

1 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

2
3 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
4 Ginger Morton, Licensing Examiner

5
6 Joining a portion of the meeting, in person, were:

7
8 John R. Clark, Occupational Licensing Investigator

9
10 Catherine Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing

11
12 Dr. Bob Carlson, Dean, UAF School of Mineral Engineering

13
14 Joseph Notkin, representing Alaska Chapter, American Institute of
15 Architects
16 (AIA-AK)(Past-President), 305 Slater Drive, Fairbanks, AK 99701

17
18 Jerry Neubert, representing AIA-AK
19 1969 Swallow Dr., Fairbanks, AK 99709

20
21 John Reiss, representing self,
22 730 Berentsen Lane, Fairbanks, AK 99701

23
24 Ross Dorward, representing Association of Professional Engineers of Yukon
25 (APEY)
26 3147-3rd Ave., Whitehorse, Yukon, Canada Y1A 1E9

27
28 Gary White, representing APEY
29 Box 4125, Whitehorse, Yukon, Canada Y1A 359

30
31 **Agenda Item 2 - Review/Revise Agenda**

32
33 Gardner asked to add an item, statutory change to Board member term limits. The
34 Chair asked that the item be placed under Tab 7, Subgroup Breakouts.

35
36 Kalen noted that Karen Tilton asked to participate by teleconference since she is
37 recovering from surgery. The Chair noted Ms. Tilton was listed on the agenda
38 under item 15d on May 18th.

39
40 McLane moved that hydrographic surveying be moved to Friday and placed under
41 Tab 18.

42
43 The Chair introduced guests that would be observing the meeting, Messrs. White
44 and Dorward from the Yukon, and John Reiss.

45
46 **Agenda Item 3 - Ethics Report**

1 The Chair noted there were no reports by Board members.

2
3 **Agenda Item 4 - Review/Approve Minutes**

4
5 Kalen noted corrections to the February 2001 minutes:

- 6
7 • Page 6, Line 28, should read: The Chair noted that Gardner, Iverson, McLane
8 and Kalen are signed up for the NCEES Western Zone annual meeting on May
9 3-5, 2001, in Maui, Hawaii.
10
11 • Page 6, Line 34, should read: Kalen serves as Chair of the ACSM, Alaska
12 section, and he will also represent the AELS Board at the Registration Boards
13 Forum.
14

15 The Chair noted that Davis and Peirsol joined the meeting at 9:11 a.m.

16
17 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Mearig, and carried**
18 **unanimously, it was**

19
20 **RESOLVED to approve the February 15-16, 2001 AELS Board**
21 **meeting minutes as corrected.**
22

23 **The Chair noted that there were no objections and the motions passed.**

24
25 **Agenda Item 5 - Correspondence**

26
27 The Chair brought up the first item, an e-mail from John Metzler, a Control
28 Systems Engineer seeking Electrical Engineering registration.

29
30 Short discussion followed.

31
32 Iverson indicated that control systems engineering is mostly electrical.

33
34 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to draft a letter and send a copy of
35 the appropriate regulation, 12 AAC 36.105(d), to Mr. Metzler.

36
37 The Chair brought up the next item, a letter from David W. Johnston, PE Ph.D.,
38 University of North Carolina, requesting the Board support their request to add a
39 construction engineering specialty.

40
41 The Chair indicated that the issue of an additional specialty for engineering could
42 be taken up during Tab 15a, Old Business, Issue Professional Engineering License.

43
44 The Chair noted the remaining items were for Board review and were not action
45 items and moved on to the next item on the agenda, Staff Reports.

46
47 **Agenda Item 6- Staff Reports**

1
 2 The Executive Administrator reviewed high points of the administrator's report:
 3

Assigned Task 2/01 Bd Mtg	Action taken:
1) Continue to work on exam costs and staff time spent on exam administration	Reviewed April exam administration for staff time spent
2) Look at the model laws and check with other states in terms of defining minor importance or incidental practice overlap between professions	Sent MBA email
3) List Goals and Objectives on flip charts	Done
4) Draft a letter to Rep. Rokeberg on HB 8, indicating that the Board is not the appropriate body to serve on the task force (for Chair review)	Done
5) Respond to correspondence	Done
6) List Server Capabilities for Subcommittee Work	Discussed List Server with Ken Truitt. Subcommittee members can email without violating open meetings act. Not necessary to have public access. Discussed concept with programmer as very feasible, if needed.

4
 5 From the February meeting, Task List
 6

1. Add "downloadable seal" to Feb. Agenda	Placed on Feb. 01 Agenda
2. Contact CLARB jurisdictions to see how many require the council record (only) and how it works for them.	See CLARB, Tab 5, Feb. 01
3. Notify APDC the Board will examine the feasibility of Board autonomy.	12/18/00 Email to Vicky Sterling. Email 5/01.
4. Ask Catherine if fines collected are accounted for separately for AELS.	Asked K. Taylor/J. Strickler. Yes, fines accounted for separately.
5. Update Alaska information on CLARB web page	(Done 11/20 gm).
6. Letter to MOA with Brown, to respond to design professionals sealing their work (see new business Nov. 00 meeting).	Done 11/30/00.
7. Do targeted mailouts to each profession.	Completed , Dec 00
8. Gardner asked that the web-based course be mentioned in the AELS News Summary.	Done.
9. Research inactive status licenses in other states.	See, Tab 5 Lapsed, Retired, Inactive, Feb. 01
10. Research how other states handle lapsed licenses (3 states).	See, Tab 5 Lapsed, Retired, Inactive, Feb. 01
11. Research with other states any problems encountered with generic professional engineer licenses	See Tab 7, Professional engineering license, Feb. 01
12. Research other states that have continuing education requirements.	See Tab 5, CEU requirements, Feb. 01
13. Draft letter to MOA on stamping own work, construction observation	(Done 11/30/00, with Chair)
14. What do other jurisdictions call other landscape professionals, what terms are limited? (Cyra-Korsgaard)	See Tab 5, CLARB/Landscape Architects and titles, Feb. 01

