

1 **STATE OF ALASKA**

2
3 **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC**
4 **DEVELOPMENT**

5 **DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING**
6 **BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS & LAND**
7 **SURVEYORS**

8
9 **Minutes of Meeting**
10 **February 7-8, 2013**

11
12 By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, Article 6,
13 the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors held a meeting
14 February 7-8, 2013 in the State Office Building at 333 Willoughby Avenue, Juneau, AK
15 99801 9th Floor Conference Room C.

16
17 **Thursday February 7, 2013**

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

20
21 10:08 a.m. The Chair called the meeting to order. Roll call, all present.

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

- 24
25
 - Brian Hanson, Civil Engineer, Chair
 - Richard Rearick, Architect, Vice-Chair
 - Eric Eriksen, Electrical Engineer, Secretary
 - Kathleen Schedler, Mechanical Engineer
 - 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, Land Surveyor

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 Representing the Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing were:

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

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

- 47
48
 - Dale Nelson, PE representing APDC

49
50 **Agenda item 2 – Review/Amend Agenda**

51
52 Jones: passed out several items that were received after the Board packets and agenda

1 were mailed.

2
3 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Rearick and passed unanimously it**
4 **was RESOLVED to approve the agenda as amended.**

5
6 **Agenda item 3 – Ethics reporting**

7
8 Maynard: Reported that he had attended an NCEES Committee meeting where travel,
9 hotel, and meals were totally funded by NCEES and he was submitting a gift report. He also
10 submitted a letter regarding his participation in the National Society of Professional
11 Engineers, the Alaska Society of Professional Engineers, the American Society of Civil
12 Engineers, Alaska Section, Anchorage Chapter, the Structural Engineers Association of
13 Alaska and the Alaska Professional Design Council. He submitted a letter naming several
14 of his partners that had submitted files for Board review and that he would not participate in
15 the review of those files and would abstain from the vote on them.

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

18
19 There were several corrections made by Board members

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

23
24 **Agenda item 12 – Regulation Update**

25
26 A) Statute Changes

- 27
28 1) AS 08.48.055 Executive Secretary of the Board and AS 08.58.091 Written
29 Examinations.

30
31 Heieren: Reports on his meeting with Rep. Thompson earlier this morning regarding HB5
32 (adding an investigator) and that he thought it would flow right through. He also commented
33 on some legislation that's being worked on to straighten out travel funding for all the Boards.

34
35 Hightower: Comments that on item two, written exams (AS08.58.091) should come under
36 HB 5 with secretary of the Board.

37
38 Maynard: Responds that it's in both bills and can be pulled out later if item two doesn't
39 move. He continues that SB16 (same as HB5) had a hearing yesterday and HB5 has a
40 hearing at 3:15 on Monday. He plans to testify and possibly some APDC people will also.
41 He adds that these are sponsored by the same people as last year and that it made it right
42 up to the end and then didn't get by.

43
44 Maynard: Continues on item two (changes to AS 08.48.221, 281, 341,331 and 091) there is
45 a draft and that Rep. Reinbold will introduce and Rep. Olson will co-sponsor. Rep. Olson
46 had asked who might oppose it and he (Maynard) responded that maybe some specialty
47 contractors. When he hears that hearings have been scheduled he will let everyone know.
48 He noted that the prohibitive practice portion wasn't in the draft and that Konrad from Rep.
49 Olson's office and John Walsh (APDC Lobbyist) were going to try and find out if it was
50 intentional or by accident.

51
52 Lent: Notes that Sen. Giessel is fully behind SB16 and will introducing it in the Senate
53 tomorrow.

1 Maynard: Responds that it will be at 1:30 today and the chair has given him permission to
2 attend.

3
4 Lent: Asks if he can attend also and the Chair nods approval.

5
6 Chair: Asks Maynard if he will be testifying at the hearing on Monday also.

7
8 Maynard: Responds that he will and he believes that Dale Nelson will also testify. He adds
9 that Dale will be here for the public comment at 1:15 and asks to be first to speak so he can
10 make the 1:30 hearing.

11 B) Regulations project.

12 1) 12 AAC 36.100 Testing Laboratory Reports.

13
14
15
16 Maynard: Reports that nobody knows of any other labs other than civil engineering test
17 labs. No electrical, mechanical, chemical or petroleum so we can delete it from the agenda.
18 We don't need to change the regulation.

19
20 2) 12 AAC 36.068. Eligibility for Landscape Architect Registration by
21 Examination.

22
23 3) 12 AAC 36.040. Simplified Application for Re-examination

24 4) 12 AAC 36.050. Application Deadlines.

25
26 Jones: Reports that all three have been public noticed and no comments were received.
27 He has an adoption order for the Chair to sign if the Board chooses to adopt them.

28
29 **On a motion duly made by Lent, seconded by Heieren and passed unanimously it was**
30 **RESOLVED to adopt regulation changes to 12 AAC 36.068. Eligibility for Landscape**
31 **Architect Registration by Examination. 12 AAC 36.040. Simplified Application for Re-**
32 **examination. 12 AAC 36.050. Application Deadlines.**

33
34 This conversation was interrupted for a call to the investigator.

35
36 **Agenda item 5 – Investigators Report**

37
38 Savage: Asks if there are any questions on the report before he gets into a few things?
39 There was no response so he continued. He reports that he has been working with Bo
40 Brownfield (ex Board member) and Harley Hightower and that Bo had been to an NCEES
41 LE committee meeting recently and it appears that other states are adopting our practice of
42 working with the Fire Marshal's Office and Building Officials around the state and using them
43 as the eyes and ears to help with enforcement, education and things like that. He feels that
44 speaks well of our system here in Alaska and hopes that the trend continues.

45
46 He informs the Board that the Fire Marshal's office is having their 6th annual Building
47 Officials and Fire Marshal's forum next week and he will be attending. It has always worked
48 out well for enforcement and for contacts. They can put a face with a name and feel a little
49 more at ease calling about something that could be a violation. I can put them in touch with
50 Vern or a Board member and we can get things rectified before it becomes a bigger issue.

51
52 Eriksen: Asks if it is a State wide gathering?

53
54 Savage: Yes and for some of the outlying areas that we don't touch frequently it's just

1 tremendous. All their Fire Officials are there, all their Building Officials are there and some
2 of the questions are kind of neat that have come up over the years. He explains that it's a
3 four day deal and the first part is going over issues and questions that they have and then it
4 goes into things like code review of things they are going to adopt or not going to adopt. It's
5 worked out well over the years.

6
7 He then talks about the AELS Investigator issue. His supervisor has been in touch with the
8 Director providing information for the law makers and hopefully this will continue to move
9 forward. He advises that the Department has just hired two new investigators for some other
10 boards and another one is on the way and hopefully if this passes we will be hiring another
11 one.

12
13 Next he talks about the issues that are at the AG's office. He has been working with the
14 Chief Investigator and hopefully will get some resolution for a couple that have been over
15 there for awhile. This has gotten some visibility from both our Chief and the Director.

16
17 Chair: Asks if the 2009 case is at the AG's office and if that what is taking so long?

18
19 Savage: Answers that it isn't but it was impacted by AG office issues and it should have a
20 clear path for some resolution by the next Board meeting.

21
22 Heieren: Asks what the chance is that he will be assigned to this Board if the Statute
23 change passes.

24
25 Savage: Can't envision it any other way. As he sees it he would lose all his other boards.
26 He has six other Boards right now and would lose all of them except geologists. He would
27 keep that one because it ties in so closely with AELS. The new investigator would take his
28 other boards full time and be part time AELS. That is the way it was when he first came
29 onboard. That way if something happened to him there would be someone familiar with the
30 AELS Board.

31
32 He then talks about Home Inspectors. There is an exemption in the Home Inspector laws
33 08.18.156 that says individuals registered as engineers or architects can conduct home
34 inspections. It also says they must seal, sign and date their report. A lot of them aren't
35 doing that they are just putting PE behind their name and that's it no seal or date. He then
36 advises that effective immediately any reports that do not contain the seal, signature and
37 date per the regulations they will be opening up an unlicensed practice investigation. We
38 need to get the word out there in a news letter or something. Another issue is that the
39 engineers and architects cannot use the term "home inspector" in any way, shape or form in
40 their title, the title of their company and they can't advertise that they have the ability to do
41 home inspections unless they get a home inspectors license.

42
43 Rearick: Asks what he is going to charge them with if they don't seal the report.

44
45 Savage: Responds that if they don't seal, sign and date the report they will be charged for
46 unlicensed practice as a home inspector. And the other one is if they hold themselves out to
47 be a home inspector or advertise that they can perform home inspections. That is violation
48 of AS 08.18.053.

49
50 Rearick: Offers that each of the Board members could pass this on to their respective
51 societies and get the work out.

52
53 Maynard: Suggests that maybe the recap we send APDC would be a good place.
54

1 Jones: Volunteers to write up something and put it on the AELS webpage and send to
2 APDC for their news letter. He will run it by Savage first.
3
4 Hightower: Asks if the cloud on their license would be their engineering license or the home
5 inspector issue.
6
7 Savage: Responds that it would be on their engineer license since they didn't have a home
8 inspector license and it would be a license action so they would have to declare it when
9 renewing or applying in another state.
10
11 Hightower: Responds that it seems a little cloudy.
12
13 Savage: Agrees.
14
15 Chair: Adds that this will be ongoing and we should keep track of it. He says the shoe
16 could very well be on the other foot because for example an electrician is exempt from
17 having a PE license to do electrical work.
18
19 Savage: Agrees. And uses the example that 4 family homes are exempted and some could
20 hold themselves out to be able to provide structural design work for residential homes and
21 we would take exception to that.
22
23 Maynard: Adds that stamping and signing drawings is part of the job. If you're doing home
24 inspections and not stamping and signing them you should be cited.
25
26 Eriksen: Suggests that maybe they are not stamping the inspections to limit liability and that
27 maybe part of education is that they may not be limiting their liability.
28
29 Savage: Responds, that that's only half of the problem. The other part is 08.053 using the
30 protected term "home inspector", that's become an issue too. They're using that term "home
31 inspector" while they're working under the exemption to the law and the licensed profession
32 out there is saying "no you can't do it" and the Statute says "no you can't do it".
33
34 Maynard: Thinks that what's probably happening is that a lot of reports don't get stamps so
35 if you do an evaluation that's not a home you may not be stamping it or your portion of the
36 work gets put in with the architect, or the mechanical or electrical engineers in a report that
37 doesn't have a stamp on and they're treating these home inspections like that not realizing
38 the law says you will stamp it.
39
40 Savage: Agrees and points out that you don't stamp it and take responsibility for it you are
41 conducting a home inspection without a license.
42
43 Rearick: Says that if they are calling their report a home inspection and don't stamp it they
44 are doing unlicensed practice but if they are doing a building inspection that happens to be a
45 home is that the same thing, or an engineering inspection?
46
47 Savage: Sure and I certainly will look at that, if a home inspector does a report and says
48 you need to have a structural engineer come in and look at this and the structural engineer
49 comes in, yes I certainly look at that and make sure that it's not that. Then it's on the
50 engineering side of the house. But here I'm talking on the home inspector's side of the
51 house, if they are conducting that inspection and accepting the money under the ruse that
52 they are exempt they must seal, sign and date that report for them to have that exemption.
53 Otherwise they are just conducting a home inspection without a license.
54

1 Rearick: Brings up another topic. He reminds everyone that a while back we had a
2 discussion with John about pre-fabricated buildings and that at the time the discussion was
3 focused around the corporate licensure and whether they had to have a corporate license to
4 do structural engineering in the State of Alaska and whether or not the structural had to be
5 on staff or they could hire a third party to stamp those. He doesn't want to rehash it in those
6 terms but did want to ask if he is encountering projects that have pre-engineered buildings
7 that don't carry the Alaska stamp and if a company actually makes a sale of a pre-
8 engineered product to somebody in Alaska and they don't have stamped drawing on those,
9 even though it might be sitting on a yard not constructed for years, if they've made that sale
10 with the intent that it was to be erected in Alaska, it seems like at the time they stamped a
11 set of structural engineer drawings for it. He asks if he is seeing any incidents where they
12 don't.

13
14 Savage: Yes we do and they are being sold with the sale documents saying it's the
15 responsibility of the customer to provide all the engineering, to hire the appropriate design
16 professionals for that building. And what we've run into is case law on both sides of the
17 house because they are not offering engineering so to speak, they are selling a product that
18 they have someone on their staff or that they have hired with an Alaska seal that sealed it
19 then when it's erected on a foundation it's still the buyers responsibility to get the rest of the
20 engineering, civil, structural, or what have you, when he is erecting that building. The
21 problem we are having is those companies are saying and some are pushing back, some
22 aren't, instead of getting the corporate authorization because of all the other taxations that
23 come along with that from state to state they are saying we are not offering engineering
24 we've provided engineering for the structure we sold the individual, we never entered your
25 state, he bought it here in Alabama and brought it to your state and the absolute biggest
26 offender in the State of Alaska is the State of Alaska. When I was getting printouts from
27 different companies and one in particular, we, the State of Alaska who has absolutely no
28 problem with this, has hundreds and hundreds of those that they buy and erect in Alaska.
29 That particular topic makes me dizzy. He continues that we are not turning a blind eye to it
30 but we need to get a handle on it one way or the other.

31
32 Rearick: Adds that he has seen so many owners that have these building setting out there
33 and they have a foundation there, a piling foundation and the building didn't take into
34 account the reactions that those pilings were designed for and they put the building up
35 anyway. I'm not sure what to do about it.

36
37 Savage: Is not sure either. He suggests maybe meeting in the future and brain storming
38 this. Another problem is that over the years those building were looked at, and that's kind of
39 how the Fire Marshal does too, on a case by case basis, you know, what is it going to be
40 used for, what is the occupancy going to be, is it going to be holding road salt, is it going to
41 have some crane's in there, airplanes and a big percentage of the places that were
42 permitted by the Fire Marshall's office, we are not going to have any occupants in it, it's just
43 going to be for our aircraft. Then six months later when I'm down in the area and I stop by
44 and just walk in and the whole back has a mezzanine and offices and there wasn't any
45 design professionals involved, they are doing it after the fact. That goes on a lot and I think
46 that, as well as what you're talking about, is what scares me and the other thing is not the
47 rule of thumb our Directors and Commissioners in the past mind you, have kind of laid it out
48 there that the State of Alaska issues a permit for this, I'd better have my ducks in a row if I'm
49 coming in after the fact and saying you can't build that or stop work or whatever for these
50 reasons so time is of the essence when I'm working on something like that. Some of it is
51 done under the cover of darkness. A couple of guys say we could put some offices back
52 there and rent them out to such and such aviation and it'd pay for this thing in no time. I
53 think that is how a lot of this comes to be after the fact. I don't think they go into it with
54 malice.

1
2 Rearick: Thinks it happens under the cover of ignorance and arrogance most of the time.

3
4 Savage: Agrees and says that when we have a little bit more investigator support we can
5 spend more time out there and can be at these places when these types of, things are
6 happening, word gets out that it's not the cake walk it was and it's going to cost them more
7 money than its worth and they just do it right from the onset.

