of verification of FE
Markus, John Alexander	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Marshall, Trevor Daniel	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil & JQ
Martinez, Ricardo	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending ARE; one additional reference; & JQ

McCoy, Dale	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending transcripts; PE-Civil; & JQ
McFarren, David E.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved- pending Arctic
McIntire, Douglas A.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
McVeigh, David L.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Melander, Christopher Michael	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil & JQ
Mildon, Kathleen M.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending & PS & AKLS
Miru, Neculai	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Mott, Erik Annar	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending verification of reference's registration #'s
Muschany, Charles Eugene	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Elec; Arctic & JQ
Nelson, Erin Jayne	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Nicolai, David C.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam
Nord, Tyler S.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE-Civil & JQ
Norman, Storman William	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE-Civil
O'Neill, Kelly J.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS
Parker, Christopher Michael	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending A.R.E. & JQ
Pendergraft, Dayna M.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending & PS & AKLS
Pepera, Michael R.	Chemical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Peterson, Deidre	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE-Civil & JQ
Pomeranz, Jacob Randall	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved pending verification of FE; PE - Elec exam; Arctic & JQ
Porter, Russell Edward	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE-Civil; Arctic &

			JQ
Potridge, Wesley A.	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending AKLS
Raab, Oliver W.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Redmond, Patrick L.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts & JQ
Reed, Paul Wesley	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending verification of ABET-accredited degree; PE-Civil; & JQ
Rinker, Zachary D.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ & \$100 in fess
Robinson, Robyn Charles	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam & JQ
Rowland, Isaac J.	Mining Engineer	Comity	Approved pending verification of PE - Mining exam
Scheks, Christopher J.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE; Arctic & JQ
Schultz, Andrew Michael	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil & JQ
Semmler, Bart Anthony	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; Arctic & JQ
Seto, Jack T.C.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending PE -Civil; verification of registration; & JQ
Shaw, Wendy L.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil
Shepherd, Daniella	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam & JQ
Smith, James William	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE-Civil & JQ
Smugala, Deborah P.	Landscape Architect	Exam	Approved - pending L.A.R.E.; & JQ
Smulski, Kristine Marie	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil & JQ
Spitler, Clayton	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending FE; PE-Civil; & JQ
Strouth, Alexander Brian	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Sweeney, Lyle	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending verification of NCEES exams from APEGGA; PE; & JQ

Sweet, Eric C.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Test, Travis Wm.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS
Theodore, Peter T.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Thibodaux, Jared W.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Tikker, Robert D.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Trullinger, John G.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending PE-Civil & JQ
Turner, Ian P.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil
van Donkelaar, Catrin	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Vaughn, K. Craig	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Walker, Jason Allen	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil & JQ
Walsh, Casey Gerard	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil & JQ
Warren, James L.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Weaver, Jonathan M.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Civil & JQ
Whitehead, Johnny D.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Winch, Mary Jane	Chemical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Wingerter, Joseph Timothy	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam & JQ
Woo, Man Kit David	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Wu, Yuangang	Civil Engineer	Com	Approved - pending PE-Civil; Arctic & JQ
Zabilowicz, John Wm.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ

Anders, Lisa M.	FE	Exam	Approved
Anderson, Kimberly Dawn	FE	Exam	Approved
Axelarris, Lyle Jordan	FE	Exam	Approved
Baus, Brian David	FE	Exam	Approved
Beede, Marc C.	FE	Exam	Approved
Bell, Jason Wm.	FE	Exam	Approved
Boumbe Boumbe, Jean-Yves	FE	Exam	Approved
Brewer, Samuel T.	FE	Exam	Approved
Broek, Janina	FE	Exam	Approved
Bronga, Jaime Lynn	FE	Exam	Approved
Bullard, Lauren Mackenzie	FE	Exam	Approved
Burt, Stephanie J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Butteri, Reuben A.	FE	Exam	Approved
Buys, Carla	FE	Exam	Approved
Campbell, Joseph Lee	FE	Exam	Approved
Chou, Irwin	FE	Exam	Approved
Clark, Jacob Allen	FE	Exam	Approved
Cochrane, Andrew	FE	Exam	Approved
Coolidge, Kelsey	FE	Exam	Approved
Critchett, Marina LeRene	FE	Exam	Approved
Crumrine, Kathleen Marie	FE	Exam	Approved
Cunningham, Michael Steven	FE	Exam	Approved
Dahl, Erik Sean	FE	Exam	Approved
Ding, Yi	FE	Exam	Approved
Duggar, Taylor Noelle	FE	Exam	Approved
Dunham, Connor Thompson	FE	Exam	Approved
Dye, Samuel Noah	FE	Exam	Approved