15. Add to the "renewal form" a provision that informs parties what happens if they fail to renew (lapsed license provisions)	Current language on the renewal form: Expired Registration If you choose not to renew your registration before it expires, you may reinstate the registration at a later date only after satisfying the requirements of AS 08.48.231 and 12 AAC 36.165. Registrations which have expired more than five years cannot be reinstated and a new application is required.
16. Put landscape architecture stamping on the agenda.	Cyra-Korsgaard asked to move to fall meeting
17. Continue work on exam costs and proctor costs	Tab 5, Exam costs, FEB 01
18. Put applicant fitness questions in the Feb packet	Tab 5 Fitness Questions, FEB 01
19. Obtain from CLARB LAAB accreditation report	Requested from C. Chaffee several times.

1
2 The Executive Administrator reviewed the Task List and discussed List Server,
3 Exam administration, and staffing issues. She indicated that the List Server
4 Capabilities for Subcommittee work is not necessary. According to Ken Truitt,
5 Assistant Attorney General, email communications between board members are
6 public communications. The Executive Administrator indicated she had also
7 discussed the feasibility with Larry Kemp, Data Processing, and the list server
8 could be set up if the Board was interested in pursuing it.

9
10 The NCEES offers exam administration and the Executive Administrator reviewed
11 additional staff costs:

12
13 **COST COMPARISON**

14

CURRENT COSTS	OCC FEE S	OCC LIC COSTS	NCEES PROPOSED COST TO APPLICANT	NCEES Pass Through
FE	\$75	\$176-200	\$175	\$100
FLS	\$80	\$181-205	\$190	\$110
PE	\$145	\$246-270	\$225	\$80
PLS	\$95	\$196-220	\$235	\$140
AKLS	\$100	\$201-\$225	N/A	N/A
TOTAL for 3 sites		\$22420/221=\$101 \$22420/195=\$115 \$22420/180=\$125		

15
16 **Approximate Exam Costs**
17 **One exam administration costs based on 2000/2001 costs**

	Anchorage	Fairbanks	Juneau
Rooms	Methodist Church \$670/\$668 Rounded to = \$670 \$845 + \$90/\$720 + \$90 = \$870 UAA Facility (& Staff monitor) UAA Total= \$875 Subtotal= \$2415	Use UAF Butrovich Building \$600	Use State Office Building Est. for room \$200
Table rental	Party World (\$511/\$605/540) Average=\$550	-	-
DHL	\$129.24 (ship to) Approx. total = \$130	\$75 approx	-

Air Freight/DHL	\$140 return Approx. total = \$140	\$75	-
Proctors and Lead proctor	Based on 5+1.5+2/5.5(min+ADA) Ave: 5 x 10 x 10= \$500 2 x 10 x 10= \$200 1x15x20= \$300 Approx. total= \$1000	5 proctors: 4x10x16=\$640 1x15x20=\$300 Approx total= \$940	4/6+1 ada (mon) 4x10x16=\$640 1x15x20=\$300 Approx. total = \$940
Co Lic Staff	2 travel costs = \$1500 (Staff wage 45 hr x 20 + OT for Licensing Examiner @\$25 hr. Approx. staff wages =\$14 Subtotal \$2905	-	1x10x16= \$160 1x15x20=\$270 Total = \$430
Subtotal	\$7140	\$1690	\$1570
Exam costs-NCEES	3 sites \$10,400 plus exam costs \$10,410	Includes rt. sip	Includes rt. ship
Staff Labor for Pre/Post Exam	Exam pre/post staff wages 80 hrs x \$20= Approx. costs \$1600		

1
2 Total for 3 sites: \$10,410 (\$7,140 + 1,690 +1,570) plus NCEES exams (\$10,410)= plus
3 pre/post \$1,600), = \$22,420
4 Staff labor involved (see table for staff preparation)
5 \$22,420/195= \$115 per candidate.
6
7 Table is based on the assumption that we could incur costs for proctors and locations
8 at the Fairbanks or Juneau sites. Exam costs are actual exam purchase costs/scoring
9 costs.