8
9 Rearick: Has had meetings with owners and told them what needed to be done before they
10 could become involved and we put up such a wall to them or they perceive it as a wall and
11 they go out and hire someone to put in pilings, then buy a building and maybe hire someone
12 to design a floor and none of the components are designed with the other components in
13 mind. The Fire Marshall doesn't have a structural component; they are looking primarily at
14 life safety, egress etc. and it just falls through the cracks.

15
16 Heieren: Asks if he could give the new Board members an overview of the disciplinary
17 guidelines.

18
19 Savage: Responds that maybe at the Fairbanks meeting would be a good time for him to go
20 over those things and maybe things like the complaint reporting process so we are all on the
21 same sheet of music. While I have you and Harley's ear, I know this is the last meeting for
22 both of you and I want you to know that professionally I can't thank you two enough. You
23 guys have just been so helpful and professional while I've been with this board. Giving your
24 time and knowledge and everything, I cannot thank you two enough and if there is ever
25 anything you need from me by all means pick up the phone and give me a call. And that
26 comes from Chief Warren too. He appreciates the professionalism from everyone on the
27 Board and with you two leaving he wanted me to express his thanks. As easy flowing and
28 professional as this Board is, his life would be a cake walk if all Boards were like that. With
29 that I think that's all I have unless you have any questions.

30
31 Chair: Asks if he wants to stay on for Misty and Sara's presentation.

32
33 Savage: Yes.

34
35 **Agenda item 6 – Expenditure Report.**

36
37 Chair: Introduces Sara Chambers and Misty Frawley.

38
39 Chambers: Thanks the Board for inviting them and says it's good to see the Board in
40 person and deliver good information that is helpful to the Boards mission.

41
42 Frawley: Asks if everyone has had a chance to look over the report and asks if there are
43 any questions.

44
45 Chair: Refers to an email sent by Chambers regarding direct and indirect costs and notes
46 that we are on track again for another record breaking indirect expenditure year. In the first
47 quarter we are at almost a hundred thousand dollars allocated to our Board. He asks what
48 exactly that is for?

49
50 Frawley: Our indirect cost approach this year changed from that of last year. Last year I
51 was giving you up to date information on what was actually being spent on indirect costs.
52 After the second quarter when our large RSA's hit last year, most all Boards had sticker
53 shock because they saw their indirect jump significantly from first to second quarter. So the
54 approach this year was more of taking the average of last year and dividing it over the four

1 quarters. So at the end of the year we will do a true-up. I would expect that our indirect
2 costs may come in slightly less and that would be based on some of the huge project costs
3 that we had last year in the Division. That was broken out for you in the letter that Sara
4 provided on our huge indirect increases in FY12. So we don't expect things of that
5 magnitude so far this year. So they should be about what they were last year or slightly
6 under.

7
8 Chair: Well we are not going to have things like software upgrade at \$165K and what is this
9 remodeling of the space, it looks like that's almost half a million between those two items.
10 So shouldn't we see a significant decrease this year in the indirect?

11
12 Frawley: The Divisions are always going to continue to update, whether it be software or
13 furniture. Certain Divisions are way behind in updating those. Last year we underwent
14 replacing all the investigations section. That's quite a large section and that was a
15 significant cost. This year we have a \$100K set aside for those same sorts of costs to
16 happen. We do not have anything on the horizon that I'm aware of regarding the software
17 update out of the norm.

18
19 Jones: Asks if the rewrite of the CBPL data base going to be part of the indirect.

20
21 Chambers: All of the IT and that sort of overhead from the Department or even at the State
22 level at the Department of Administration is built into the indirect. However, our IT staff, for
23 better or worse, doesn't bill specifically to programs. They are an ongoing, on retainer type
24 of service. So regardless of whether they are focusing on Professional Licensing this year,
25 business licensing next year we're going to continue to see that as a stable cost without any
26 spikes due to projects they are working on. I believe that this expense was a third party
27 software package that needed to be renewed and updated so that would be more of a
28 onetime expense.

29
30 Schedler: Forgive me if I'm asking questions that are obvious to everyone else. Is there a
31 State staff that provides services to these 41 Boards and that's the only thing they do?

32
33 Frawley: Certain examiners on Sara's team provide direct service to Boards.

34
35 Schedler: So, you're saying there is a staff and this is a portion of what they do?

36
37 Chambers: If I'm understanding the question correctly, we do have staff that charge,
38 through the indirect rate a percentage of time broken out to each program. Misty and I
39 would be examples of, at the management level that our time is not billed directly to each
40 program for how many minutes a day we may spend on it. It's over all of the programs
41 because what we do affects all of the programs. Above us, and that would be true of our
42 Director as well, above that though there is Department staff. This entire section that sits
43 over here (she indicates the area adjacent to conference room C) is a staff that services the
44 entire Department through fiscal and budget and IT, procurement, their costs are divided out
45 to the Division and that's another staffing overhead that ultimately reaches you through that
46 percentage that was on the second page of the indirect, the one that you're looking at right
47 now. So not only within the Division are there a handful of folks that would be charging time
48 to every profession but above that there is staff that at the Department and State level,
49 payroll for example, happens outside of our Department and so that's a cost that's factored
50 in.

51
52 Schedler: So about how many people does this indirect expense support?

53
54 Chambers: It's really hard to know. Within the Division probably just a hand full us at the

1 executive management level, two or three, three or four perhaps. But then at the
2 Department level you're looking at an entire Division that supports the Department of
3 Commerce with those various units that are outside of our Division. And then above that
4 any of the Department of Administration, for example the Commissioner of Administration
5 serves the entire State as the Department of Administration, General Services for example,
6 this building, and that in Anchorage. Ultimately this Board will support a fraction as every
7 other Division in the State fractionally supports because they shore up that infrastructure is
8 required to operate. But within our Division we just have a few people are serving all of the
9 four business units in our Division and so that gets broken out in that indirect.

10
11 Schedler: I may never understand how 41 Boards with revenues of 7.5 million dollars have
12 indirects that are so outrageously high.

13
14 Chambers: Well hopefully the memo that we circulated in January helps give an
15 understanding of the intense amount of overhead that State Government requires.
16 Everything from the State level staffing, the Department of Administration to this building,
17 lights, parking, security all of the things that our Division doesn't supply but State
18 Government and our union contracts require for our staff and working conditions. It really is
19 a bigger bureaucracy, if you will, being a government agency. So all of the pieces that go
20 into what we need to directly affect the mission and where Alicia and Vern maintain positive
21 time keeping directly to AELS and only AELS and John Savage, a portion of his time. There
22 are other things that work behind the scenes make it possible for them to be able to do their
23 jobs.

24
25 Schedler: I certainly understand the bureaucracy of government and the cost of it but I do
26 not understand the decision to bear that these 41 Boards have to bear that weight. It feels
27 to me like the legs on the table are just going to crumble. We don't get the, you know we try
28 to produce the revenue so that we can function and in just my short time on the Board it
29 appears as if that's becoming increasingly more difficult and it always comes down to
30 money. But it's a matter of these Boards have been tagged with keeping up the weight of
31 this monster. So someone somewhere decided that the revenue from these Boards could
32 support that bureaucracy. That decision could just as easily be made that they don't have to
33 support that bureaucracy.

34
35 Chambers: You're exactly right and that's in Statute and the Legislature made that decision.
36 So as you're continuing to have conversations with your Legislators on a variety of topics,
37 that is one to keep in mind that the law requires that your licensees support all of the costs
38 of administering the program and because it's a government and not a non-profit association
39 or a college as they have in Canada that operates a little bit more independently, there is
40 that interconnectedness of the State of Alaska and the fiduciary responsibility of the State to
41 supply all of the things that we just discussed. But that would lie with the Legislature so you
42 can carry that message forward.

43
44 Schedler: But it sounds like it's not just the cost of the licensing that we're bearing it's the
45 cost of the State government. I just have a really hard time explaining to the licensees why
46 the costs are what they are. We can't explain why we have half of our budget is indirects
47 that we cannot explain and you can't explain. To me it just seems like it, it is, it's just
48 crumbling under the weight of government.

49
50 Chambers: I hope that we can continue to do a better job of it. We are not doing an
51 adequate job of explaining where the costs are coming from. We can continue to give good
52 examples, you know, one might be that in addition to sort of the physical things such as the
53 building and parking and lights and heat we have two staff members that are directly
54 supporting the Board and others that take work off of the staff members and our job

1 description and the things that we are tasked to do and our Director as well. Our union
2 contracts and the State employment provide that we should get health insurance and
3 benefits as part of our employment. And there are teams on other floors of this building
4 whose job is to make sure that that is adequately administered. That would be, I think, a
5 sound example of how their costs are supported by licensing fees because in order to run
6 this program you need staff and because it's a government and you don't really have an
7 option to shop around, unfortunately or fortunately for staff it comes as a package deal that
8 when you are authorized by the Legislature to become a Board and you're designated a
9 certain amount of staff then your staff has the built in employment expectation.

10
11 Schedler: That's why I started the conversation about how much staff are there and the
12 answer is we don't know. Because we know we have two and we have a part of John.
13 That's not \$400K worth no matter what kind of union contract or health insurance you have.
14 So if a phantom number of additional costs that are coming from other employees or it's
15 paying for heat and lights for the Department of Commerce, so it is, I would like to know how
16 many people are charging these 41 Boards in the State of Alaska. How many people
17 charge part of their salaries to support this? Because my guess is you could dig in and
18 come up with a number but when you look and say what do they really do, none of us can
19 put our finger on that. We can find no value in their charging us. Someone decided under a
20 budget cut, here's a place to fund this position. To me that's the root of it and we can talk
21 about how high these numbers are about how frustrated we are how hard you worked to
22 explain to us what the numbers are but to me these Boards have been tasked with
23 supporting an amount of State government that is not equitable.

24
25 Chambers: Well we are working to help all of you understand the way that the systems
26 works now so you can be better prepared to address either licensees or the Legislature
27 where you may wish to advocate for a change to that system.

28
29 Chair: Thanks Sara and asks for an accounting of the 3.7? Not just paper clips but there
30 must be a general ledger for those indirect expenses, do you have that information? It might
31 be helpful to the Board to see, say maybe 1.5 of it is labor and personnel services kind of
32 like what we have here (referring to the expenditure report).

33
34 Frawley: We can certainly break it out. It comes down to time and manpower of how much
35 detail do we go into on a consistent bases and at what point do you stop questions. So I
36 can say we paid 1.8 million dollars to Administrative Service and the Commissioner's Office.
37 But from there then you'll ask "well what did we get with that" question and you just continue
38 to drill down. And there's that point in time where I don't have that kind of time to go into so
39 much level of detail so we try to do these kind of overviews. Here's a huge inflation, here's
40 right where we can explain these, outside of our normal cost of running business. Even
41 Vern and Alicia, the same kind of line items that your Board directly sees, or their payroll
42 directly affects, by folks running their payroll, it's going to be the same on a much larger
43 scale. I can show you personnel services line but I don't know that that would be adequate
44 for you or show a service line for your indirect costs you paid \$150K of your service for
45 indirect. But that still doesn't give you enough meat to solve the question. Like Sara's
46 explaining we continue to look for ways to give you valuable information. We are currently
47 working on a project to delve into some of these deeper details for you and provide on a
48 consistent basis, it's just that it take so much time to get to that process. So these are all
49 things that we continue to speak about on a regular basis. These are not new questions
50 that Boards have asked us, tell me everything that we are paying or define it and we're
51 trying to help define that for you.

52
53 Shiesl: Asks if the deficit was reconciled at the end of the year?
54

1 Frawley: That we roll over on a specific Board?

2
3 Shiesl: Well just in general. You run a 1.7 million dollar deficit this year. I understand
4 you're on a two year budget but what do you do with the deficit?

5
6 Frawley: Board's specifically, and I think you may have written a letter on a Board running
7 at a deficit or a profit (referring to Sara). Sara's really good at explaining the silo's that we
8 have because through the Legislature we are given an authorization level of what we can
9 spend. We don't, in theory, go over that as a Division but a specific Board may go over their
10 amount and carry a deficit for a period of time but in our authority we don't, in theory go over
11 that. You don't have a bank account. Each specific Board doesn't have a bank account.

12
13 Shiesl: It all goes into the General Fund. Is that correct? Then it's allocated by the
14 Legislature so in theory we're carrying other Boards that are running deficits. Is that right?

15
16 Frawley: Yes.

17
18 Schedler: What's happening with the nursing? That's violating the Statute is what you're
19 saying based on your previous statements. Their total revenues are \$500K and they're in a
20 \$1.2M deficit. So they've violated Statute.

21
22 Chambers: The roll forward, the Divisions Boards, well all of the programs, all 39 of the
23 programs are allowed to have this carry forward because they're in a biennial license cycle.
24 So you may have huge spikes of revenue at your renewal time and then you have that sort
25 of deficit appearance, I think that's where Misty's saying theoretically because you can't
26 recoup, you have these expenses, you only have these spikes every two years in revenue
27 so you're able to carry it forward so we can try to smooth that and not be.....

28
29 Shiesl: I understand that. 2012 is the first year of the two year budget?

30
31 Chambers: It depends on the program because we all renew at different times.

32
33 Chair: So 2013 would be the first year.

34
35 Chambers: Right so you're seeing these huge, this is an annual, not a biennial column so
36 you're looking at a deficit, huge deficit for some programs because maybe three months
37 from the time that number was closed out then they're in a renewal, which is true for nursing.
38 Their renewals were this fall which would have been captured in FY12.

39
40 Shiesl: So these are actual numbers, they're not budgeted numbers?

41
42 Chambers: Right.

43
44 Schedler: So at the end of the two year period you have a deficit what happens to that
45 deficit for that Board?

46
47 Chambers: It continues to roll forward and that's where we get into continued discussions
48 about spending but also to offset it with increased fees or to decrease fees if you
49 accumulate a surplus. The law says that licensing fees must be set to approximate the cost
50 of running the program. So where you may have swings for example investigations. You
51 may have a hearing that costs \$30K which was unanticipated. If you have that cushion in
52 your surplus then you may weather the storm and not see future license fee increases
53 because of that spike. Many of our smaller Boards may have 30, 50, 90 members, may
54 have a spike like that and they are seeing their licensing fees potentially increase by

1 quadruple. And that's something that we at the Director level or higher are looking at
2 strategic ways to try to keep those peaks and valleys from happening. But the roll forward,
3 to get to your original question, the roll forward, whether it's a surplus or deficit, is allowed to
4 continue with your Board and while you may be sort of at a period of time theoretically
5 funding another Board that money isn't exiting your program. It's always allocated directly to
6 your program because your licensees paid those fees.

7
8 Shiesl: Are we allow to carry fund balances or not? A reserve fund?

9
10 Chambers: That's the surplus or deficit.

11
12 Frawley: We want to carry a balance at all times just in case something like legal happens.

13
14 Shiesl: In our case we are but others are not.

15
16 Chair: And we had the opportunity, I believe, two years ago we were told that we could
17 lower our fees and we decided to just maintain, because I believe in two years our fees are
18 going to have to go up.

19
20 Maynard: It's my understanding that dues paid to NCARB and NCEES fund travel to those
21 organizations and that that is not allowed by the State Regulation or Statute. Can you
22 identify which those are because the Legislators I've talked to say that's crazy and that it
23 shouldn't be not allowed.