Edin, Truman Yung	FE	Exam	Approved
Elliott, Marshall James	FE	Exam	Approved
Emery, Kyle David	FE	Exam	Approved
Ferguson, Lucas R.	FE	Exam	Approved
Field, Paloma Helena Evelyn	FE	Exam	Approved
Freeman, Tae Cherie	FE	Exam	Approved
Galterio, Jeffrey V.	FE	Exam	Approved
Ge, Xiaoxuan	FE	Exam	Approved
Gephardt, Travis Matthew	FE	Exam	Approved
Gieryic, Steven M.	FE	Exam	Approved
Gilliland, Simon Cameron	FE	Exam	Approved
Gu, Lin	FE	Exam	Approved
Hallford, Kelsey Rose	FE	Exam	Approved
Harvey, Justin Oliver	FE	Exam	Approved
Hearn, Philip McConnell	FE	Exam	Approved
Hewitt, Kagen J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Holt, Eli Elumpik	FE	Exam	Approved
Hough, Chad R.	FE	Exam	Approved
Hughes, Thomas Chapman	FE	Exam	Approved
Hussein, Zaid Saher	FE	Exam	Approved
Johnson, Micah James	FE	Exam	Approved
Jordt, Erik James	FE	Exam	Approved
Karnikis, Taylor Moore	FE	Exam	Approved
Keatts, Thomas M.	FE	Exam	Approved
Langton, Jeremy Peter	FE	Exam	Approved
Larsen, Elliott M.	FE	Exam	Approved
Lauritsen, Alexander	FE	Exam	Approved
Lee, Stephen T.	FE	Exam	Approved
Lewis, Laura Diane	FE	Exam	Approved
Li, Hui	FE	Exam	Approved
Li, Liang	FE	Exam	Approved
Liang, Hongyang	FE	Exam	Approved

Lober, Ryan Aldridge	FE	Exam	Approved
Lock, Rysa S.	FE	Exam	Approved
Louthan, Kirk M.	FE	Exam	Approved
Manyoky, Imre S.	FE	Exam	Approved
Maxie, Jeremy Allen	FE	Exam	Approved
Maxwell, Brandon Jackson	FE	Exam	Approved
McCoy, Shelley Alexis	FE	Exam	Approved
Merritt, Andrew Bryant	FE	Exam	Approved
Montes, Pablo Salvador	FE	Exam	Approved
Murphy, Shea Patrick	FE	Exam	Approved
Oba, Matthew William	FE	Exam	Approved
Oliver, Brian James	FE	Exam	Approved
Oyao, Sharon Felicio	FE	Exam	Approved
Parkinson, Steven David	FE	Exam	Approved
Paxson, Andrew Wm.	FE	Exam	Approved
Pearce, Jack Douglas	FE	Exam	Approved
Peck Katherine Elizabeth	FE	Exam	Approved
Phelps, Nicholas Cale	FE	Exam	Approved
Powers, Roland G.	FE	Exam	Approved
Rais, Terence L.	FE	Exam	Approved
Renner, Justin Lee	FE	Exam	Approved
Renovatio, James J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Rodgers, Eric J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Rodrigues, Talisa Marie	FE	Exam	Approved
Rudd, Michael James	FE	Exam	Approved
Samuelson, Jr., Timothy V.	FE	Exam	Approved
Schnell, Robert J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Shank, Michael Lewis	FE	Exam	Approved
Shaw, Miles Anthony	FE	Exam	Approved
Shillington, Blaine Wesley	FE	Exam	Approved
Shirack, Andrew J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Stransky, David J.	FE	Exam	Approved

