

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 **August 2-3, 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 August 2-3, 2012 in the Atwood Building, 550 W. 7th Ave., Suite 1270 Anchorage AK.

15
16 **Thursday August 2, 2012**

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

19
20 The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. Roll call, all present except Eric Eriksen
21 and Kathleen Schedler who were both excused from this meeting by the Chair.

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

- 24
25
 - Brian Hanson, PE, Chair
 - Richard Rearick, Architect, Vice Chair
 - Harley Hightower, Architect
 - Colin Maynard, Civil Engineer
 - David Hale, Land Surveyor,
 - Donald Shiesl, Public Member
 - Burdett Lent, Landscape Architect
 - Keith Walters, Mining Engineer
 - Richard Heieren, PS

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 Note: Rearick joined the meeting at 8:03 a.m.

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

- 38
39
 - Don Habeger, Director (by telephone)
 - Vern Jones, Executive Administrator
 - Alicia Kelly, Licensing Examiner
 - John Savage, Investigator
 - Misty Frawley, Administrative Officer II (by telephone)

40
41
42
43
44
45 Members of the public in attendance for portions of the meeting were:

- 46
47
 - Diana Parks, representing the Fire Marshal's Office.
 - Roger Weese, PE representing RSA Engineering.
 - Michael Schroder, PS representing BLM
 - Dale Nelson, PE representing APDC
 - Robert "Buzz" Scher, PE representing ASHSC.
 - Clifford Baker, PS representing himself.

1
2
3 **Agenda Item 4 – Review and approve minutes from the May 2012 meeting.**

4
5 Lent: Had some grammar and spelling corrections that he will forward to Jones.

6
7 **On a motion duly made by Shiesl, seconded by Hightower and passed unanimously it**
8 **was resolved to approve the minutes from the May 2012 meeting as amended.**

9
10 **Agenda item 3 – Ethics reporting**

11
12 Dave Hale reported that he is the president of the Alaska chapter of ASPLS. Will
13 submit a letter to the AG's office.

14
15 Heieren: Notes that he did the same thing and it was reviewed and he is still an ASPLS
16 office and still on the Board. It's not a huge issue but still needs to be addressed.

17
18 **Agenda item 5 – Investigative Report.**

19
20 Savage: Introduces Diana Parks of the Fire Marshal's Office, Chief of the Review Section
21 for the State of Alaska. She has had the supervisor position for about a year and was there
22 for quite awhile before that. He emphasizes how instrumental she has been in bringing
23 violations to his attention.

24
25 Parks: Mentions a few other changes, the Director is retiring. She adds that they have
26 improved the turnaround time for plan review.

27
28 Rearick: Asks about the status of some code changes they were working on.

29
30 Parks: Responds that it is still in legal and that there have been a lot of issues about
31 adopting this at this time. She adds that they are allowing people to use the 2009 version.

32
33 Maynard: Asks what the Legislature's concern is and if it is a particular Legislator?

34
35 Parks: Responds that she doesn't know any details. They are asking what the benefits of
36 changing are. She adds that it has to do with undue burden.

37
38 Hightower: Thanks Diana for attending and that the Board appreciates all her office does for
39 us.

40
41 Savage: Echo's what Harley said and adds that without their help a lot would be falling
42 through the cracks and hopes that the cooperation is helpful both ways.

43
44 Parks: Indicates that it is.

45
46 Savage: Asks the Board for help in the way of a letter to the AG's office in getting some
47 cases moving that have been there for years. He adds that it is crazy to be coming back to
48 someone who had a violation 3 or 4 years later with a disposition. He indicates that
49 presently the AG has three of our cases and that he is considering pulling one or two back
50 and going a different route. He mentions that he has been approved to attend the NCEES
51 Annual in St. Louis and how important contacts with the other jurisdictions is and how much
52 help they have been. He adds that we need more travel funds for in state site visits.
53 Presently he is pretty much confined to the Anchorage area. He knows there are cases of
54 violations out there and his only hope of catching them presently is through the Fire

1 Marshal's Office and the various Building Officials. He feels that at some point we need to
2 stop worrying about cost and look at what we are charged with doing. He mentions the
3 Investigative Advisory Committee and that he will be calling on whatever discipline or
4 profession he needs for a particular case.

5
6 Jones: Asks him to send an estimate of what he would need for travel for a year.

7
8 **Agenda item 2 – Review/Amend Agenda**

9
10 Hightower: Asks to move item 8 to occur after public comment item 14. He wants to wait
11 until Dale Nelson is present to discuss it.

12
13 Chair: Vern passed out some items to add to the Board Packet.

14
15 **On a motion duly made by Shiesl, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously**
16 **it was resolved to approve the agenda as amended.**

17
18 Lent: Advises the Board of the process of making recommendations to the Governor for his
19 replacement which will be next year. He has coordinated with the ASLA president on
20 recommendations.

21
22 Savage: Re enters and introduces Quinton Warren the Chief Investigator to the Board.

23
24 Warren: Briefly addresses the Board and offers his assistance if and when needed.

25
26 **Agenda item 10 – Correspondence sent since May 2012**

27
28 Chair: Goes through the list of correspondence sent. There were no comments on 10 a.
29 which was a letter to NCEES requesting Emeritus Status for several former Board members.
30 10 b. was an email to Kathleen excusing her from this meeting. 10 c. was a letter to DEC
31 regarding drawing disclaimers. 10 d. was a letter from the Chair to NCEES requesting 3 test
32 centers in Alaska, Anchorage, Fairbanks and Juneau for computer based testing. The
33 response from NCEES was that there would be 2 in Alaska, Anchorage and Fairbanks.

34
35 Chair: Asks if we want to pursue a site in Juneau.

36
37 Jones: Doesn't think we have enough applicants in Juneau to justify another test center
38 unless maybe they use UAS.

39
40 Maynard: His understanding was that NCEES contract for a certain number of test center
41 for the entire country and if we take another one, someone else might not get one.

42
43 Rearick: Adds that the architects have the same situation. The only test center for them is
44 in Anchorage and that we should keep this on our radar and maybe as technology
45 progresses it would be feasible to have a test center in Juneau.

46
47 There was no comment on 10 e. which was a letter from the chair to the Division requesting
48 the investigator be sent to the NCEES Annual in St. Louis.

49
50 Chair: skips to item 11 b. re Record drawing disclaimers and notes that it is related to item
51 10 c.

52
53 **Agenda item 12 – New Business**

1 a. 12 AAC 36.190 Testing Laboratory Reports

2

3 Maynard: Reports that he received an email from Stafford Glashan noting that the
4 regulation only covers civil engineering labs and that there might be electrical engineering
5 labs that maybe should be covered as well and asks if we might want to revise the
6 regulation.

7

8 A discussion revealed that no one knows how many, if any, other labs exist and it was
9 decided to initiate a regulation project to evaluate whether or not a change was necessary.

10

11 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Rearick and passed unanimously it**
12 **was resolved to propose a regulation change to 12 AAC 36.190 clarifying to include**
13 **all engineering disciplines.**

14

15 Chair: Assigns to project to Maynard.

16

17 b. Arctic engineering course for CE credit.

18

19 Jones: We have about 4 minutes before we need to make a call.

20

21 Chair: We will stop at 12 b. and come back to it later. We need to make a call to Dan
22 Branch.

23

24 **Agenda item 6 – Discussion with AAG regarding consultants.**

25

26 The Board called AAG Dan Branch and there was a discussion on whether or not a
27 professional that volunteered as a subject matter expert for the Board would be immune
28 from law suits or indemnified if someone were to bring a suit against them. AAG Branch
29 advised that it would take a Statute to allow the Board to provide immunity or indemnity for
30 volunteers. He added that basically it's not something that is within the authority of the
31 Board to address.

32

33 Shiesl: Asks if it is a complicated process.

34

35 Branch: Advises that Jones would have to get Commerce to push a bill through to get this
36 kind of immunity. It has been approved by the Legislature in other contexts but the deadline
37 for submitting proposals to the Governor for legislation for this next session has passed. It
38 would be possible for a Legislator to submit a bill if they were interested in this. He offered
39 to help Jones draft the request for a legislative proposal but since the deadline is passed it is
40 probably not the best use of his time. Over the next year if a solution is not found then
41 maybe you could ask the Commissioner to ask the Governor to approve a bill project.

42

43 Heieren: Asks if there is any way this could be address in some kind of ex officio adoption
44 of an individual as a Board Member in order to indemnify them to the degree we are
45 indemnified.

46

47 Branch: Responds that the Governor is the only one that can appoint an individual to the
48 Board and that the makeup of the Board is in Statute as well so appointing an ex officio
49 member isn't possible.

50

51 Chair: Asks if ex Board members are covered.

52

53 Branch: Doesn't think so.

54

1 Hanson: So once your term ends your indemnification ends?
2

3 Branch: Yes and no, it would end for anything new but you would still be covered for actions
4 you took while on the Board.
5

6 Hanson: Asks if emeritus status members would be covered.
7

8 Branch: Again responds that the Governor is the only that can appoint a member and the
9 composition of the Board is in Statute and can't be changed without a Statute change. He
10 added that he had looked at all angles and couldn't figure out any way the Board itself could
11 provide immunity or indemnity.
12

13 The discussion continued for several minutes regarding whether the State would have a
14 problem with an individual who had litigation insurance providing services. The AAG didn't
15 think it would be a problem. He was then asked if a member of a Board in another state who
16 had indemnity through their Board would be indemnified here. He responded that he didn't
17 know but would be surprised if that was the case. He was then asked if members of
18 NCEES, who has insurance would be ok. Again Mr. Branch stated that in that case if they
19 were covered by the organizations insurance he didn't think that would create a problem for
20 the Board. He was then asked if our Board Members would be indemnified for work they
21 were doing for NCEES as several of our Members are on committees or hold National office.
22 AAG Branch stated that he didn't know. He would have to do further research on that.
23

24 Chair: Thanks AAG Branch for his input.
25

26 Branch: Asks Jones to call him before the next agenda item is addressed.
27

28 Jones: Advises the Board that Mr. Ward wanted to address the Board regarding his case
29 and that if the Board allows it then AAG Branch has to also be included in the conference
30 call. He then leaves the room to call the AAG.
31

32 8:57 a.m. – 9:05 a.m. Break
33

34 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hightower and passed**
35 **unanimously it was resolved to go into executive session under authority of AS**
36 **44.62.310(c)(2) to review the Michael Ward Case.**
37

38 9:50 a.m. Back on record.
39

40 Chair: We were on item 12 b.
41

42 Jones: Explains that this letter was from an applicant who submitted an arctic engineering
43 course to satisfy his CE requirements. It has been the Board past policy that arctic
44 engineering courses were not acceptable as CE because they are required for licensure.
45 The applicant noted that it had been many years since he took the course and he felt that a
46 refresher should be acceptable.
47

48 After a short discussion it was decided that it should be allowed.
49

50 **On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Heieren and passed unanimously it**
51 **was resolved to accept cold regions engineering courses as valid continuing**
52 **education for licensure renewal.**
53

54 **Agenda item 11 – Old Business**

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

a. Electronic Signatures

Alicia passes out an email from Roger Weese regarding electronic signatures and retention of drawings. The Board takes a few minutes to read the handout.