24
25 Chambers: That's actually a State Policy, it's not in a Statute or Regulation. The
26 Department of Administration is authorized by the Legislature to manage issues that are
27 State wide such as travel. So our State travel Policy is sort of a one size fits all document
28 that applies to all State travelers and then we are required to fit into that structure. This has
29 been a hot topic this year in that we've talked about it with this Board and Vern and I talk
30 about it regularly and Misty and I do too so it's something that we are looking at. Because it
31 is a policy our Commissioner and the Commissioner of Administration are engaging in a
32 conversation about where flexibility may lie within the existing State government to review
33 that and potentially make changes.

34
35 Maynard: Is it written somewhere so I can get a copy and I can give to the Legislators so
36 they know what the problem is?

37
38 Chambers: Sure, Vern you've got a copy of the policy on the intranet. You can get that to
39 them. I've met with our Executive Staff, we have six executives like Vern that are assigned
40 certain Boards and we have talked about it and you've got the matrix that I delivered which
41 pulls out some of those specific points.

42
43 Maynard: Because I'm sure we could get a few Legislators to call them and say this is nuts
44 and get it changed a little bit quicker.

45
46 Chambers: You know as you're engaging in the travel authority question which I know your
47 Board has been an advocate for with the Legislature it's within your purview to request any
48 changes that would benefit your Board. So that might be something you could bring up as
49 well that we at this time, we have this concurrent process of, we need to maintain what State
50 Policies say but at the same time at the Commissioner level there is questioning happening
51 to see what flexibility may arise with what's there. The issue of dues is extremely
52 compelling that if the expectation of the organization is that your dues directly fund travel
53 then we're faced with a question of why are paying this thing that we can't use and how do
54 we get to use it or how do we go to these associations and say we need to negotiate

1 because our State, like California and other states are pulling back on travel because of the
2 over arching expense is there a way to negotiate our dues so we are not paying this extra
3 five or ten thousand dollars a year, whatever it may be in travel. I know that one of those
4 options may be preferable to another but again, just kind of laying some options on the
5 table. We are aware of that concern. Vern has been a strong advocate for gathering
6 information and he's worked with the associations to help deliver more documentation
7 because with all of our Boards, our 20 Boards that have professional memberships and
8 have a desire to travel out of State to fulfill you mission we don't necessarily have all of the
9 documentation like a broken out invoice of what portion funds travel, what portion funds their
10 overhead, what portion funds exams for example. So we're getting that information, but
11 you're exactly right, it's a conundrum and we're stuck with it for now but we are looking into it
12 and you also have the power to look into it as well.

13
14 Chair: So is the policy on that travel that we fill out a gift form.

15
16 Chambers: There are a variety of ways to slice and dice it depending on the type of travel
17 that you're engaging in. If you are traveling on State business, if you're representing the
18 Board, then you must travel through the travel approval process and the State of Alaska
19 must pay for that travel. So it comes out of our travel authority and ultimately your licensing
20 fees pay for that travel. If you're traveling not as a State representative, if you're not going
21 to a meeting that's only for Board members, say there's a conference somewhere that
22 anyone could attend and you happen to be compelled by your own interests to attend it then
23 you can attend that on your own and then if there's a benefit like a hotel fee that's waived or
24 travel's paid for by that association you would need to fill out an ethics disclosure form
25 disclosing that you received a gift of free hotel, free travel. And that's submitted through the
26 Chair and staff to the Ethics Officer. But that can only happen if you're not attending as a
27 Board Member where you're not asked to represent the State, where you're not voting on
28 behalf of the Board or the Board says we're going to send one person to this meeting and it
29 has to be a Board Member. There's a clear demarcation between when you're representing
30 the State of Alaska or you're just attending the conference because you might attend
31 anyway or anyone else could attend that conference. It is complex and I'm happy to
32 continue that discussion if you have a specific example it's often handier to look at it that
33 way and again I've broken it down in a matrix format for our executives so they can look at it
34 on order to be better equipped to explain it.

35
36 Chair: I think we understand it.

37
38 Maynard: Can we use my example?

39
40 Chair: Well you're on a committee and the committee has a meeting and they provided
41 travel.

42
43 Maynard: But I'm only on that committee because I'm on this Board.

44
45 Chair: Anyone can apply to be on an NCEES committee.

46
47 Maynard: I'm not representing the Board; I guess I'm representing myself.

48
49 Chambers: So if they were paying for your travel, as I understand it, then you would just fill
50 out an ethics disclosure form.

51
52 Maynard: Which I did.

53
54 Chair: Then it's up to the ethics supervisor to determine, correct?

1
2 Chambers: Then it goes on to the Department of Law to ultimately review it.

3
4 Chair: And then we get dinged again by them for reviewing it.

5
6 Chambers: Well it's perfunctory; you know we are dealing in the days of VECO and other
7 junkets and that kind of thing. I want to assure you that our Division, CBPL, has had zero
8 suspicion. We are operating in a clean environment where there is no scrutiny of travel
9 happening because someone somewhere believes that Boards are getting really great golf
10 trips out of being on the Board. I know you wish that was so but you work really hard at
11 these conferences and maybe you get pig in a blanket on a plate when you get there. So
12 there are others in any State government that don't operate with that level of responsibility
13 and so we all get to share in the bushel of apples that were spoiled by that one.

14
15 Chair: Asks if this Board is subject to the APOC ethics reporting requirements.

16
17 Chambers: Responds that some of the Boards do but she isn't sure about this one and will
18 check. She points out that there are quarterly ethics reports that have to be filed and that is
19 on the agenda of each meeting. She explains that the gift report is something that was
20 always there but in the past we didn't think it pertained but free travel to attend a board
21 conference would definitely raise red flag and we wanted to be proactive before we get a
22 call about a non disclosure.

23
24 Chair: Well send Vern the link to the APOC requirements. He thanks Sara and Misty for
25 taking the hot seat and explaining how things work. It may not always come across this way
26 but we do appreciate your explaining things for us.

27
28 Chambers: Explains that they are trying to communicate with the Boards and provide the
29 information they request but points out that too much detail would require additional
30 personnel and would come back to the Boards through indirect costs.

31
32 Chair: Asks if there is any Board Member training planned for this year.

33
34 Chambers: Responds that they are looking at less costly means such as webinars but
35 nothing is scheduled yet. She offers to come to future meetings to talk about certain topics
36 if the Board sees a need for training in a certain area.

37
38 Maynard: Comments that all we were asking for was, you know \$1.8M for Department of
39 Administration for rent and health insurance and Division office this and you know it's a
40 three or four line thing to explain where the \$3.7M comes from. We don't need to go into
41 reams of paper and that shouldn't take them that long because they have to figure out how
42 the 3.7 is in the first place. But saying that, talking to the staff of one of the finance
43 committee members yesterday I guess there is a discussion back and forth, a disagreement
44 between the finance committee and Legislative finance and CBPL about how they are
45 keeping track of all their money and what happened to the Real Estate Commission. I'm not
46 sure what happened but it blew up. They got like a 4X increase in their rates which made
47 them look at CBPL closely and CBPL didn't have the right answers or not in the form that
48 Legislative finance wants. The upshot of which is that the Finance Committee isn't
49 interested in giving any more money to CBPL until they've got their act together.

50
51 The other thing that they said was yes we can add \$75K to the travel budget but that doesn't
52 mean that you'll get it. It might go to one of the other Boards or it might go into something
53 other than travel because once in that big appropriation they can shuffle things around. So
54 we might increase the budget from \$400K to \$500K but that doesn't mean we will get more

1 travel.

2

3 Chair: They can give our Board a line item.

4

5 Maynard: They can but they're afraid that then they'll have 40 line items.

6

7 Chair: They should have 40 line items.

8

9 Schedler: It feels to me that if all those Boards went away they would still have to pay a lot
10 of those costs. So they really aren't directly linked to the Boards. They've just found a way
11 to pay for the lights and the heat for the Department of Commerce or whatever it is and
12 that's who they've tagged it too.

13

14 Jones: I talk to Don about this all the time. The one that gets me is the legal fees. If the
15 State need a legal section then they should fund them, they shouldn't be sucking money
16 from everyone else.

17

18 Schedler: That's right and the irony is that that's exactly their approach when the
19 Legislature dealt with the University. There better not be a legal charge that's charged to a
20 remote campus because the University has to have a legal department anyway. So you
21 better not parlay it out like exactly what they are doing.

22

23 Rearick: Explains how an autonomous board (Nevada Architects Board) works.

24

25 Maynard: Adds that about ten years ago this Board was considering that but the Real
26 Estate Commission had done that before and then the economy tanked and they went
27 under and had to be pulled back into the Department of Commerce so the Legislature
28 doesn't want to go through that again. It would be a big uphill battle to get that.

29

30 The call to John Savage is terminated.

31

32 Continue Item 12 B.5. 12 AAC 36.063 Engineering Education and Work Experience
33 Requirements.

34

35 Maynard: Asks the Board to review the handouts he provided re structural engineering. He
36 met with the Structural Engineering Association in December and they would like for the SE
37 license to be post civil and only required on important buildings.

38

39 He explains the links between all the structural engineering associations and provides a
40 policy statement from the National council of Structural Engineers Associations, Structural
41 Engineering Certification Board which advocates that jurisdictions require structural
42 engineering licensure for anyone providing structural engineering services for designated
43 structures. At one point they defined what those structures were but then decided that each
44 Board should decide for themselves due to differing seismic or weather conditions in
45 different parts of the country. The structural engineering association of Alaska was doing
46 category 3 and 4 which would be hazardous facilities and essential facilities and some
47 bridges and docks but that we could discuss. There should be some kind of grandfathering
48 process and they encourage each state to adopt SE licensure and they support modifying
49 existing regulations to require that the SE license be post civil. In some states that might be
50 post any PE even mechanical. In some states you pass one exam and you can do any kind
51 of engineering you want as long as you think you're qualified. That would fall into line with
52 what the Structural Engineers of Alaska would like. Then I have a couple of handouts from
53 NCEES. One is how you get the MLE designation and then the Model Law which is an
54 engineering standard.

1
2 His recommendation is that we make SE post CE so that we match the rest of the West
3 Coast. He asks for comments to see if there is consensus on that before we proceed.
4
5 Rearick: Asks if we could table the discussion until his committee report.
6
7 Maynard: Agrees.
8
9 Chair: Points out that there were no ABET accredited programs in control systems,
10 structural and only one in FPE. So they are already going to have to get additional
11 experience according to our tables. So that's part of the 063.....
12
13 Maynard: Responds that's why we came up with that list of degrees, those are the tests and
14 which degrees that would be able to take those tests without additional experience. So if
15 you have a mechanical engineering degree you can take the FP exam without having two
16 more years of experience.
17
18 Chair: Instructs everyone to look over the handouts so we can have a meaningful
19 discussion, probably tomorrow morning.
20
21 Hale: Asks about the letter from the seismic folks. Maybe add a requirement for seismic
22 along with the arctic or rolling them together somehow.
23
24 Maynard: Advises that those who take the civil structural exam are probably the people who
25 are going to be designing structures or those who take the structural exam. Both of those
26 have seismic parts to them. So, unless you are concerned about all the other engineers
27 knowing about seismic, you know mechanical or electrical. There are some lateral support
28 for mechanical and electrical equipment these days but whether we want to create our own
29 seismic exam, because we would have to do it or buy California's because there is no
30 National seismic exam.
31
32 Heieren: Thinks he is talking about course work being rolled into the arctic courses.
33
34 Maynard: Responds that it is mentioned in the Northern Design course and asks who needs
35 to know that? Are we going to require that of all engineering licensees and all architectural
36 licensees or just civil and structural? Well they're already getting tested on seismic.
37 Hopefully they will have taken some course or done some work that enables them to do
38 that.
39
40 Heieren: Asks if it is a significant part of the structural exam?
41
42 Maynard: Structural yes. The civil structural it's part of it.
43
44 Rearick: Reminds the Board that the Seismic Commission addressed the Board several
45 meetings ago and he thinks that is where this is coming from.
46
47 Hale: Agrees and believes that seismic is more pressing than arctic.
48
49 Maynard: Feels that they don't realize what is in the test already. He explains that
50 architects, structural engineers and civil engineers that took the afternoon structural portion
51 of the exam have been tested in seismic. Electrical and Mechanical don't need it and asks
52 the Board if they want everyone to have to take a seismic course and reminds them that we
53 will have to come up with our own test or buy California's.
54

1 Hale: Was just curious why it hasn't been developed as a requirement in the past.
2
3 Maynard: Because it's already dealt with in the testing we already take.
4
5 Rearick: Suggests we give a report back to them concerning what is covered. He could
6 speak to what architects are tested on and what our schooling includes.
7
8 Jones: Suggests that Rearick and Maynard forward to him what architects and structural
9 engineers do regarding seismic and he will put a letter together for the Chair.
10
11 11:57a.m. Break for Lunch.
12
13 1:05 p.m. back on record – roll call all present except Maynard who is excused to attend a
14 Legislative committee hearing regarding SB16.
15
16 Chair: Starts the public comment period early to accommodate Dale Nelson of APDC who
17 wanted to address the Board and also make the Legislative committee hearing.
18
19 Mr. Nelson: Dale Nelson with the Alaska Professional Design Council. As soon as I'm done
20 I'm out because I'm going over on Senate bill 16 which is at 1:30. It's for the investigator
21 and a little correction to take "written" out of one. We have that and mentioning it the House
22 side is bill 5 is going to have a hearing on Monday at 3:15 so we have both houses. What
23 I'm hearing is looking very positive it's moving. It's one of those things, it's comforting, you
24 know. Some of you have worked the halls over there, if you hear anything let me know.
25 Those are actually written bills and now we have, in draft, and are working on the other four
26 parts. We had one draft back and they left out a part of it and we had to send it back. I
27 have not heard where it's at right now. Everybody is quite busy over there. Those are the
28 ones that are working for you. We've got, just for your information, for the engineering
29 buildings at UAF and UAA they just had SB40 in the Education Committee. Everything went
30 very well and hopefully it will be out of there and go to Finance, so that's moving. That's a
31 \$109M so it may hit a big bump in the road.
32
33 That's about all I had, just to bring you up to speed on what we're doing. He asks if there is
34 anything he needs to know about and states that he has another half day over there.
35
36 Chair: If you could get us \$50K for travel.
37
38 Mr. Nelson: Oh, thanks for bringing that up and we have been bringing that up. Everybody
39 has been briefed on that, it's not in our position paper but thanks for bringing it up. Those
40 that are sitting on, what is it the Commerce Committee that addresses you folks. So we've
41 been bringing it up, John Walsh does a good job.
42
43 Chair: Thanks Mr. Nelson for his testimony and wishes him good luck this afternoon.
44
45 Lent: Asks if Mr. Nelson is testifying and adds that Senator Giessel asks that we convey
46 that this is no expense to the tax payers the investigator is funded as part of our activities.
47 She said that that's really important.
48
49 Mr. Nelson: You Know, thank you for bringing that up because Senator Giessel aide did
50 have that in the instructions. Thank you for bringing that up and yes, I will do that.
51
52 Chair: Advises he will continue with the agenda in case anyone shows up late and wants to
53 address the Board.
54

1 12 B 6. Evaluate and/or adopt software engineering license regulation.