10
11 **JUNEAU OCC LIC STAFF COSTS PER EXAM ADMINISTRATION:**

12
13 **2000 EXAMS BY SITE**

	Anchorage		Fairbanks		Juneau		Total
	Apr	Oct	Apr	Oct	Apr	Oct	
PE	63	52	14	5	8	2	85/59
PLS	11	4	0	0	1	3	12/7
AKLS	23	-	1	-	2	-	26
FLS	7	6	0	1	1	1	8/8
FE	21	35	38	17	2	1	61/53
Total	125	97	53	23	14	7	192/127
GRAND TOTAL							319

15
16 **TOTAL EXAMS ADMINISTERED (includes 2001 1st exam cycle)**

	1998	1999	2000	2001 APR	2001 OCT
PE	122	155	144	99/78	

PLS	12	20	19	12/11	
AKLS	14	20	26	68/26	
FLS	15	23	16	11/9	
FE	143	116	114	31/56	
Total	306	334	319	221/180 scheduled/ no shows	

1
2 Approximate total for highest exams given was approximately 195 exams per April
3 administration.

4
5 The Chair indicated that exam administration could be taken up under Agenda Item
6 17, New Business.

7
8 **Agenda Item 7, Subgroup Breakouts**

9
10 The Chair brought up the next item, Subgroup Breakouts, and the Board members
11 broke up into three groups at 10:15 a.m. The subgroups were:

12
13 Building Officials Reference Manual: Gardner, Cyra-Korsgaard, with staff,
14 Executive Administrator and the Licensing Examiner, and observers, White, and
15 Reiss;

16
17 Term Limits/Board Membership Legislation: Davis, Kalen, Mearig, and Peirsol;

18
19 Incidental Practice of Minor Importance: Iverson, Siemoneit, Brown, and observer
20 Dorward sat in.

21
22 **Agenda Item 8, Subgroup Reports**

23
24 The Chair brought the Board back to order at 11:05 a.m. and asked for updates.

25
26 Gardner reported on the Building Officials Reference Manual subgroup and
27 indicated that the group made some revisions to the markup and were looking at
28 additional changes by adding in information acquired from the New Mexico
29 reference manual. Work would continue between now and the August meeting and
30 a markup should be completed in time for the August meeting.

31
32 Short discussion followed.

33
34 The Chair indicated that once the Board has completed its review, the document
35 could be circulated to the Building Officials for review.

36
37 Kalen reported on the Term Limits/Board Membership Legislation subgroup. The
38 subgroup discussed an issue where board member appointments are significantly
39 delayed and the actual term served has been less than two years, or they have been
40 appointed to complete the term of a departing Board member. In those instances,
41 the subgroup felt that the partial time served should not count as a full term.

1 Several AELS board members are affected by this change and would not be eligible
2 to serve an additional term, yet they served approximately 6 years or less, and not
3 the 8 allowed under AS 08.48.

4
5 Davis thought it would be helpful if the Executive Administrator could poll other
6 boards and find out if they have term limits, and if so, do they count partial terms.

7
8 Iverson reported on the Incidental Practice of Minor Importance subgroup. The
9 subgroup found it was difficult to define “of minor importance,” particularly in
10 terms of architects and engineers. One item the group identified to isolate would be
11 the landscape architect public health and safety areas.

12
13 McLane added that the subgroup could define “not normally occupied” and
14 “normally occupied”.

15
16 The Chair suggested that the Building Officials Reference Manual could cover
17 examples and give guidance about when an architect or engineer is required. She
18 added that defining according to square footage wouldn’t necessarily work for
19 determining when a professional would be needed.

20
21 Short discussion followed.

22
23 Break for lunch at 11:35 am.

24
25 Reconvened at 12:55 p.m.

26
27 **Agenda Item 9 – Public Comment**

28
29 The Chair welcomed members of the Association of Professional Engineers of Yukon
30 (APEY). Ross Dorwand spoke about mobility within Canada and work that has
31 continued between Canada and the United States through the National Council of
32 Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES). Mr. Dorwand introduced their
33 Executive Director, Gary White.

34
35 Mr. White used a series of overheads to describe the Canadian registration program
36 in the Canadian provinces and through their association, the Canadian Council of
37 Professional Engineering (CCPE). Canada has accreditation and quality programs,
38 including 4-5 years education and 4 years experience. There is a close association
39 between the education system and the professional societies so there is control over
40 the programs offered at the universities. Candidates take a 2-hour national
41 practices exam as well as an exam from the province in which they will practice.
42 The Canadian exams are not based on the specific practice of engineering, like the
43 NCEES exams, but focus on the ethical practice or the specific laws of the provinces.
44 Engineering titles are also protected and there are trademark rights on the use of
45 those terms. The provinces use a “notwithstanding clause” to put into place the
46 specific requirements they may have.

1 Discussion followed.

2
3 The Chair indicated the Board would be taking up Canadian Engineering
4 Reciprocity under Agenda Item 17, New Business, tomorrow.

5
6 Dr. Bob Carlson, Dean, UAF School of Mineral Engineering, gave the Board an
7 update on the current remodel of the Duckering Building and on the new equipment
8 for which they have received additional funding from the Legislature. He offered to
9 take the Board on a tour at the next May Board meeting. Dr. Carlson indicated he
10 teaches the Arctic Engineering course and does not plan to drop the classroom
11 course even though the video and web based courses are available to students.

12
13 Break: 1:45 p.m.

14
15 Reconvene: 2:00 p.m.

16
17 Joseph Notkin discussed SB 9, the Sunset Audit legislation that passed the
18 Legislature this session. The Legislature may have held the bill at one point
19 because of some membership concerns but the leadership of the AIA-Alaska was
20 supportive of the bill and did not participate in stalling action on the bill.