Rearick: Acknowledges Mr. Weese's take on this subject and that a lot of professionals struggle with this situation and how to comply with the regulations. He adds that he has done a white paper on this and has yet to come up with any solutions. He directs the Board to 12 AAC 36.185(f).

Chair: Asks Lent if this is in the Guidance Manual.

Lent: It's on page 10 at the top of the page items 1 and 2. He continues with some background regarding the software to remove the signature if the drawings are altered.

Rearick: Adds that the software is expensive and that software constantly changes and the updates are not always backwards compatible.

Hale: The solution needs to be universal and easy for people to do.

Rearick: We want to know what the actual final stamped document is and we want them to retain that for a period of time. He goes over the different types of digital signatures and the problems with printing .pdf files. He notes that there are situations where the prime or the owner may want original documents. He advises how they do it in his office, they sign the original and then the same day and time they print a second copy and sign it and on the margin put duplicate original. He notes that the investigator wants to see the original when he is reviewing plans and he believes this is where the requirement for a wet signature came from. He notes that today technology has changed all of that.

Maynard: Shares a project he is working on now where a lot of changes have been made and he has several originals but the only one that counts is the last one. He asks if he can throw the previous copies away or does he have to retain those also and hard copies or scanned.

Lent: Points out that clients are requesting copies on CD's with an electronic signature.

Maynard: Thinks that this goes back to the day when there was one original on paper or Mylar and now everything is on computers and goes out as a .pdf or cadfile. He feels that we are living in the past with some of this language and it needs to be changed.

Rearick: Notes that the Cad file is not a legal document or an original. He has looked a little at what other States are doing but he isn't real satisfied with what they are doing.

Chair: Points out that in the past the Board left this up to the individual design professional or firm what a reasonable amount of time to retain original documents.

Maynard: Its 10 years. In the Legislature it was 6 years until the last minute then it was changed to 10.

Chair: Right but the engineer may want to retain those longer.

The discussion continued for a short time without any new material.

1 Rearick: Volunteers to take on a regulation project to address this. And to provide a written
2 response to Mr. Weese.

3
4 Chair: Tasks Rearick with reviewing the language in the regulation and making
5 recommendations to the Board for a regulation change.

6
7 Heieren: Notes that surveyors rarely see original documents and that you have to see the
8 reality of what's happening out there.

9
10 Judge Freeman returned to the room and the board went back into executive session to
11 complete review of the Michael Ward case.

12
13 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Rearick and passed unanimously it**
14 **was resolved to go into executive session under authority of AS 44.62.310(c)(2) to**
15 **review the Michael Ward Case.**

16
17 10:25 – 10:39 in executive session

18
19 10:39 back on record.

20
21 **On a motion duly made Hale, seconded by Hightower and passed unanimously by roll**
22 **call vote (Eriksen and Schedler were absent) it was resolved that The Board of**
23 **Registration for Architects, Engineers, and Land surveyors, in accordance with AS**
24 **44.64.060(e)(3), revises the disposition of the case. Mr. Ward's application for**
25 **registration is GRANTED subject to his acceptance of the following conditions:**

26 1. Pursuant to AS 08.01.075(a)(7), Mr. Ward will be on probation through
27 December 31, 2015;

28 2. During his probationary period, Mr. Ward shall report any arrest for Driving
29 Under the Influence (or similar offense), or any arrest for other driving offenses or
30 alcohol related offenses. This report shall be made to the board, in writing, within 15
31 days of the arrest;

32 3. If Mr. Ward is convicted of Driving Under the Influence or similar offense
33 during the probationary period, Mr. Ward's registration as an engineer shall be
34 summarily suspended pursuant to AS 08.01.075(c) and AS 08.48.111.

35 If Mr. Ward dies not consent to these terms in writing within 15 days, his
36 application for registration is denied.

37 All remaining portions of the attached proposed decision are adopted.

38 DATED this 2 day of August 2012.

39
40 Returned to agenda item 12.

41
42 c. Use of NIACS code 541330 by unlicensed businesses.

43
44 Jones: Explains that use of this code will prevent online applications for a business license
45 and ask the applicant for a professional license. He adds that some Federal RFP's require
46 this code.

47
48 Discussion followed on whether or not a company should be allowed to use the engineering
49 code without being properly licensed as an engineering company. The result being that the
50 Board feels that allowing companies to use the engineering code would lead the public to
51 believe that they were an engineering company.

52
53 d. Anchorage Ordinance AO 2012-62.

1 Maynard: Explains that the ordinance would allow a design professional to stamp plans for
2 house drawings certifying that it meets building codes and allow the plans to bypass the
3 building official review in an effort to cut the time presently taking for plan review.
4

5 The discussion brought out that the wording of the ordinance indicates that a single design
6 professional could certify a set of drawings with their stamp. A design professional is only
7 allowed to stamp plans that they personally did and within the scope of their license. This
8 ordinance could set design professionals up for violations. The Board decided to write a
9 letter to the Anchorage Municipality indicating that plans would require multiple design
10 professionals and that this ordinance as worded could cause registrants to violate State
11 Statutes and Regulations.
12

13 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hightower and passed**
14 **unanimously it was resolved to write a letter to the Anchorage Assembly, Mayor with**
15 **a copy to the Building Official to inform them that the ordinance AO 2012-62 would**
16 **require multiple design professionals because a design professional cannot legally**
17 **stamp or certify drawings outside their discipline.**
18

19 Shiesl: Adds that the letter should cite the applicable Statute.
20

21 e. Regulation Project

22 1. 12 AAC 36.068 Eligibility for LARE
23

24 Lent: Explains that the makeup of the LARE is changing and will go entirely to CBT.
25 CLARB is recommending that some sections of the exam should be allowed soon after
26 graduation. Their studies show that taking certain sections of the exam early shows a
27 much better pass rate. Lent argued for letting CLARB decide which sections could be
28 taken early but the Board insisted on making the determination.
29

30 Discussion resulted in a motion for a regulation project to allow sections 1 and 2 of the
31 LARE to be taken early.
32

33 **On a motion duly made by Lent, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it**
34 **was resolved to initiate a regulation project for 12 AAC 36.068 to allow early testing of**
35 **Sections 1 and 2 of the LARE.**
36

37 2. 12 AAC 36.040 Simplified application for re-examination.

38 3. 12 AAC 36.050 Application deadlines.
39

40 Jones: Explains that the in 12 AAC 36.040 examination deadlines in our regulation are
41 specific dates and the deadlines established by NCEES fluctuate which causes problems
42 with the NCEES deadline being before ours or sometimes on day after ours. He wants to
43 change the wording to read "5 days before the deadline established by NCEES". On 12
44 AAC 36.050 he points out that there is one section where the "5 days before the deadline
45 established by NCEES" language is added. This regulation also established deadlines for
46 submission of application to the Board. It presently says 10 days before the meeting and he
47 wants to change that to 10 business days before the meeting to allow for a few days extra to
48 prepare files for review.
49

50 Maynard: Suggests that the 5 days be business days as well.
51

52 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hightower and passed**
53 **unanimously it was resolved to start a regulation project for 12 AAC 36.040 and 12**
54 **AAC 36.050 to change the deadlines.**

1
2 11:37 Break for lunch

3
4 1:07 Back on record all present except Eriksen and Schedler.

5
6 Chair: Asks the two that attended the APDC meeting if they had anything to share. Hearing
7 none he opened the public comment period.

8
9 **Agenda item 14 – Public Comment.**

10
11 Michael Schoder: My name is Michael Schoder for those of you who may not know me. I'm
12 a registered land surveyor in Alaska. I'm here today to provide some information to the
13 Board of Registration concerning my official position which is the Chief Cadastral Surveyor
14 for Alaska. In that capacity I hold a direct delegation from the Secretary of the Interior to
15 execute and approve and defend all the Federal authority surveys. Those are surveys done
16 under our Federal authority for all Federal interest lands which includes BLM managed
17 lands as well as other agencies such as the Park Service, the Forrest Service, the
18 Department of Defense, the trust properties, the trust allotments, trust town site lots that DI
19 manages the trust responsibilities for the Secretary.

20
21 What I wanted to do today is just explain to you that we have in our Federal system a need
22 to qualify our surveyors that we call cadastral surveyors. In the office of Personnel
23 Management at the Federal level sets forth a description of these professional series
24 positions, and for land surveying its series 1373. What I'm going to do, I made 15 copies, I
25 hope that's enough to go around. We have to hire our professional surveyors into service at
26 BLM and there are some other agencies like the Corps of Engineers and the Forrest Service
27 that it's also required that they hire land surveyors, although they have different authorities
28 for what their responsibilities are in the basic requirements for the series. I printed out the
29 series sheet of what OPM provides for this land surveying series.

30
31 I want to share with you a relationship we have with state licensed land surveyors in these
32 basic requirements. I'll just go through them very briefly, it's similar for some of the
33 requirements you have for state licensure. We do require that an applicant for original entry,
34 or when they apply for a different job. Maybe it's a promotion, maybe it's a lateral in a state
35 office. It could be a job with another state that has authority; my authority only extends to
36 the BLM on state office lands that's in our state office jurisdiction which is the whole State of
37 Alaska. There's eleven other state offices that a mix of states that fall within that BLM
38 offices. I won't dwell on that.

39
40 The basic requirement can be met by a degree in land surveying and/or civil engineering.
41 But it's specific that it should have 6 semester hours of surveying and more specific, 3 hours
42 of land lot, 21 semester hours or any combination of the following: surveying photogramtry,
43 geodetic surveying, geodesy route surveying, remote sensing cartography, survey
44 astronomy, land information systems, curative mapping and aerial photo interpretation and
45 survey analysis and adjustments.

