

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 **November 1-2, 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 November 1-2, 2012 in the Atwood Building, 550 W. 7th Ave., Suite 1860, Anchorage AK.

15
16 **Thursday November 1, 2012**

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

19
20 8:00 a.m. The Chair called the meeting to order. Roll call, all present except Richard
21 Rearick, Architect who was excused from this meeting by the Chair to attend the NCARB
22 MBC/MBE conference in Boston, MA.

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

- 25
26
- Brian Hanson, PE, Chair
 - Eric Eriksen, PE, Secretary
 - Kathleen Schedler, PE
 - 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
- 35

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

- 38
- Sara Chambers, Operations Manager (by telephone)
 - Vern Jones, Executive Administrator
 - Alicia Kelly, Licensing Examiner
 - John Savage, Investigator
 - Misty Frawley, Administrative Officer II (by telephone)
- 44

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

- 46
- Dale Nelson, PE representing APDC
 - John Walsh, representing APDC
 - Kara Moriarty, representing AOGA
 - Dave Norton, PE, representing SOA DOG
 - Becky Kruse, representing SOA DOL
 - Guy Schwartz, representing SPE-AOGCC
- 52

1 **Agenda item 2 – Review/Amend Agenda**

2
3 Jones: passed out several items that were received after the Board packets and agenda
4 were mailed. He adds that item 9J was not in the packet because it contained information
5 that would normally be reviewed as part of an applicant file in executive session.

6
7 Lent: Add 21 C – CLARB meeting report.

8
9 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it**
10 **was RESOLVED to approve the agenda as amended.**

11
12 **Agenda item 3 – Ethics reporting**

13
14 Nothing reported.

15
16 **Agenda item 4 Review and approve the Minutes of the August 2012 meeting.**

17
18 Lent: had a correction to page 3 line 19 changing ASPLA to ASLA.

19
20 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it was**
21 **RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the August 2012 meeting as amended.**

22
23 **Agenda item 5 – Investigators Report**

24
25 Savage: asks if there are any questions on the report.

26
27 Chair: asks about the 2009 case.

28
29 Savage: reports that it looks like that will be moving forward soon. He also hopes to move
30 forward on those that are at the AG's office, he is looking at possibly going an alternate
31 direction on them. Hopefully by the next meeting some of the older ones should be off the
32 books. He adds that some of the older cases from 2009 have been resolved.

33
34 Maynard: asks if they have been sitting in the AG's office since January 2011.

35
36 Savage: responds, yes or longer.

37
38 Schedler: asks what the alternate direction is.

39
40 Savage: explains that it can't be discussed at a meeting. He adds that one thing slowing
41 them down is the money issue. He can't just go out and get an expert witness like he could
42 in the past. For an AG that is getting ready to go to court and knows absolutely nothing
43 about what you gentlemen and ladies do, it's pretty intimidating. In his opinion this
44 complicates things in that people notice this and hire a lawyer right away.

45
46 Schedler: asks if all we can do is write a stern letter.

47
48 Savage: answers no, we can go the distance it's just not as easy as it used to be. He adds
49 that sometimes the AG, if the case has been sitting for a couple years, will request that the
50 investigation be updated such as having a survey re-done or having an engineer re-review it
51 and release another report on it. There are a lot of costs associated with these matters.

52
53 He then talks about the recent NCEES meeting he attended and the valuable, money saving
54 information that they come back with from these meeting, things other States DA's, AG's

1 and investigative staff, some of the hills they've had to climb, some of the barriers they have
2 come up against and some of the law suits they have or have not weathered. It's really an
3 eye opener for the State of Alaska making sure we don't step into the same trap that other
4 states have that has cost them a ton of money. It was worth the little bit of money it cost to
5 send the Alaska delegation there. He appreciates the Board's support in his attendance at
6 these meetings.

7
8 Chair: thanks John for the report and asks if there are any other questions for John?

9
10 **Agenda item 7 – Regulation Update**

11
12 Hightower advises that he has been traveling and hasn't been available for the APDC
13 meetings but will attend the next one. He adds that we will work closely with APDC on
14 these Statute changes and that he needs to find out exactly what we need for the
15 Legislature and he will find out at the next APDC meeting.

16
17 Maynard: adds that the next meeting is today down stairs and everyone is invited.

18
19 Jones: advises the Board that Dale Nelson was planning on arriving at 9:30 to be present for
20 this discussion.

21
22 Lent: asks about the status of the regulations changes.

23
24 Jones: responds that the three in the packet are those that he did and they are ready for the
25 Board to approve for public notice.

26
27 Chair: decides that since Dale Nelson wants to be present for the Statute discussion we
28 should move to the regulation changes.

29
30 7 b 1) 12 AAC 36.190 Testing Laboratory Reports

31
32 Maynard: reports that he hasn't made any progress on it. He needs to find out if there are
33 any testing labs that aren't civil in nature to see if there is actually a problem. He then
34 recaps that the question was asked by Mr. Glashan, why are only civil labs licensed. He will
35 have something for the February meeting.

36
37 7 b 2) 12 AAC 36.068 Eligibility for Landscape Architect Registration by Examination

38
39 Lent: asks if there are any questions.

40
41 Chair: clarifies that this change is to allow early testing.

42
43 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Lent and passed unanimously it**
44 **was RESOLVED to approve changes to 12 AAC 36.068 for public notice.**

45
46 7 b 3) 12 AAC 36.040 Simplified Application for Re-examination

47
48 7 b 4) 12 AAC 36.050 Application Deadlines

49
50 Jones: explains that our deadlines are in fixed regulation and NCEES's deadlines fluctuate
51 which sometimes only allow a day or two to notify all applicants and let NCEES know who is
52 approved for the exams. This change will allow our deadlines to be flexible and allow 5
53 days between deadlines.

1 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it**
2 **was RESOLVED to approve changes to 12 AAC 36.040 and 12 AAC 36.050 for public**
3 **notice.**

4
5 7 b 5) 12 AAC 36.063 Engineering Education and Work Experience Requirements

6
7 Maynard: explains the chart in 12 AAC 36.063 and notes that there are no ABET accredited
8 programs in control systems or structural engineering and only one in fire protection
9 engineering which would require everyone applying for those to have additional years of
10 experience. He recommends as a possible solution to expand the types of degrees
11 acceptable for the various branches of engineering. For example, most applicants for
12 structural exam will probably have a civil degree and he wants to add the architectural
13 engineering degree also. He provided a chart recommending the various ABET accredited
14 degrees and what branches they would be accepted for. He adds that the structural
15 engineering organizations would like to see a requirement for a civil license before a
16 structural can be obtained and with limitations on where a structural license is required.

17
18 Chair: asks if the Board doesn't have some leeway in what we accept.

19
20 Jones: points out that sub paragraph (b) provides some leeway.

21
22 Maynard: goes through his chart and explains which degrees would be acceptable for each
23 branch and adds that there may be others that the Board would want to include.

24
25 Chair wants to leave this open for now.

26
27 Schedler: is in favor of clarifying the chart because that is what most applicants look at. And
28 this board may require 3 years experience with a certain degree and the next Board may
29 require 5 years for the same degree. She also likes the idea of listing what disciplines go
30 with which degree.

31
32 Heieren: thinks the Board could state "at the Board's discretion" in the regulation and adopt
33 a policy on what is acceptable.

34
35 Maynard: recounts some variations in experience required of people he knows and thinks
36 that using the chart and putting it in the Guidance Manual as a guide for the board and other
37 people is a good idea.

38
39 Heieren: suggests that after a trial, if this is working then it can be added to the regulations.

40
41 Eriksen: suggests that maybe just do the structural for now and work the others in as
42 needed.

43
44 Maynard: feels that we need to do something sooner rather than later on structural, controls
45 and FP. He also would have preferred that we require a civil prior to structural.

46
47 Jones: thinks that it would be better to write a specific regulation for structural instead of
48 combining it with the existing regulations.

49
50 Maynard: agrees if we make it supplemental but if we leave it as is we can just include it. He
51 asks if we care what the structural engineers think or do we leave it as is.

52
53 Chair: points out that it's not what the structural engineers think it's the HSW of the Public
54 that counts.

1
2 Maynard: adds that we aren't in line with the rest of the Western States. To get comity with
3 them you will need a civil license as well as structural. He points out that California would
4 require that you take the civil exam as well as their exam on seismic and land surveying.

5
6 Chair: states, it looks like we can either do a regulation or a policy and points out that
7 Maynard and Schedler seem to have a handle on this and asks if they want to come back to
8 the February meeting with something and if Maynard wants to take the lead on it.

9
10 Maynard: asks for clarification on which way the Board wants to go. Do you want a
11 regulation or a policy?

12
13 Heieren: thinks we can do something today such as implement a regulation that would allow
14 us to adopt a policy to deal with the issue.

15
16 Jones: reminds them that they did a motion last meeting to start a regulation project on this.

17
18 Eriksen: suggests moving in the direction Heieren had suggested.

19
20 A short discussion resulted in Maynard stating that he will work up something to vote on
21 later this meeting.

22
23 Chair: notes that we already have the regulation that will allow us to implement the policy.
24 He reads sub paragraph (b) again and adds that what the policy is going to do is determine
25 the amount of credit. He feels we need something in writing for future Boards.

26
27 Maynard: will add reference to sub paragraph (b) on the chart and asks for any other
28 amendments to what he has.

29
30 There was a discussion on which degrees should be accepted for each branch. Several
31 suggestions for additions for various branches were made and Maynard will amend the
32 chart this afternoon.

33
34 Chair: decides to move on to software engineering but advises that we will stop and call
35 Sara Chambers and Misty Frawley at 9a.m. for the expenditure report.