2
3 Eriksen: Recaps where we are to date, NCEES has offered the exam and we have had one
4 person inquire about it. He draws attention to the IEEE letter in the last Board Packet that
5 expressed opposition to a software engineering license. He included a written
6 recommendation that we consider a regulation change to adopt software engineer and
7 provided some wording for that change. So the next step would be to discuss and decide if
8 we want to make a motion for a regulation change.

9
10 Schedler: Asks where the push to create the software engineering license coming from.
11 She asks if there are people in the state that are interested.

12
13 Eriksen: Answers that during the discussion on General licensure that question came up a
14 lot and he looked at more of what is the potential benefit to the State and that when we
15 talked about it we decided that any new exam should be evaluated on that basis. He
16 advises that we did receive a letter last meeting from someone that was interested in
17 software engineering licensure.

18
19 Hale: Asks what the opposition is.

20
21 Eriksen: Thinks it is mostly unfamiliarity with it. What is software engineering? Is there a
22 governing body? The National IEEE and NCEES have answered those questions but he
23 thinks there is the natural concern of "how's that going to affect my profession" if I'm doing
24 software engineering as an electrical engineer, will that affect my ability to do so? It's the
25 same discussion we had with the general licensure. The civil engineers and the structural
26 engineers had that same question. The electrical engineers and control engineers and the
27 mechanical engineers had the same question and it's the same answer I assume. We are
28 not going to take anything away from electrical engineers that are doing software
29 engineering we are going to create opportunities for those that that is their area of expertise.

30
31 Hale: Asks if there is a lot of software engineering going on in the State right now.

32
33 Eriksen: Didn't have an answer for that one. He referenced the letter from the local IEEE
34 society who promoted the idea that existing engineers are doing that so I would say that it is
35 happening in the State now.

36
37 Chair: Believes it is happening in the State now and offers airfield lighting as an example.

38
39 Eriksen: Add's that control systems usually have a software package that runs them.

40
41 The discussion continued for a short time with several Board Members giving examples but
42 with no new information. It was asked how to continue with this and Eriksen recommended
43 putting it out for public comment. Jones suggested that it could be put out for comment for
44 30 days and if there was a lot of push back it could be extended and oral comments taken at
45 a meeting.

46
47 Hightower: Asks if software engineering couldn't pertain to a lot of things other than what
48 we do? Don't banks use software engineering and how broad would this get?

49
50 Chair: Refers to the IEEE position paper and says that one of the things it asks is does the
51 software control a device or devices that if they were to fail that the public would be harmed
52 or could harm a human being. So if an airplane is flying in and the software malfunctions
53 and all the lights go out at the airfield would that conflict harm and if the bank has a problem
54 would that inflict harm?

1
2 Jones: So you're not going to make Microsoft license their engineers to sell Windows in
3 Alaska.

4
5 Chair: Right. I don't think that's where we are headed with software engineering.

6
7 Hale: That was my question. How much is prepackaged as opposed to what would be
8 developed in the State?

9
10 Eriksen: Points out that utility companies have people in house that do that sort of thing.

11
12 Rearick: Acknowledges the value but doesn't think we should be on the leading edge of
13 implementation. Would prefer to see it play out a little bit at someone else's expense.

14
15 It was noted that the western states with the most software industries were against it.

16
17 **On a motion duly made by Eriksen, seconded by Walters and passed unanimously it**
18 **was RESOLVED to send the recommended changes to 12 AAC 36.180 and 12 AAC**
19 **36.990 for adding software engineering out for public notice for a period of 30 days.**

20
21 12-B-7. 12 AAC 36.207 (or 12 AAC 36.215) Standards of Practice for Land
22 Surveyors.

23
24 Heieren: Moves to add a new regulation titled Standards of Practice for Land Surveyors.

25
26 During the discussion it was revealed that the Alaska Society of Professional land Surveyors
27 Standards of Practice - 2013 would adopted by reference. The document is in the process
28 of being revised and is only partially updated. It is available online at www.alaskapls.org.

29
30 Heieren: Advises the Board that he just asking for this to be public noticed and adds that
31 presently we do not have a Standards of Practice for Land Surveyors in law or by external
32 reference and it creates problems in investigating complaints of substandard work. There is
33 no ruler to apply it to so it goes by the wayside and this is damaging to the public. He notes
34 that the architect regulations adopt an education standard set by NCARB by reference and
35 this would basically be the same thing. He feels that this is preferable to the Board
36 duplicating the work by establishing the standards themselves.

37
38 Chair: Asks if we could remove 2013 and just adopt the standard.

39
40 Jones: Advises that each time the standard is updated it has to be readopted by the Board
41 and goes over the procedures for the regulation change.

42
43 Chair: Asks if it will be available online by the time we public notice it.

44
45 Heieren: Yes.

46
47 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it was**
48 **RESOLVED to put out for public notice new regulation 12 AAC 36.215 Standards of**
49 **Practice for Land Surveyors.**

50
51 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Hightower and passed unanimously**
52 **it was RESOLVED to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c) (3)**
53 **to review applicant files.**

1 1:44 p.m. Off record in Executive Session.

2

3 5:30 p.m. Recessed for the day.

4

5

6

Friday February 8, 2013

7

8 8:00 a.m. On record, roll call, all present except Eriksen and Lent.

9

10 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it was**
11 **RESOLVED to go into Executive Session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c) (3) to**
12 **review applicant files.**

13

14 8:03 a.m. Eriksen arrived.

15

16 8:05 a.m. Lent arrived.

17

18 8:43 a.m. Out of Executive Session, on record.

19

20 Maynard: Provides an update on the Senate Labor and Commerce Committee hearing on
21 SB16. Senator Giessel presented the Bill and I presented the meat for it. Don Habeger
22 answered a few questions and then Janet Matheson of the AIA and Dale Nelson of APDC
23 testified. Senator Olson was concerned about adding \$110K per year to the budget and we
24 tried to explain to him that it was not oil money it was licensee money but it didn't seem to
25 matter to him. There was also concern about the "written" verses computer and if it would
26 make it too easy. Before the meeting they were talking about just moving it at the end of the
27 hearing. At the end of it Senator Dunleavy held it for more public hearings. He was at the
28 same restaurant I was at last night and he came over to the table and thanked me for my
29 testimony and said he was holding it for a couple of issues. He didn't say what the issues
30 were. I let John Walsh know so he and the sponsor can find out. It may be the \$110K
31 because Sen. Dunleavy is fiscally conservative.

32

33 Jones: Reports that he had a call from Legislative staff asking about the computer based
34 testing and that he explained how it worked.

35

36 Maynard: Adds that he also received a call and answered some of the question the Division
37 couldn't answer. That testing would be in Fairbanks and Anchorage. We tried to get one in
38 Juneau but there are not enough applicants to justify it.

39

40 Jones: Adds that Pearson-Vue uses palm scan for security and that there was a bill in the
41 Legislature last year against using palm scan so he wasn't sure how this would play out.

42

43 Hightower: Says maybe just remove written and leave out about the computer.

44

45 Jones: That's what we did but they don't understand how it will work. They think someone
46 will be able to just go up on their home computer and take the exam.

47

48 Maynard: Thinks Sen. Olson was hoping they could because he's from Nome. So his
49 constituents wouldn't have to fly to Anchorage. He thought the exam could be sent to Nome
50 and have someone proctor it for them.

51

52 **Agenda item 13 – Board correspondence Received since November 2012**

53

54 A) CLARB items 1 through 4.

1
2 Lent: No comments other than he may not be able to attend the Spring meeting because
3 the travel hasn't been approved.

4
5 Chair: Notes that Lance Merig is running for CLARB office.

6
7 B) NCARB items 1 through 7.

8
9 Rearick: Points out that item 2 contains an A.R.E blackout due to splitting the process
10 between two providers which requires down time to update the web module. Because of
11 this NCARB is adding 12 weeks onto the 5 year rolling clock. Concerning item three,
12 unlicensed practice in India, he thinks this came about because of an AIA trade mission in
13 India. He explains a new requirement for the WCARB meeting in March. Each Board is
14 required to come up with a "golden nugget" outlining something about their Board that is
15 working well so he needs something about our Board that he can present. He notes that
16 Mark McKechnie is running for office again and he is in favor of supporting him.

17
18 Jones: Asks if we can extend our 5 year limit on passing the exam also since our applicants
19 won't be allowed to test during the change. If we can do that we probably should have a
20 motion.

21
22 Rearick: Will write a motion.

23
24 C) NCEES items 1 through 12.

25
26 4. Letter from Jerry Carter to Sara Chambers re funding for NCEES meetings

27
28 Chair: Notes the Letter from Jerry Carter to Sara Chambers and asks if we are going to be
29 able to use the funded delegate program?

30
31 Jones: No, not until they change the State Policy.

32
33 There was a short discussion about the policy and what to do about it and who to talk to
34 about it. Maynard said he talked to Rep. Millett last night and she said it was nuts and that
35 she would talk to Curtis about it. The consensus was that it's not a Statute or Regulation
36 and policies can be changed. The Board will pursue this.

37
38 6. News release re civil engineers online survey.

39
40 Chair: Comments that he did an online survey on civil engineer activities and knowledge.

41
42 Jones: Remarks that there was another one that just came out for the Surveyors regarding
43 the PAX study.

44
45 Chair: Recognizes Rearick who is ready with his motion on extending the amount of time an
46 applicant has to complete testing to match the extension by NCARB on their rolling clock.

47
48 **On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Maynard and passed unanimously it**
49 **was RESOLVED to extend the 5 year rolling clock for ARE candidates for an**
50 **additional 12 weeks to allow for NCARB's ARE Blackout between July and August**
51 **2013.**

52
53 8. Electronic License and Exam Verification System.

1 Jones: Explains how the new NCEES online verification works. When someone wants a
2 verification sent to someone they contact NCEES fill out the form and NCEES notifies the
3 State that it goes to and they go online and download. It doesn't have the State seal on it
4 but it has a seal from NCEES stating that it is verified.

5
6 Chair: Asks Vern if there is anything on CBT.

7
8 Jones: Explains that starting in January of 2014 the FE and FS will be computer based and
9 examinees will no longer have to take the exam in the State where they apply. They can
10 take it in any test center in the U.S. States have two ways to approve a candidate,
11 automatic and manual. We are presently using the manual system where we inform them
12 who is authorized to take the exams. In the automatic system an applicant would go to the
13 NCEES webpage to register for the exam. They would have to acknowledge a statement
14 that passing the exam does not authorize them to work as an EIT in any state or jurisdiction.
15 They have to apply to the State Board where they want to work. If they decided to work in
16 Alaska they would have to apply to this Board. I would prefer to do it that way because it will
17 reduce our workload tremendously. It will also reduce our revenue a little bit.

18
19 Eriksen: So they would have already passed the exam when they apply here?

20
21 Jones: Yes. He explains that we presently charge \$50 to apply for the exam. If we go with
22 the automatic system those graduating in Alaska that didn't intend to stay in Alaska would
23 not be paying the Alaska application fee. However anyone coming into the State that wants
24 to work as an EIT would have to apply and pay the fee. If the revenue reduction is too much
25 we can increase the fee. He adds that this may also save us money in that the reduction in
26 workload may eliminate the need for a second licensing examiner or at least delay it for
27 several years because she is reading in 275 records today and how many are
28 fundamentals, half?

29
30 Kelly: A third to half.

31
32 Jones: That's that many files we would not have to process. This will require a regulation
33 project. If you want I can work up the wording for the next meeting and present it to you if
34 you're agreeable to doing that.

35
36 Maynard: Asks if we need a motion to do that.

37
38 Jones: Yes. Assign it to one of you guys and I'll do it for you.

39
40 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it**
41 **was RESOLVED that Jones prepare a regulation project on computer based testing**
42 **applications for Board review.**

43
44 D. Letter from Thomas D. Hixson re NSPE Licensure and qualifications for Practice
45 (L&QP) committee.

46
47 There was a short discussion regarding whether or not we had any special considerations
48 for military or ex military. It was determined that they can apply the same as anyone else
49 and if properly documented their military experience will be considered. The Chair tasked
50 Jones with writing a letter response for his signature.

51
52 E. Letter from Alaska Seismic Hazards Safety Committee.

53
54 This was discussed previously and it was noted that the committee had addressed the

1 board at a prior meeting and it was decided that we had adequate testing already. Rearick
2 and Maynard will provide Jones with information on the testing of their respective
3 professions and he will prepare a letter for the Chair's signature.
4

5 Hale: Has talked to Mr. Scher and notes that they have been trying to get something done
6 on this for a while. He referred them to us.
7

8 Eriksen: Asked if California tests all engineers or just civil's.
9

10 Maynard: Responds just civil's. He explains that to get a civil license in California you have
11 to pass a 4 hour seismic exam and a 4 hour surveying exam in addition to the NCEES
12 exams. Then once you have that you can take the 16 hour SE exam.
13

14 Jones: Notes that applicants have come to Alaska for their civil license because they
15 couldn't pass that seismic exam.
16

17 Eriksen: But your point is that NCEES tests for that in their exam already?
18

19 Maynard: the civil structural exam and the structural exam.
20

21 Hale: The basic civil doesn't?
22

23 Maynard: Responds that water resources doesn't, transportation and construction don't.
24

25 Hale: Points out that that was their point that all civil's are required to take the arctic course
26 but not all have had seismic testing.
27

28 Maynard: Asks how many times someone doing water resources does something that will
29 be affected by seismic. Maybe pipelines but they aren't going to be designing buildings.
30 They can but usually they don't. People who are going to do building design are going to
31 take the civil structural or the 16 hour structural.
32

33 Hale: That would be practicing outside their area of expertise.
34

35 Maynard: Which we should be slapping them for if they are going to be doing stuff that they
36 don't know what they are doing. We have earthquakes all the time and I haven't heard of a
37 rash of buildings falling down.
38

39 There was a short discussion on buildings falling down because of things other than
40 earthquakes such as snow loads.
41

42 G. E-mail from Alan Rogers re/continuing education.
43

44 Chair: He would like pro-bono work?
45

46 Jones: He wants it to count as CE. He also thinks that attending Board meetings should
47 count.
48

49 There was a short discussion and it was decided that pro-bono work and attending meetings
50 shouldn't count. It was suggested that being on the Board should count and it was pointed
51 out that our Board policy is that it would not count.
52

53 H. E-mail w/attachments from Colin Smith of APEGBC re licensure mobility.
54

1 Jones: Reports that he and Eric talked with him while he was in Juneau with the PNWER
2 group and that the subject was the same as Neil Windsor promoted. Canada feels that
3 anyone that has been licensed for 8 years and hasn't had any problems should be accepted
4 on their record. However they decline to waive their ethics exam. He also points out that
5 they do not have a Principles and Practice exam like ours. They rely on the University tests
6 and experience to base their license on.
7
8 Someone from Alaska going over there would have, in two provinces, a year to take the
9 exam after licensure in two Provinces and then in BC I think they have 5 years I think. It's in
10 that correspondence.
11
12 Kelly: Informs the Board of an applicant from BC that was applying in Alaska and showed
13 her a 4 inch binder full of work verifications and they turned him down and told him to come
14 back with more documentation. She said it was the most comprehensive work experience
15 verification she had seen she adds that their work experience forms are very detailed.
16
17 Jones: They have an Education Committee that studies their education and an Experience
18 Committee that studies their experience.
19
20 Chair: Points out that they have a large staff to do this.
21
22 Eriksen: Points out that they are asking for a response from us.
23
24 Jones: Adds that their contention is that the exams are different. Theirs is ethics and
25 business practices and ours is on engineering with very little ethics and business practices.
26
27 Eriksen: Indicates that there has been no information to change the position of the Board.
28
29 Maynard: Now if they were willing to be straight across it'd be ok but they are not. We don't
30 have to meet your different requirements but you have to meet our different requirements.
31
32 Eriksen: If we were willing to consider this then that would be a significant point to make.
33
34 Lent: Adds that several Provinces are working with CLARB on this.
35
36 Jones: Another point they make is that their education system and accreditation system far
37 exceeds ABET.
38
39 Eriksen: Adds that if we don't do something they may try another avenue such as going to
40 the Legislature.
41
42 Jones: They already have. They've been talking to Sen. Dyson for years.
43
44 Heieren: Asks what happened to them providing a copy of their exam.
45
46 Jones: Responds that they will not give us the exam but provided a sample of the questions
47 and a syllabus of it.
48
49 Eriksen: They said they couldn't give it to us.
50
51
52 The Board then turned to the syllabus and sample questions and took a few minutes to
53 review them.
54

1 Eriksen: There was another item they brought up last year. An emergency reciprocity thing
2 in the event of a major catastrophe where people could work across borders.