46
47 Or, an applicant can meet it by a combination of education and experience. Courses
48 equivalent to a major in land surveying or civil engineering as described in that former
49 paragraph plus appropriate experience or additional education. But education is required
50 along with something to prove to the Human Resource person that screens these
51 applications that they meet the equivalent of this 4 year degree. That is how I, as the Chief
52 here, on my original entry job was, as a staff land surveyor met the requirements for 1373.
53 My state license to show in addition to my degree that I held from UAA was equivalent to the
54 4 year degree. The one that I really want to talk to and focus is what is highlighted there,

1 some key words. The third option is this basic requirement can be satisfied by a current, and
2 that's very important, current registration as a land surveyor in the State, Territory or D.C.
3 attained by written examination. Key word though is this registration must have been
4 obtained under the conditions outlined by NCEES Unified Model Law for registration of
5 surveyors. That change of putting a State license required to be an NCEES model law
6 State came into effect in 1979 by Federal registered notice. This is what's problematic to
7 us. The people that review the initial applications are Human Resources specialists. How
8 can they judge that this land surveying license from the State is one that's, one, either
9 current or two, meets the model law requirements. And it has to meet the model law
10 requirements and be current. We have repeatedly tried to contact NCEES. You would think
11 that NCEES, it's their model law, they would have a list but they won't answer our replies,
12 written, by the phone, can't produce a list. How can we administrate this? And what has
13 happened truthfully is that has been so confusing for HR specialists that they have accepted
14 any land surveyor license. Applicants don't know if my license is NCEES Model Law or not,
15 they can't find out on the web. They can't find out by writing. Due to the locality pay law
16 that Congress passed, there's going to be huge retirement in Alaska. I'm going to lose 17
17 people on my staff to retirement. I have a huge hiring. I have people on staff that want to fill
18 positions for promotions. They can't find out if their license complies with NCEES Model
19 Law or not. I've done my best to try to do research. I've found some good documents, a
20 summary of what states requirements for their state licensure. But it doesn't say they are
21 model law or not. I have had to go into the Model Law, all that's produced, interpret what
22 constitutes a model law surveying license. Go to all the States statutes and regulations and
23 try to determine what is current for that state but how can I tell what was current in 1980.
24 This is completely unwieldy for us. We're having to deny people that are on staff that have
25 been 1373 full performance and they can't apply for a job because we can't do a model law.

26
27 We are going to take corrective action to fix this. I think the corrective action I'm going to
28 recommend to our Chief in Washington is, let's just drop this NCEES gig. If the agency
29 that's in charge of this has convinced registration boards and everyone else to become
30 model law can't even define who they are, which states they are and can't provide a list of
31 currents. Here's another really good example. Say a surveyor was licensed in Florida, the
32 very first state, that's where NCEES got the idea for a 4 year degree and a model law. And
33 he got registered somewhere else he got the thrill of Alaska. He came up here, maybe he
34 got an Alaska license by comity. I'm working Alaska, I love Alaska, I don't want to do my
35 CEU's in Florida, it's a lot of dues, he drops it. Definitely a model law state. He's not
36 current, he can't apply for a job. These words are very powerful and when we have to
37 administrate these based on this series, we get no help or relief from NCEES, it's a shame.
38 So I know you have a liaison with NCEES, you attend their meetings. I'm here today to say
39 I'd like for you to bring it to their attention that I think they owe all the registration boards, the
40 owe the public, they owe the licensees the ability to pass judgment, is that state license
41 model law or not and what year did they begin that. Then when those people apply for
42 Federal jobs in Alaska or any other state, until we get this series change they have an
43 opportunity. So I thought this was pretty curious and it involves the registration board and
44 very few people at BLM are familiar with the ins and outs of registration. I'm fortunate that
45 most of my career has been as a registrant and I've been involved with professional
46 societies and been before this board before and I can try to put some sense into what this
47 really means. I'm hopeful that if I hire my entry level person as a GS5. Any land surveying
48 license at least proves that they have 8 years experience in nearly any state. They've taken
49 a two day examination that's put on by NCEES. That's another confusion that applicants
50 say well this must be NCEES model law. I remember taking that two days test with NCEES
51 all over my booklet. But the definition is muted in NCEES stuff and there's not just clear
52 guidance on what this means and what states comply or not. Another interesting fact, we
53 had John ---- a professor here at the University of Alaska in our Geomatics program, a great
54 program. We have a provision in the Federal law that will pay a salary and he could work for

1 us this summer, what a great deal. Bring a academia out here and show him to the real
2 world. I could not hire him. He did not meet the 1373. So something's really broke in our
3 Federal System when we can't hire a professor of an academia that produces number a. the
4 degree, he's teaching the degree and he doesn't comply with any of these requirements.
5 He has a 4 year math degree but he doesn't have a surveying degree so we couldn't hire
6 him on this summer which is really a shame. It's mainly trivia for you. What I bring forward
7 to is in your discussions with NCEES maybe you can bring some of my testimony, the
8 questions of, I think you owe it to us NCEES to provide this list and maintain the list current
9 so that us in the Federal sector that are playing along with the model law that this is a good
10 way to provide basic requirements, we can, you know, administer this. Otherwise I think the
11 easiest thing for us is to just make any registration available to meet our minimum
12 requirements. That would make all our Alaska licensees available to get some of these
13 Federal jobs. We're really looking for new blood and get some experience of that
14 professional surveying expertise into our Federal segment. It's healthy to have that
15 diversity, much like myself, I've come in and it's now my career. That's really all I had, you
16 said you couldn't ask questions. As we formulate maybe a formal request to the Office of
17 Personnel Management that changes this requirement I'd be glad to copy the board on it.

18
19 Chair: Thank you for your testimony.

20
21 Dale Nelson: Most all of you know who I am, my name is Dale Nelson and I'm here
22 representing APDC, the legislative liaison committee of which I am Chair. In the past we've
23 worked some, APDC has worked some legislation requests that the board has had as close
24 as last year. Before we get into that I want to bring a couple things, just for your information,
25 we have fall forum, and we do this fall forum, we try to do it annually. Some years we miss
26 because we didn't get the work done, but this year we are going to have a fall forum and we
27 are going to probably do this in conjunction with AGC. This docket was going to be ALS
28 capitol projects, you know this is work in progress. We are inviting the Anchorage State
29 Senate districts G, J and M. This is just to let you know that we are active and talking to the
30 legislature not only in Juneau but here and pursuing the projects that effect the design
31 community. With that I'm here to see what is on the plate for APDC this coming year. Last
32 year we worked the investigator for the board. That came really, really, really close, then we
33 had 5 other items, seals, prohibited practice, definitions and exemptions and then changing
34 some writing on some examinations and examination fees. My question is are we to expect
35 this again this year? What is the boards direction so we can start planning, now is the time
36 when we start talking to legislators working them. That's why I'm here.

37
38 Chair: We do have regulation updates that is going to happen after the public comment
39 period. So maybe you could stick around.

40
41 Hightower: Asks Dale to speak to whether we should go just for the board investigator issue
42 or all of them.

43
44 Nelson: Legislation is a very complicated, as we all know, we touch base with someone
45 along the way and it takes time. That why we have a lobbyist to work some of these. The
46 investigator was one separate bill last time and that took a lot of work and we came so close
47 to success. This year is a new session so we have to re-enter bills, we have to get sponsors
48 and so forth. With that said, the other items out there, there's discussion out there that
49 some of them are a little bit difficult. You know we can read difficult in different ways but
50 then others are just cleaning up, like the one for 8.091 it's cleaning up, striking a word,
51 removing a word, it's housekeeping. Actually I look at all five of those as housekeeping but
52 it takes time walking and getting a sponsor, getting somebody to then draft the bill, we don't
53 have a drafted bill for those five items. But we need to get it drafted, we need to get
54 something. My recommendation is I don't see how it's going to conflict with one or the other

1 because these are considered housekeeping we'll work it as housekeeping and, let's start
2 working. Focus one would be in the investigator and then the next one is, let's get the
3 housekeeping bill for all five of those. But it takes time and there's two sessions. If we start
4 now and we don't get it this time, then we get it next time. It takes another session. It's an
5 education.

6
7 Chair: We will discuss these after the Public Comment period.

8
9 Nelson: Then I'll hang around.

10
11 Buzz Scher: Can I do a power point?

12
13 Chair: We don't have those capabilities.

14
15 Mr. Scher: You don't have a projector, all right then. You guys have your own name plates.
16 I'm Buzz Scher, I'm a PE and a geotechnical engineer with R&M Consultants here in
17 Anchorage. That's not who I'm here with. I'm a Commissioner on the Alaska State Seismic
18 Hazards Safety Commission. I'll hand out these power point slides. Our Commission meets
19 monthly. This morning we had our August meeting on the floor right below here and we will
20 be back in this room in September.

21
22 What I want to talk about today and it's not really testimony, I want to say it's a conversation.
23 We'll see if there's interest. If there is a way we can get something going between the two
24 Commissions. Maybe the direction is we'll call you, don't call us. It has to do with seismic
25 engineering, seismic training, and seismic experience requirements for PE licensing within
26 the State. That's what it's eventually getting to. I'm going to preface it with a few minutes
27 about our Commission because as we in our Commission have tried to infiltrate the
28 Legislators, the various municipalities and various other State agencies, we're pretty
29 unknown. That's alright it's good to fly under the radar.

30
31 The Alaska Seismic Hazards Safety Commission is charged, and I'll just read this verbatim,
32 this is out Alaska Statute 44.37.067, to recommend goals and priorities for seismic risk
33 mitigation to the public and private sectors and to recommend policies to the Governor and
34 Legislature to reduce Alaska's vulnerability to earthquakes. The Commission was first
35 established in 2002. However it was not actually formed. The first members were
36 nominated and appointed at the end of 2005 and it was actually in 2005 there was a first
37 meeting. So it is a very young Commission. To be honest it's a Commission that's also sort
38 of young enough that we're a lot of spinning balls, electrons spinning around. I don't know
39 that we've found a nucleus yet to spin around necessarily. We went through a Sunset Audit
40 in 2011. They found some issues with bookkeeping items, notices, agendas being
41 published, stuff like that. The recommendation was to extend the Commission through
42 2016. That went through the House, it went through the Senate until it got to some one
43 individual in South Anchorage and I don't know what the Commission has done but we were
44 also attached to a bill that included the Bureau of Alcohol and Tobacco, the Beverage
45 Commission and a Beauticians Commission. So there was a problem with our Commission,
46 we have a budget of \$10,000 a year. We have no regulatory authority, we have no paid
47 staff, but something was wrong, so, the bill got passed and we've been approved now until
48 2014. So next year we'll go through the audit again two years later and go through the
49 whole process again, we'll see what happens.