21
22 Mr. Notkin presented draft language for a proposal in the Board packet that would
23 provide an alternate path to Architect by Comity licensure without requiring an
24 NCARB Council Record. Mr. Notkin indicated that the AIA-Alaska Chapter has
25 engaged in many discussions and could not come to an agreement but that the
26 executive board did vote on this proposal. He felt that the primary mission of the
27 board is safety and reasonable regulation of the profession, and that this proposal
28 does this and raises the bar in terms of comity licensure in Alaska.

29
30 The Chair indicated that NCARB does provide an alternate path for architects
31 through their Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) Program.

32
33 Mr. Notkin said that some members have looked at this program and find it
34 onerous and that it may double or triple the amount of work experience an architect
35 is required to gain prior to certification.

36
37 The Chair indicated that NCARB has a working group to provide yet another path
38 and it has been coined the "Nebraska proposal", as that jurisdiction has taken the
39 lead on this proposal.

40
41 McLane asked about the provisions of the proposal as it relates to work experience
42 in Alaska.

43
44 The Chair felt that the arctic course requirement satisfies the concerns about
45 practices in Alaska.

1 Siemoneit agreed and felt that requiring specific work experience in Alaska could be
2 interpreted to be a form of gatekeeping.

3
4 Davis explained that that process could take 17-22 years total, which could
5 basically span a large block of one's career. She indicated that she and Ken Truitt,
6 the Assistant Attorney General, had looked at the current Architect by Comity
7 requirements at the last Board meeting and the proposal being presented, and the
8 AIA-AK was presenting this for the purposes of discussion. She thought that the
9 work experience in Alaska may have come out of this language revision.

10
11 Discussion followed about the BEA requirements, the Nebraska proposal,
12 experience versus education, and regulation process.

13
14 The Chair noted that this matter would be taken up again on Friday under Agenda
15 Item 17, New Business, Architect by Comity.

16
17 Break for lunch at 11:40 am.

18
19 Reconvene at 1:25 p.m.

20
21 **Agenda Item 10- Application Reviews**

22
23 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, Application Reviews.

24
25 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Mearig, and carried**
26 **unanimously, it was**
27 **RESOLVED to go into executive session for the purpose of**
28 **reviewing applications.**

29
30 **Authorities for executive session are noted as AS 44.62.310(c)(3) and**
31 **AS 08.48.071(d).**

32
33 The Board came out of executive session at 5:00 p.m. and promptly recessed until
34 Friday, May 18, 2001.

35
36 **Friday, May 18, 2001**

37
38 The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:14 a.m. Members present and
39 constituting a quorum of the Board were:

40
41 Daphne Brown, Chair, Architect
42 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member
43 Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor
44 Don Iverson, Electrical Engineer
45 Kathy Gardner, Mechanical Engineer
46 Scott McLane, Land Surveyor
47 Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer

1 Patricia Peirsol, Architect
2 Ernie Siemoneit, Mining Engineer
3 Marcia Davis, Public Member
4

5 Excused from the meeting were:

6
7 Dr. Robert Miller, Vice-Chair, Civil Engineer
8

9 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

10
11 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
12 Ginger Morton, Licensing Examiner
13

14 Joining a portion of the meeting by teleconference was
15 Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing
16 Karen Tilton, ASPLS
17

18 Joining a portion of the meeting in person, were

19
20 John R. Clark, Investigator
21

22 Ross Dorward, representing Association of Professional Engineers of Yukon
23 (APEY)
24 3147-3rd Ave., Whitehorse, Yukon, Canada Y1A 1E9
25

26 Gary White, representing APEY
27 Box 4125, Whitehorse, Yukon, Canada Y1A 359
28

29 The Chair indicated that Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational
30 Licensing would be joining them at approximately 8:30 a.m. and they could
31 continue to work on the agenda.
32

33 The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 15, Old Business**, 15c, Feasibility of Board
34 Autonomy.
35

36 Gardner explained that she had done some work on board autonomy and pencilled
37 in costs and referred to her handout. She projected income at about \$1.1 million
38 over the biennial period or about \$550.0 (thousands) per year. Her expenses totaled
39 about \$700.0 per year and were based on 3 administrative staff, office lease in
40 Anchorage, utilities (phone, internet), postage, monthly supplies, miscellaneous
41 costs (\$20.0), Board travel, and administration of exams. She also included costs for
42 copiers, computers, and fax for initial outlay and planned to outsource
43 investigations, legal services, accounting, and computer programming. Areas she
44 had not looked into, but that would need to be considered, were insurance, bonding,
45 mediation, and court. She has a detailed spreadsheet but did not have that
46 available for the Board today. It was available to anyone interested.
47

1 John Clark joined the meeting at 8:20 a.m.

2
3 Gardner indicated that her sources were actual market costs, the Oregon Board, the
4 AIA-Alaska, and a local, small business in Alaska.

5
6 Short discussion followed.

7
8 Gardner indicated she thought there were some merits to the semi-autonomous
9 board and felt that additional work needed to be done to explore more options.

10
11 Kalen suggested that the Board wait before taking any action on autonomy. He
12 suggested that there was work done previously by the Board and also that
13 Delaware and Florida were two states that are autonomous or partially
14 autonomous.