3
4 Jones: Right now they are working with Washington. They are going to have a list of
5 engineers that are pre-licensed in both jurisdictions that can cross the border if there is a
6 major earthquake say in Seattle and they need people to assess structural integrity and stuff
7 like that. There would be a ready supply of engineers to do it. Once they have finalized it
8 with Washington they plan on going to the rest of the western states and Alaska with it.

9
10 It was the position of the Board that their position hasn't changed and that Jones could
11 respond by email.

12
13 Lent: Again notes that CLARB is working with Canada and maybe we could use some of
14 that.

- 15
16 I. Governors' appointments to Boards and Commissions submitted to the
17 Legislature.

18
19 Chair: Congratulates Eric on his re-appointment and notes that Jeff Koonce and John Kerr
20 will be joining us.

21
22 Maynard: Adds that there are two nominees for the landscape architect seat.

23
24 Lent: We had three nominees for landscape architect submitted. I mentioned this last
25 meeting and those nominations went up to the Governor. Yesterday the head of Boards
26 and Commissions Jason Hooley informed me that it was ok to tell the Board that they've
27 selected one of those three, the lady's name is Luanne Urfer. He feels she is the most
28 qualified person in the State as far as landscape architecture is concerned. The Governor
29 still has to make the announcement.

30
31 **Agenda item 14 – Correspondence Sent since November 2012**

32
33 Chair: Notes that both items are responses to items from last meeting.

34
35 **Agenda item 15 – Old Business**

- 36
37 A) Electronic Signatures

38
39 Rearick: Reports that the only thing he has at this point is that at the last NCARB meeting
40 the MBE's are working on some language to address this issue but he doesn't know how far
41 they will go with it.

- 42
43 B) Professional Being regularly employed in an office.

44
45 Schedler: That was mine and Vern did some great work on that and generally I saw that
46 other states require that you be physically in the same office the majority of the time. So, it's
47 really an issue for our discussion as to what direction we want to take and what type of
48 definition we want to lend to that section of the Statute I guess and how we interpret it. I
49 really do think that, I mean people do bridge the gap by having someone physically in their
50 office sign off for them even though someone else electronically is really their day to day
51 contact. Maybe that's ok. So I at least wanted to bring it back for discussion because it
52 seemed quite premature to draft a change to the Statute.

53
54 Chair: Asks how this came up.

1
2 Jones: It was posed by a company that wanted to know if they were going to have to have a
3 PE in every office.
4
5 Maynard: My opinion is yes, because sitting at the same table and looking at the calc's and
6 drawings is a much better way than over the phone. So I think you have to be there at least
7 half the time anyway.
8
9 Hale: We discussed a little bit about field office too and there is a distinction between a
10 branch office and a field office.
11
12 Maynard: Agrees. If you're on a construction site that would be a little different.
13
14 Schedler: I guess the way the conversation went last time was definitely a construction site
15 is different than a remote office. So if you have engineers in a remote office that you're
16 overseeing, I think the example was Anchorage and Wasilla, and you don't have a PE that's
17 in Wasilla 100% of the time, how would those engineers meet their experience requirement.
18 I think that's where the conversation sort of went and we were wondering if our language
19 was old and need to be updated or there should be some percentage. The one example
20 you gave was 60% or some majority of the time someone has to physically be there. Right
21 now ours is being interpreted as 100% of the time.
22
23 Maynard: Asks how the surveyors work. Obviously they are not in the office 100% of the
24 time. They are in the field taking measurements. You don't necessarily have a licensed
25 surveyor on every survey team do you?
26
27 Hale: R&M does. Not everyone but they work out of the Anchorage office so they are back
28 at the Anchorage office at the end of the day so they do work under the direct supervision of
29 a licensed individual. But if we have an office like we do in Fairbanks it's staffed with a
30 licensed individual.
31
32 Schedler: The question as I remember was "is the language antiquated" and should it
33 change?
34
35 Hale: Asks what the specific language is.
36
37 Chair: Reads the portion of the regulation: "Each office maintained for the preparation of
38 drawings, specifications, reports, or other professional work that will require a professional
39 seal must have a registrant assigned to and regularly employed in that office who has direct
40 knowledge and supervisory control of that work."
41
42 Hale: From what I see when firms create offices in new cities or locations they do stock it
43 with one their principles or associates.
44
45 Chair: That's a pretty standard practice.
46
47 Hightower: Asks if strict interpretation of that would preclude employees working at home.
48
49 Chair: Depends on what your definition of office is.
50
51 Hightower: They have a home office and they are producing drawings.
52
53 Schedler: I think it does and I think that's where our conversation started last time. In the
54 age of technology sometimes the direct supervisor PE that's overseeing those calculations

1 and drawings is doing it all remotely.

2
3 Hightower: Asks if there is anything wrong with that.

4
5 Schedler: They would not be able to have that person sign off as any of their responsible
6 charge because they were not in the office.

7
8 Hightower: Then it does preclude it.

9
10 Maynard: They would have to show up at the office at least half of the time.

11
12 The discussion continued for a short period. Some of the points being that the important
13 thing is that a licensed PE is overseeing the work. Another point was that with modern
14 technology the office is expanding electronically. The Board decided to let the language
15 stand and interpret it that a licensed professional had to be in the office more than half of the
16 time and they would continue to track it.

17
18 C) Examination Retakes.

19
20 Walters: Reports that the other states have many different requirements. Some require
21 more education; others require the applicant come before the Board after three tries. He
22 feels that if you don't pass an exam after three tries some additional education or a review
23 course should be required. He feels that would show their commitment to getting their PE
24 and fits in with what the Board's missions is and suggests that after three tries an applicant
25 would have to show that they took a review course or something.

26
27 Maynard: States that ASPE and ASCE both offer PE CE refresher courses but hasn't heard
28 of anybody doing an EE or ME or PS refresher course. Are they in Anchorage or online.

29
30 Eriksen: I know they're online.

31
32 Schedler: The University holds refresher courses. They were recently asking why the
33 numbers for enrollment were so low.

34
35 Walters: Adds that Universities around the country have review courses and that Montana
36 has a great review course and he took it. It's a week long course.

37
38 Hale: Asks if most pass the exam in a couple tries.

39
40 Kelly: We just have a few "frequent flyers".

41
42 Jones: The number of people that take more than five tries to pass is very low. He
43 recommends that it be left at five years or five tries to keep the regulation projects down
44 since that regulation applies to all professions.

45
46 Schedler: Thinks five tries is a little high, I like three maybe. They're missing something
47 and they are just trying to do the same thing over and over.

48
49 Walters: Agrees. I like that idea.

50
51 Heieren: Points out that the Board has had this discussion a couple times already and we
52 just kind of left it alone.

53
54 The Board continued discussing with several conversations going at the same time.

1
2 Eriksen: Asks who is being hurt by someone taking the test 5 or 10 times. How is it
3 impacting negatively?
4

5 Heieren: Adds that what he has seen on the National level is interviewing the candidates
6 and seeing what the problem is. That's one thing this board hasn't done very much is
7 engaging the registrants on a one to one level. He would have like to have seen that more
8 often. When asked what they said he responds that most of them were just poor test takers.
9 They were good engineers and surveyors but that there are people out there that can't take
10 a test.
11

12 Eriksen: Doesn't have problems taking tests but know someone who struggles. They do
13 good work and are very effective and he had known the person in school and they struggled
14 and they are still struggling and can't pass the exam. They take classes before the test,
15 they've tried all of that it's just some anxiety that they develop. That person is not a
16 detriment to the public and if at some point they do pass the test in my mind that person has
17 worked pretty hard to pass that test.
18

19 Schedler: Responds that the negative perception is what she doesn't like. She realizes the
20 numbers are probably very low and has read through the responses provided by Vern. She
21 doesn't like the negative perception of the fact that they can take the exam forever. What
22 does it take to become a licensed engineer, you have to take the test and you can take it
23 forever. That's what I take objection to; I think we should be stronger than that. Say you
24 can take it three times and then, whether it's an interview with the Board, additional
25 education. Then if that person that you speak of had come before the Board and explained
26 that then we would rejoice in his completion of it instead of feeling like what is wrong? Why
27 can't they pass the test? This is that engagement part and would really help everybody.
28

29 Jones: Explains that the reason he said 5 years or 5 tries is because that is a blanket
30 regulation that covers all of our professions. He points out that the architects and landscape
31 architects have a different testing system. They have numerous sections of their test and it
32 takes them awhile to complete it. So if you reduce the number of tries make sure you write it
33 so it is specific to engineers and surveyors.
34

35 Hale: Points out that it's not an easy test and you need to be bright to do it and when you
36 finally do pass, if it took you eight times, it's harder for some people than others. But it still
37 speaks more to the test and the profession that it's not simple.
38

39 Lent: Explains that until they went digital they would provide a red line review. Now they
40 have education programs that show how to take the exam and why it is structured the way it
41 is. He saw this at the last ASLA meeting, it's very good and a move in the right direction.
42

43 Maynard: Asks if the examinees that fail get anything to show their weak areas.
44

45 Chair: Yes they get feedback.
46

47 Walters: Notes that it sounds like when we go to CBT that they will get more feedback and
48 that might cure a lot of the problems. They know where to look for the education or the
49 parts of the test they couldn't pass.
50

51 Maynard: Was looking more along the lines that you have to take a class in the area that
52 you are weak in rather than just a blanket PE refresher course.
53
54

1 Eriksen: Feels that that is a positive approach and would be positive feedback to help those
2 people be more successful. The person he knows has been doing that and wouldn't have a
3 problem with it. That would be more positive than saying five tries and you're out. He adds
4 that we've had discussions on meeting with people in the past too and brings up the
5 possibility of liability due to subjective view points.

6
7 Rearick: Feels that there are two types of people that we are talking about, those that are
8 bad test takers and those that don't know the material. If they don't know the material they
9 ultimately are not going to pass the test. If they are a bad test taker making them learn
10 more about what they already know isn't going to help them pass the test. So I'm of the
11 opinion that it's their responsibility. They need to figure out what they need to do to learn
12 the material or relax how to take tests and I think we should leave it where it is.

13
14 Maynard: Adds that this is a test of minimum competency. We are not trying to weed out
15 weak engineers and give them a license it's the minimum level that you're allowed to go
16 practice. It's difficult but it's not insurmountable or shouldn't be anyway.

17
18 Chair: So by that you should only be given two opportunities.

19
20 Maynard: No we should find a way to help them.

21
22 Hale: If you're going to cut it off at some point you're telling someone who has 10 years of
23 their life invested that you need to go find another profession.

24
25 Maynard: I wouldn't cut them off, I wouldn't mind if they took it 25 times go right ahead but I
26 wouldn't mind having them jump through some other hoops.

27
28 Walters: Offers that maybe we should look into what our statistics are and how many
29 people are affected by this and if it's a problem and not get into anything wild about
30 changing regulations. And as you said we can always ask somebody to come see us and
31 see what's wrong and give them some advice. I assume we can do that. Unless someone
32 has something that they want me to work on, I'll look at it a little bit more but after listening to
33 everybody I don't think we should do a regulation project yet.

34
35 Chair: So, you'll bring us back more information.

36
37 Jones: Adds another dynamic to the discussion in that someone he knows has taken the
38 test a time or two and failed because they just don't have the time to study. They have
39 small children and want to spend the time raising them. Once they are up and out of the
40 house they will probably take and pass the exam.

41 42 **Agenda item 16 – New Business**

43 44 A. Sealing of documents by exempt licensees.

45
46 Chair: Reminds the Board that John talked about this yesterday and we will hold off on
47 finalizing anything pending the current legislation we're trying to get passed.

48
49 Maynard: You seem to have two things here. One is residential designs and the other is the
50 house inspections. I'm assuming that on residential designs, at least as per MOA, you don't
51 have to stamp those you just have to say you did the design and the drawings are in
52 accordance with your design. But if you do stamp it then it has to meet the standard of care
53 period. With house inspections the reason we had the exemption of architects and
54 engineers is so you could do architecture or engineering related to a house or do an

1 inspection of a house not that an architect can go do a mechanical or electrical inspection
2 on a house. It's not so any licensee can go do the entire thing. You are supposed to be
3 limited to what your license covers which is why you stamp it. Ok, I did the structural
4 inspection of this house and this is the result. If you've got a whole bunch of stuff about the
5 mechanical system and the electrical system then you're acting outside of your discipline
6 and you should have your hand slapped.

7
8 Chair: And that raises the whole issue of you are exempt.

9
10 Maynard: From the house inspection requirement, not from practicing outside your license.
11 You do not have to be licensed as a home inspector to do inspection on a house but you are
12 limited to what your license allows you to do.

13
14 Chair: But you are exempt.

15
16 Maynard: From being a licensed house inspector. It doesn't say you can do a complete
17 house inspection. He can do the electrical and I can do the structural inspection. I can't do
18 the electrical inspection just because it says I don't have to be license as a home inspector.

19
20 Chair: Well there are some people that would disagree with you.

21
22 Maynard: I was there when they passed the bill and that was the intent.

23
24 Chair: Practicing individuals I'm saying. That's why this issue has come up and we're going
25 to continue to track it.

26
27 B. Seismic requirement for civil and structural engineers.

28
29 Chair: We've already discussed.

30
31 C. Policy re when applicants are considered in the system for licensure.

32
33 Heieren: I submitted a proposed policy for implementation of tables to clarify the practice of
34 accommodating folks that are trying to get under the wire.

35
36 **On a motion duly made by Heieren, seconded by Hale and passed unanimously it was**
37 **RESOLVED to adopt the attached policy regarding qualifying for the FS and PS tables**
38 **for June 2014.**

39
40 If a person applies for the Fundamentals of Land Surveying Examination before July
41 1, 2014 and meets 75% of the requirements of one of the Classifications listed under "12
42 AAC 36.064.(2)(A) – Table A of Education and Work Experience Requirements for
43 Fundamentals of Land Surveying Examination" that person shall be considered in the
44 system and shall be allowed to use "12 AAC 36.065.(2)(A) – Table A of Education and Work
45 Experience Requirements for Professional Land Surveyors" for a period up to five years
46 beyond July 1, 2014.