50
51 It's got 11 members we are not a technical or non-technical group. We really are more of an
52 advisory Commission. There's one representative from the University of Alaska system.
53 That happens to be the State Seismologist from the Geophysical Institute at Fairbanks.
54 We have three local government representatives, actually right now we have two, if anybody

1 in your areas knows somebody that fits into under the heading of local government and
2 would be interested in getting involved we will gladly take their name or pass it on the
3 Governor's Office under Boards. One of them is the Chief of the Fire Department in Sitka.
4 We have a civil engineer with the U.S. Coast Guard in Kodiak, those two of the three, a
5 member of the Department of Natural Resources DGGGS out of Fairbanks, State Geologist.
6 DMVA, Department of Military Veterans Affairs that's under the Homeland Security group,
7 Emergency Response Group is a member. Federal agencies, insurance agency
8 representative and three public, I'm one of the public, John Aho, I think some of you people
9 here may know John, he is another public representative, he's also the Chair. So the point
10 is it's not a technically or regulatory based group. We have people from a variety of
11 backgrounds to start on the theme of seismic hazards in the State. We can't reduce the
12 hazard, we can mitigate the hazard. We do have one staff person with DNR out of
13 Fairbanks and that's who the Commission reports to. So far in the short period since 2005
14 we focused on schools and public buildings. Principally because away from the major
15 metropolitan areas schools serve also as the emergency response centers, the community
16 centers, their more than just a school outside of Anchorage and Fairbanks. So we focused
17 on making sure, trying to work with the State Fire Marshal right now and other ways to try to
18 tighten up or to assure requirements for the design complying with the seismic elements of
19 the building codes and in particular that there are inspections to that effect during
20 construction to follow-up that they are actually being done. Seismic hazard studies and
21 planning scenarios, we've done a couple projects with FEMA. We are doing one right now
22 in Kodiak where they've done a simulated earthquake scenario and through a HAZAS which
23 is a program which FEMA runs to assess the damage from a potential from an event, flood,
24 wind storm whatever in this case earthquake. We are doing this for the Borough through
25 our Commission to work with FEMA and the State Homeland Security Group.

26
27 Post earthquake evaluations I'm sure you remember some of the classes that the
28 municipality of Anchorage was sponsoring in the 90's for post earthquake rapid assessment
29 going out and screening buildings, posting them green, orange or red, I think are the three
30 placard colors, quickly afterwards. Now that program was stopped for awhile and has now
31 been picked back up by our Commission and Homeland Security Group out on base or
32 DMVA. So we've been sponsoring those and putting those classes on and then public
33 education.

34
35 We have yet to come up with an idea for legislation or an approach. One of the things we try
36 to do is we write policy recommendations which go annually back to the Governor in an
37 annual report and to the Legislature. One of those policy recommendations from 2011 read,
38 considering that Alaska is the most seismic active state the safety of Alaska's populous and
39 economy require that the design and construction of infrastructure adequately consider the
40 seismic hazard. Therefore the Commission recommends that applicants for registration as a
41 professional engineer practicing civil engineering in Alaska be required to have completed a
42 university level or equivalent course addressing seismic hazards. Well because of my being
43 a PE and my interest in this and I'm also the Chair of their Education and Outreach
44 Committee it fell upon me to sort of be the champion of this policy recommendation and to
45 try to do more than just have it on a piece of paper.

46
47 So I have made some preliminary conversations and I say we've established some basic
48 communications, we really haven't really started anything, with Colin. And what Colin has
49 really done is pointed me in the right direction of who is where you need to go to. Dale is
50 certainly on the list, not Dale as much as APDC. When I get to that point, I do intend to go
51 to their meetings too. The next slide on the next page would be, I'm not a student of law, so
52 I don't know that I've overlooked things, probably, but I've gone through our State's Statutes
53 and Regulations and I could find the word seismic three times, not in the Statutes but in the
54 Regulations I could find it three times. All in reference to architects but nothing relative to

1 engineers, I may have overlooked it if it's using a term that is synonymous with seismic or
2 something. Then I went to the National Testing Standards that licensing requirements point
3 to for engineers and architects and yes certainly underneath the engineer side NCEES has
4 tests that are required to take for registration in the State. The morning session has nothing
5 on it about seismic engineering neither hazards, seismic loading forces, response
6 consequences or so on. The afternoon session, the five sessions they now offer, two of the
7 five, structural engineering and geotechnical engineering to have a pod or series of
8 questions that demonstrate an understanding of a seismic hazard and designing for seismic
9 forces and loads and the consequences thereof. But the other three do not, construction,
10 environmental and transportation. That's not a problem with that I'm just point out how it
11 may already be captured or may not be captured. I'm not familiar with the architects
12 requirements. I've seen reference in our regulations to what they said, an exam on seismic
13 forces but when I go to the NCARB I can't find an exam that has that title so I'm not sure
14 exactly what that is.
15

16 I looked then, certainly California has their own testing requirements, their own special
17 situation there that they've really gone, not to say over the top but they have an awful lot of
18 requirements relative to that. As a preface, I'm not proposing that route yet. But I was more
19 surprised when I went to Oregon and Washington and I didn't see anything in theirs, in
20 searching their Statutes and Regulations relative to licensing. Then again I'm not sure I'm
21 looking in, exactly, all the right places. But friends of mine, PE's, structural engineers and
22 exec's that I worked with in Seattle tell me that they're not aware of any requirements for
23 PE's at least in Washington. Which is sort of surprising given they're in a similar seismic
24 setting as us, maybe not as seismically active but their seismic activity relative to populace
25 is greater than ours. I was surprised by those two states.
26

27 So here it gets to the bottom of page three, again this is all just introductory conversation
28 we're talking about. I wondered how could something be added to our Regulations that
29 could be enforced that wouldn't be burdensome or cumbersome but I think it's reasonably
30 realistic. Then the first question is who would this really apply too? Certainly, I think, civil
31 engineers and structural engineers. I don't know that there would be a lot of question that it
32 would not apply to those two. Architects, maybe it would be nice, our Commissions initial
33 opinion was that anybody in that profession, architects or engineers, dealing with public
34 infrastructure should have an awareness of the seismic environment we live in. But that can
35 be handled through continuing education or something. But certainly civil and structural
36 engineers, environmental engineers maybe, they're dealing with projects or an element of
37 our infrastructure that has a lot of risk associated with it if something were to go wrong with
38 it. So maybe, maybe not, but we are initially just focusing on civils and structurals so it's a
39 small element of the regulations.
40

41 Some strategies that I thought about, and they are not listed in any order, they're not even
42 alphabetical. While I may say all of them would be great, one would be a start. Education,
43 maybe we add something that paragraph for licensing requirement for applicants that they
44 demonstrate that they have taken an accredited course from an accredited university that
45 pertained, or dealt with or introduced them to an understanding of earthquakes and what
46 earthquakes do and how to evaluate that. A specific earthquake course, we have our own
47 course for arctic engineering. I have a masters degree in arctic engineering, my passion is
48 frozen ground. I came here 30 some years ago to work in frozen ground. To be honest in
49 the last 20 years I've had maybe a couple of projects that I've worked with frozen ground
50 and had anything to do with arctic engineering. But I can tell you every one of them over the
51 last 30 years had a seismic element to it. I'm not trying to imply that arctic engineering is not
52 necessary it is a very important and good class. Maybe we prepare something along that
53 similar line for seismic engineering. That's a big effort. I'm not trying to say any of these
54 things are really simple. Maybe the simplest one is to just do an educational requirement as

1 continuing education. We have a biennial requirement for 24 hours for engineers and
2 maybe it says that some percent, three of those hours, has to involve seismic engineering.
3 Maybe it was a webinar, ASTM has been putting on a series of these webinar's. I've looked,
4 there are lots of ways, inexpensive easy ways, for engineers to take classes that could meet
5 something that we had in mind, relatively easy and meet an existing requirement in the
6 State. The only amendment would be that some percent of those 24 have to be within a
7 heading or have captured a heading. And a final one, there is a part of the Regulations right
8 now dealing with disclosures. Maybe that could be a very complicated thing to add in there,
9 but engineers have to disclose when they're dealing with a project that involves public
10 funding like a school project that they have to disclose whether or not they've met some
11 experience criteria dealing with seismic engineering right up front. I don't pretend to
12 understand which of these is easy, which of these is hard, the reality of how they would
13 actually be incorporated into regulatory requirements or statutes. We're simply trying to see
14 if we can, if there's interest that leads us to the last one. Whether or not I could hear
15 anything right now? We could hear back, is the Board interested in this idea? Actually
16 when I first contacted Colin and others, I thought I remembered somewhere in the last 30
17 years of being licensed here that I remembered the subject, I don't know that this is the first
18 time this subject has come up. Let me put it that way. If it has been talked about before,
19 great, what were the stumbling blocks, what happened, can we fix that or can we move
20 around it or something? I don't want to re-invent any wheels or have you guys go through
21 something that was already gone through once. Is the Board interested? If so, great, what
22 can the Alaska Seismic Hazards Safety Commission do to help? Would you like some
23 suggested legislation written, drafted, a white paper, a formal proposal. I don't know the
24 process that this Board has to introduce something to get an action from the Board. But
25 we're open to whatever suggestions you may have. Maybe forming a joint support group.
26 And then the final one is maybe, you know thanks for your input, there's the door, we'll call
27 you.

28
29 So, maybe you can or can't say anything right now, I appreciate the time, I'm hoping that we
30 can get something going with this and on your next face to face meeting. Do you call these
31 face to face meetings or just your biennial meeting?

32
33 Board: Several members responded "quarterly".

34
35 Our Commission meets monthly but it's always teleconferenced and we have two meetings
36 where everybody comes from around the state so we call those face to face. Anyway we
37 can have a joint session at our next or another face to face in the future or somehow try to
38 see if we can help advance this little cause. Thanks, any questions?

39
40 Chair: Thank him for his testimony and shares the Board mission and process with him. He
41 assures that the Board will evaluate the need that his letter was reviewed at the previous
42 meeting and the Board position was that those issues were covered under the NCARB
43 exam and the structural exams and the civil structural especially now that we are going to
44 the 16 hour requirement. That doesn't mean that there's the door we'll be in touch.