Tee, Jared Chong-On	FE	Exam	Approved
Teegardin, Kyle R.	FE	Exam	Approved
Tinajero, Edgar	FE	Exam	Approved
Tinajero, Edgar A.	FE	Exam	Approved
Toth, Frank J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Tracy, Nancy R.	FE	Exam	Approved
Twogood, Christina M.	FE	Exam	Approved
Untiet, Jesseca Lauren	FE	Exam	Approved
Van Nortwick, Nathanael J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Vesper, Aron James	FE	Exam	Approved
Wharry, Stanley W.	FE	Exam	Approved
White, Devki Dawn	FE	Exam	Approved
Widmer, Kenneth C.	FE	Exam	Approved
Willis, Ryan Michael	FE	Exam	Approved
Wong, Michael Ning	FE	Exam	Approved
Xu, Lei	FE	Exam	Approved
Yao, Jun	FE	Exam	Approved
Yngve, Margaret J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Young, Matthew Scott	FE	Exam	Approved
Zhang, Xiaoyu	FE	Exam	Approved
Zhang, Zhenzihao	FE	Exam	Approved
Flint, Peter J.	FS	Exam	Approved
Holmstrom, Benjamin C.	FS	Exam	Approved
Kesler, Gates C.	FS	Exam	Approved
Rucinski, Michael Gary	FS	Exam	Approved
Schollenberg, Jason Lee	FS	Exam	Approved
Stefan, George Gerard	FS	Exam	Approved
Wilmot, Brett A.	FS	Exam	Approved

1
2 Walsh: Asks if a motion is necessary regarding the arctic engineering course syllabus?

3
4 It was decided that the Statute requires a university level course and that we should go back
5 to them and tell them it needs to be a university level course. This course syllabus was
6 pretty narrow and geared toward the oil industry.

7
8 Heieren: Asks if the University of Washington course was evaluated by us.

9
10 Jones: Advises that the professors that teach the course in Washington are emeritus
11 members of either UAA or UAF.

12
13 Break: 09:10 – 10:10. The Board adjourned to the Lt. Governor's office for the Regulation
14 signing ceremony.

15
16 10:10 Back on Record.

17
18 Chair: Introduces the Director.

19
20 Habeger: Mr. Chairman and members of the AELS Board. Good to be with you, just
21 wanted to bring up a few things. Thinking about all the Boards and all the professions,
22 where we are going, just bring a few things to your attention if you're not aware of them. I
23 know we've had discussions in the past about Board travel, let's start with that one. I know
24 you can't see this (holds up a chart) but I'm going to circle a little number here and its right
25 here in the FY13 Governors Budget. You can't see it but it represents \$551,000. So looking
26 at FY11 actual's \$348,000 and the FT12 management plan \$306,000 and the proposal, after
27 your fine work convincing the Administration that Boards do need to get out across the
28 Nation and deal with your peers and make sure we are at the forefront as you determine for
29 your professions and are allowed to go to those National meetings. So we hope stands. It's
30 too early to say what's going to pass, but it's in the proposal. So kudos to you guys. Now,
31 let's talk about paying for that. As you know we had a slight bump in licensing fees. And
32 interestingly enough we didn't get many objection from your professions about that slight
33 bump. But, when we sent out the regulation package there were a couple of more
34 significant bumps for other professions. And some of the drivers of those bumps are
35 investigative cases. State law requires us to pass those costs on to you all the licensee.
36 And as there is more activity for a particular license those costs are going to that license
37 group. And that was the case for a number of these. We suggested that in compliance with
38 law that their licensing fees should have gone up in some cases 200%. That's a big ouch.
39 The state and this particular wasn't ready for that and it came back to us after numerous
40 comments which led to legislative hearings on the whole issue that we needed to find a way
41 to settle this without going to that top end. Now getting back to how that affected you.
42 Since it was all one package and since the Division and the Administration decided to take a
43 second look at it. It also affected you folks as well. So you didn't see any kind of fee
44 increase this go around and it wasn't a huge issue for you, however, what I do want to bring
45 to your attention, again you can't see this sheet. But I have looked at all the professions and
46 I've kind of projected where you ended FY12 surplus deficit and I've just brought out the
47 licensing fee cycle. I made a few assumptions that you're going to grow a little bit over in
48 the number of licensees over time. I've made a few assumptions that costs are going to
49 grow a little bit, CPI that kind of thing, over time. And according to the work that is least laid
50 out on historical based on a future we maintain a surplus somewhere in the FY12/13
51 biennium and then we begin to get down into the negative balances. So we're ok for now,
52 however, if trends continue and we don't make any changes, I kind of, it's all arbitrary but I
53 looked this out until the 2024/25 biennial licensing cycle. And based on current trends, if we
54 do nothing, the Board will be about \$2M in the hole. So we've got lots of time to talk about it

1 and figure it out. Right now we're good but I just wanted to say at some point in time we
2 have to have the discussion. So, setting you up for the cost and you know that's really all I
3 had just to talk about some of the major issues.