36
37 7 b 6) Evaluate and/or adopt software engineering license regulation

38
39 Eriksen: Reports that NCEES has decided to offer a software engineering exam. He points
40 out that 24 States are recognizing software engineering but that the 4 Western State will not.
41 He adds that the local IEEE has provided a position paper and that they are generally not in
42 support of software engineering but that the comments seem to be along the lines of the
43 comments we received when we added all the other branches. For example why do we
44 need this when the service is already being provided much like the civil and structural
45 engineers position when we first introduced the additional branches. He asks what direction
46 the Board wants to proceed. Is there a need for software engineers in the State? He feels
47 there is and that it may augment the expertise available in the State.

48
49 Chair: feels software engineering is a distinct branch unlike the architectural engineering
50 branch which has a lot of overlap with many other branches and would cause confusion
51 among the public of the difference between an architect and an architectural engineer.

52
53 Heieren: points that the National IEEE is in favor of it.

1 Eriksen: suggests that maybe this can wait until someone asks about it.
2
3 Maynard: asks Jones if any software engineers have requested licensure.
4
5 Jones: responds that he didn't know if he was a software engineer but there was
6 correspondence from someone at the last meeting asking what we were going to do about
7 it.
8
9 Maynard: thinks that if we adopt software engineering we will have to be very careful how
10 we define it. If we limit it to software systems that are in the build environment so we aren't
11 getting Microsoft with excel because that really isn't our bailiwick. Then the question also
12 becomes do we cover software engineers who design programs that engineers use to
13 design buildings, or is it only software that is in control systems or software that drives
14 mining equipment? We need to define it very well. I'm not sure we are not going to get
15 much more confusion than architectural engineering would have. He is kind of torn right
16 now.
17
18 Eriksen: adds that those were some of the concerns in their letter.
19
20 Maynard: thinks their concern was that an electrical engineer wouldn't be able to stamp
21 them. But if adopted, electrical engineers would continue to be able to do all the work they
22 are now doing just as civil engineers can continue to practice as they always have.
23
24 At this point the discussion stopped so the teleconference on the expenditure report could
25 begin.
26
27 Chair: starts the teleconference with good morning Sara, Misty this is Brian. So you have an
28 expenditure report for us. We have one in front of us.
29
30 Frawley: responds that she sent the final FY12 and asks if the board has any questions?
31
32 Maynard: points out that the row titles on the left were cut off so they don't know what each
33 row represents.
34
35 Frawley: provides the titles for all the lines. The first one is licensing revenue and the next
36 one down is total revenue. And the next group down is your direct expenses. The first one
37 is personnel services. The second line is travel. The third is contractual. The fourth is
38 supplies and the fifth is equipment. And that is your total below that bar. Next are your
39 indirect expenses then your total expenses. And then the annual surplus/deficit. Next is
40 beginning surplus/deficit and finally the ending surplus/deficit.
41
42 Heieren: asks what the ratio of the indirect expenses is.
43
44 Frawley: didn't have the percentage for this Board but that it was based on license count.
45
46 Chair: asks if she can explain why it has gone up so much.
47
48 Frawley: explains that the indirect expenses will continue to rise each year and that they
49 could analyze by breaking it all down but that the Board can continue to see the growth.
50
51 Eriksen: thinks it looks like the FY12 indirect will be higher than the direct.
52
53 Frawley: explains that there are variables such as the license count may be higher.
54

1 Jones: thinks that the percentage went from 11 something percent down to 10.4.

2
3 Chambers: says she will look it up.

4
5 Chair: points out that there is approximately 35 percent increase in indirect costs and we
6 would like to know what caused that increase.

7
8 Frawley: we can take a look at that and get back to you. She adds that there was the same
9 concern from another Board because the indirect expenses went up since last year.

10
11 Chair: notes that everything stayed pretty much the same or went down except indirect. He
12 asks for a report on that.

13
14 Chambers: explains that one element that may be a factor is that any increase in costs to
15 the State would be passed along to the licensees such as labor contracts etc. One
16 mitigating factor is the license count. She explained that the methodology that had been
17 used had some gaps and was not really a true capture of the number of licenses that are
18 processed annually or in a previous year during biennial licensing activity so we worked it
19 with our IT and Fiscal departments and came up with a new methodology that more
20 accurately captures the number of licenses that are held as well as the level of effort that
21 goes into processing those and that resulted in gains in licensee numbers for many
22 programs. She adds that it is much more accurate and that may be the reason AELS had a
23 1200 licensee increase last year. There were 443 new licenses issued in FY12 but there
24 may be increases in the numbers because of that methodology. She adds that this occurred
25 with many other programs as well.

26
27 Maynard: asks what the change in the process was. You only have so many licensees, how
28 can you count them differently?

29
30 Chambers: responds that that's an excellent question. The methodology that had been in
31 place for many years was to search our data base and pull numbers based on one day out
32 of the year. And it was either the last day or the first day of the FY. We stopped processing
33 licenses and published what was valid on that day. Many of you can probably see from that
34 explanation how that can lead to inaccuracies. So we engaged our IT team and took a look
35 at what was the activity over the course of the year. What may be valid as a snapshot in
36 time on one particular day may not capture all of the activity that happened over the year.
37 We believe it's an improvement on what had been in place and Vern may have mentioned
38 that we are in the process of developing a new data base, a new data management system
39 that will be in keeping with the 21st Century and provide more technological tools that will
40 help us accomplish these tasks more clearly in the future.

41
42 Chair: could it possibly be an increase to indirect expenses as well?

43
44 Chambers: the allocation of indirect expenses is based on the number of licensees. So if
45 your number of licensees went up in FY12 because of this different methodology that would
46 have affected your indirect cost. All these percentages are available on our website in the
47 annual reports.

48
49 Chair: asks for the total indirect expenditures for the Division for FY12.

50
51 Chambers: says, we don't have it in front of us right now but we can get it for you.

52
53 Chair: if we could have the total for FY11 and the total for FY12 that may give us our
54 answer.

1
2 Heieren: voices his frustration with the system. He points out that a business looks at what is
3 necessary to keep the doors open and charges accordingly and this all seems a little
4 backward to him. In order for the Board to do its job we need a certain amount of money
5 and it's sort of like the tail wagging the dog. We don't always feel like we are being effective
6 as a Board in serving the Public's interests because of the lack of money.
7

8 Chambers: Richard H, are you suggesting that the Board would like to see a fee increase?
9

10 Heieren: responds, yes.
11

12 Maynard: says he would like to be able to spend the \$340,000 we've got in the bank and
13 then acknowledges, that's a Legislative problem, I know.
14

15 Chambers: adds that we understand your concerns, Vern does an excellent job of carrying
16 the Boards concerns to us and we continually strive to communicate with the Boards and
17 see that the exec's have the tools to do their job and I think you're right it really does hit on a
18 government accounting level, a Legislative level and we just want to continue to be
19 receptive to hearing your message and I know you have provided Director Habeger with that
20 message as well which Misty and I will relay back to him. It's good to hear from Boards,
21 what your concerns are even though the Division doesn't have direct control. We can keep
22 our finger on that pulse and work up through channels to make sure your concerns are
23 heard. A Legislative change is something the Board would work directly with the Legislature
24 and I know you're familiar with that process and that the Division steps out of that process.
25

26 Eriksen: reiterates that just in the time he has been on the Board Richard's concerns have
27 been brought up regularly by the Board and it's not something new it's been a consistent
28 message.
29

30 Schedler: introduces herself and adds that she would just like to say that, never in my
31 previous lives would I have brought a budget to a Board, or to anyone, that has a 39%
32 increase without explanation especially when that is something we cannot control at all.
33

34 Chambers: acknowledges that they understand that and I think that the issue in indirect is
35 one that we are continuing to get more information on. Last fall the Division issued a letter
36 explaining how indirect fees are calculated and what essentially goes into an indirect fee. I
37 looked up the licensing percentage from last year and the percentage was 10.18 so there is
38 an element of increase there but we just want to continue to encourage you to ask questions
39 and as you receive these reports let us know specifically what you're looking for and we'll do
40 our best to tease out that information. Unfortunately this is not information that any Board
41 would want to hear but there is sort of a level of detail that we can get to only so far with
42 indirect and it's generated so far outside the Division that we don't get an item by item
43 breakdown. So we will continue to be responsive to your concerns with the information that
44 we have and as Misty indicated that other Boards have concerns as well then we want to be
45 proactive and jump on that theme and make sure that we are providing you with as much
46 information as possible. We may not have the answers today but we can look into those
47 and, through Vern, get back to you.
48

49 Frawley: adds, absolutely and I thank all of you for the concerns that you bring to us and it
50 certainly isn't a lack of us being proactive on our behalf. There is a lot of research to go into
51 on why all of the costs increased. As Sara said there's only a certain level in the accounting
52 system that we can go to. I can see an increase in one specific area but I don't necessarily
53 have the invoices that I can call up for explanation. I understand that can be frustrating on
54 your behalf and it will be something that I can continue to look into and will try to have an

1 answer for you by your next meeting.

2
3 Chair: asks if there are any further questions or comments. Thank you Sara, thank you
4 Misty, Vern has a comment.

5
6 Jones: asks Sara if she wants to talk about travel a little bit.

7
8 Chambers: responds that she thought we were going to be able to escape that. It sounded
9 like it was winding down. (Laughter) I have talked to a couple of the Board members in the
10 last couple of months and let me assure you that Vern carries your banner waving high on
11 the issue of travel. We are very well aware of your ongoing needs and the things that you
12 need to accomplish on behalf of the licensees in your mission. I guess I will try to touch on
13 two items to start with and then if you have any specific questions we can address those.