45
46 Mr. Scher: If I may, my response is that two of the five afternoon exams cover it. So you
47 can pass the test and be a licensed civil without having to take any testing requirements
48 about seismic. I would not necessarily agree entirely that the existing testing and education
49 requirements address it.

50
51 Chair: Suggests the Board stay in touch with the Commission and assign someone to track
52 that and see if there is something that we need to bring before the Board and act on as a
53 Board.

54

1 Rearick: Advises that the A.R.E. contains a lateral exam that deals with wind or seismic
2 forces. And that NAAB accredited degree structural component has a lateral component
3 that is not super in depth but there is an awareness there.
4

5 Mr. Scher: If you look at the way our policy recommendation was actually written it is more
6 focused on the awareness of the hazard of the seismic environment. Just like the arctic
7 requirement is focusing on that we work in a cold region and have to account for cold region
8 effects. So I know that a lot of my ideas have spun off to the educational side and training
9 side. Well, architects and PE's have to take some of their exams, certainly in the
10 architectural exam and their familiar with the codes and working with that part of it, that's
11 where the continuing education units or a percent of those units being associated with an
12 awareness of the seismic environment setting. You know, what sources there are, hazards
13 maps and so on. It was more for an awareness, like I think the arctic engineering is really
14 intended for too.
15

16 Hightower: Adds that California requires the seismic test and that they have reviewed the
17 NCARB exams and if you took the proper exams they will exempt you as an architect from
18 that exam.
19

20 Mr. Scher: Coming up with our own test, well I personally would like to see it, it's an awful
21 lot. But we do see there may be a hole, whether everybody agrees or not.
22

23 Maynard: Asks if it would suffice to have the arctic courses to do two classes on seismic
24 design rather than a whole additional course.
25

26 Mr. Scher: That would be a really quick way to incorporate it. Because actually in the
27 Regulations it' arctic and seismic requirements.
28

29 Chair: Ok thank you. Former Board member Cliff, you're up.
30

31 Cliff Baker: Thank you Chair and Board members, my name is Cliff Baker, I'm not sure if
32 everybody knows me. I'm just here basically to make an emeritus report. I wanted to thank
33 you for allowing me to be emeritus with NCEES. I'm on the EPS Committee and just real
34 short, I've attended several meeting this year working on the FS and the PS and trying to go
35 toward the CBT format. The FS CBT is planned to go live in January 2014. So the last
36 written test will be in October 2013 and the first CBT for the FS will probably be in April
37 2014. I'm on a sub-committee with that for setting the standards, the cut score standards for
38 that first exam. We just had our meeting this last weekend and at the end of the meeting we
39 have member comments and my comment was that I was going back to reasonable
40 weather. I just wanted to give you a short report and let you know where we are going.
41

42 Chair: Thanks Cliff for his report and closes public comment.
43

44 Break: 1:50p.m. – 2:00p.m.
45

46 Chair: Before you make that motion item 8 was moved to after the public comment.
47

48 **Agenda item 8 – Regulation update.** 49

50 Hightower: Advises that all these issues have been sent forward in the Annual Report....
51

52 Jones: That was just to give the Division an idea what was coming.
53

54 Hightower: Acknowledges that and notes that on the Board there is a difference of opinion

1 on how to proceed. Some feel the investigator issue should go forward and the others
2 should wait. Item number five is a controversial issue and may cloud the issue on
3 something that's very important such as the investigator for the Board. Other feel that we
4 need to get these things moving or we will lose momentum and it will take many more years
5 to get them done. It's been suggested that we separate them, have the investigator as one
6 and then combine the rest.

7
8 Rearick: Agrees with that approach.

9
10 Chair: Suggests that we walk through each of the changes for those who may not be up to
11 speed on them.

12
13 Hightower: Advises that most of them are just housekeeping. He then explains the reasons
14 for the changes such as wording in the Seal's regulation that would allow someone to stamp
15 a drawing but could be used to limit responsibility. Under the prohibitive practice and
16 definitions need cleaning up to be consistent with what we are trying to do in establishing
17 that qualified design professional work within their field of practice. Exemption is the one
18 that is a controversial issue because there's a requirement in there that exempts specialty
19 contractors from all the requirements of these Statutes and that's being interpreted in the
20 field that you could get a mechanical contractor and an electrical contractor, (unintelligible)
21 wall contractor and a steel fabricator and they could go design a five story building and build
22 it without the use of design professionals. It's not being practiced that way but in a lot of
23 cases, particularly in the rural areas, a mechanical contractor and an electrical contractor
24 are designing those systems. As long as they have the administrator license they can go
25 out and I think the Fire Marshal is reviewing the plans that way and that certainly wouldn't be
26 the intent. We've had the AG in talking about this and they indicated we could go back and
27 find out what the intent was in the legislation. I've tried to do that but there is no way I could
28 get that information, what the intent of this legislation was. But I just can't imagine architects
29 and engineers writing a Statute that would allow a plumber to design their buildings. He
30 ends explaining that this is just trying to clean up those issues.

31
32 Maynard: Asks if there is suggested language for all of these.

33
34 Hightower: Responds that there is that this has been around for at least 4 years. He would
35 like to go back and dust them off to make sure we haven't overlooked something. There
36 isn't a lot of work there. He adds that dealing with the Legislature is a lot of work. He
37 recaps the work involved in the last session on the investigator issue.

38
39 Maynard: Suggests that items 2 through 5 get in on a housekeeping bill and also suggests
40 that we try to get either the Senate or House Commerce Committed to sponsor it so it
41 doesn't have any one person's name attached to it. Sometimes when a specific Legislator's
42 name is attached someone in the other house tries to use that as a club to get their vote on
43 other issues. A housekeeping bill coming out of the Commerce Committee is not unheard
44 of. He explains the process and the possible hurdles involved. He feels that the
45 investigator should go through in one session but the other 4 will take some education and
46 may take at least two 90 day sessions.

47
48 Discussion continues on the best route to take and what to introduce as a single item and
49 what to combine in a housekeeping bill.

50
51 Chair: Asks Dale Nelson if he has any comments.

52
53 Nelson: Re-iterates that a lot of the work is done but much more to do and that now is the
54 time to get things moving.

1
2 Maynard: Recommends that everyone attend any fund raisers held by Legislators or those
3 running for the Legislature to talk with them about these issues.
4

5 **On a motion duly made by Hightower, seconded by Maynard and unanimously**
6 **approved by roll call vote it was resolved to pursue the approval in the upcoming**
7 **Legislative Session of the revision of AS 08.48.055, and separately pursue the**
8 **revisions to AS 08.48.221, AS 08.48.281, AS 08.48.341 and AS 08.48.331 and AS**
9 **08.48.091**

10
11 Heieren: Asks for a friendly amendment to separate AS 08.48.091, second agreed.
12

13 Chair: Asks why we would separate that one.
14

15 Maynard: Because it will fly through and the others may not. He adds that the Legislature
16 may put them all into one bill anyway.
17

18 Discussion clarified that items 2 thru 5 in the agenda were one bill and items 1 and 6 would
19 be introduced as individually.
20

21 Heieren: Asks Dale to submit different emails to Vern as dictated by the motion.
22

23 Lent: Reminds the Board that the first LARE that goes digital is this December.
24

25 Hightower rereads the motions.
26

27 **On a motion duly made by Hightower, seconded by Maynard and unanimously**
28 **approved by roll call vote (Eriksen and Schedler were absent) it was resolved to**
29 **pursue the approval in the upcoming Legislative Session of the revision of AS**
30 **08.48.055, and separately pursue the revisions to AS 08.48.221, AS 08.48.281, AS**
31 **08.48.341 and AS 08.48.331 and pursue the revisions separately to AS 08.48.091.**
32

33 Chair: Acknowledges the work that Hightower has put into this and the help from APDC.
34

35 Jones: Asks for the final wording on all the Statute change once the bill is drafted.
36

37 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it**
38 **was resolved to go into Executive Session under authority of AS 44.62.310 (c)(3) to**
39 **review applicant files.**
40

41 2:30p.m. off record in Executive Session.
42

43 6:05p.m. adjourned for the day.
44

45 46 **Friday August 3, 2012** 47

48 8:00a.m. Called to order, roll call all present except Eriksen, Schedler, Lent, Shiesl and
49 Rearick. Lent and Shiesl will be late do to closure of the Glenn Hwy because of a Trooper
50 involved shooting.
51

52 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it was**
53 **resolved to go into Executive Session under authority of AS 44.62.310 (c)(3) to review**
54 **applicant files.**

1
2
3 8:03a.m. Rearick arrives.
4

5 8:59a.m. Back on record.
6

7 **Agenda item 18 – Expenditure Report**
8

9 Called Don Habeger and Misty Frawley.
10

11
12 Chair: Greets Don and Misty and asks for their report.
13

14 Habeger: Starts by explaining the new report form and what transpired to prompt the
15 change in format. He explains that the Division was responding to several issues brought
16 up by a Legislative Audit requested by the Legislative Budget and Audit Committee. They
17 made a number of recommendations in 2011 which concerned financial reporting to Boards
18 and Commissions. The Division agreed with the recommendations in that some
19 improvements were needed. Misty and the fiscal team reviewed all the reports from the last
20 10 years, reconciled all of them making adjustments where necessary. The process led to
21 protocol standardization of work products so that we became more systematic in how we
22 reported information and sent out to the Boards a 10 year look back at all the financials. In
23 addition to that in this last Legislative Session in response to a more specific issue which
24 was that the Division was not properly allocating all the General cost pool to the various
25 programs. Historically Professional Licensing was picking up 100% of that cost pool. We
26 adjusted that procedure. We, going back to the Legislative piece, they realized that
27 Professional Licensing over paid. To true that up they gave Professional Licensing
28 programs \$3.4M and the Legislation required that we go into the Professional Licensing
29 programs, distribute that on an equal basis to all licensees. That has been done. The new
30 report, the 10 year look back report, includes that distribution of over payment of each of the
31 licensees for the General Cost Pool. The last piece of that mandate at the end of FY12,
32 which is a number we haven't quite seen yet because we are still in the midst of closing the
33 year 12. June 30 FY12 all of these programs will have an accurate roll forward. It is the
34 balance that includes the adjustment based on the \$3.4M and all the clean up and that
35 number is the final roll forward number and will be the piece each of the programs use
36 henceforth.
37

38 So a lot of work has gone into this. Some of it took longer than anticipated so FY12 3rd
39 quarter was delayed in getting out to the various programs. Now, however, we've come up
40 with a new procedure where on a quarterly basis, usually a month after the first three
41 quarters, Misty and our fiscal colleagues will go through the data base and send out to all
42 programs a quarterly report. Then at the end of the fiscal year, and typically there's been
43 delays due to adjustments and all the bills coming in etc., sometime near September that
44 fiscal year is officially closed. It's those final 4th quarter reports that we intend to use in our
45 discussion with the various programs on fee adjustments. So that's the work we've done
46 Mr. Chairman and Board and all of that data is summarized in the report before you.
47

48 Chair: Thanks Don for the report and ask if there are any questions.
49

50 Rearick: Asks if the report only included number through the end of the third quarter.
51

52 Habeger: Yes, there is a process and I'm not sure I understand all the adjustment process
53 so I'll hand that off to Misty to explain what the State goes through to close the books.
54

1 Frawley: We go through the end of August to finalize the previous fiscal year. It allots that
2 time frame for any final bills to come in or any adjustments that need to take place. The
3 books are officially closed at the end of August. The reports can then be generated and
4 submitted to the Boards in mid September for the entire fiscal year.