47
48 Chair: States that we just went through the whole two year process of changing the
49 education tables and now you're going to give them some slack?

50
51 Heieren: It was always intended that there would be some accommodation.
52 Implementation of the regulation was at an accelerated pace because it had languished so
53 long. It was never intended to disqualify persons who actually fall under the old table and
54 this actually will suit that individual who is attempting to become registered and still qualify

1 under the old tables.

2

3 Chair: Notes that the regulation says for application on or before July1, 2014 and asks if
4 they are further clarifying that?

5

6 Jones: What he is saying is that the FS application qualifies them for that. They don't
7 necessarily have to submit a PS application. Once they apply to take the FS they are under
8 the old rules.

9

10 Discussion continued for a short period with the result that the motion passed.

11

12 10:10 Chair calls for a 5 minute break, be back at 10:15.

13

14 10:15 Back on Record.

15

16 Chair: Introduces Don Habeger Director of CBPL to the board. He then asks Jones to give
17 an update on upcoming travel and travel we may not be able to use.

18

19 Jones: We have two requests in right now, one for NCARB and one for CLARB pending
20 approval. Sara said she has forwarded them on up, they're for Out of State so they've got
21 go all the way.

22

23 Chair: Is that funded by us or funded by.....

24

25 Jones: Funded by us. We cannot use the funded delegate program until the travel policy is
26 changed. Right now if anybody travels the State has to pay for it.

27

28 Habeger: That is correct. Mr. Chair if I may I'll just kind of explain that process so you're
29 aware of it. Perhaps in my ignorance, when I was new, I was offsetting the expenses
30 initially with what the State calls third party reimbursements. So if an association is willing to
31 underwrite airfare or underwrite lodging I would take that off on the expense side before we
32 even put in the request. It was brought to my attention recently that that was in violation of
33 State policy. The policy that was hammered out, I understand, in the mid 90's was that it is
34 responsible use of public money to show all expenses. So when it was brought to my
35 attention that we have to show expenses including travel even if it's going to be reimbursed
36 it has to follow this procedure that we show all expenses, as a State organization we pay for
37 all travel up front. If there are reimbursements we are to collect those and they are
38 essentially deposited into the General Fund. So from a Board's perspective you have a
39 direct expense, you don't get recognized on your Board, if you will, revenue expense sheet
40 with corresponding revenue. That discussion has your concern over that issue, and when I
41 say your, I mean many of the Board's have brought a fairness question before me saying
42 that doesn't sound fair to us. That has generated additional discussion and right now we are
43 still in that discussion phase on how to solve that for, if you will, an enterprise Board like
44 yourself.

45

46 Maynard: Asks who the person at the Department of Administration who's in charge of that
47 policy so we can get the Legislators to talk to them specifically about getting that changed.
48 Or would it be possible to say ok this person is traveling and the expense is being paid by
49 the dues we've already paid that's how travel is being paid. So it is an expense but this how
50 we are doing it, we paid NCARB to do the travel. They are paying the airfare and hotel but
51 we paid them to arrange the travel. Is that a way around that? Because we are paying for
52 it.

53

54 Habeger: Right. Yes I think there is. Do I know the specifics at this point in time? I do not,

1 however, I can let you know that I was asked to attend a meeting with some
2 Representatives over this issue. We discussed each of our positions and we think there's a
3 budget fix to that and because, well it's on the House side and one member from the House
4 Finance Committee was there in that meeting as well as another member who is very
5 sensitive to Board issues. In this case the CPA Board has been talking to him. We think it's
6 a budgetary fix and if the language is circling that which is used in the budget bill it may give
7 us that additional authority to return it back as an offset. It'll be a Legislative maneuver if
8 you will.

9
10 Jones: Asks about direct pay like the NCEES funded delegate program where they pay
11 everything up front.

12
13 Habeger: You have one out of three as I recall that are holding that position. It doesn't
14 sound like the Department of Administration is changing that policy. Recently Commissioner
15 Hultberg wrote a letter to a request that is right on this topic to the Board of Nursing and it
16 said that they are going to continue to follow policy which means that Departments and
17 Divisions under them follow that policy. It could be that that one instance will have to
18 continue to use State policy and hopefully the association will come to our way of thinking.

19
20 Chair: Asks who the board should write a letter to about an exception to the policy.

21
22 Habeger: That's the Department of Administration so that's Commissioner Hultberg.

23
24 Chair: So we would have to ask permission through the Department of Administration to
25 attend the meeting as a funded delegate because it's in violation of State policy to be funded
26 by an organization?

27
28 Habeger: Yes. I feel that in my position I need to follow State policy and the Department of
29 Administration is in control of that part of our policy so as a good soldier I'm walking that
30 line.

31
32 Chair: I'm considering taking the tact of just asking for an exception not a change to the
33 policy for this specific instance. Because we have a couple of meetings coming up, one in
34 April that we've already paid for through dues that we are not going to be able to take
35 advantage of.

36
37 Habeger: I thought we wrote a letter asking for a reduction in dues.

38
39 Jones: NCARB is the only one that so far that has said that their dues are designed to
40 cover travel. NCEES says they don't consider that we just think it's important enough that
41 we pay for attendance. So the argument that our dues are paying for it won't stand up.

42
43 Hightower: Asks if it has been explained to the decision makers that if we pay for it and we
44 can't do it and we're wasting money. It's kind of basic, do they understand that?

45
46 Habeger: Wasting money probably depends on your point of view. From the State's
47 perspective, with the exception of this one group which sounds like an anomaly the State is
48 recouping some of that travel dollar. The problem for the Boards is that it is going into the
49 General Fund.

50
51 Hightower: But if we don't take the trip it doesn't come back to the State. So here's some
52 money for a trip but we aren't going to take it.

53
54 Heieren: They don't refund the money.

1
2 Habeger: I understand our Professional Licensees position. I'm not discussing your
3 position verses mine; I'm just saying that I'm following the rules as I've been told to follow
4 them.

5
6 Eriksen: Understands the position of the Division but adds that maybe we don't understand
7 the perspectives that are driving the State policy. In our mind it seems pretty cut and dried
8 why there should be a change but there must be other reasons we may not see or
9 understand and maybe helping us understand those would have some effect.

10
11 Habeger: Yes. Maybe I didn't talk about this clearly enough. In the 90's the State made a
12 decision that it was very important that the public understood every expense that each of the
13 agencies were spending. So, if travel was to happen the full cost of that travel for an agency
14 was on the books, was public, everybody could look at that. The difficulty that seems to
15 have arisen is that Professional Licensing Boards are somewhat of an anomaly. It is your
16 fees are being used to underwrite travel for example. We have this third party
17 reimbursement issue that we've just now discussed and getting an offset on the revenue
18 side is important to you all but the State's system, which is one shoe fits all doesn't
19 necessarily, isn't tailored from your perspective enough to meet your needs. That
20 discussion is happening as I mentioned. And there is a secondary issue. The issue is just
21 authority. If you will, your licensing fees cover the travel. Anytime that I get additional
22 licensing fees it goes into, if you will, the savings account. And at some point in time if
23 you're overpaying for your expenses, for example, you get it back in a licensing fee or we
24 just don't increase those at a future date and your expenses catch up and use that surplus.
25 One of the problems is that the Legislature says I can spend X amount of dollars. They give
26 me a travel budget, in this case \$403K total to spend in that line item and that's my
27 appropriation, by Law I can't spend \$404K or \$550K which we believe is the real figure to
28 send all the Boards, all the professionals to the in state and out of state travel. The
29 Administration made that request last year for \$550K for travel. The Legislature, in their
30 wisdom, cut that down and funded us at \$403K. I have to now figure out how get you where
31 you need to go based on those limited resources. The discussion, as I just mentioned, was
32 once again held with a member of the House Finance Committee and I suggest if you want
33 to go leverage that discussion you might want to talk to the good Representative from
34 Fairbanks, Representative Thompson he was at that meeting. He understands the Boards
35 arguments here. It is clear to me that some Boards members have already talked to him
36 and it maybe opportunity for you and your associations to continue that discussion just to
37 see if we can move that dial.

38
39 Eriksen: Asks if it would be fair to say that some of the priorities the Administration has
40 would be transparency and the perception that the operations of the Board are very public
41 and a secondary thing is budgetary. When you started off I felt that transparency and
42 funding of the Board is what protection is of the policy.

43
44 Habeger: Absolutely correct that is the right interpretation. Again, we are a subset of an
45 entire State organization and the policy was made in the mid 90's for that transparency.

46
47 Eriksen: Feels that it's more of a transparency question than a budget question. I'm sure it
48 is that too but it seems like the higher priority is transparency.

49
50 Habeger: Appreciate the question. I think they're probably parallel. One fix is a budgetary
51 fix and based on what I understand is being said at the budgetary level it sounds like if one
52 fix comes it's possible that the other fix will follow, it will naturally fall into place.

53
54 Rearick: Has some confusion on how we approach some of this travel. One would be

1 where we are representing the State and would be paid for by the State. The other would
2 be where we are on a committee and the way the committee does that is they fund it
3 completely and the way I heard things yesterday it sounds like if you did that then you need
4 to report that as a gift. But because it's not Board business it's the committee business, it
5 wouldn't be run through the State reimbursement process.

6
7 Habeger: A couple of issues. If you are traveling on behalf of the Board. The State
8 considers you, in that responsibility, a state employee. So if you're representing the Board
9 you ask for travel through the Division. In so far as you're traveling from the day you leave
10 to the day you get back you're sort of a state employee. Certain benefits, if you will,
11 insurances kind of cover you for that travel. If you're an interested professional in an
12 association meeting and you don't come under our umbrella and you're advocating for your
13 profession, to a degree the State doesn't care, you're on your own.

14
15 Rearick: Those types of committee meetings NCARB doesn't recognize us as a Board
16 Member. We are not there representing the Board, we're doing NCARB business or
17 NCEES or whatever but then that brings me to my next conundrum. And that's with the
18 Westcarb Regional meeting that's coming up I'm also on the Westcarb Executive
19 Committee. They would fund me completely but what we have here is for me to travel to
20 Westcarb as a delegate for the State. So I guess my question is, if I wasn't voting on any of
21 the resolutions could I still travel as an Executive Committee member through funding with
22 Westcarb not representing the State, by just representing that committee?

23
24 Habeger: The answer is yes you could travel if, for example the Board didn't send you.
25 You're not on that travel request that you tell me you're going to do. You're representing
26 your profession, you have a keen interest in it and you want to make sure your profession
27 heads in the right direction and that's why you're involved. If you're traveling under those
28 circumstances and you're not a true representative of the Board you're on your own. Now,
29 there is another part of this and this is where the ethics question comes in. Could there be a
30 link between a decision you make on you're going to stay with the organization at the Board
31 level, any of that kind of thing. There could be. Could there be a perception that because
32 your receiving travel to do something professionally, yes it could be perceived that it could
33 change your decision on a matter pertaining to that association at the Board level. If that is
34 the case it would behoove you to fill out one of those ethics reports and just say, you know
35 what, I went to this meeting, I represented my profession and they paid for it. That's the
36 purpose of the ethics report, to tell the public and your fellow Board Members that this
37 happened, I don't believe it will affect my decisions in the future, but you know about it. It's
38 just full disclosure.

39
40 Maynard: Asks how much the Division requested?

41
42 Habeger: \$550K.

43
44 Maynard: And that was based on us having the 50K that's in our budget?

45
46 Habeger: When I tallied, again going to that annual report. Each year you'll say this is our
47 need. I pullout that travel section. I have staff add it up for me. And if I look at that, you all
48 together are saying that we need \$550K to make all of our in State and Out of State travel
49 happen.

50
51 Maynard: I was just wondering how much of that \$550K was ours.

52
53 Habeger: Around \$91K.

54

1 Chair: Asks if we can get an accounting of the \$3.7M indirect costs that we pay 10% of as
2 discussed yesterday with Sara and Misty and he believes it would be helpful to the Boards
3 to see an accounting of that. He adds that Sara and Misty had indicated it would take a
4 substantial amount of effort to provide that information. The total is there so it's getting
5 tallied somehow.

6
7 Maynard: Explains that we just want something like the Dept of Admin charged this much
8 for lights, heat, health insurance etc. and the Commissioner's Office charges the Division
9 this much etc. So at least we know where that is coming from.

10
11 Habeger: There was a kind of an overview breakdown. One of the other professional
12 boards had asked for that. Have you seen that document?

13
14 Chair: We have the one in our Board Packet that talked about the reason for the increase,
15 the \$850K increase. But it didn't go into any detail

16
17 Habeger: And you want additional information.

18
19 Maynard: I think they said \$1.8M came from the Dept of Administration but with no
20 explanation what that was for.

21
22 Chair: Our concern is that it increased 25%. It went up \$100K for our Board yet we are
23 being told our travel need to stay cut. So a cost we can control has to stay the same and we
24 can't do anything about but a cost we can't control is just, here's your bill, pay it and there's
25 no accounting for that to the Boards. Your saying here's what we're spending your money
26 on. It's essentially our members' money that covers that indirect cost.

27
28 Eriksen: I think it raises a transparency question for us. (Laughter) I think we are just
29 concerned that we may be subsidizing other things that are going on and we don't
30 understand.

31
32 Habeger: I appreciate the question. As I've gone through, you know, the budgets, and what
33 not, there are certain things that we're required to, if you will, chip into. That \$1.8M is
34 Department of Administration. I consider them the 10th floor. But the HR system and you
35 could look at that through records, you could look at that through disciplinary projects, the
36 Union contract. You are helping support the 10th floor so that's where that cost is. I have
37 talked to their Deputy Commissioner and I said we really could use a breakdown so that my
38 Boards know what all is going into that and I'm still hoping I get additional information. But
39 HR and all it consumes is our share of that \$1.8M. Further, we all get to support our senior
40 management i.e. the Commissioner Office. So you've got this various strata, to pin that
41 down in its entirety, not at the paper clip level but at least at the section level, how much is
42 actually going to HR, how much is going to centralized computer processing? I can't give
43 you that detail.

44
45 Eriksen: Thinks there are two questions and that he thinks we would see that one portion
46 has a red flag to it that shows that is where the growth is coming from. The next question is
47 are we bearing a fair burden compared to other boards. He asks how it is divided among
48 the Boards.

49
50 Habeger: Some of the cost drivers for this year are in-specific. The State has an interesting
51 way of doing business, for example, if I make a decision, which I did recently, to upgrade
52 office equipment, an interesting way of handling that. So we went through a capital
53 expenditure. It has a relatively long service life and the best way I know how to explain it is
54 if you walk around the ninth floor and you look at our section compared to, the States kind of

1 moved to upgrade equipment. I affectionately refer to our side as the slum because our
2 equipment is 30 years old. In fact it's old enough I can't replace it. So as I look at the
3 Division and make decisions on where to upgrade, we did make a recent upgrade, in our
4 investigations section. We decided to do that first. What I didn't know at the time in making
5 that decision is that capital improvements, I cannot amortize like a normal business would. I
6 cannot take the cost of that off the useful life. So unfortunately it hits the books all at once.
7 It was a significant chunk of change, a couple hundred thousand. In hindsight I probably
8 erred in that decision on one hand but on the other hand, should you take care of your
9 employees and give them a decent work space, I think so. Was it time to buy new
10 equipment after 30 years, I think so. So, we made that investment, however, that hits the
11 books all at once and it becomes an immediate increase. That's part of my learning cycle,
12 part of the pain.