14
15 As you know the travel authority is set by the Legislature and we did not see a dramatic
16 increase in that spending authority for travel from the Legislature this year. So, I don't want
17 to minimize what's happening in the year by saying we are implementing austerity measures
18 but we are continuing to try to be conservative with travel and push as much of that over to
19 the Boards for your Board member travel with the highest priority being your Statutory Board
20 meetings, and then the next priority being your Board member travel that you need to
21 accomplish to fulfill your mission to stay engaged with the industry nationwide. We are
22 constantly looking for opportunities to relieve the pressure. So we'll continue to look for any
23 administrative tool we may have at our disposal to do that. I know that we've pulled back a
24 little bit from our Division travel that Don and Misty and I need to accomplish. But we are
25 continuing to look for those types of solutions and hopefully will have some guidance for you
26 in that area. We did receive, as Vern has probably told you, and I did, again, speak with a
27 couple of you about this. We did receive word a couple of months ago from the Division of
28 Administrative Services, our Fiscal folks, kind of the arm of the Department of Administration
29 here in our Department that we have been engaging in some travel activity that is not in line
30 with State travel policy. And one of those areas is what I'm going to call direct payment from
31 associations to vendors such as hotels or car rental companies or airlines for Board Member
32 travel or Staff travel. I don't know what extent AELS is affected by that but I know you are to
33 a certain extent. So what that really means is that where there has been some kind of an
34 offset in your Board's travel expenses because the association is paying directly to those
35 vendors for those costs and the State has not had to pay those costs. That practice is
36 against the State's travel policy and we can no longer allow that to happen. So all of the
37 Board Member travel needs to be processed at its full cost and if there is an offset from the
38 association that goes back to the Department through the General Fund but continues to not
39 offset your travel expenses. Long story short there is no way currently under State travel
40 policy to offset any of your Boards travel expenses through any kind of gift or offering from
41 an outside party.

42
43 Schedler: responds, that doesn't make sense, I'm sorry!

44
45 Chair: thank you Sara and we have been in contact with you regarding our concerns on
46 travel and I think every Board meeting we are going to continue to ask and echo those
47 concerns that we need more travel budget.

48
49 Jones: asks if the member is part of a committee and not representing the State if there is a
50 problem with that.

51
52 Chambers: explains that if a Board Member happens to desire to travel to an industry event
53 and you are not representing yourself as a Board Member from Alaska, the Board has not
54 sent you to represent the State of Alaska, you're just traveling because you care about your

1 industry and you want to attend that conference just like any other architect or engineer or
2 land surveyor in the State of Alaska or any other State for that matter might want to attend a
3 conference or event then certainly you can do that. You would need to travel as a private
4 individual and you would need to work out with that association on your own any benefit that
5 might be available from that association. You would not be putting that travel through Vern
6 you would do it on your own, again, as a private individual as anybody else would. The
7 minor additional activity you would need to perform is to after your travel is over, to fill out an
8 ethics disclosure that you've received a gift from that association. And this is any State
9 employee or Board Member if you receive a gift greater than \$150 then you need to go
10 through this travel work sheet and, Vern has access to that worksheet. Basically it asks, is
11 the donor of that gift a person or entity that could receive some kind of a benefit from your
12 activity as a Board Member. And, we've talked about this and if there is an industry
13 association meeting or if you're traveling on anything that has to do with your profession that
14 is represented by the AELS Board then you do need to disclose that gift. You may not have
15 any pending activities, no pending agenda items you as a Board Member have the ability to
16 influence industry activity and do need to report that gift and it could be just that the
17 association paid for your hotel, it could be a golf trip, you know it could be any scope or
18 range of financial benefit that you received in conjunction with that travel even if you're
19 traveling as a private individual. So if you have any questions about that please give me a
20 call before you plan to travel if you want to talk through it. It's a policy that's been in place
21 for a long time but because we haven't engaged in Board training not every Board is familiar
22 with that process. So we are happy to talk about it and to educate Board Members on their
23 responsibilities as a Board Member or as a nexus with your Board related travel. But Vern,
24 that's right if you do travel and receive some kind of benefit you do have to disclose it and
25 go through that travel process separate from your official state travel process.

26
27 Chair: asks Sara if we are funded by our National Organization to go to a meeting and we
28 do not take action on behalf of the State then that is allowed I guess, right?

29
30 Chambers: If you are just going like anyone else from the State of Alaska and you're not a
31 Board member on your name badge and not participating in Board member activities or
32 speaking on behalf of the State of Alaska, you're there like everybody else then you would
33 do that on your own, you would pay for that on your own, and then if the association
34 provides you some benefit, financial benefit, then you would have to disclose that benefit.
35 And we've found that all the associations are different. Some of them say that you have to
36 be a Board Member or that the State of Alaska sends two or three people to represent the
37 State and that's how they receive that offset and so they probably would be unlikely to
38 award that benefit because it's not an official travel. Anyone from Alaska could then apply
39 for that benefit, not a Board Member. So those are the kind of nuances I would kind of want
40 to talk to you about ahead of time and make sure we are maximizing your ability to travel
41 within the parameters of the State travel policy and ethics disclosure.

42
43 Maynard: I think we are getting a little confused here. We are not talking about going to the
44 Society of Civil Engineers meeting that any engineer can go to. Because we are a member
45 of the AELS Board, that is a member of NCEES, the National association of engineering
46 boards or the architectural boards we end up on committees of that National Board helping
47 them write tasks or requirements of the model law and really, only members of licensing
48 boards or people who were on licensing boards and continue on to finish whatever work
49 they were on go to those meetings. It's not an open meeting that any engineer or architect
50 can go to. So for example I'm on the Education Committee for NCEES and its task is to
51 determine what the continuing education requirements are and what the education
52 requirements are to get licensed in the first place and we've got a meeting in December in
53 Phoenix which they pay me to go to. Are you saying that I can't do that? Or I have to
54 declare it as a gift?

1
2 Chambers: responds, I'll tell you what my understanding is today and I can seek further
3 clarification. My understanding is that if you are attending those meetings and you are not a
4 delegate from Alaska, the Board hasn't said we get one vote and we want you to be that one
5 vote so please go represent the State of Alaska. It sounds like if the committees are
6 generally based from the membership and it's not that each State has a representative on
7 the committee. You've chosen to serve on that committee from anyone within that
8 membership and you're traveling on your own and you're paying for that travel on your own.
9 My understanding is that that would be fine to do but you do have to disclose it as a gift as
10 you would any gift over \$150 from anyone who you may have professional influence over.
11 That's the way that the difference has been presented to me and I can seek further
12 clarification but it sounds like you would be able to go to that meeting but you do have to
13 bear all of the expenses yourself and then declare any offset of that expense in that ethics
14 disclosure form.

15
16 Several Board members expressed exasperation.

17
18 Chambers: continues, well unfortunately the ethics laws have been in place for a long time
19 and perhaps we haven't done a great job in providing consistent training to Board Members
20 and certainly something we are working on with the office of Boards and Commissions to
21 make sure that Board Members are aware of their legal requirements as a Board. The
22 worksheet provides some guidance on what needs to be declared or not and I think the
23 simplest way of presenting that is if that caveat of, do you have an ability to effect the giver
24 of the gift because you are a Board Member and if it's an industry activity the safe answer to
25 that is yes even if nothing is pending. You know if your Brother and Sister-in-Law give you a
26 gift that is worth more than \$150 then you don't have to disclose that. I think it's a holdover
27 from the VECO days and some of the experiences that happened politically and because
28 you're political appointees through the Governor's Office you do fall within the requirement
29 of the Department of Law to follow those rules. So we want to make sure that Board
30 Members are aware of those. In the Board training manual that was released this summer
31 there was a section on ethics disclosure but it is quite lengthy and there are a lot of nuances
32 to it so again we want to keep our end of the bargain by helping you be aware of those
33 things. But that requirement is not new and I would just like for you all to continue to be
34 safer rather than sorry and it really is just a piece of paper. No one is making an accusation
35 that CBPL Board members are engaging in some kind of activity that's untoward. But it's
36 better for you to disclose that on the record before something came up in the Legislature,
37 came up before the Board and then it was discovered that Board Member were receiving
38 free travel and you probably just want to be on the leading edge of reporting that.

39
40 Chair: alright, well, we thank you for your time and it sounds like you're going to be
41 continuing to work on this travel, you were doing a white paper the last time I talked to you
42 on Board travel and such. Is the Division going to present a final interpretation of all of this
43 and clear direction to the Boards?

44
45 Chambers: Well as soon as we come up with something final then we have another idea,
46 you know we have another strategy. I told Vern, you know he did ask, "Sara do you have
47 anything for me" and you know we have the current interpretation and are working on some
48 ideas. So, if we can kind of gather our tools together and come up with something sooner
49 rather than later then I want to present to the Boards the best possible information and best
50 possible scenario and you have what we know as of today. Hopefully we will be able to get
51 more information out to you soon and perhaps we'll have new information that has yet to be
52 conclusively determined. So, for right now just continue to work with Vern and work with me
53 on your travel. We want to continue to maximize that and if you have questions about any
54 of these elements please don't hesitate to pick up the phone.

1
2 Chair; thanks Sara and Misty and adds, we appreciate your time and we look forward to
3 getting that information from you and we will see you in February if we don't talk to you
4 before then.

5
6 Chambers: thanks the Board.

7
8 9:45 a.m. – 9:57 a.m. Break

9
10 At this point the Board went back to item 7 Statute changes.

11
12 Hightower: asks Vern to send him a copy of the position paper dated July 12. He then goes
13 over each of the Statute changes. He will put together something for APDC and start
14 getting ready for the Legislative session.

15
16 Chair: asks if the change to 08.48.055 is ready to go back to the Legislature.

17
18 Hightower: responds that it is and that it almost made it last year but got held up at the last
19 minute.

20
21 Maynard: recommends putting something in the position paper that the costs of the
22 investigator will be borne by the licensees through license fees and that they are ok with
23 that. He adds that that was one of the questions that came up during the committee
24 hearings.