5
6 Heieren: Asks about direct versus indirect expenditures. He wants to know where the
7 services provided by the AG's office would show up.

8
9 Habeger: They're under contractual, actually I better refine that, under direct expenses and
10 contractual. The way the process currently work is when an investigation starts and gets to
11 the point where an AG is involved. They keep a positive time and give us a monthly report
12 of each of the projects they worked on for each of the programs. Misty and her team are
13 responsible for going through the invoice and divvying it out to each of the programs and
14 that shows up under your contractual. That bill we get on a monthly basis includes all 40
15 programs but it is gone through, if you will, with a fine tooth comb and subdivided out to the
16 licensees.

17
18 Heieren: Adds that at one time there was as much as a year and a half lag time on the bills
19 and asks if this is still the case.

20
21 Habeger: Replies that his experience is that it's been corrected and the monthly reports are
22 timely. It takes a day or two for the division to process but the reports to the Boards are as
23 accurate as we can give you.

24
25 Heieren: Then asks about the travel figures.

26
27 Habeger: That is correct but there could be delays in that. He gives an example of a
28 meeting near the end of a quarter and the TA's coming in late could affect the accuracy of
29 the quarterly report.

30
31 Heieren: Emphasizes that travel to National meetings for this Board is critical. It's
32 imperative that we engage in National Organizations. They have a huge impact on how well
33 we do our job. He then explains one instance where the investigator going to a meeting in
34 Colorado received information that probably saved us 6 figures. Another State had gone
35 down a road that we were going down so it's very beneficial that we become educated on
36 things and the networking is critical in helping us do our job.

37
38 Habeger: In response to that for FY13, which was the last session, the Governors budget
39 asked for \$550,000 for this Division in support of Board travel. The Legislature trimmed that
40 down to \$403,000. We didn't get what we asked for, however, for FY14 we are in the midst
41 of planning and because I recognize that very point that you're making, Richard, that out of
42 state travel and involvement in associations is critical for your protection of the public. At
43 least on that beginning phase of discussion I'm asking for more travel dollars again. Maybe
44 we'll get there. I understand what you mean and that's how the dialog works between the
45 Administration and the Legislature.

46
47 Heieren: Adds that this will not affect him as this is his last year on the Board.

48
49 Chair: Thanks Don for approving travel for the John Savage to attend the Nation in St.
50 Louis. He adds that it is equally important for the investigator and staff to attend. He offers
51 the Boards help in any way it can. He then asks when fee setting is scheduled.

52
53 Habeger: Explains that the Division is required by law to do an annual review to get the
54 most accurate information to make sure that the Statute's are being followed essentially

1 meaning that the license fees cover the costs of the program. We felt that using year end
2 data is the most accurate so we've delayed the process a little. The analysis will begin as
3 soon as all the FY12 books are closed. At that time I'll take look and see where you're at. I
4 would say at the end of third quarter and with nearly \$600K in reserves we may not have to
5 do anything immediately. On the flip side, when I looked at FY10 - FY11 your expenses
6 exceeded revenue by about \$200K, if I remember correctly, so we will use that up in another
7 cycle or two and at that point in time we will enter into a discussion on how we want to move
8 forward. On the second piece I realize that I'm still kind of constrained on giving out travel
9 dollars and I already explained the reason for that. My approach is that in-state Board
10 meetings are number one priority. There is some Divisional travel that needs to take place
11 in support of State business so I try to fund that as well but it does not take precedence over
12 your in-state activities. Third is the out-of-state. Typically what happens is I look at those
13 when a request comes in from a particular board and it looks like the desire, as a proposal,
14 exceeds what I think I have in the particular budget I usually kick it back, in this case to
15 Vern, and say we can't afford six people going but we can afford three people going. I don't
16 presume to select who are the best people to represent you so I kick it back to your program
17 to decide if we have limited resources. So that's how that works.

18
19 Rearick: Thanks Don for initiating the CLEAR training that he and Brian attended. He found
20 it very helpful even going into his second term on the Board. He thinks it's a good idea for
21 new Board members and hopes there is funding for it in the future.

22
23 Hightower: Thanks Don for supporting John Savage's attendance at the NCEES Annual in
24 St. Louis. He notes that it is very important for him to be there and the Board appreciates
25 the support.

26
27 Habeger: Certainly, when you make it a priority I try to meet those needs.

28
29 Heieren: Comments that Vern and Alicia deserve a raise. (laughter)

30
31 Habeger: I can't say I disagree with you but the State system is the State system.

32
33 Hanson: Comments on the Statute changes coming up and acknowledges that the Division
34 must remain neutral and only provide information and he thanks Don and Misty for their
35 reports.

36
37 Habeger: If I can respond to that Legislative piece quickly. What helps me in kind of
38 advocating as best I can, although ultimately I'm neutral, is if the Board puts those things in
39 motion it is a tool that I can use to talk to Legislators and say, this is what the Board says.
40 So I just want to put that in your tool bag.

41
42 Brian: Thank you and hopefully it will get sunny down there. (call ended)

43
44 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it**
45 **was resolved to go into Executive Session under authority of AS 44.62.310 (c)(3) to**
46 **review and applicants file.**

47
48 9:25a.m. into executive session

49
50 9:35a.m. back on record.

51
52 9:36a.m. – 9:42 Break

53
54 **Agenda item 20 – Correspondence Received Since May 2012**

1 Chair: We will go through these if anyone has anything they want to discuss let me know. I
2 believe there were a couple Vern wanted to talk about.

- 3
- 4 A) E-mail from Dan Walsh re May meeting
- 5 B) E-mail from NCEES re NCEES Str II exam.
- 6 C) E-mail Burt Lent re Mentoring
- 7 D) Letter to Boards from Don Habeger re CLEAR Training
- 8

9 Rearick: Explains what the training was about and that it was put on by a Canadian
10 company and was excellent for new Board members. He notes that the handouts were very
11 helpful.

12

13 Hale: Says he wanted to attend and if there were handouts he would like them.

14

15 Jones: Once Sara gets the manual finalized I will send you all copies.

16

17 Chair: Wishes he had had the training as a new Board member. It was very helpful
18 especially being to talk with other Boards.

19

20 Hale: Hopes they have this again and notes that it would be a lot easier to attend something
21 like this in the winter months.

22

23 Chair: Asks if Vern and Alicia attended. (The response was yes). He notes that the
24 Anchorage session was three days and the Juneau session was only 2 days.

- 25
- 26 E) E-mail from Scott Fergie re disclaimers on record drawings
- 27 F) Letter from Jerry Carter (NCEES) re Emeritus Status for former Members
- 28 G) E-mail from Dan Walsh re Emeritus Status
- 29 H) Letter from Jerry Carter (NCEES) re Alaska Test Centers
- 30 I) CLARB
 - 31 1. Deadlines for CLARB annual in San Francisco
 - 32 2. LARE Connection for May 2012
 - 33 3. E-News June 2012
 - 34 4. Email from Bert re outreach.
- 35 J) NCARB
 - 36 1. Fast Facts April 2012
 - 37 2. Fast Facts June 2012
 - 38 3. News Clips 23 June 2012 Resolutions
 - 39 4. News Clips 25 June 2012 Ronald Blitch
 - 40 5. News Clips 25 June 2012 Blakely Dunn
 - 41 6. News Clips 25 June 2012 Presidents Medal
 - 42 7. News Clips 25 June 2012 Installation of BOD
 - 43 8. NCARB BOC Brief June 2012
- 44

45 Hightower: Explains that these are just some Publications that came from NCARB that are
46 for information only. A lot of it covers the NCARB meeting which we will report on under
47 item 25.

- 48
- 49 K) NCEES
 - 50 1. Memo from Tim Miller re exam changes
- 51

52 Chair: Explains that the exam specifications are designed to let examinees know what to
53 expect and what to study.

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

- 2. News Release re Industrial exam
- 3. News Release re Software exam

Chair: Notes that this is introducing a new branch of engineering and asks Vern if there is some correspondence on this as well.

Jones: Answers that there is correspondence wanting to know if we are going to adopt software engineering and what the requirements for it will be.

- 4. News Release re Deepwater Horizon disaster
- 5. Meeting report for BOD meeting 5/20-21/2012
- 6. E-mail from Lance Kinney re software engineering
- 7. News Release re engineering award
- 8. News Release re FE exam changes

Chair: This is the FE exam spec's for the CBT starting in 2014 and one of the reasons we need that statute change.

Maynard: So the FE is not going to be the same for everybody anymore. It's going to be the same for 9 of the disciplines but the other six get their own.

Chair: Adds that it isn't much different than what is offered now. They have several different disciplines and a general which is what he took.

There was a short discussion on the make-up of the exam in the past and the reason for having the different disciplines in the fundamentals exam.

- 9. News Release re Dale Jans named distinguished engineer
- 10. News Release re PS going to closed book exam
- 11. Update on move of FE, FS to CBT
- 12. FE exam specifications for 2014

Chair: Notes that there will be a module on this at the NCEES Annual. He adds that there will be more test sites and it will be given in windows instead of specific dates and that examinees can only take it once in a window. He notes that the results will be available in 4 days instead of 8 to 10 weeks. He adds that we may want to consider how we are going to notify examinees of the results.

Kelly: Adds that she is trying to get Vern to consider letting NCEES do the notifications. And explains that examinees could log into their NCEES account and get their results.

L) E-mail from Jake Horazdovsky re SE qualifications

Chair: This deals with having a civil engineering degree and the way our Statutes are written, it's not necessarily in the branch of structural, without getting into this individual, I believe it's substantially similar.