13
14 Hale: Thinks everyone understands the need for overhead costs but what we don't see is it
15 doesn't go to our mission, it doesn't directly relate to our mission whereas the travel we do
16 does. We're trying to figure out a way to perform our mission and a huge part of that is
17 travel, going down and seeing how other people do it. So, we're just looking for ways to
18 make that happen.

19
20 Habeger: I will be very direct then. If you would send your association folks that are
21 working the hill, you might want to have a conversation with Representative Hawker and
22 Representative Thompson.

23
24 Heieren: We did.

25
26 Maynard: We also had a conversation with Representative Costello's staff.

27
28 Habeger: Excellent. I think we made some break through on this issue with the
29 Representatives I mentioned.

30
31 Chair: Thanks Mr. Habeger for his time.

32
33 A short discussion regarding how the costs are allocated and how much our share is and
34 how it is determined. It was also pointed out that while we only have 1/6 of an investigator
35 we paid 11% of the costs to remodel their spaces.

36 37 **Agenda item 18 – Board Travel**

38
39 Jones: Asks who can go to Western Zone. Hanson and Hale will be able to go.

40
41 A discussion on travel restrictions ensued. Requests are already in and pending for NCARB
42 regional and CLARB Spring meeting both in March.

43
44 Maynard: Asks Vern to send him an email re how the different organizations deal with
45 travel.

46
47 The discussion regarding travel continued. It was decided to write a letter to the Department
48 of Administration asking for a change in the travel policy or an exemption for this Board to
49 allow use of the funded delegate program. Point was made that the policy was probably put
50 in place because they have the perception that these organizations are lobbying the Board
51 for something when it's actually the other way around. They are providing services to us. It
52 was suggested that we ask if we put all travel through the approval process and let them
53 know who is paying for it and what the benefit to the State of Alaska is and that would meet
54 the ethical requirements. Give them solutions to the problem. Provide more detail on the

1 benefit to the State. It was noted that this Board has multiple professions and that it is the
2 biggest member wise and fourth in licensees.

3
4
5 Chair: Will draft the letter.

6
7 **Agenda item 19 – Board Elections.**

8
9 **On a motion duly made by Hightower, seconded by Heieren and passed unanimously**
10 **it was RESOLVED to nominate new board officers for the following positions: Board**
11 **Chair – Eric Eriksen; vice Chair – Richard Rearick; Secretary – Don Shiesl.**

12
13 Chair: Congratulates the nominees and adds that their term of office will start August 1st.

14
15 **Agenda item 20 – Special Committees.**

16
17 Licensure Implementation:

18
19 There was a discussion on whether or not a civil license should be required before a
20 structural license. The structural engineering societies recommend it and all the Western
21 States require it. Point was made that in order for licensees to get comity with the other
22 Western States our requirements need to be the same as theirs. It was noted that some
23 states require a structural license on hazardous or essential facilities. Some states it's
24 schools and hospitals, some states it's by size or importance. Some states require a
25 structural on any building.

26
27 Chair: Asked Maynard what his recommendation was.

28
29 Maynard: I recommend that a structural license be post civil.

30
31 Chair: Asked if this would muddy the waters regarding the grandfathering presently allowed.

32
33 Maynard: Responds that by the time any regulation was approved the grandfathering
34 regulation would have expired. Maynard asks if the Board is in favor of that type of change.

35
36 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Rearick and passed unanimously it**
37 **was RESOLVED to initiate a regulation project to make SE a post CE license.**

38
39 Eriksen: Points out that this may go against what we have been telling everyone that they
40 can continue to practice as they have been.

41
42 Maynard: Responds that that would only happen if we limit the types of structures a civil
43 can design. We can make it post civil without any limitations. He asks how the Board wants
44 him to proceed.

45
46 Rearick: Would rather not make any limitations at this time. The Board agrees.

47
48 Maynard: Points out that municipalities or other agencies can make their requirement more
49 stringent.

50
51 Registration and Practice.

52
53 Hightower: Advises that this is concerning the legislation we are trying to get through. For
54 the next couple months we will probably be busy testifying and providing the sponsors aids

1 with information. He will continue to do that through March 1st I guess. He doesn't mind
2 coordinating with them after that and with Colin calling on folks to testify. If they need more
3 data I will put it together as long as the Board asks me to.

4
5 Mining Engineering/Geologists.

6
7 No report.

8
9 Changes to 12 AAC 36.068 and timing of such changes (LARE)

10
11 Lent: Reports that the first digital exam has been given. He adds that a presentation at his
12 ASLA meeting reported that it was superior to the written exam and that there would be no
13 red lines reviews.

14
15 Since this change was public noticed and the Board will sign an adoption order at this
16 meeting this committee is discontinued.

17
18 TWIST Program.

19
20 Heieren: Reports that NCEES did fund the program. \$25K matching funds for sending
21 people to a Teaching with Spatial Technology, it's kind of an introduction to surveying, to
22 middle and high school teachers.

23
24 Hale: Reports that ASPLS is matching funds and sending two delegates, one is the chair of
25 the geomatics program at UAA the other is a West High math teacher. The idea is for the
26 UAA chair to learn all about it then he can do classes up here to train more teachers.

27
28 Heieren: NCEES is concerned with the falling numbers of test takers and this is one of the
29 programs they've looked at to try and help that.

30
31 Hale: Will get those applications in after this meeting and hopes there will be enough
32 interest in the program.

33
34 **Standing Committees.**

35
36 Investigative Advisory Committee.

37
38 Several members reported calls from the investigator regarding complaints.

39
40 Heieren: Asks if Hightower can continue to provide guidance to the investigator after his
41 term on the Board expires.

42
43 Jones: Reads the Board policy passed at the last meeting allowing the investigator to call
44 on former Board Members at his discretion. He also advises that since they are not Board
45 members they may not be indemnified from civil suits.

46
47 Guidance Manual.

48
49 Lent: Asks when 12 AAC 36.068 is going to be approved.

50
51 Jones: It was adopted by the Board yesterday and will be sent to Law next then it will go to
52 the Lt. Governor or they will send it back to us.

53
54 Lent: Asks if everyone read his report. He corrects under item 1. Revisions to 36.040 and

1 36.050 regarding, enter the words, engineering and landscape architecture applications. He
2 then brings up the addition of the chart Colin prepared on engineering education that are
3 acceptable for each branch of engineering. He points out that the people that use the
4 Guidance Manual are those that do building and planning. He asks if this should be in the
5 manual.

6
7 Maynard: Doesn't mind if it's not in the Guidance Manual as long as it's someplace where
8 applicants can access it.

9
10 Jones: It's in the Board Policy document.

11
12 Maynard: Asks if it is on the website.

13
14 Jones: yes.

15
16 Maynard: Indicates that that is acceptable.

17
18 Legislative Liaison.

19
20 Chair: Points out that we have a lot going on and encourages everyone to testify when they
21 can and write letters of support.

22
23 Hightower: Will keep everyone informed on how many they want to testify.

24
25 Emeritus Status.

26
27 Jones: Points out that there is a report from Brownfield on his NCEES LE committee
28 meeting.

29
30 Heieren: Asks the Board to ask NCEES for emeritus status so he can continue his
31 committee assignments.

32
33 **On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it**
34 **was RESOLVED to ask NCEES to grant Richard Heieren emeritus status for a period**
35 **of two years.**

36
37 Budget Committee.

38
39 Shiesl: Just the shocker that the whole travel issue is just a policy; it's not a legislative
40 mandate.

41
42 Continuing Education.

43
44 No report.

45
46 IDP Liaison.

47
48 Rearick: The only thing is that blackout dates for the ARE in August of this year.

49
50 **Agenda item 22 – National meeting reports.**

51
52 A) NCARB MBC/MBE meeting in Boston, MA

53
54 Rearick: He reported that military licenses were mentioned. It was recommended that

1 states have some equivalency requirements so that unqualified individuals would not be
2 licensed. They looked at electronic seals and will have more info at the National meeting
3 this summer. NCARB completed its practice analysis and will start rolling out the results in
4 modules. He mentions a data sharing program with three states piloted by NCARB. He isn't
5 sure what data they are sharing but it's more intense than just the disciplinary database.
6 The top three executives of NCARB and AIA meet twice a year. Some of the issues they
7 discuss are CE and the definition of welfare. They are developing better language for
8 license re-activation requirements for the Model Law and addressing CE requirements for
9 re-activation. He worked on some of that with the education committee. They have a power
10 point for the path to architect on the website now. They had a long discussion on the term
11 welfare. He's finding that their definition is more building oriented so it may not fit our
12 regulations. He is involved in that committee and they have developed a draft and it's gone
13 to the Board. Their round table discussions produced talking points that NCARB will discuss
14 at the National Conference. It was a good meeting mostly NCARB trying to find out from the
15 MBE's and Chairs what the issues are.

16
17 **Agenda item 23 – Licensing Examiners report.**

18
19 Kelly: Gives her report containing graphs showing the October NCEES Candidate Survey
20 Results and the increase in applications each February since 2010.

21
22 **Agenda item 24 – Board Tasks.**

23
24 Eric: Software engineering research - done.

25
26 Hale: Working on Ethics Regulation and a flow chart for disciplinary action.

27
28 Hanson: Will send Chambers a letter requesting that the travel policy be changed. Forward
29 ethics reports. Letter re 13g – no CE credit for board meeting. Letter to DA re member
30 societies. Letter to NCEES re emeritus status.

31
32 Hightower: Statute project done and ready to submit to the Legislature. It will need to be
33 tracked.

34
35 Lent: 12 AAC 36.068 is done. The Guidance Manual is ongoing.

36
37 Maynard: Didn't get the letter to the Governor but will copy him on the letter to the
38 Legislators. Still working on the civil license/structural regulation project. Send Vern the
39 seismic info. Letter to DA.

40
41 Rearick: Send Vern the seismic info. Regulation project on 12 AAC 36.185(f) still pending.

42
43 Schedler: 36.185c is done at this point.

44
45 Walters: Will get more details on exam re-takes and report back.

46
47 Jones: All from last meeting done. Email task list to Board. Respond to 13d. Regulation
48 project for CBT.

49
50 Savage: Provide sanction guidelines at May meeting.

51
52 Chair: Called Harley and Richard H. up front and presented each with a certificate of
53 appreciation for his service on the Board. He then excused Heieren from the rest of the
54 meeting to catch a plane.

1
2 **Agenda item 25 – Read applications into the record.**

3
4 **On a motion duly made by Rearick, seconded by Eriksen and passed unanimously it**
5 **was RESOLVED to find the following list of applicants for registration incomplete with**
6 **the stipulation that the information in the applicant files will take precedence over the**
7 **information in the minutes.**

8
9 *The subsequent terms and abbreviations will be understood to signify the following*
10 *meanings:*

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

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

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

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

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

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

18 JQ refers to the Jurisprudence Questionnaire.

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

20

Germiller, Jr., Richard J.	Surveyor	Comity	Incomplete - pending 30 sem credit hours in Surveying; verification of exams
Metcalf, III, Charles H.	Surveyor	Comity	Incomplete - pending 18 semester hours of survey coursework; & AKLS
Diedrich, Timothy James	Civil Engineer	Exam	
Wilke, Nathan D.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending 17 months experience exam; & transcripts
Presler, Wendy A.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending 20 months experience; exam; & transcripts; JQ
Bradshaw, Travis	Civil Engineer	Exam	Incomplete - pending 20 months experience; exam; & JQ
Andersen, Stephen R.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Incomplete - if BS Civil, transcrips; if not Civil ver of additional 5 mos experience.
Wayne, John D.	Surveyor	Comity	Incomplete - pending Investigations;

			verification of exams & registration; & AKLS
Emerson, Matthew R.	SE	G'fthr	Incomplete - pending drawings & calcs for Chena project

1
2
3
4
5
6

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

Afoa, Savannah Lee	FE	Exam	Approved
Amundsen, Grace	FE	Exam	Approved
Armstrong, Jessica K.	FE	Exam	Approved
Bang, Charles	FE	Exam	Approved
Baus, Brian	FE	Exam	Approved
Beede, Marc Curtis	FE	Exam	Approved
Boman, Wade	FE	Exam	Approved
Bontrager, Rebecca Erin	FE	Exam	Approved
Borade, Chaitanya	FE	Exam	Approved
Bridgman, Eric Wayne	FE	Exam	Approved
Chamberlain, Andrew	FE	Exam	Approved
Choummittaphan, Sean	FE	Exam	Approved
Clausen, Elliot	FE	Exam	Approved
Conlon, Jordann	FE	Exam	Approved
Daley, J. Doss	FE	Exam	Approved
Debrah, Aaron	FE	Exam	Approved
Deng, Chengyu	FE	Exam	Approved
Dolena, Jeffrey	FE	Exam	Approved
Drake, Johnathan	FE	Exam	Approved
Dunn, Margaret J.	FE	Exam	Approved
Ellingson, Dalton	FE	Exam	Approved
Engstrom, Daniel G.	FE	Exam	Approved
Fernando, Milca	FE	Exam	Approved
Filippova, Anastasia	FE	Exam	Approved
Fitzpatrick, Devon	FE	Exam	Approved
France, Carlton H.	FE	Exam	Approved
Gallagher, Andrew	FE	Exam	Approved
Gallardo, Patricia Joy	FE	Exam	Approved
George, Nicholas	FE	Exam	Approved
Gilbert, Lindsay	FE	Exam	Approved
Graham, Walter	FE	Exam	Approved
Gremley, Nicholas S.	FE	Exam	Approved
Gwynn, James J.S.	FE	Exam	Approved
Hall, Scott	FE	Exam	Approved
Hann, Jason Howard	FE	Exam	Approved

Hansen, Derek	FE	Exam	Approved
Harris, Samantha	FE	Exam	Approved
Hopkins, Heather	FE	Exam	Approved
Hovda, Gerry	FE	Exam	Approved
Huang, Jian	FE	Exam	Approved
Hunner, Joseph David	FE	Exam	Approved
Jack, Jesse Ryan	FE	Exam	Approved
Jenson, Sean Roth	FE	Exam	Approved
Johnson, Christopher Emile	FE	Exam	Approved
Jones, Adam	FE	Exam	Approved
Kellie, Nicholas	FE	Exam	Approved
Kerin, Elizabeth	FE	Exam	Approved
Kirk, Timothy John	FE	Exam	Approved
Klatt, William Allan	FE	Exam	Approved
Kornfield, Tyler Stanton	FE	Exam	Approved
Kosmin, Petr	FE	Exam	Approved
Krylo, Matthew	FE	Exam	Approved
Kurfessa, Ebisso	FE	Exam	Approved
Lauritzen, Benjamin Michael	FE	Exam	Approved
Li, Lin	FE	Exam	Approved
Liu, Qingquan	FE	Exam	Approved
Liu, Yupei	FE	Exam	Approved
Lower, Diana Catherine	FE	Exam	Approved
Maase, Afshan	FE	Exam	Approved
Matteson, Ian	FE	Exam	Approved
McIntosh, Samuel	FE	Exam	Approved
McNamara, Kil	FE	Exam	Approved
Melvin, Graham B.	FE	Exam	Approved
Michel, Scott	FE	Exam	Approved
Milhoan, Benjamin	FE	Exam	Approved
Milke, Shaun M.	FE	Exam	Approved
Netardus, John Jaro	FE	Exam	Approved
Nicolazzo, Jillian	FE	Exam	Approved
Niedermeyer, James K.	FE	Exam	Approved
Njie, Isatou Bantang	FE	Exam	Approved
O'Connor, Francis J., II	FE	Exam	Approved
Ortega, Simon	FE	Exam	Approved
Pasilan, Emesjoy	FE	Exam	Approved
Pence, Steven	FE	Exam	Approved
Pender, Dorothy Ann	FE	Exam	Approved
Porreca, Samantha S.	FE	Exam	Approved
Posma, Allen Michael	FE	Exam	Approved
Reed, Jordan	FE	Exam	Approved
Richeson, Paul	FE	Exam	Approved
Riley, Mark A.	FE	Exam	Approved