25
26 Chair: points out that we shouldn't say it's ok with all the licensees because it may not be ok
27 with everyone.

28
29 Hightower: notes that we have not had any opposition to it. He then points out that the other
30 changes are just housekeeping items where we need to clarify the language. There have
31 been instances where our interpretation is different than the AG's.

32
33 Chair: asks if we have sponsors.

34
35 Maynard: advises that he has talked to Representative Olsen who has been Chair of the
36 Commerce Committee for the last four years and that his desire is to stay there. We will find
37 out at the end of next week what the organization will be. He has been discussing with Rep.
38 Olsen about making this a Committee Bill so it doesn't get hung up by who sponsored it and
39 held hostage for their vote on something else. He adds that Rep. Olsen raised the issue of
40 the landscape architect being a permanent seat and asks if we wanted to add that to that
41 bill. We might want to consider adding this into it and we can pull it later if we have to.

42
43 There was a discussion on how to address the subject of sponsors. It was decided that the
44 change to AS 08.48.055 should be separate from the others.

45
46 Lent: advises that the Board use caution when considering adding the landscape architect
47 permanent voting seat issue to any of the Bills because of opposition from certain
48 Legislators.

49
50 Maynard: recommends putting it in unless Rep. Stoltze ends up on a committee that it has
51 to go through.

52
53 Eriksen: asks if there shouldn't be a discussion on the make-up of the Board with the
54 addition of all the new branches.

1
2 Maynard: notes that this has come up over the years and that most of the other branches
3 are not represented by a large number of licensees and that there is an “other” seat on the
4 Board that can be filled by any branch. He is not sure we need to re-work the make-up of
5 the Board and that it would be a monumental task to get through the Legislature.

6
7 Lent: points out that those previous reviews of this issue have revealed that it is not the
8 number of licensees in a particular branch but the responsibility of that branch in respect to
9 the HSW of the public that dictates whether or not a seat on the Board is warranted.

10
11 Eriksen: agrees that numbers shouldn't be the only criteria but points that we have more civil
12 engineers because we do more civil engineering.

13
14 A short discussion continued on the make-up of the Board. One suggestion was eliminating
15 seats for specific branches and just saying 5 engineers. Another was to split the Board by
16 profession. In the end, the consensus was that the present make-up is sufficient for the
17 present time. It was decided to see what APDC's take on adding the landscape architect
18 seat in one of these bills. Maynard recommended that the Board leave it up to the
19 Legislative committee. Dale Nelson representing APDC asks for direction on action to be
20 taken regarding one bill or two. It was decided to go for two bills, 08.48.055 and 091 as one
21 bill and the other four grouped together in another bill with the landscape architect issue
22 tentatively included in it in it.

23
24 Chair: reminded everyone to be available to testify when these are before the Legislature.

25
26 Maynard: advises everyone to arrive in Juneau a day early in February.

27
28 Chair: this wraps up 7 A1 through 5 now let's get back to software engineering.

29
30 Eriksen: thinks that maybe we should approach this by defining software engineering first
31 and see how the other Boards approach it then make a decision on whether or not to
32 proceed.

33
34 Chair: points out that when the Board adopted the additional Branches we knew there would
35 be others come along in the future and that we should continue to proceed with the
36 regulation project to define it and get it out for public notice.

37
38 Jones: suggests that maybe the National IEEE could provide some input on a definition.

39
40 Eriksen: is in favor of pursuing it. It would help develop standards and raise the bar on
41 software engineering.

42
43 Chair: directs Eriksen to continue evaluating it and putting together a definition and a
44 proposed regulation for consideration at the next meeting.

45
46 Lent: speaks of a presentation at a recent ASLA meeting and how they could possibly be of
47 assistance in developing this definition.

48
49 **Agenda item 9 – Correspondence Received since August 2012.**

50
51 A) E-Mail from Nicolas Rodes re FP examination.

52
53 Maynard: relays a question that he has been asked by those applying for additional
54 branches if applicants have to provide transcripts if they are already in another file.

1
2 Jones: responds No. He adds that this individual is asking if he gets licensed as a FPE
3 under the additional branches regulation can he, at a later date apply for and take the FPE
4 exam.

5
6 Maynard: responds, yes, that way he would be able to get comity somewhere else.

7
8 B) Email from Bob Paddock re software Engineering

9
10 Chair: notes that we've already responded.

11
12 C) Email from Sara Chambers re Change to mining license requirements.

13
14 Chair: states that at first he thought this was regarding PE license but points out that it has
15 nothing to do with PE's. This has to do with mining companies. They are no longer going to
16 license sand and gravel operations under mining.

17
18 D) Email from Cave Norton re oil and gas rigs.

19
20 Chair: advises that we are going to discuss this under item 11. We will have a short break
21 before then. He briefly explains what DNR wants and that it applies mostly to rigs in Cook
22 Inlet and the Gulf of Alaska.

23
24 Jones: points out the conflict between what they want to require and the industrial
25 exemption.

26
27 Maynard: adds that he was involved as an expert witness re a case on the North Slope re
28 design of a platform by an engineer who didn't work for the contractor or the owner of the
29 rig. His take was that under those circumstances he needed to be licensed in Alaska but
30 wasn't sure and ask the Board for their opinion. If someone moves a drilling rig from Asia or
31 the Gulf into Cook Inlet does it have to be recertified by an Alaska licensed engineer? Or if it
32 was designed to be build there would it be required?

33
34 Jones: was wondering if the Board might consider repealing the industrial exemption as part
35 of the pending Statute change.

36
37 Maynard: explains that it was removed around 1992 and it took the utilities and oil
38 companies exactly one year to get it back in again.

39
40 E) Letter from James Wasserman re removal of a stamp.

41
42 Chair: asks if we have responded to this.

43
44 Jones: replies that the response is 10 E. We told him he needs to talk to the Muni of
45 Anchorage.

46
47 Short discussion revealed that he can't remove his stamp but can notify the building officials
48 if it's not being constructed per plan or if you know of something amiss. If you stamp a set
49 of plans and it's not build to plan you are not liable for that.

50
51 F) Email from Angie Kinnaird Linn re brokering of survey services.

52
53 Chair: asks the surveyors if they have any comments?

1 There were none.

2
3 G) CLARB

4
5 1. Email from Mark Kimerer re ASLA Outreach.

6
7 Lent: explains that this ties in with the request from the Lt. Governor re outreach. The ASLA
8 local chapter has agreed to set up an outreach program. I'll cover items 2 and 3 under new
9 business.

10
11 H) NCARB

12
13 Chair: asks Harley if he has comments on 9 h 1 through 8.

14
15 Hightower: responds, this is mainly for information only and is mostly housekeeping. Item 4
16 concerns a fee reduction which looks like they are rewarding people for bad behavior.

17
18 I) NCEES

19
20 Chair: notes that 9 I 1 through 9 are NCEES related. He briefly goes over each one with
21 emphasis on the PE and PS exams converting to computer format. He doesn't believe
22 there was anything of major concern to our Board that was passed at the Annual Meeting.
23 He points out that they are looking to shorten the exams when they go to computer format.
24 Southern Zone pulled out of the joint meeting in Alaska due to travel restrictions so it will be
25 in Arizona. The Western Zone will be in Alaska in 2016.

26
27 10:55 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. Break

28
29 **Agenda item 12 New Business**

30
31 A) Sealing of engineering product related to gas and oil.

32
33 Chair: asks the visitors to introduce themselves to the Board and then, Dave can come up
34 and give a synopsis of their White Paper and some of their concerns.

35
36 I'm Dave Norton from the Division of Oil and Gas. I'm Becky Kruse from the AG's Office.
37 I'm Kara Moriarty I work for the Alaska Oil and Gas Association.

38
39 Mr. Norton: explains that he submitted a White Paper for the Board Packet. The purpose of
40 it was not to ask for any type of action on your part. It was just provided for your general
41 awareness. We decided to come in today and talk about it and answer any questions you
42 may have on it. So, it's not really a Board action just Board awareness and to do it in a
43 public setting.

44
45 The Division of Oil and Gas, Department of Natural Resources issues leases for oil and gas
46 development. These leases have connected with them mitigation measures called Best
47 Interest Findings. The leases themselves and the Best Interest Findings all have general
48 language that requires that the leases be developed using good engineering practice and
49 terms like that. It also says that the applicant is supposed to present a plan of operations to
50 use the lease. And the plan of operations is supposed to be accompanied by all the
51 appropriate descriptions, plans, design criteria, and what have you, to fully describe what
52 the use of the land is going to be. So, the Division of Oil and Gas has engineers in it, we
53 have petroleum engineers primarily to evaluate the resource itself. The surface use of the
54 land is more on the Division access portal land use manager as a landlord. So there's not a

1 lot of structure or rigor around these submittals about the surface use of the land. We are
2 trying to be more specific and efficient with how we do this so we are considering making
3 sure that whatever submittals are submitted that they are deemed to be the practice of
4 engineering and they need to be sealed by an engineer registered in the State of Alaska.
5 That's essentially the gist of it. I'm not sure if the Board has had any kind of issues related
6 to this in the past but I'd like to get any feedback you may have on it. My paper also speaks
7 about the industrial exemption, not trying to change the industrial exemption or any part of it
8 but most surface improvements, pipe lines, facilities and construction, are all typically
9 designed by special engineering corporations as a consultant to the Lessee. The Lessee
10 has, if they are an Oil and Gas company they usually have some engineers on staff. But
11 those engineers typically are focused on well design and down hole petroleum and the
12 surface developments are done by consultants. We don't see a big issue with that because
13 the corporations are supposed to seal their work, the practice of engineering, anyway so we
14 are not going to do any enforcement we are going to, when a plan of operations is
15 submitted, we'll have some kind of method, yet to be determined, on how to evaluate the
16 application to see if some of the submittals are the practice of engineering and if they are
17 and they are not sealed we'll send it back for sealing before it's accepted at the Division.
18