Maynard: Notes that there is only one and possible two degrees that are BS or MS in structural engineering. He adds that ABET does not list structural as an approved program. So there is no ABET approved structural program so even if you had a structural engineering degree it wouldn't be ABET approved. Now you may have a civil engineering degree where you did only structural engineering work that is ABET approved. He hasn't checked if fire protection or controls are ABET approve but thinks they are.

1
2 There was a short discussion on the wording in the regulation and possible solutions. It was
3 noted that this individual was asking how much experience would be require in his case.
4

5 Heieren: This should be on a case by case basis.
6

7 Maynard: Thinks that we may need to modify the table in the regulation. He suggests
8 wording that like "in a branch similar to" so that architectural would be able to take the civil
9 exam or mechanical would be able to take the fire protection or electrical take the control
10 systems. He adds the Board would have to check transcripts to make sure they were
11 studying that kind of work.
12

13 Heieren: Suggests add the wording "acceptable to the Board".
14

15 Chair: Asks if a regulation project is in order.
16

17 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Heieren and passed unanimously it**
18 **was resolved to start a regulation project to address 12 AAC 36.063 to address**
19 **degrees in branches related to the discipline applied for listed in 12 AAC 36.990(17).**
20

21 There was a short discussion on what the wording in the regulation would be whether it
22 would specify degrees that were acceptable for the branches in question or whether it would
23 say "substantially similar" and then the Board would adopt a policy stating what it considered
24 to be substantially similar for the branches in question.
25

26 Chair: Assigned this one to Maynard.
27

28 M) E-mail from Bob Paddock re Software Engineering licensing requirements.
29

30 Chair: Opens this up for discussion stating that we do owe this individual a response.
31

32 Heieren: Thinks we should be proactive and start a regulation project to look into software
33 engineering. He thinks there is a place for software engineering in Alaska just like anywhere
34 else in the U.S.
35

36 Maynard: Questions where the public safety issue is. He feels it's more of a product safety
37 code than an issue like we deal with.
38

39 Rearick: Agrees with Colin and thinks we should lag behind a little and see if a need
40 develops.
41

42 Chair: Points out the recent news stories where software glitches have caused the loss of
43 Billions in the Stock market. While it's a monetary issue it is a welfare issue. He adds that
44 while we shouldn't just cart blanch follow NCEES we knew when we added all the branches
45 that this was going to happen eventually. Software engineering has been in the works for
46 several years now and he agrees with Heieren that there should be a regulation project.
47

48 The discussion continued with several points being reiterated and new questions such as
49 would each piece of software sold in Alaska have to have an Alaska stamp or would it just
50 apply to those working in Alaska. Would there be a timeline on this? It was felt that it could
51 take several years to evaluate and make a decision. Some felt that we should wait to see if
52 there is a need for this. Some felt we had enough on our plate and should put this on a
53 future to-do list. The final result was a regulation project to look into software engineering.
54

1 Chair: I will assign this to Eric if I get a motion.

2
3 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously on a**
4 **roll call vote (Eriksen, Schedler and Shisel were absent) it was resolved to start a**
5 **regulation project to evaluate and/or adopt software engineering licensure regulation.**

6
7 Chair: Asks Jones to draft a response to Mr. Paddock.

8
9 N) E-mail from Sara Chambers re Letterhead.

10
11 Jones: Explains that the Board letterhead had the Board seal as a water mark and that the
12 State is changing the letter head and individual watermarks are no longer allowed.

13
14 Heieren: Suggests that a Code of Ethics be adopted by the Board and volunteers to do the
15 research.

16
17 Heieren: Asks to be excused from the rest of the meeting.

18
19 Chair: Determines that we would still have a quorum and excuses Heieren from the
20 meeting. He asks if anyone else has anything for Richard before he leaves.

21
22 Rearick: Will check with NCARB and AIA re the ethics issue.

23
24 Heieren: Notes that the investigator has mentioned a number of times that when I say this
25 isn't really ethical for somebody to do something like that speaking about a surveying
26 problem he says there is nothing in regulation that gives me any guidance at all. This will be
27 a first step in helping him with this.

28
29 **Agenda item 21 – Special Committees.**

30
31 Jones: this is a Guidance Manual change that Burt wanted to discuss.

32
33 Maynard: Recommends accepting the suggested language as long as we putting a period
34 at the end of the last sentence.

35
36 After discussion on the language of the change the motion was drafted as follows.

37
38 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Hightower and passed**
39 **unanimously it was resolved to add to “Guidelines for Reporting Violations” the**
40 **following after the third sentence. “An Investigative Committee is available to assist**
41 **the Investigators in evaluating allegations of violations”. Also add a final sentence**
42 **“Anonymous complaints are not acceptable.”**

43
44 Licensure Implementation.

45
46 Nothing to report

47
48 Registration and Practice.

49
50 Hightower: Refers to an outline of the Statute changes everyone has and reports on the
51 status. He needs to add 08.48.091. He will get a first cut of it and get it to the committee
52 members then to APDC.

53
54 There was some re-hashing of the earlier discussion about who to get to sponsor and how

1 to go about pushing these through the Legislature. Harley and Colin will coordinate with
2 Dale at APDC.

3
4 Licensure Mobility.

5
6 Nothing to report.

7
8 Mining Engineers/Geologists.

9
10 Walters: Nothing new except that we actually had someone apply for the mining exam this
11 time.

12
13 Changes to 12 AAC 36.068 and timing of such changes.

14
15 Chair: Bert isn't here. I believe we approved him to continue on that.

16
17 TWiST Program.

18
19 Hale: Reports that it was canceled this year due to lack of interest.

20
21 **Standing Committees**

22
23 Investigative Advisory Committee

24
25 Nothing to report.

26
27 Guidance Manual

28
29 Nothing further to report.

30
31 Legislative Liaison

32
33 Maynard: Go out and meet candidates. Get your faces known.

34
35 Emeritus Status

36
37 Cliff made his report yesterday during the public comment.

38
39 Budget Committee

40
41 Nothing to report

42
43 Continuing Education Committee.

44
45 Rearick: Requests to be put back on this committee.

46
47 IDP Liaison

48
49 Hightower: Will turn chair over to Rearick.

50
51 Nothing to report.

52
53 **Agenda item 22 – Licensing Examiner Report**

1 Kelly: Gives her report which contains the statistical report from the Annual Report.

2
3 **Agenda item 23 – Annual Report**

4
5 Chair: Hopefully everyone has had a chance to read this. He thanks Vern and Alicia for
6 their work on this report.

7
8 Jones: Explains how he puts the report together and how he estimates the expenditures for
9 the upcoming FY. He also covered how funded delegates to National meetings are done,
10 explaining that NCEES funds them up front but NCARB does the third party reimbursement.

11
12 There was a short discussion on this. The difference is that NCEES travel section takes
13 care of everything and the State is not involved. With NCARB the State fronts the travel and
14 NCARB reimburses the State. The reimbursement goes into the General Fund instead of
15 the AELS travel account so even though NCARB is picking up most of the travel costs AELS
16 pays for it and the State gets the reimbursement. The architects decide to bring this up to
17 NCARB and see if they can get that changed.

18
19 **Agenda item 24 – Board Travel**

20
21 Chair: Vern has put together a list for the upcoming year.

22
23 Jones: Notes that the CLARB meeting in San Francisco is approved for Burt and himself.
24 And the NCEES Annual in St. Louis is approved. Hanson and Maynard will be the funded
25 delegates and Savage will be funded by the State. Hale will be partially funded by the State
26 and Walters will be funded by himself or his company. Everything else for the FY year is
27 questionable. We have already spent close to 10K and we only have 15K for out of State
28 travel.

29
30 **Agenda item 25 – National Meeting Reports**

31
32 Maynard reports on the NCEES Western Zone in Jackson Hole, WY. He reports that it was
33 interesting to see all the issues that were raised that he had no clue about. He commented
34 on some of the complaints from other states on their people having to drive an hour or so to
35 take the test when we have to drive 8 hours or fly thousands of miles. He notes that
36 Heieren was elected assistant vice president of the Zone and him and Hale both got
37 committee assignments.

38
39 Hightower: Reports on the NCARB National in Minneapolis. He reports that they always
40 spend a lot of time on Practice Analysis which is an effort to continue to improve the
41 Architect Registration Exam. It guides our association with the Nation Architect
42 Accreditation Board and continuing education policies. There is also a lot of emphasis on
43 the value of NCARB Certification. He notes that the meeting was available on the web for
44 those who couldn't attend. We have been very fortunate in being able to attend these
45 meetings. He notes that the dues will be going up \$500 per year until 2017 where the dues
46 will be \$8500 per year. He adds that the present BOD and President Elect do committee
47 assignments and right now we have one that is friendly to Alaska. Richard is on the CE
48 committee and the NAAB accreditation committee and I was also appointed to that for 4
49 years.

50
51 Rearick: Reports that NCARB renewed its contract with PROMETRIC in concert with Alpine
52 Testing Solutions. PROMETRIC will handle onsite management of the testing and Alpine
53 Testing Solutions will handle the candidate content management. This will provide greater
54 data transparency and access to the individual candidate data. This will benefit the

1 candidates, registration Boards and volunteers with improved access to data. They spend
2 \$750,000 to \$1M annually on research and development for the ARE. They are looking out
3 into the future for some type of desktop version of the ARE. Harley mentioned the 2012
4 Practice Analysis which included a huge pool of architects and that sets the basis for what's
5 going to be in the exam and sets the mold for NCARB as far as where the industry is
6 heading and where it's at right now. So they will be looking for different delivery methods for
7 the exam and perhaps different scoring models for the types of tests that they offer.

8
9 **Agenda item 26 – Board Tasks (to-do list)**

10
11 Chair: He recaps who was assigned what this meeting. Eric has software engineering.
12 Richard H and Richard R are going to work on ethics. Harley and Eric Statute changes.
13 Colin has got 12 AAC 36.190 and 063 and a letter to MOA. Richard you have 12 AAC
14 36.185.

15
16 Rearick: I was also going to give Roger a formal response back.

17
18 Maynard: I'm also going to try to get APDC to write some letters to the Governor to try to
19 increase our travel budget.

20
21 Chair: Good luck with that. If we need to send one as well.

22
23 Maynard: We can do that in November.

24
25 Chair: For Vern I had the letter to Glashan, letter to Paddock and travel estimate from John
26 and the manual from Sara.