15 **Agenda Item 12 - Budget Summary Report**

16
17 This agenda item was taken up after agenda item 18, Board Member Reports.

18
19 **Agenda Item 13 - Director's Comments**

20
21 Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing, joined the
22 meeting by teleconference at 10:20 a.m.

23
24 Reardon brought up SB 9, the sunset audit legislation, and indicated that the bill
25 passed the Legislature on May 2, 2001, with a letter of intent attached. The letter
26 of intent requires the Board to report back by February 15, 2002, efforts it had
27 made in conjunction with the professional societies on developing a continuing
28 education program and on alternative paths to Architect by Comity registration.
29 Reardon indicated she thought the Board would consider these matters and provide
30 a written report to the Legislature by February 2002.

31
32 Reardon recapped HB 227, introduced by Representative Harris relating to land
33 surveyor standards. The bill is currently before the House Labor and Commerce
34 Committee. They held a hearing and held the bill over. Kalen did a good job
35 testifying and the bill was held over through the interim to allow the industry and
36 the Board to consider the issues and comment. It was Reardon's understanding that
37 the bill was introduced on behalf of a constituent who had problems with an as-built
38 survey not accurately reporting information that should have been included in the
39 survey. She also mentioned that HB 8, by Representative Rokeberg, would
40 establish the Legislative Pioneer Road Development Task Force. Initially the bill
41 had the AELS Board participating, but the current version of the bill has a member
42 of the Alaska Professional Design Council participating instead. The Board
43 expressed interested in HB 27, by Representative Rokeberg, relating to home
44 inspections. That bill is currently before the House Finance Committee.

45
46 Kalen mentioned that the Board is interested in term limits as it relates to Board
47 members. There has been prior legislation on this issue. The Board hopes that if

1 you serve two years or less of a term it would not count as a full term or as one of
2 the Board members' two terms.

3
4 Davis expressed interest in knowing from the Director if other boards have had
5 similar problems, where there is a considerable lag time for appointments.

6
7 Reardon said she would check with the Governor's office to find out their view on
8 this matter before checking with other boards.

9
10 The Chair indicated that the Board member expiration dates falling in March could
11 affect architect Board members whose terms would expire just before the WCARB
12 and NCARB meetings.

13
14 Reardon discussed the increment for \$106,000 as she envisioned it after discussing
15 the increment with the Executive Administrator.

16
17 A brief recap of the allocation plan:

18
19 FY 01-02 AELS ALLOCATION PLAN

20
21 (In thousands)

FY 01 AELS BUDGET ITEM	FY01 ALLOCATION PLAN	FY01 ACTUAL	FY02 PROPOSED BUDGET
CLARB	3.0	3.0	3.0
Computer equipment	11.0	12.0 +8.0 = 20.0 COMPUTERS & COPIER	0
Exam Proctors	2.0	2.0	2.0
LARE administration	4.0	3.0	4.0
AKLS Workshop	8.0	5.0 for 2001 Workshop	5.0
Strategic Planning/Training	17.0	2.6	0
Printing & Mailing	10.0	3.0	5.0
MBA Committee Travel	.5	.2	0
Data Processing	45.0	Current programming work on renewals 10.0-15.0	35.0
Subtotal	100.5 of 106	53.8	54.0
Investigator (fulltime is \$62.05 x .75=\$46.5)	-		46.5
Total	100.5		100.5
Balance			5.5

22
23 Reardon's allocation plan is the expenditure authority for the increment the Board
24 was authorized by the Legislature in 2000. It represents an estimate of what is
25 anticipated for expenditures and may be that expenditures for FY01 exceed the
26 amounts shown. The Board can review the FY02 proposed amounts and make

1 recommendations for the allocation. If it would like to fund the additional time for
2 an investigator, the approximate cost would be \$46.5 for FY02.

3
4 Reardon explained that there is an investigator position vacant and would the
5 Board want to use some of the increment for this position. Presently the Board has
6 an increment for \$106,000 expenditure authority for computer projects, equipment,
7 strategic planning, and other items. The cost to fund a fulltime investigator
8 position is approximately \$65,000. The Legislature funded a half time investigator
9 for tobacco. One option would be to hire a fulltime investigator and part of that
10 position could be for the AELS Board. Only the time spent on AELS would be billed
11 to the Board. The Board also received funding for the additional licensing examiner
12 requested, in lieu of the half time clerk position. The licensing examiner position
13 will be authorized on July 1, 2001, although it will take time to post and fill the
14 position.

15
16 The Chair asked for funding for Board Training or Strategic Planning and indicated
17 the Board could discuss this as a whole.

18
19 The Chair noted that the Board also needs a new recorder as the current recording
20 equipment is not working well. The Board also felt it would be helpful to have a
21 travel-type printer that is compatible with the laptop to have at its meetings.

22
23 Reardon said that was fine and the Executive Administrator should remind her in
24 Juneau about the request.

25
26 The Chair indicated the Board's commitment for the additional investigator.

27
28 Reardon indicated that Larry Kemp would be giving an update on computer
29 technology as it relates to the on-line renewal project. Reardon responded that it is
30 still her intention to have on-line renewal for the upcoming licensing cycle and she
31 believes the project is moving along well. She indicated it took a long time to get
32 the approval for the programmer but now that the project has started she
33 anticipates the work will be intense until the end of the fiscal year, and that
34 increased expenditures could be anticipated. Once the on-line renewal project is
35 completed, the programmer will work on the on-line application process and other
36 enhancements requested by the Board.