4
5 Actually there is one more that I did want to talk to you about and that's about the bill that
6 Senator Giessel has out before you and the request is for your own investigator. I have
7 made a comment to Vern, I've made a comment to Senator Giessel that, first of all, do I
8 support it? Yes. Do I think it's the best solution? No and here's why. One of the things I
9 think we have an issue with in investigations. We've got lots of investigators, they're all
10 doing good jobs at what they're paid to do but we don't have that under pinning. What I
11 mean by under pinning is we don't have that admin support to the level that we should. At
12 some point in time we have to back fill that admin services. If I were in the private sector I
13 would have had the problem solved by now but the State just doesn't work that way. PCN's
14 are controlled at a different level. It's the Office of Management and Budget and those
15 decisions are made based on authorizations from the Legislature. So it takes a little bit
16 longer. I just brought the issue up to Senator Giessel; if the bill passes it's a good thing.
17 Does it ultimately get us to the most efficient process when an investigator who is at a
18 higher range is doing more and more admin work to support their own services? I don't
19 think so. So that's one of the issues that I at least raise, bring to the Board as well as I had
20 a nice meeting with Senator Giessel and talked about some of the things that we all deal
21 with. So that's my report, some of the things we've been working on, oh, one more.

22
23 The last thing you will be hearing about in the future is cost analysis. We've had some
24 challenges in the past in making sure that the costs are assigned to the appropriate
25 program. And as we've gone into that issue we realized that professional licenses have
26 picked up a little more than their fair share of those general admin costs. We took, as you
27 may have heard, phase one analysis which was pretty high level, not a lot of detail, but for
28 FY11 we recalculated based on staff time how much should be picked up by business
29 licensing, and I point that way because they are down at that end of the hall, and how much
30 should be picked up by professional licensing. Based on just staff time and where they
31 should belong you saw a 16% reduction in the general admin pool costs. We want to refine
32 that number better and so we brought in some contractors to help plus look at those
33 services that you require in your program and make sure that you pay for those services and
34 we know what those services do cost and that you do not pay for other services. So those
35 are some of the things we are working on and now I conclude my report.

36
37 Heieren: Thanks Don for working with Senator Giessel and asks if we should back off.

38
39 Habeger: No, go for it.

40
41 Heieren: Advises that we have a Representative in the House who will introduce a similar
42 bill.

43
44 Habeger: We'll figure out how to deal with the admin issues but if you've got a bill in play,
45 let's go for it. Like I said, I'm not opposing it. I do think there is a better way to get it done
46 but that's my problem, not necessarily yours.

47
48 Heieren: Predicts a large surge in licensees in the next 1 to 2 years.

49
50 Fredeen: Asks about increasing the Board staff.

51
52 Habeger: Temporary is a fix we used for the Medical Board but getting that in this
53 atmosphere is a little difficult.

1 Lent: Thanks Don for finding the funds for his trip to Florida.

2
3 Walsh: Adds that we all appreciate his efforts on the travel front and that that level of
4 support in the future can be a continuing commitment.

5
6 Heieren: Talks about the fee levels over the last five years and how we are on the low end
7 compared to some of the other states and that it is appreciated.

8
9 Walsh: Adds that the Board is aware that the present fee levels are the artifact of a surplus
10 that we are trying to run through.

11
12 Habeger: What I would like to do when we get a little bit closer, which is not too far away, is
13 make sure we have open dialog. What I don't want to do is...based on the circumstances I
14 caught the Real Estate commission by surprise and I understood that, I knew it was a
15 gamble and they won and I lost. I don't want to repeat that ever again. So now that we
16 have a clear picture of our finances and we understand the pieces. I want to make sure that
17 you're well aware of where we are going because you're the solution and all I can do is bring
18 the information to you.

19
20 Chair: Thanks Don for bringing these issues to the Board as they are important to us.

21
22 Habeger: At your service. (Applause)

23
24 Chair: Ok, we have one more thing added to the agenda. We are way ahead of schedule
25 and we have a person here that couldn't get here for the public comment period. He invites
26 Vlad Irimescu to address the Board.

27
28 Vlad Irimescu: Thank you for accepting me, I was out of town for a couple of days enjoying
29 the woods. I just got back here, I had some time to print some additional information, I
30 made 8 packages with quick information which I think I didn't provide to the Board when I
31 ask for registration by comity. So if I can give to everybody to have just two minutes.

32
33 Chair: Vern, can we do that?

34
35 Jones: We shouldn't discuss his licensing, uh you can submit that as part of your licensing
36 package but we shouldn't discuss it in open session. The regulation change to allow
37 licensure without the NCARB Certificate was signed a few minutes ago and will be effective
38 in 30 days so at that time we will be able to review your application.