Riley, William Gelber	FE	Exam	Approved
Saqib, Najmus	FE	Exam	Approved
Schriver, Kevin	FE	Exam	Approved
Schultz, Jacob	FE	Exam	Approved
Seibold, Hunter	FE	Exam	Approved
Sinook, Ralph	FE	Exam	Approved
Slone, Maxwell Alexander	FE	Exam	Approved
Smith, Lilan	FE	Exam	Approved
Smith, Caleb P.	FE	Exam	Approved
Spuler, Penne	FE	Exam	Approved
Swetzof, Nathan	FE	Exam	Approved
Sy, Kristine	FE	Exam	Approved
Taiwo, Olajide	FE	Exam	Approved
Teune, Joel	FE	Exam	Approved
Titus, Mitchell Patrick	FE	Exam	Approved
Trainor Ponchione, Shanti	FE	Exam	Approved
Tweet, Darell	FE	Exam	Approved
Walker, Bernard	FE	Exam	Approved
Wang, Kai	FE	Exam	Approved
Wardell, Ty	FE	Exam	Approved
Wasserman, Robert	FE	Exam	Approved
Webb, Colin	FE	Exam	Approved
Wheeler, Tanya	FE	Exam	Approved
White, Justin Hunter	FE	Exam	Approved
White, Sava	FE	Exam	Approved
Wiehe, Christopher	FE	Exam	Approved
Woolfolk, Samuel	FE	Exam	Approved
Worth Allison Marie	FE	Exam	Approved
Woster, Scott Daniel	FE	Exam	Approved
Wu, Ruonan	FE	Exam	Approved
Wuestenfeld, Matthew William	FE	Exam	Approved
Yang, Xuanyu	FE	Exam	Approved
Zajac, Christopher	FE	Exam	Approved
Zajac, Kristine L.	FE	Exam	Approved
Zhang, Mingyan	FE	Exam	Approved
Zheng, Toutian	FE	Exam	Approved
Zrebiec, Joseph Tyler	FE	Exam	Approved
Brady, John Patrick	FS	Exam	Approved
Cerney, Eric James	FS	Exam	Approved
Erickson, Mark A.	FS	Exam	Approved
Hipsak, Stacy	FS	Exam	Approved

Johnston, Jeff David	FS	Exam	Approved
Knight, Thomas	FS	Exam	Approved
Lujan, Joseph Edward	FS	Exam	Approved
Moore, Taylor Maxwell	FS	Exam	Approved
Burgin, Bryant James	FS	Exam	Approved
Johnson, Carey Acts	FS	Exam	??
PE's, PS's	Arch's		
Kim, Grace H.	Architect	Comity	Approved
Salazar, Sarah N.	Architect	Comity	Approved
Sharp, Mark F.	Architect	Comity	Approved
Dyer, Noah Francis	Chemical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Bonn, Eric E.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Emerson, James David	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Kehrer, Kelly S.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Mereszczak, Yuri S.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Roth, Grant J.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Smith, Brian D.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Van Patten, Matthew	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Willnecker, Brandon C.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved
Rader, Robin J.	Control Systems	G'fthr	Approved
Lin, Join-Wei Aipo	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Fitch, Paul Madison	Environmental Engineer	Comity	Approved
Burrough, Ben M.	Fire Protection	G'fthr	Approved
Leistico, Matthew J.	Fire Protection	G'fthr	Approved
Marshall, Matthew O'Neal	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved

Smit, Curtis L.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Widdle, Richard Dean	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved
Fielding, Theresa L.	NAME	Comity	Approved
Tietje, III, Emil D.,	NAME	Comity	Approved
Bartel, John Mark	SE	Comity	Approved
Brookins, Billy Joe	SE	G'fther	Approved
Button, Richard C.	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Feller, Troy J.	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Franklin, Nelson	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Gillie, Donald Lee	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Gruhn, Scott Matthew	SE	G'fther	Approved
Huffman, Greg D.	SE	Comity	Approved
Lee, Stephan H.	SE	G'fther	Approved
Morris, Andrew P., Jr.	SE	G'fther	Approved
Nelson, William E.	SE	G'fther	Approved
Neuman, Aaron Scott	SE	Comity	Approved
Nielsen, Brian C.	SE	Comity	Approved
Ryan, Jeremy Lee	SE	Comity	Approved
Stielstra, Matthew Clark	SE	Comity	Approved
Tedrick, Robert Clarence	SE	G'fther	Approved
Welch, Nick C.	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Westbrook, Wm	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Yang, Liao	SE	G'fthr	Approved
Collins, Michael D.	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending AKLS
Hollingsworth, Jeffery	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending AKLS

P.			
Moistner, Daryl Karl	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending AKLS
Phillips, Donald S.	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending AKLS
Stark, Thomas E.	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending AKLS
Stephens, Douglas A.	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending AKLS
Tatman, Joshua C.	Surveyor	Comity	Approved - pending AKLS
Arndt, David E.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Gerger, Stuart G.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Montgomery, Billy A.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Paige, Jr., Howard J.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Schinman, Mark A.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Feely, Chris J.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Simons, Patrick A.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic
Rokach, Abraham Jacob	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic; & JQ
Djorovic, Nemanja	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Haydon, Gary L.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic & JQ
Mitagi, Iosefa	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic; & JQ
Miller, Brent A.	Environmental Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic; & JQ
Moore, Garry D.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic; & JQ
Peterson, Steven James	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic; & JQ
Duman, Michael L.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic; & JQ
Mays, Darrell Craig	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending Arctic; & JQ
Duan, Xiaodong	SE	Exam	Approved - pending Arctic; & JQ for CE; or exam for SE

Stott, Timothy	Environmental Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending BSE; Arctic & JQ
Bredlie, Michael S.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved
Warren, Jennifer Evamary	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved
Schwartz, Guy L.	Petroleum Engineer	Exam	Approved
Bradford, Traci R.	Environmental Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam
Engleby, Alissa Jacob	SE	Exam	Approved - pending exam
Bentti, David Nikoli	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam
Shearer, Greg Emerson	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam
Hofmann, Ian Lewis	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam
Garber-Slaght, Robbin Lynn	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam
Bohm, Robert Earl	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam & JQ
Creelman, Richard Logan	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam & JQ
Duncan, Thomas E.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam & JQ
Nguyen, Xuanmai	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam & JQ
Oliva, Daniel C.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam & JQ
Schiweck, Vaughn Allen	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam & JQ
Tomme, Matthew A.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam & JQ
Monzingo, Darren Grant	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending exam & registration verification; transcripts; & JQ
Galido, Darlene Elizabeth	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & Arctic
Greenhill, Joshua Alexander	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & Arctic
Rutledge, Kristin S.	Chemical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ

Wu, Daniel C.	Chemical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Benjamin, Sean Paul	Environmental Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Stewart, Olga	Environmental Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Balzarini, Charles Glenn	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Bredlie, David S.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Busch, Kristina Heather	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Calvin, Peter August	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Dougherty, Matthew Leigh	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Meehleis, Kurt A.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Oistad, Wesley K.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Pender, Dorothy Ann	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Pendergast, Kevin J.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Telford, Brandon S.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Wilt, Colleen C.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Latreille, Gregory Oliver	SE	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & JQ
Vaughn, Joy Anne	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; & transcripts
Obrigewitch, Beau James	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; Arctic & JQ
Jemin, Matthew Wm.	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; Arctic & JQ
Oluwadiya, Modupe	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; Arctic & JQ
Nelson, Chase Andrew	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; FE; Arctic, & JQ
Dianoski, Bruce Tanner	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending exam; remainder of fees; & JQ
Acevedo, Estaban D.	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending exam; transcripts; Arctic & JQ

Thornton, Samuel B.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending FE verification: & Arctic
Blubaugh, Davin Kenneth	Electrical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending FE verification; PE exam; Arctic
Mulliner, Douglas	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending FE; PE; all fees; & JQ
Erickson, Mark A.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending FS & AKLS
Bratlavsky, Tanya	SE	G'father	Approved - pending Investigations
Leadbetter, III, Robert Barger	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Suver, Julia M.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Veerman, Scott R.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Ayer, Luke Alan	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Baker, Jolene M.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Lenaburg, Eric C.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Mendieta, Edward A.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Morse, David C.	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Abdie, Jerald L.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending JQ
Nardini, Mark O.	Architect	Comity	Approved - pending letter of reference & verification of additional 7 mos of responsible charge in accordance with 12 AAC 36.103(b) 3(a)
Kinish, Tonya	Electrical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending PE Electrical exam
Levings, Jared C.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; verification of FE; & JQ
Burnham, Randy S.	Mechanical Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending PE exam; verification of FE; & JQ
Esposito, James Dominic	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS
Drossos, Philip J.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS

Hood, Melinda Rose	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS
Huhta, Tasha A.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS
Lasanan, Daniel J.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS
Maxwell, Jake L.	Surveyor	Exam	Approved - pending PS & AKLS
Stekoll, Skye Alexander	Landscape Architect	Exam	Approved - pending the LARE; & JQ
Umedera, Makoto	Mining Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending transcript evaluation; registration; Arctic; & JQ
Flynn, David John	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending transcripts; & Arctic
Collins, Brian Michael	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams & registration
Willnecker, Brandon C.	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams & registration; & JQ
Wierzbicki, Jan Kazimierz	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams & registration; transcripts; clearance from Investigations; & JQ
Oberlander, Russell Kent	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending verification of exams; registration; & Arctic
Smith, Quentin P.	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending verification of exams; transcripts; & JQ
McKay, Marty Edward	Mechanical Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification of exams; transcripts; registration; & JQ
Ferguson, Dwayne Gerard	Civil Engineer	Exam	Approved - pending verification of FE; & exam
Hopwood, Wesley Dale	Agricultural Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification of FE; & JQ
Shea, Gregory F.	SE	Comity	Approved - pending verification of SE; & JQ
Pfeiffer, Timothy James	Civil Engineer	Comity	Approved - pending verification transcripts; exams & registration

1
2
3
4

Chair: That was a long one.

1 **Agenda item 26 – Calendar of Events.**

2
3 May 2-3, 2013 Fairbanks
4 August 1-2, 2013 Anchorage
5 November 7-8, 2013 Anchorage
6
7

8 Schedler: Asks that it be changed. After discussion it was decided to make it October 31st
9 and November 1st.

10
11 Jones: Asks that the February meeting be moved up a week due to the NCEES Presidents
12 assembly during the first week of February each year.

13
14 January 30-31, 2014 Juneau
15

16 Maynard: Left the meeting to attend a noon meeting.
17

18 **Agenda item 27 – Board Member comments.**

19
20 Rearick: It's been an honor to work with Harley and Richard over these past years. They
21 have offered great wisdom and insight to all the Board issues.
22

23 Eriksen: I would like to say the same thing. Richard and Harley have provided exceptional
24 leadership. Their presence has always set a level of expectation for the Board.
25

26 Walters: I would like to say the same thing. I appreciate the way this Board runs. It's well
27 organized.
28

29 Schedler: I thought it was a good meeting we got a lot of work done. It's good to cross
30 paths with Harley again after all these years. You will be very much missed.
31

32 Kelly: This was the busiest meeting ever. We definitely have more applicants which is a
33 good thing for the professions.
34

35 Lent: I think this was a particularly good meeting, a lot got done and I think everybody's
36 done a great job. I want to particularly thank Harley for his excellent work on the Board
37 composition study and his support for our little profession and setting the stage for possible
38 permanent status. Also Richard was very helpful to me when I was getting started on the
39 Board.
40

41 Shiesl: Same with me about Harley and Richard. They gave me a lot of help when I first
42 came on the Board. Being a Public Member I didn't know much about the professions and I
43 appreciate that. And I was glad to see that we were civil toward staff. I've been on that side
44 and believe me it's not a comfortable position to be in and we just need to keep in mind that
45 these are guys who are just following directions from others and there's no sense in yelling
46 at them because they can't do a thing about it anyway.
47

48 Hightower: I've spent a lot of time over the last 30 or 40 years on pro-bono work and I'd like
49 to say serving on this Board and with WestCarb and NCARB has been some of the most
50 rewarding and demanding work I've ever done. It's mainly a result of the quality of this
51 Board, the staff here at the State, Vern and Alicia and others and just in general the
52 personnel I've work with throughout the profession and I appreciate that. I'll miss all of you.

53 Hale: I'd like to say it was nice to work with Harley and Richard as well and wish I had more
54 of an overlap with you guys; you have a lot of institutional knowledge to share. Hopefully we

1 can stay in contact.

2
3 Jones: Harley and Richard will definitely be missed but I'm sure they are going to enjoy not
4 having all these demands put on them. This meeting went rather well. I figured we would
5 be backed up here until 3 or 4 this afternoon. Our Chair keeps things moving. This is
6 probably the best Board of them all and like I've said many times before all the other
7 licensing examiners are jealous. You folks are very professional at all times and that can't
8 be said for all of them.

9
10 Chair: Thanks Vern. Again I appreciate the opportunity to serve as chair. We've just had
11 elections and selected some fine individuals to continue to lead us into the future. I want to
12 thank Vern and Alicia especially, that's a lot of applications to get ready. Is that the most
13 ever?

14
15 Kelly: Yes, in my time and from any statistics I could find, it is.

16
17 Chair: Was it what, 277 applications to prepare in a very short order and I'm sure like
18 everyone, they're submitting it well in advance of the meeting. (Laughter) So you have lots
19 of time to go through it, right? I do appreciate Richard and Harley's service on the Board. I
20 think I learned a lot from both of you guys when I came on the Board new a few years ago.
21 With the exception of Eric and Richard here it's kind of a changing of the guard. I hope we
22 can continue the Board as it's operated since I've been on it and see it be productive and
23 effective. I do echo Don's comment there that, I believe somebody made a comment that
24 one of the other Board's was not so professional when dealing with the staff. It is nice that
25 we can express our frustrations professionally. Thank you everyone.

26
27
28 12:10p.m. Meeting adjourned.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

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

Respectfully submitted:

Richard V. Jones, Executive Administrator

Approved:

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

Date: _____