37
38 The Chair clarified that travel was not included in the \$106,000, and Reardon
39 responded that travel is in a different increment.

40
41 The Chair expressed interest in having Reardon attend the August meeting if
42 possible and she indicated she would try to do so.

43
44 Reardon mentioned that she will have spreadsheets on fees for the August meeting.
45 She did not anticipate fees changing but must go through the process of projecting
46 fees and costs before the renewal cycle. If there will be a change in fees she would
47 report it to the Board before the public noticing would occur.

1
2 Reardon advised the Board that she is willing to pay participant's travel expenses
3 to attend the Alaska Land Surveyor's workshop in June.
4

5 Discussion followed.
6

7 Reardon indicated she would leave the matter to the Board to discuss but she is
8 willing to pay participant travel up to the \$5,000 limit for this year. It is possible
9 that if a new contract is let with Test, Inc. for subsequent workshops, that the
10 expert subject matter participant costs could be figured into that contract.
11

12 The Chair noted that the AKLS Workshop is on the agenda for later today, Agenda
13 Item, 15f, under Old Business.
14

15 Break: 9:30 a.m.
16

17 Reconvene: 9:55 a.m.
18

19 **Agenda Item 14 – Investigator's Report, Discussion Items**
20

21 The Occupational Licensing Investigator, John R. Clark, gave a summary of the
22 investigator's report that is included in the Board's packet.
23

24 The Chair asked if there were any questions for Clark and indicated that the Board
25 would be considering redirecting funds for additional investigator time, particularly
26 to allow for rural, on-site construction inspections. She noted that Reardon would
27 be discussing possibilities with the Chief Investigator.
28

29 Clark indicated his understanding that with a new investigator there would be
30 more rural site investigations.
31

32 Clark expressed interest in participating in the Board discussion of the Building
33 Official's Reference Manual at the next Board meeting.
34

35 Clark indicated that there is probably some unlicensed landscape architect activity
36 occurring since there are only 12 licensed landscape architects statewide.
37

38 The Chair indicated that there is some overlap between professions and that the
39 building officials have not yet started requiring the landscape architect to stamp
40 most plans.
41

42 Cyra-Korsgaard felt that whenever there is expenditure of public funds or work on
43 public facilities, the plans should require the stamp of a registered landscape
44 architect.
45

46 10:05 a.m. Kalen rejoined the meeting.
47

1 Clark indicated that an area the Board may wish to look at is the specialty
2 contractor's exemption that allows a specialty contractor to engage in construction
3 contracting under AS 08.48.331(7). He felt that there are some instances where a
4 specialty contractor is doing mechanical engineering without a mechanical engineer
5 being involved in the project. One example of this is a muffler shop in Wasilla built
6 without any consultation with a mechanical engineer.

7
8 Iverson stated he did not believe that it was the intent of the legislature to exempt
9 specialty contractors from the requirement to have an engineer involved.

10
11 Mearig thought it was the legislature's intent, but that this was not an exemption
12 the Board supported.

13
14 Short discussion.

15
16 Davis suggested this be a topic for a subgroup to discuss at the next meeting. She
17 asked if the Executive Administrator could ask Ken Truitt to obtain the legislative
18 history, intent and, his interpretation of exactly what this exemption allows
19 specialty contractors to do.

20
21 The Chair asked who was interested in this subgroup and Board members Davis,
22 Iverson, and investigator Clark indicated they were interested in this subgroup.

23 24 **Agenda Item 15 – Old Business**

25
26 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, Old Business, 15a, Issue
27 Professional engineering license.

28
29 **On a duly made by Mearig, seconded by Kalen, and adopted, it**
30 **was**
31 **RESOLVED to begin a regulations project to accept any**
32 **NCEES 8-hour examination for engineering, and to issue a non-**
33 **discipline specific engineering license, but to keep intact the**
34 **education and experience requirement.**

35
36 Mearig stated that the intent of this regulation project is for increased engineering
37 mobility. With Alaska only licensing six disciplines the effect is that many qualified
38 engineers are not able to obtain registration in Alaska. If passed, the Board would
39 offer all the specialties that NCEES currently offers exams for, some 18 to 20
40 disciplines. As NCEES drops or adds exams, Alaska would create or drop a code for
41 each, add those specialties to the data base, and license that specialty in Alaska.

42
43 McLane thought it would be a more dynamic system.

44
45 **Siemoneit objected** because he felt there would be less accountability with a
46 general license.

1 Davis thought the Board would have to change education and experience
2 requirements with this change.

3
4 Iverson would prefer not to list the discipline but to have a generic license.

5
6 Cyra-Korsgaard wondered if the public would be better protected if the type of
7 specialty were listed on the stamp.

8
9 Discussion followed.

10
11 Clark thought it would make it more difficult for enforcement.

12
13 The Chair indicated that training and outreach combined with strengthened ethics
14 law could help with enforcement.

15
16 Mearig indicated that he has presented this to the Alaska Professional Design
17 Council (APDC) and the National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE). He
18 has not received any negative feedback from these professional societies. Mearig
19 felt that the Board could spend some time developing this and indicated his
20 intention is to not rush into this, but rather to move forward with a proposal for
21 review.