39
40 Chair: It will be much more favorable to those who are applying by comity. So, at that time
41 apply and again we have to review that in executive session.

42
43 Irimescu: Ok, that's wonderful. Also I have a resume and a list of the projects I have
44 designed in Alaska already. I was lead architect on the Discovery Lodge project in Kaasan,
45 \$40M project and I now am lead architect on the Walter Soboleff Center which is in
46 downtown Juneau. I think that's all I have to say and thank you very much for accepting me.

47
48 Chair: Thank you for coming in.

49
50 **Agenda item 25 – Board member comments.**

51
52 Walsh: Notes that this is probably his last meeting and that it's been a pleasure serving on
53 the Board. He adds that it's been a real professional opportunity, that he has learned a lot
54 and contributed a little and while he wouldn't mind staying on the Board another 4 years he

1 is perfectly content to say adios to all of us and wish us the best of luck.

2
3 Rearick: Would be pleased if Dan could be on the Board for another term. He feels the
4 members have brought a lot of interesting perspective to the Board.

5
6 Hanson: Is sorry he missed the last meeting and wasn't able to vote on the regulations. He
7 feels it was an exciting opportunity to have it signed on the last meeting for some of the
8 members. He acknowledges Bo for his hard work and is glad he could be a part of it. He
9 enjoyed working with everyone.

10
11 Shiesl: Has served on a lot of Boards, some good and some bad, but this is one of those
12 Boards you can actually get something done and he feels today proved it. He thanks those
13 leaving for all they have taught him since he has been here and he hopes the new Board is
14 as effective as this one has been.

15
16 Lent: Starts by thanking the staff for their help. He thanks Cliff for taking him under his wing
17 and helping him when he was just getting started on the Board. He congratulates Bo and
18 the General Licensure committee for their accomplishment.

19
20 Eriksen: He thanks Richard for recognizing an opportunity and asking the Lt. Governor to
21 sign the regulations today. He echoes the other comments and thanks for the Board and
22 their accomplishments.

23
24 Baker: This is the end of a long journey for me, a learning journey. He acknowledges
25 working with some very outstanding professionals and feels this Board has accomplished
26 more that several Boards before it. He does a quick run through of the accomplishments of
27 the Board the last several years and really appreciates being a part of that.

28
29 Fredeen: Echoes what Cliff said. He was thinking about the list of accomplishments in the
30 last 8 years. He is sad to go but recognizes how important it is for Boards to get new blood
31 with new ideas that keep it fresh and keep things moving forward. He recognizes Bo for his
32 efforts to get the engineering regulation through. He mentions how impressed he has
33 always been at the Boards ability to disagree on one thing, agree on another and still friends
34 at the end of the day.

35
36 Brownfield: Reflects on the many Boards, businesses and organizations he has been
37 involved with during his life and that one of the most rewarding things he has been involved
38 in is this Board. He hates to leave but at the same time he is ready to leave. He thanks the
39 Board for the companionship, professional relationships, for the fun times, the serious times;
40 all of it has been very rewarding. He appreciates all the accolades but notes that everyone
41 worked hard and that everything done by this Board is a team effort not one particular
42 person and again stresses that it has been one of the most rewarding teams he has worked
43 with. He relates a funny incident when Heieren first came on the Board and then thanks
44 everyone and wishes them the best in the future.

45
46 Heieren: Acknowledges and thanks each departing member and the staff.

47
48 Kelly: Is sad to see everyone go and is sad that she missed the dinner Thursday night; she
49 forgot that it would be the last meeting for them and hopes to see them at future meetings.
50 She is excited about the new branches even though it will be more work.

51
52 Jones: Notes that is has been a bittersweet meeting and he is sad to see some of the
53 member go. He is glad the regulation changes that they worked so hard on were signed
54 while they were still on the Board. He adds that this is the best Board to work with and that

1 several of the examiners are jealous of Alicia's position. He points out that next February will
2 see more members depart and at that time it will be a completely new Board.

3
4 Chair: Thanks the Board for the architect comity regulations. He adds that while it might not
5 be as big as the engineering regulations that it was very important to some very qualified
6 professionals in the State that were not able to get licensed under the old regulation. He
7 agrees with all the other comments and then presents each of the departing members with a
8 wall certificate acknowledging their time on the Board.

9
10 10:47 a.m. Meeting adjourned.

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

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

Harley H. Hightower, FAIA Chair
Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers and Land Surveyors

Date: _____