19 Chair: asks if this is a change in policy for the Division of Oil and Gas.
20

21 Mr. Norton: answers, no, it's not a change in policy it's more of a clarification. The Statutes
22 and Regulations are fairly clear on what's required. The Division may not have been
23 rigorous in the past about this.
24

25 Eriksen: asks if there is a specific issue that has drawn this to their attention.
26

27 Mr. Norton: responds, not really, there was some issues about some offshore work and
28 some of the pipelines on the North Slope, State leases that weren't jurisdictional to other
29 agencies like Penza, DOT or like that. There hasn't been a screw up. The problems that
30 the Oil and Gas Industry has in Alaska with accidents and spills and what have you. Most of
31 those, if not all of them, are related to failure of maintenance or failure of management
32 change processes. They are not related to design flaws. This change won't fix
33 maintenance problems or management change problems but it will indicate that there's a
34 kind of a level of care associated with oil and gas development that should give the public
35 reassurance that things are being done right to start with. If the Division wanted to get more
36 specific about this requirement, one way to do it, we would have to hire a bunch more
37 engineers and have them do design reviews. That doesn't seem to be a realistic way of
38 doing it. Plus it's probably not appropriate anyway if we want the lessee to be responsible
39 for his improvements. A responsible lessee would have work done on his lease by a
40 professional engineer.
41

42 Schedler: asks if the Board should expect to hear from the lessee's when they are required
43 to have stamped drawings because perhaps they didn't in the past.
44

45 Mr. Norton: doesn't know. We're working with AOGA right now to try to get feedback from
46 them. We had some meetings with them last week and have some more meeting with them
47 so we've got kind of a formal working group to understand the implementation impacts of
48 this. So we're not going to be dumping this on industry as a surprise. It's going to be
49 worked out well in advance before we start requiring. The main reason I'm here today is
50 because you were having your meeting today and wanted to get this issue in the public
51 record somewhere and use this opportunity to spread the word.
52

53 Chair: asks if some or most lessees' are complying now.
54

1 Mr. Norton: responds that some are, most are not.

2
3 Chair: indicates that we might expect to hear some....Colin brought up a point earlier, for
4 example, a jack-up rig or something that's been designed for another area of the world that
5 maybe doesn't have ice, maybe it does and they bring it into Alaska and would like to plant
6 that somewhere, potentially some push back there from having to do an engineering
7 analysis on that rig. Is that something that you for see the Division requiring?

8
9 Mr. Norton: responds, possibly. Right now the structural integrity of the rig, in State
10 Regulations, that's controlled by the Department of Environmental Conservation. I believe, I
11 can't speak for them, but I believe they use the old MMS, whatever they call themselves
12 now, their standards for offshore rigs. And you're right there could be specific arctic type
13 requirements. I think the only place where oil and gas operations are ongoing on State
14 leases is Cook Inlet. Cook Inlet's not considered arctic but it is considered kind of a severe
15 weather area. I think north of a certain latitude, or some kind of geographic point, in Cook
16 Inlet there's ice restrictions. You can't have a jack-up out there past a certain date. So
17 there are controls there.

18
19 Lent: brings up the situation in Homer regarding the rig parked there and the demonstrations
20 and asks if his engineering community provides guidance for staging etc.

21
22 Mr. Norton: says he can't really speak to that, I do know that that rig is being parked there
23 over the winter. It's supposed to be used in the upper Cook Inlet and they are restricted, I
24 think its October 21st they are supposed to be out of there. I'm not sure what the problem is
25 down in Homer.

26
27 Eriksen: asks if he can speak to a measure of exposure to the Public, and asks what kind of
28 risk we are talking about.

29
30 Mr. Norton: clarifies, you're talking about the onshore stuff? Well the North Slope is
31 restricted access except I think there's some access to Nuiqsut using a spine road. People
32 in Nuiqsut could be exposed to some concern if there was an accident. Since most of the
33 North Slope is restricted access the people that are up there are employees of the various
34 companies and sub-contractors so they, I can't speak to it but my impression is that
35 employees are not people, is that kind of the way, you have to protect the public but the
36 public doesn't include employees. Is that....?

37
38 Eriksen: says he doesn't know how, under the industrial exemption, that would be
39 interpreted.

40
41 Chair: adds but there are public lands involved, that all the public owns.

42
43 Mr. Norton: responds, there are public lands and the worker population on the North Slope
44 is as high as it's ever been.

45
46 Eriksen: notes that, environmental impacts are a major public hazard as well.

47
48 Mr. Norton: explains, well there are three measures. We want to protect the people, we
49 want to protect the environment and we also want to protect the economy of the State. You
50 probably remember when that 06 spill happened up there they shut down half the field for
51 awhile and the entire field for a shorter time and the cash registers quit running, the State's
52 income. So if there was some kind of a problem on the North Slope that created a shut
53 down for an extended period of time it could possibly impact not only the environment or
54 population it could impact the economy of the State.

1
2 You've got new players coming in that may be perfectly fine oil and gas companies, I'm not
3 saying they're not. But we've got new players coming in that may not be up to speed on
4 working in the arctic and sub-arctic. And we are concerned, as an example, using
5 something that has worked in West Texas and put it up here. So we're thinking that
6 professional engineers working for professional engineering corporations consulting to the
7 oil and gas industry would be cognizant of that risk. A PE stamp doesn't preclude an
8 accident or a problem or design flaw, for that matter, but it does indicate a level of care that
9 should be reassuring to the public.

10
11 Maynard: comments that he would think that if an oil company was bringing a rig up here
12 they would want to make sure it would work in this location and wouldn't have problems with
13 icing or snow loads or earthquakes that they don't have in Texas. I'm sure they are doing
14 some of that work already whether it's by an Alaska licensed PE or not, that may be a
15 question. Going back to the industrial exemption, we went through this almost 20 years ago
16 now. When the industrial exemption was removed the discussion was that industries had
17 big pockets so they didn't need to have a PE to control it because they had their own self
18 interests to make sure they would do it in the right way although it applies to small utilities as
19 much as to BP or Conoco Phillips. The other argument was that they were industrial
20 facilities that did not have a lot of people so when it went back in it said except for where the
21 public is going to be there.

22
23 Mr. Norton: agrees that the enlightened self interest rational covers most. Not to digress but
24 Norway, similar to us with their oil and gas and their location in the North. Their regulatory
25 regime in the past has been based on this enlightened self interest, you know, companies
26 are driven to do what's right anyway. Regulatory oversight should be a light touch. They
27 are kind of going back to more prescriptive because as the North Sea fields age out and
28 new players come in there finding, similar to us, you know we've been dealing with the
29 Arco's and the Conoco Phillips, the Exxon's and the BP's for thirty years and they do know
30 what's going and they do have enlightened self interest. But, some of these other's that are
31 new players coming in may not have that same aspect so we're just trying to get ahead of
32 the curve and recognize the changing risks to the State. The State's changing. The
33 infrastructure that is there is changing. The new players, the, uh, lots of reasons to think
34 that the risk is increasing, qualitatively not quantitatively. We think this approach is going to
35 be effective. If you do start hearing from people coming here complaining it's because we
36 implemented it wrong.

37
38 Chair: asks if there are any more comments or questions. Well, thank you for coming and
39 sharing that and hopefully we won't hear anything from anyone. We'll know you're doing it
40 right, sometimes it doesn't matter how you implement it you can't make everyone happy.

41
42 Chair: continues on with item 9 j. This is the industrial engineer.

43
44 Jones: advises that he didn't include this in the Board Packet because it contains personal
45 information that usually is only available during the file review during executive session. He
46 explains that Mr. Theiss wanted to take the industrial examination and after reading our
47 regulations he noted that it's kind of a catch 22. Due to the industrial exemption he hasn't
48 worked for any industrial engineers, in fact he hasn't worked for any engineers and wants to
49 know how he can qualify to take the exam.

50
51 The situation was discussed with the outcome being that there is a process in place that
52 provides a path to licensure for those who don't work for engineers. He would have to use
53 the mentoring program or get a job with a company that had engineers and when he had the
54 required experience under an engineer or a mentor he could apply.

1
2 **Agenda item 10 – Correspondence sent since August 2012.**

3
4 Chair: went through the 5 items in this section which were all responses to previously
5 received correspondence.

6
7 Maynard: explained his work with the Muni of Anchorage regarding items c and d which
8 referred to their Ordinance AO 2012-62 and resulted in rewording it to comply with State
9 regulations.

10
11 **Agenda item 11 – Old Business**

12
13 A) Electronic signatures.

14
15 Chair: notes that Rearick is not present and no update was provided.

16
17 B) Record drawing disclaimers.

18
19 Nothing new to report.

20
21 **Agenda Item 12 – New Business**

22
23 A) Sealing of engineering product related to oil & gas.

24
25 This was discussed earlier when Mr. Norton made his presentation.

26
27 B) Professional being regularly employed in an office.

28
29 Discussion pointed out that while 12 AAC 36.185 states that each office must have a
30 registrant assigned to and regularly employed in that office, with the advances in technology
31 a lot of work is done passing documents back and forth electronically. It was pointed out
32 that some of the larger companies employ professionals that live all over the country. It was
33 decided that the language in the regulation was dated and needed to be revised to meet the
34 present work environment with all the technological advancements in communications.
35 Schedler agreed to take on the project.

36
37 **On a motion duly made by Hale, seconded by Heieren and passed unanimously it was**
38 **RESOLVED to update the language in 12 AAC 36.185 (c) to more accurately reflect**
39 **current practices.**

40
41 11:37 a.m. – 1:10 p.m. Break for lunch.

42
43 1:10 p.m. Back on Record. Roll Call – All present except Richard Rearick.