22
23 McLane wondered how this would affect the composition of the engineering
24 professions on the Board.

25
26 The Chair stated there was a motion on the table.

27
28 **The motion passed 8-1, with Siemoneit as the only “no” vote, and Miller**
29 **was excused.**

30
31 The Chair brought up the letter from David W. Johnston, PE Ph.D., Professor and
32 Associate Head, from the North Carolina University, asking for support for a
33 Construction Engineering Specialty version of the professional engineering and
34 practices (PE) exam.

35
36 Brief discussion.

37
38 The Board decided to have the Executive Administrator respond that the Board
39 took no position on this matter.

40
41 The Board moved to the next item on the agenda, **15d, Continuing Education.**
42 Karen Tilton spoke by teleconference to the Board. She presented the Alaska
43 Society of Professional Land Surveyors' (ASPLS) proposal for a Continuing
44 Education Program. She indicated that it was their intent to create a simple
45 program that could be randomly audited and one that would not be a burden to
46 implement.

1 The proposal was as follows:

2
3 A. Introduction

4
5 Every licensee shall meet the continuing professional competency requirements of
6 these regulations for professional development as a condition for each jurisdiction's
7 licensure renewal.

8
9 B. Definitions

10 Terms used in this section are defined as follows:

- 11
12 1. Professional Development Hour (PDH) - A contact hour (nominal) of instruction or
13 presentation. The common denominator for other units of credit.
- 14 2. Continuing Education Unit (CEU) - Unit of credit customarily used for continuing
15 education courses. One continuing education unit equals 10 hours of class in
16 approved continuing education course.
- 17 3. College/Unit Semester/Quarter Hour - Credit for course in ABET approved
18 programs or other related college course approved in accordance with article (E) of
19 this section.
- 20 4. Course/Activity - Any qualifying course or activity with a clear purpose and objective
21 which will maintain, improve, or expand the skills and knowledge relevant to the
22 licensee's field of practice.
- 23 5. Dual Licensee - A person who is licensed as both an engineer and a land surveyor.

24 C. Requirements

25 Every licensee is required to obtain 15 (30 if biennial) PDH units during the
26 renewal period year. If a licensee exceeds the annual requirement in any renewal
27 period, a maximum of 15 PDH units may be carried forward into the subsequent
28 renewal period. PDH units may be earned as follows:

- 29
30 1. Successful completion of college courses.
- 31 2. Successful completion of continuing education courses.
- 32 3. Successful completion of correspondence, televised, videotaped, and other
33 shortcourses/ tutorials.
- 34 4. Presenting or attending qualifying seminars, in-house courses, workshops, or
35 professional or technical presentations made at meetings, conventions, or
36 conferences.
- 37 5. Teaching or instructing in (1) through (4) above.
- 38 6. Authoring published papers, articles, or books.
- 39 7. Technical or professional organization membership.
- 40 8. Active participation in professional or technical societies.

- 1 9. Patents.
- 2 10. Presentations to technical, professional or civic organizations.
- 3 11. All activities described in Items 1 through 10 above must be relevant to the practice
- 4 of Engineering and/or Land Surveying, and may include technical, ethical or
- 5 managerial content.

6 D. Criteria

7 Continuing professional development activities must meet the following criteria:

- 8
- 9 1. There is a clear purpose and objective for each activity, which will maintain,
- 10 improve or expand skills and knowledge obtained prior to initial licensure or to
- 11 develop new and relevant skills and knowledge.
- 12 2. The content of each presentation is well organized and presented in a sequential
- 13 manner.
- 14 3. There is evidence of pre-planning, which should include the opportunity for input by
- 15 the target group to be served.
- 16 4. The presentation will be made by persons who are well qualified by education
- 17 and/or experience.
- 18 5. There is a provision for individual participant registration, which will include
- 19 information required for record keeping and reporting. The organization conducting
- 20 the activity that qualifies for continuing professional development credits should
- 21 provide certificates or other acceptable proof of attendance.

22 E. Units

23 The conversion of other units of credit to PDH units is as follows:

	Activity	PDH value
1	1 College or unit semester hour	45 PDH
2	1 College or unit quarter hour	30 PDH
3	1 Continuing Education Credit	10 PDH
4	1 Hour of professional development in course work, seminars, or professional or technical presentations made at meetings, conventions or conferences	1 PDH
5	For teaching apply multiple of 2*	
6	Each published paper, article or book	10 PDH
7	Technical or professional organization membership (each organization)	3 PDH
8	Active participation in professional and technical society (each organization)	5 PDH
9	Each patent	10 PDH
10	Presentations to technical, professional or civic organizations	2 PDH per hour of presentatio

	n
*Teaching credit is valid for teaching a course or seminar for the first time only. Teaching credit does not apply to full-time faculty.	

1 F. Determination of Credit

2 The board of licensure has final authority with respect to approval of courses,
3 credit, PDH value for course, and other methods of earning credit.