27
28 **Agenda item 27 – Read applications into the record.**

29
30 **On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it**
31 **was resolved to find the following list of applicants for registration by comity and**
32 **examination incomplete**

33
34 *The subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*
35 *meanings:*

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

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

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

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

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

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

43 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

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

45

Sinclair, Derek M.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Incomplete - pending 2 new letters
--------------------	----------------	--------	------------------------------------

			of reference
Polamarasetty, Ravi K.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending 24 mos responsible charge in ME; 6 years total experience; an additional PE reference; Arctic & JQ
Ayers, III, Kenneth W.	FS	Exam	Incomplete - pending 6 semester hours of Surveying coursework
Cooper, David E.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending additional 20 months experience; PE; & JQ
Yang, Yuhu	SE	G'father	Incomplete - pending calculations or supporting documents for both projects
Murphy, Michael Wm.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Incomplete - pending FE; or, verification of additional 12 years experience; Arctic & JQ
Hrinko, William T.	SE	G'father	Incomplete - pending project letters
Loftus, James J.	SE	G'father	Incomplete - pending project letters or verification of SE exam
Rice, Jeffrey Wallace	SE	G'father	Incomplete - pending signed letter from re: stamp
Bai, Feifei	Civil Engineer	Comity	Incomplete - pending verification of PE exam & registration; & additional 12 months experience

1
2
3
4
5
6

On a motion duly made by Rearick seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it was resolved to approve the following list of applicants for registration by comity and examination under 12 AAC 36 with the stipulation that the information in the applicant's files will take precedence over the information in the minutes:

Atkinson, Philip Michael	Control Systems Engineer	Comity	Approved
Axness, Daniel S.	Agricultural Engineer	Comity	Approved
Bosch, John E.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Brock, Jennifer McFerran	FE	Exam	Approved
Brooks, Lavon J.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Buell, Shawn C.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved

Daugherty, Leslie	SE	G'father	Approved
Dean, Michael C.	SE	G'father	Approved
Doggett, Timothy Hugh	SE	G'father	Approved
Doran, Zachariah	FE	Exam	Approved
Egelhoff, Frank L.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Eisberg, Kim	FE	Exam	Approved
Eversman, Aaron H.	SE	G'father	Approved
Freeman, Jared	FE	Exam	Approved
George, Nicholas	FE	Exam	Approved
Gill, Thomas J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Glashan, Stafford John	Environmental Engineer	G'father	Approved
Gobeli, Jesse Lee	SE	G'father	Approved
Gonzalez, David F.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Guo, Yan	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Hahm, Joel A.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Hamman, Michael	FE	Exam	Approved
Hansen, Sabrina M.	Fire Protection	G'father	Approved
Helin, Kurtis M.	Architect	Comity	Approved
Hoisington, David	FE	Exam	Approved
Hoisington, David	FE	Exam	Approved
Holmes, Travis	Environmental Engineer	G'father	Approved
Igl, Nicolas J.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Ivanoff, Clifton M.	FE	Exam	Approved
Keyser, Jared F.	SE	G'father	Approved

Keyuravong, Pisonth	Control Systems Engineer	Comity	Approved
Keyuravong, Pisonth	Fire Protection Engineer	Comity	Approved
Kienle, Florian J.	Control Systems Engineer	G'father	Approved
Kuipers, Jeremy James	FS	Exam	Approved
Lam, Peter H.	SE	G'father	Approved
Lang, Kristin Ann	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Lorenzen, Todd A.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Machara, Anthony	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Machara, Anthony	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Maddock, Ric F.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Martin, William E. J.	Architect	Comity	Approved
Mazzolini, Andrew	FE	Exam	Approved
McGregor, Owen Lewis	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
McGuire, Frank	FS	Exam	Approved
Millam, Jason Langdon	SE	Exam	Approved
Millam, Jason Langdon	SE	G'father	Approved
O'Brien, Jerry	FE	Exam	Approved
O'Donnell, Justin N.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Ogawa, Daniel	FE	Exam	Approved
Pasilan, Emesjoy	FE	Exam	Approved
Pawlowski, Kevin	FS	Exam	Approved
Pinilla, Aleida	FE	Exam	Approved
Raj, Vaibhav	FE	Exam	Approved
Redick, Rori Ann	FE	Exam	Approved

Reinhard, Patrick W.	SE	G'father	Approved
Schambeck, Stephan	SE	Comity	Approved
Schmitt, Earl H.	Control Systems Engineer	Comity	Approved
Shimota, Richard James	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Springer, Mark J.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Stierwalt, David D.	SE	G'father	Approved
Terrell, Ricky N.	Fire Protection Engineer	Comity	Approved
Toth, Frank	FE	Exam	Approved
Untiet, Jessica	FE	Exam	Approved
Upsall, Benjamin	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Van Nortwick, Nathanael	FE	Exam	Approved
Wallis, Paul B.	SE	Comity	Approved
Webster, Damon Charles	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Widmer, Kenneth	FE	Exam	Approved
Willis, Ryan	FE	Exam	Approved
Worcester, Stanley C.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Wuestenfeld, Matthew	FE	Exam	Approved
Graetz, Ethan E.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; & JQ
Moroi, Shigeyoshi Albert	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Johnson, Warren Gene	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Jones, Neal R.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Ranaletta, Victor	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Waverek, Jody T.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ

Pfaff, Trevor K.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts; Arctic & JQ
Berry, Gregory Allen	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts; PE exam; Arctic & JQ
Hoskins, Mark A.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams & registration; & JQ
Callicott, Michael W.	SE	G'father	Approved - pending 2 additional references
Gallagher, Michelle	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending A.R.E.; & JQ
Cooke, Aaron M.	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending A.R.E.; Arctic & JQ
Morse, Melissa S.	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending A.R.E.; Arctic & JQ
Jenski, Wayne Anthony	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending A.R.E.; IDP; Arctic & JQ
Kaner, Arkady	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending additional PE references; & Arctic
Hernandez, Marcos A.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Johnson, Jr, Saint Patrick	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
LeDoux, Matthew Joseph	Control Systems Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Doerr, William B.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Hitchcock, David	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
King, James Michael	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Lee, Shong Leng	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Lee, Kenneth F.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Patsy, Blake D.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Secary, Daniel Wm.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Engel, Amanda M.	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending ARE; & JQ
Levesque, Bryan	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending exams; registration; transcripts; & JQ
Gano, Jacob R.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending FE, PE Civil; & JQ

Mastny, Ethan A.S.	Petroleum Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending FE; PE Petro; & JQ
Boehnen, Jr., Thomas R.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Dahl, Kenneth E.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Forster, Zachary Reiff	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Hamel, Scott E.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Lindsey, Brian C.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Lussier, Monique Alice	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Menne-Jacobsen, Karen Marie	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Ormerod, Derek R.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Pease, Matthew S.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Ratz, Nathan H.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Robison, Edward G.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Rumbaugh, Matthew W.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Shah, Chandrakant M.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Shelton, Adam G.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Hayden, Gabriel C.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending payment of fees; PE Civil; Arctic & JQ
Anderson, Michael C.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending payment of fees; verification of FE; PE- Mech; Arctic & JQ
Boudreau, Curtis	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE - Mech & JQ
Hepler, David R.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE - Mech & JQ
KC, Praveen	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE - Mech & JQ
Ludemann, Adam	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE - Mech & JQ

Wayne			
Li, Hui	Mining Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE - Mining
Henry, Timothy Daniel	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil
Forthun, Jay S.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; & JQ
Ooms, Andrew W.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; & JQ
Petrov, Nikolai Runnells	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; & JQ
Miller, Carrie A.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; Arctic; & JQ
Hiemstra, Aaron Kyle	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; JQ
Mollenkopf, Mathew	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; JQ
Nguyen, Binh Thanh	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; JQ
Oliveira, Nickolas M.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; JQ
Reed, Steven E.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; JQ
Russell, Kathryn B.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; JQ
Stielstra, Matthew Clark	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; JQ
Willoughby, Courtney A.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; JQ
James, Joshua I.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; transcripts; Arctic & JQ
Olson, Matthew Robert	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE -Mechanical; & JQ
Gard, Krysta M.	Professional Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS
Giessel, Peter A.	SE	Exam	Approved - pending SE exam
Rossiter, Brian Wm.	SE	Exam	Approved - pending SE exam
Satpathy, Basant K.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts; & JQ
Worthington, Steven Scott	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts; & JQ
Hagerman, James E.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts; payment of fees; 2 additional

			Architect references; & JQ
Mestas, Amy Kephart	SE	Exam	Approved - pending verification of exams
Stalzer, Jr., Richard F.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams; transcripts; JQ
Dawson, Robert Miles	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams; registration; Arctic & JQ
Edgar, Christopher Wm.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE & PE Civil; registration; & transcripts
Homerding, Nicholas John	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending verification of FE; PE Civil; JQ
Richards, Paul David	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE; & JQ
Wood, Craig T.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending verification of FE; PE - Mech; & JQ

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

On a motion duly made by Rearick, Seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it was resolved to find the following list of applicants for registration in additional branches of engineering under 12 AAC 36.106 incomplete.

Note: The applicants are included in the list above with the other incomplete applicants.

On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it was resolved to approve the following list of applicants for registration in additional branches of engineering under 12 AAC 36.106 with the stipulation that the information in the applicants files will take precedence over the information in the minutes.

Note: The applicants are included in the list above with the other approved applicants.

Agenda item 28 – Review Calendar of Events

It was determined that the agenda had the wrong dates for the November meeting. The meeting will be on November 8-9, 2012 in Anchorage.

Agenda item 29 – Board Member Comments

Rearick: Congratulated Brian on his first meeting as Chair. Felt it was a good meeting.

Hightower: Thanked Brian, Alicia and Vern for a good job.

Maynard: Suggested the check off sheet for the grandfathering files be changed to only include those items that concern the grandfather license. That it not include items already check off on their original license. Good Meeting and good job everyone.

Kelly: Had a great time as always. She enjoys working with this Board.

1 Hale: Looks forward to the next meeting, maybe the room will feel warmer by then.

2

3 Jones: Good job guys, everything went well, it was a good meeting. I hope Don and Bert
4 are ok.

5

6 Chair: Thanks everyone who made it and thank you Alicia and Vern for all your hard work.
7 Good meeting, thank you for the opportunity to Chair it, hope I did a good job.

8

9 11:50a.m. Meeting adjourned.

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

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

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

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

Date: _____