44
45 **Agenda item 14 – Public Comment**

46
47 Chair: advises that the limit for comments will be about 5 minutes and asks each public
48 member to start by stating their name and who they are representing.

49
50 Guy Schwartz: My name is Guy Schwartz and I work for the Oil and Gas Commission and
51 I'm also on the ASPE Board of Directors here for the Alaska Chapter. Part of my duties
52 there are continuing education so that's one of the reasons I'm here. I'm still in the process
53 of getting my registration done and I've tried to get more people in our chapter interested in
54 getting registered as a petroleum engineer and there's a little bit of uncertainty out there.

1 When I look at the process it wasn't as straight forward as I thought. It seems to be geared
2 more toward civil and you do a lot more of those type of testing here in the state. I just
3 wanted to come here and talk about that quickly and maybe work with Alicia and you guys to
4 give some leeway in professional verification and that kind of thing. A lot of the engineers
5 here have not worked under a registered engineer in their career for the time that's needed.
6 And we are asking, is there a substitute we can use for that? It's been difficult for me to get
7 myself, and I'm talking here for myself but I've talked to five or six other people that are
8 having the same problem I am trying to track down people that can verify professional
9 employment. The other question I had, or topic I have was, I work for Commissioners John
10 Norman, Cathy Foerster and Dan Seamount over at Oil and Gas Commission and there is
11 no petroleum on this board, I know it's a volunteer position and we were just discussing that
12 and we thought at the next opening maybe we could nominate somebody to get on the
13 Board if there is a open position in the future since oil and gas is pretty critical for the State.
14 It would be good to have someone representing our side of the subject on this Board.
15 That's really all I had to say. I wanted to meet you guys and get that out there.

16
17 Chair: advises Mr. Schwartz that there is a process in place for people who don't work
18 directly under an engineer and he should contact Alicia or Vern for information. He adds
19 that there is a provision to allow a petroleum engineer in the mining seat if a mining engineer
20 is not available.

21
22 Maynard: adds that one seat is for "other" branches and a petroleum could be appointed to
23 that seat. He adds that when we were trying to fill the mining seat he sent a request to the
24 President of the ASPE asking for a recommendation and they didn't submit one.

25
26 Mr. Schwartz: responds that he just got on the Board about three months ago. That won't
27 happen on my watch.

28
29 Dale Nelson: It's me again, Dale Nelson, I'm here as the chair of the LLC which is the
30 Legislative Liaison Committee for the Alaska Professional Design Council. We just had our
31 monthly meeting and Colin, thank you and Harley and Dave and Brian, thank you all and
32 Eric thank you for attending. It was great. Basically I got my marching orders on the
33 Statutes and we are looking at two bills there. A third bill we are looking at is QBS. Another
34 item that's on our work list is the engineering funding for the University of Alaska Fairbanks
35 and Anchorage. To make sure they will have full funding for the construction of those
36 engineering facilities. Then the last one that we will be working on with you that Colin
37 brought up at the Board meeting is the travel so any information you can provide us and
38 Colin, give us what you can. We are paying the fees so let's see if we can get you folks
39 where you need to be. Thank you and I want to introduce John. John Walsh is our lobbyist.
40 I think most of you have seen him off and on during the fly-in. And all these items I have on
41 here he's going to be working for.

42
43 John Walsh: For the record I'm John Walsh of Juneau Alaska. I am a registered lobbyist for
44 the APDC and look forward to continuing. I don't have a lot to report directly. I do
45 appreciate your engagement. I know you're one step removed from the political but your
46 significance in the State licensee process is not unnoticed. Your audits continue to show
47 the need to keep you as a professional board. So we, working with APDC, we enjoy the
48 proximity and the interchange between the two groups and look forward to continuing to
49 help advance the issues that you bring forward. I don't know of anything in particular other
50 than the election is Tuesday and that's going to set the tone for how the Legislature
51 proceeds. The budget comes out in December and that's what the Legislature uses for
52 proceeding in their budget review. So anything we can do to help assist your efforts, I take
53 seriously and I pretty much get those directly through Dale and APDC. I guess that's about
54 it. I'll take any questions if anyone has any.

1
2 Chair: thanks John and Dale for their time. He then asks, are we at 12 C? We have 12 c to
3 go through and then we are planning to go into executive session just in case anyone is
4 running late for public comment. I wanted to keep this open for a little bit so they show up
5 late they will have an opportunity to participate. So we'll continue on with the agenda here
6 for a little bit before we go into executive session, so item 12 c Bert!

7
8 C) E-mail w/attachments from Bert Lent re LAAB accreditation of Non-Degree
9 programs.

10
11 Lent: explains that California is using a program where the Universities have a certificate
12 program where students can get a certificate by attending to night classes and become
13 landscape architects without getting the full degree. LAAB in cooperation with CLARB is
14 asking Boards comment on whether or not they support LAAB accrediting these certificate
15 programs.

16
17 After a discussion it was decided that our regulations already cover both accredited and
18 non-accredited degree and non-degree paths to licensure. So we have no opinion for or
19 against as this will not affect Alaska one way or the other.

20
21 **On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it**
22 **was RESOLVED to go into executive session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(3) to**
23 **review applicant files.**

24
25 1:57p.m. Executive Session.

26
27 4:37 p.m. Adjourned for the day.

28
29 **Friday November 2, 2012**

30
31 8:00 a.m. On Record, roll call all present except Colin Maynard and Richard Rearick.

32
33 **Agenda item 18 – Board Travel**

34
35 8:04 a.m. Colin Maynard arrived.

36
37 Jones: explains the travel matrix and advises that the Board packet contains some of the
38 information that Sara Chambers mentioned during the financial report. He continued to
39 explain that due to current state travel policy the Board is not allowed to take advantage of
40 travel funded by the national organization even though our yearly dues to these
41 organizations are designed to cover some of this travel. All travel by the Board must be
42 funded up front by the State at the time of travel. Any reimbursement from a national
43 organization must be paid to the State and goes into the General Fund not back into the
44 Boards travel budget. This results in the Board actually paying for some travel twice, once
45 when we pay our dues and then again when the travel is accomplished. He adds that the
46 Board has spent it's out of state travel budget and there probably will not be any further
47 attendance at National Conferences for the rest of the FY unless we find some more money
48 from somewhere.

49
50 Heieren: suggests that we get the Legislature to put our travel into a line item in the budget
51 like they did the Guide and Transporters Board.

52
53 Chair: advises that APDC will be provided with a copy of the estimated travel in the Annual
54 Report and they will lobby the Legislature for travel funds for the Board.

1
2 Jones: points out that the item on the chart that says investigator is for the AELS
3 investigator. I requested funds for John to travel around the State to check out construction
4 sites for compliance and they allocated \$10K.

5
6 Discussion continued with the Board looking for possible solutions to the travel shortfall.
7 One of the points was that Anchorage is the least expensive location for Board meetings. It
8 costs around \$6K to meet in Anchorage and around \$10K to meet in Fairbanks and Juneau.
9 This is dependent on airline fares at the time of the meeting. Jones pointed out that the
10 Division is working with Administration on the travel policy to see if there is a way to take
11 advantage of the national organizations picking up the tab for travel and for getting third
12 party reimbursements credited back to the Board. Chair will follow up with another letter to
13 Chambers regarding this issue of the travel allocation with the gist of it being that the current
14 level is not acceptable for the Board to do what it needs to do. It was asked what figure we
15 were going to ask for and the response was the figure in the Annual Report which was
16 around \$92K. Schedler recommends that we include in the letter what the Board will not be
17 able to accomplish with the current level of funding and what the ramifications of that will be.
18 Hale points out that the travel allocation should be 33% higher than it is.

19
20 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Shiesl and passed unanimously it**
21 **was RESOLVED that the FY13 Travel Budget be set at \$120K.**

22
23 Further discussion noted that the amount for out of state travel would fluctuate depending on
24 where the meetings were being held as they are in a different city each year and that the
25 Board would get a letter off to the Division and APDC. Jones asked if the Board wanted to
26 go ahead with the Fairbanks meeting or change it to Anchorage to save money. It was
27 decided to leave it in Fairbanks because the last time we did this it didn't result in any
28 additional travel being approved. The discussion turned to the availability of State
29 conference rooms in Fairbanks. Jones pointed out that at one time we used the Regents
30 Conference room at UAF but that they couldn't guarantee that even with a reservation it
31 would be available. If the Regents needed it at the last minute the Board would have to go
32 elsewhere. He tried one year to reserve one of the other state conference rooms but was
33 told that the Board would have to vacate for one hour during lunch for an exercise session
34 that was booked for every day so for the last two Fairbanks meetings we have rented the
35 Board Room at Sophie's Station which costs around \$400 with coffee service.

36
37 Lent: asks that in the event money for travel is found that consideration be given to send
38 Don Shiesl to the CLARB meeting in the spring.

39
40 **Agenda item 19 – Special Committees**

41
42 Licensure Implementation: Chair – Maynard.

43
44 Maynard: presents his revised Alternate ABET Degree Programs chart to the Board. The
45 chart lists the degree's that would be acceptable for approval to take the examinations in
46 each branch of engineering without additional years of experience as long as they contained
47 at least 18 hours of instruction related to that branch. For example a degree in civil
48 engineering would allow an applicant to take the construction engineering, geological
49 engineering or the mining engineering examination without having to verify additional years
50 of experience and they presently do. This chart will be in the Guidance Manual and adopted
51 as a Board policy.

52
53 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Hightower and passed unanimously**
54 **it was RESOLVED to adopt the amended chart presented by the licensure**

1 **implementation committee as a policy for alternative education tracts to licensure.**

2
3 Registration and Practice: Chair – Hightower.

4
5 This has been covered under the Statute changes and in the discussion yesterday about
6 landscape architecture certificate programs.

7
8 Licensure Mobility: Chair – Rearick.

9
10 It was determined that even though there has been nothing on this since the last meetings
11 with the APEGGA that the committee should be retained. We have put the onerous on them
12 and are still waiting for a response to our request for a copy of their ethics examination.

13
14 Mining Engineering/Geologists: Chair – Hanson.

15
16 No new information.

17
18 Changes to 12 AAC 36.068 and timing of such changes (LARE): Chair – Lent.

19
20 This is being taken care of in the current regulation changes. The regulation has been
21 approved for public notice.

22
23 TWiST Program: Chair – Heieren.

24
25 All indications are that NCEES will match funds for all scholarships to 8 through 12 grade
26 teachers to attend the program put on at Clark College in Vancouver Washington. It
27 introduces high school and middle school teachers to the surveying profession and the tools
28 and the software that surveyors use. NCEES has indicated that they will support it.
29 Hopefully it will be something that will take off on the national level.

30
31 **Standing Committees**

32
33 Investigative Advisory Committee: All members

34
35 Hanson: reported that he was contacted by the investigator and had to decline because of a
36 conflict of interest and that members should not be afraid to pass the buck to another
37 member if there is a conflict of interest involved. Hightower reports a couple of calls from
38 John and that the issues were resolved. Eriksen notes that most of the time John has a
39 solution in mind and just needs to bounce it off somebody.

40
41 Guidance Manual: Chair – Lent.

42
43 Lent: the manual is pretty much up to date. Rearick is working on electronic signatures and
44 then the new chart the Board just adopted.

45
46 Legislative Liaison: Chair – Eriksen.

47
48 Eriksen: reports that this was taken care of yesterday with Dale Nelson and John Walsh.

49
50 Emeritus Status: - All Members

51
52 Nothing to report.

53
54 Budget Committee: Chair – Shiesl

1
2 Hanson: notes that we do have some follow-up on questions we ask of Sara and Misty.
3 Heieren advises that there was a budget shortfall in Guides and Transporters of something
4 like \$300K and wonders if that had an effect bring up the indirect costs. Maynard points out
5 that each board has to support its self. Jones explains that AELS money does not support
6 any other Board. A particular Board may get a larger portion of the Divisions allocation but it
7 is charged to that Board. He reminds them that the chart was the Division's allocation and if
8 Division priorities changed then the figures could change. Hanson notes that we had an
9 indirect cost applied to our Board that was 35% higher without an acceptable explanation up
10 to this point.

11
12 Continuing Education: Chair – Hanson

13
14 Hanson: recaps that at last meeting the Board gave staff authority to review CE and to bring
15 any they weren't sure of to the Board.

16
17 IDP Liaison: Chair – Hightower.

18
19 Hightower: reports that Rearick has taken over chair of that committee since the next
20 meeting will be Harley's last.

21
22 **On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it**
23 **was RESOLVED to go into executive session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(3) to**
24 **review a continuing education audit.**

25
26 9:00 a.m. in Executive Session.

27
28 9:10 a.m. On record.

29
30 **Agenda item 21 – National Meeting Reports.**

31
32 A) CLARB Fall Meeting

33
34 Lent: draws attention to his report and map in the Board Packet and asks if there are any
35 questions.

36
37
38 B) NCEES Annual in St. Louis.

39
40 Hanson: reports on the NCEES annual in St. Louis Mo. Attended by himself, John Savage,
41 Dave Hale and Keith Walters. He notes that they will be looking at the Industrial Exemption
42 and we, as a Board, should follow that closely. The next meeting is in Texas. The next
43 Western Zone meeting is in San Francisco in April. There was some discussion regarding
44 serving on National Committees.

45
46 **Agenda item 22 – Licensing Examiner Report.**

47
48 Alicia Kelly gives the Licensing Examiner report. She points out that we will now be letting
49 NCEES notify our examinees of their scores instead of sending them to us and then we
50 relay them via letter. This will lessen our work load and speed the results to the examinee.
51 Jones appoints out that we will have the ability to stop any notification if there is a problem
52 with the applicant. The Board asked why we no longer provided the numerical statistics with
53 each report. Alicia explained that it is very labor intensive to pull all the information. Each
54 branch of engineering had to be pulled separately. She adds that we are getting a new

1 program that will greatly enhance our capabilities in that area.

2
3 **Agenda item 23 – Board Tasks**

4
5 Chair: goes over the tasks assigned to each member during the meeting and gets status
6 reports on those from last meeting. During this process there was some discussion
7 regarding next meeting being the last one for Heieren and Hightower.

8
9 Lent: advises that his last meeting will be May 2013 so ASLA has submitted several names
10 to the Governor for consideration.

11
12 The assignment of researching multiple failures on exams prompted a discussion on
13 multiple DUI's and the Board being consistent in how we deal with these issues especially if
14 we don't have a policy, which we don't.

15
16 Chair: suggests that the Board come up with a policy on these issues.

17
18 Jones: adds that he has had calls asking if a felony would preclude someone from getting a
19 license. His answer is that it would depend on the felony, the applicants corrective measures
20 and the decision would be at the Board's discretion.

21
22 Schedler: points out that a policy can't be like a check list it's more like a white paper that
23 guides you but there is not a black and white solution.

24
25 Hale: recommends a flow chart kind of thing.

26
27 Heieren: notes that we have disciplinary guidelines and asks if they are in the Guidance
28 Manual.

29
30 Jones: advises that the investigator asked that they not be place in the Guidance Manual.

31
32 Chair: points out that the Medical Board has theirs in their Statutes and Regulations. They
33 also tie DUI's to time of day in regards to your shift so there are ways to be consistent.

34
35 Hale: asks if we should provide some kind of question based flow chart to provide that
36 consistency and volunteers to take it on.

37
38 Chair: asks Keith to take the lead on the retake issue and Don will help on it and Vern will
39 provide some documentation from other Boards.

40
41 It was pointed out that we have had some individuals take the exam 10 times before
42 passing. It was also pointed out that they may not mean they are bad engineers it could be
43 many things, they may not study much or maybe they are just bad at taking tests.

44
45 Chair: asks everyone to take these tasks seriously and get them done so we can move on.
46 He mentions that during the upcoming Legislative committee hearings on our Statute
47 changes Board members may be called on to testify.

48
49 9:45 a.m. – 9:53 a.m. Break

50
51 **Agenda item 27 – Read applications into the record.**

52
53 **On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Walters and passed unanimously it**
54 **was RESOLVED to find the following list of applicants for registration incomplete with**

1 **the stipulation that the information in the applicant files will take precedence over the**
 2 **information in the minutes.**

3
 4 *The subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*
 5 *meanings:*

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

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

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

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

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

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

13 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

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

Burroughs, Ben M.	Fire Protection	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending project letter detailing resp charge
Harshbarger, Ned J.	Civil	Exam	Incomplete - pending 14 months experience ; Arctic; JQ
Kinish, Tonia N.	Electrical	Comity	Incomplete - pending 24 months responsible charge experience under PE EE; Electrical exam; & JQ
Piburn, Christopher G.	FS	Exam	Incomplete - pending 16 additional credit hours in Surveying
Murphy, Michael Wm.	Electrical	Comity	Incomplete - pending 12 years experience for FE waiver; or, FE exam; Arctic & JQ
Sharp, Mark F.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending 3 mos experience; & JQ
Lenaburg, Eric C.	Mechanical	Comity	Incomplete - pending properly completed work exp form; & JQ
Morse, David C.	Mechanical	Comity	Incomplete - pending properly completed work exp form; & JQ
Button, Richard C.	SE	G'fthr	Incomplete - calcs

16
 17 **On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Walters and passed unanimously it**

1 was **RESOLVED** to approve the following list of applicants for registration with the
 2 stipulation that the information in the applicant's files will take precedence over the
 3 information in the minutes:
 4

Adams, Andrew P.	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Ayers, Jessica Joy	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Bakken, John Arne	Electrical	Comity	Approved
Baranko, Lucille E.	Landscape Architect	Exam	Approved - pending LARE; & JQ
Battalora, Raymond J.	Fire Protection	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Bettisworth, Alex B.	Architect	Exam	Approved - pending ARE; Arctic & JQ
Bishop, Jr., Bobby W.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Booker, David Richmond	SE	Comity	Approved
Brown, Zachary R.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Carioscia, Jacquelyn Anne	Chemical	Comity	Approved
Chang, Daniel S.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Chapman, David R.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Cinadr, Edward M.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Clark, Alexander John	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending clearance by Investigations; & JQ
Connor, John A.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Cowman, Kimberly R.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Crumrine, Kathleen Marie	Petroleum	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam & JQ
Dahl, Brent M.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Dhaliwal, Gurjeet S.	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
DiGregorio, Stephen J.	SE	G'fthr	Approved

Elkind, Scott P.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams; & JQ
Feely, J. Chris	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Fisher, Timothy Winslow	Civil	Comity	Approved
Fitzgerald, Thomas Jerome	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams & registration; & JQ
Fong, Freeman	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Friel, John M.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts; verification of exams & registration; Arctic & JQ
Gilstrap, Jeremy	SE	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Golden, John Dean	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending; Arctic & JQ
Gordin, Vyacheslav S.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Hammond, David	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Hardy, Justin R.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Hasse, Christopher Allen	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Hawes, David A.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Heath, Stephen Douglas	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Hemry, Matthew S.	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Hennis, Dana Michael	SE	Comity	Approved
Herinckx, Taylor M.	NA/ME	Comity	Approved
Hoople, Nathan A.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Hrinko, William T.	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Inci, Gokhan	Civil	Comity	Approved
Jacob, Clint Lewis	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
James, Timothy P.	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending Civil exam; & Arctic

Javidi Niroumand, Saeed	SE	Comity	Approved - pending SE exam; \$100 in fees; Arctic & JQ
Johnson, Christopher T.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Johnson, Troy Adam	Control Systems	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Johnson, Michael E.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending FE & JQ
Keyuravong, Pisonth	Nuclear	Comity	Approved
King, Brian W.	NA/ME	G'fthr	Approved
LaCiura, Paul James	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Lafortune, Richard S.	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Ledyard, James Nicholas	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Lewis, Kevin J.	Electrical	Comity	Approved
Livermore, Hugh	Electrical	Comity	Approved
Lund, Robert	Environmental	G'fthr	Approved
Maish, Frederic Scott	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
McElmurry, Vince Alvin	Electrical	Exam	Approved - pending exam; Arctic & JQ
McPherson, Ronald	Civil	Comity	Approved
Miller, Chris H. (2 branches)	Control Systems Fire Protection	G'fthr Comity	Approved Approved
Miller, Kirk David	SE	G'fthr	Approved
O'Leary, Dana A.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Olson, Bryan D.	Mechanical	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Ozkan, Senda	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Palaniuk, Trevor Donald	Chemical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; & JQ
Pettit, Scott M.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending \$25 in fees; & JQ
Polamarasetty, Ravi	Civil	Exam	Approved - pending PE Civil; Arctic & JQ

Powell, Rick Blaine	Civil	Comity	Approved
Radisic, Vesna	Architect	Comity	Approved
Reynolds, William P.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Rice, Jeff Wallace	Control Systems	G'fthr	Approved
Rockwood, Nathan D.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Sample, Richard Alan	Electrical	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Schacht, Walter	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Seger, Richard M.	Electrical	Comity	Approved
Selvaggio, Steven A.	Mechanical	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; Arctic
Sinclair, Derek	Civil	Comity	Approved
Soni, Mehul H.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Stewart, Matthew Jeremy	Mechanical	Comity	Approved
Thom, Jason H.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Thomas, Nathan C.	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Vanairsdale, David A.	SE	Comity	Approved
Vasicek, Patrick Richard	Civil	Comity	Approved
Vesecky, Peter S.	Civil	Comity	Approved
Wagner, Carl	Chemical	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Wildridge, John B.	Architect	Comity	Approved
Willman, Timothy J.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS exam
Yamada, Niles E.	SE	Comity	Approved
Yanakiev, Plamen Krastev	NA/ME	Exam	Approved - pending FE & PE exams; Arctic & JQ
Yang, Yuhe	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Zhang, Wei	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ

Zou, Yunyi	Civil	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams & registration; transcripts; & JQ
<i>FS Exams</i>			
Hipsak, Stacy M.	FS	Exam	Approved
Knight, Thomas Craig	FS	Exam	Approved
McCormack, Lucas	FS	Exam	Approved
Abaza, Alma	FE	Exam	Approved
Allen, Rusty Wayne	FE	Exam	Approved
Autrey, Mitchell C.	FE	Exam	Approved
Baguyos, Rolan	FE	Exam	Approved
Barnes, Nick	FE	Exam	Approved
Beauvais, Michael P.	FE	Exam	Approved
Birmingham, Grant	FE	Exam	Approved
Brandon, Patrick	FE	Exam	Approved
Burdick, Robert Wm.	FE	Exam	Approved
Carroll, Russell	FE	Exam	Approved
Chacho, Matthew J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Ciufo, Jake A.	FE	Exam	Approved
Corey, Tyler R.	FE	Exam	Approved
Cotton, Heather D.	FE	Exam	Approved
Cozby, Dustin	FE	Exam	Approved
Darrington, David A.	FE	Exam	Approved

Dexter, Justin	FE	Exam	Approved
Doran, Zachariah	FE	Exam	Approved
Dunn, Margaret J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Eisberg, Kimberly	FE	Exam	Approved
Engstrom, Daniel G.	FE	Exam	Approved
Freeman, Jared	FE	Exam	Approved
George, Nicholas	FE	Exam	Approved
Gill, Thomas	FE	Exam	Approved
Gremley, Nicholas Sheridan	FE	Exam	Approved
Hamman, Caleb	FE	Exam	Approved
Hamman, Michael	FE	Exam	Approved
Harrison, Kayla C.	FE	Exam	Approved
Hatley, Sarah C.	FE	Exam	Approved
Hayes-Vasilieva, Philip	FE	Exam	Approved
Hoisington, David	FE	Exam	Approved
Hooper, David	FE	Exam	Approved
Hooper, David L.	FE	Exam	Approved
Ivanoff, Clifton	FE	Exam	Approved
Jackson, Jermaine	FE	Exam	Approved
Jones, Adam M.	FE	Exam	Approved
Konefal, Nicholas W.	FE	Exam	Approved
Larsen, Mikala A.	FE	Exam	Approved
LaSota, Jack A.	FE	Exam	Approved
Mazzolini, Andrew	FE	Exam	Approved
McCurtain, James	FE	Exam	Approved

Melvin, Graham B.	FE	Exam	Approved
Morales, Deborah Rose	FE	Exam	Approved
Neeley, William J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Nielson, Drew Reed	FE	Exam	Approved
O'Brien, Drew	FE	Exam	Approved
Olsen, Karlee	FE	Exam	Approved
Overbeck, Levi D.	FE	Exam	Approved
Parksinon, Steven	FE	Exam	Approved
Pasilan, Emesjoy	FE	Exam	Approved
Pi, Jake S.	FE	Exam	Approved
Pinilla, Aleida	FE	Exam	Approved
Raj, Vaibhav	FE	Exam	Approved
Redick, Rori	FE	Exam	Approved
Remillard, Erin M.	FE	Exam	Approved
Rudd, Michael J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Russell, Robert J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Simmons, Priscilla	FE	Exam	Approved
Simpson, Jocelyn M.	FE	Exam	Approved
Squires, Kristofer T.	FE	Exam	Approved
Stine, Elijah James	FE	Exam	Approved
Stribrny, Joseph	FE	Exam	Approved
Toth, Frank	FE	Exam	Approved
Tracy, Nancy	FE	Exam	Approved
Tymick, Jonathan J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Umanskaya, Lyudmila	FE	Exam	Approved

Updegrove, Daniel	FE	Exam	Approved
Urvina, Erin	FE	Exam	Approved
Van Nortwick, Nathanael	FE	Exam	Approved
Vandermeer, Jordan	FE	Exam	Approved
Vilce, Eric C.	FE	Exam	Approved
Walton, Michael G.	FE	Exam	Approved
Wasserman, Robert	FE	Exam	Approved
Widmer, Kenneth	FE	Exam	Approved
Willis, Ryan	FE	Exam	Approved
Wuestenfeld, Matthew	FE	Exam	Approved
Yanakiev, Plamen Krastev	FE	Exam	Approved
Zajac, Kristine L.	FE	Exam	Approved

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

Agenda item 25 – Calendar of Events.

Next meeting is in Juneau on February 7th and 8th in Juneau and will start at 10:30 or so on the 7th. Those that want to be involved in the APDC fly-in should arrive early on the 6th. February is a heavy month for application due to the spring exams and since we are getting a late start on Thursday member should book the late flight on Friday.

The May meeting is on the 2nd and 3rd in Fairbanks. The August meeting is the 1st and 2nd in Anchorage and November 7th and 8th in Anchorage.

Eriksen: advises that the August meeting is always tentative for him due to his company's Annual Board meeting.

Agenda item 26 – Board Member Comments.

Eriksen: notes that the chair did an excellent job facilitating the meeting and that it was a quick meeting that it didn't decrease efficiency.

Walters: agrees with Eric's comments and adds he enjoys working with everyone and offered his help if needed.

Schedler: is pleased with the issues the Board will be working on and she is glad to get to know everyone a little bit better.

Maynard: feels it was a good meeting and asks that amendments be made to the additional branches application.

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

Shiesl: advises that he is a substitute teacher and that a lot of the kids don't have a clue what job opportunities are out there or what engineering is. He thinks an outreach program by the societies would be beneficial for the professions.

Jones: points out that the NCEES website has information available for download but someone has to present it to the students.

A short discussion followed concerning the situation and possible solutions. The Lt. Governor's outreach program was mentioned. Hightower will distribute a catalog of current accomplishments to the Board. Next step is getting into the Schools to promote the professions. He will also have a report for APDC.

Kelly: states that she enjoyed the meeting as always.

Hightower: thanks Board and Staff for all the hard work and commends Rearick on his work for the Board regionally and nationally. He mentions the committees he is on and that he is progressing through the organization and is well respected locally, regionally and at the national level.

Lent: thanks Chair for his conduct of the meeting and everyone for their help with the question about LAAB accreditation.

Hale: is happy to be part of the group.

Heieren: thinks it was a very rewarding meeting. Notes that the next President elect of NCEES will be from the Northeast Zone and down to two candidates. He encourages all to meet the two candidates if the opportunity presents. Again, enjoyaboe meeting, Bo says hi. Thanks Staff.

Jones: advises that on the last out of state travel request he was asked what the benefit to the State was and he asks the Board to draft a white paper or something to advise the members of the Legislature and the Department/Division on the benefits of Board participation in these National Conferences.

Chair: appreciates the opportunity to serve as chair. Thanks the Board and Staff for making the meetings flow smoothly. Regarding outreach he feels everyone in the room has an obligation to promote their profession. He goes to elementary schools and takes a survey instrument, photos and plans and lets the kids play with the things. He isn't a surveyor but he can show them how the instrument works and get them thinking about it. Starting early pays dividends in later years. The Board will be following the Industrial Exemption being discussed by NCEES. He reiterates that the Board will need to testify when our Statutes changes get to the committee hearings.

10:20a.m. Meeting adjourned.

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

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

Brian Hanson, PE, Chair
Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers and Land Surveyors

Date: _____