- 4
- 5 1. Credit for college or community college approved courses will be based upon course
6 credit established by the college.
 - 7 2. Credit for qualifying seminars and workshops will be based on one PDH unit for
8 each hour of attendance. Attendance at qualifying programs presented at
9 professional and/or technical society meetings will earn PDH units for the actual
10 time of each program
 - 11 3. Credit determination for activities E6 and E9 is the responsibility of the licensee
12 (subject to review as required by the board).
 - 13 4. Credit for activity E8, active participation in professional and technical societies
14 (limited to 2 PDH per organization) requires that a licensee serve as an officer
15 and/or actively participate in a committee of the organization. PDH credits are not
16 earned until the end of each year of service is completed.

17 G. Record Keeping

18 The responsibility of maintaining records to be used to support credits claimed is
19 the responsibility of the licensee. Records required include, but are not limited to:

- 20
- 21 1. a log showing the type of activity claimed, sponsoring organization, location,
22 duration, instructor's or speaker's name, and PDH credits earned;
 - 23 2. attendance verification records in the form of completion certificates or other
24 documents supporting evidence of attendance.

25 H. Exemptions

26 A licensee may be exempt from the professional development educational
27 requirements for one of the following reasons:

- 28
- 29 1. New licensees by way of examination or reciprocity shall be exempt for their first
30 renewal period.
 - 31 2. A licensee serving on temporary active duty in the armed forces of the United States
32 for a period of time exceeding one hundred twenty (120) consecutive days in a year
33 shall be exempt from obtaining the professional development hours required during
34 that year.
 - 35 3. Licensees experiencing physical disability, illness, or other extenuating
36 circumstances as reviewed and approved by the board may be exempt. Supporting
37 documentation must be furnished to the board.

1 4. Licensees who list their occupation as "Retired" on the board approved renewal form
2 and who further certify that they are no longer receiving any remuneration from
3 providing professional engineering or land surveying services shall be exempt from
4 the professional development hours required. In the event such a person elects to
5 return to active practice of professional engineering or land surveying, professional
6 development hours must be earned before returning to active practice for each year
7 exempted not to exceed the annual requirement for two years.

8 I. Reinstatement

9 A licensee may bring an inactive license to active status by obtaining all delinquent
10 PDH units. However, if the total number required to become current exceeds 30,
11 then 30 shall be the maximum number required.

12
13 J. Comity/Out-of Jurisdiction resident

14 The continuing professional development (CPD) requirements for this jurisdiction
15 will be satisfied when a non-resident certifies to be licensed in and having met the
16 mandatory CPD requirements of any jurisdiction approved and listed by
17 jurisdiction.

18
19 K. Dual Licensees

20 The number of PDH units required for renewal shall be 30, 15 of which shall be
21 obtained in each profession.

22
23 L. Forms

24 All renewal applications will require the completion of a continuing professional
25 development form specified by the board outlining PDH credit claimed. The
26 licensee must supply sufficient detail on the form to permit audit verification, must
27 certify and sign the continuing education form, and submit with the state renewal
28 application and fee.

29
30 M. Audit

31 Audits for compliance with this provision will be conducted according to regulations
32 set forth in 12 AAC 02.960.

33
34 Tilton indicated that the proposal was based on the NCEES model and that
35 Washington, Oregon, and Alabama all used the NCEES model for the basis of their
36 program.

37
38 **On a motion duly made by McLane , seconded by Kalen, and adopted,**
39 **it was**

40 **RESOLVED to start a regulation project for a continuing**
41 **education program for all AELS professions based on the**
42 **ASPLS continuing education proposal.**

43
44 **Siemoneit objected.**

1 Siemoneit felt that the Board was creating more regulations, and by default, more
2 forms and boxes for registrants to check. He thought this project would create a lot
3 of work just to exclude a few bad apples. He feels most of the design professionals
4 are good, professional citizens who are going to comply with these requirements
5 anyway. The result is the Board has to sift through all the lame excuses someone
6 might present just to determine that they did not meet the continuing education
7 requirement.

8
9 Peirsol did not feel comfortable denying someone a license because they were short
10 on continuing education professional development hours (PDHs).

11
12 Davis suggested this be a voluntary program with incentives such as reduced fees
13 for compliance.

14
15 Iverson clarified that the vote is just to review such a proposal and not implement
16 one, and the Chair responded that this is just for the Board to look at and would not
17 mean the Board is implementing the program.

18
19 The Board voted on the motion before them.

20
21 **The motion passed 8-1, with Siemoneit as the only “no” vote, and Miller
22 was excused.**

23
24 The Chair announced that Larry Kemp, Division of Occupational Licensing
25 programmer, had arrived and would do a presentation on the on-line renewal
26 program he is currently working on for the upcoming renewal cycle. She brought up
27 **15i, Overview Presentation on On-Line Renewal.**

28
29 Larry Kemp presented an overview of the renewal program in terms of what data
30 processing screens registrants would access. The PIN, registration number, and
31 social security number would be required to access the process. The PIN and
32 registration number would be sent to each registrant whose active license is set to
33 lapse on 12/31/01. Those who had not renewed in the 1999 or prior cycle would not
34 be eligible to use the on-line system, nor would those who answer yes to any of the
35 fitness questions on the renewal form. He explained the status of the programming
36 and his anticipation that the system would be on-line in October for the upcoming
37 November mailout.

38
39 The Chair thanked Larry Kemp for the briefing.

40
41 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, **15e, Hydrographic
42 Surveying.**

43
44 **On a motion duly made by McLane**
45 **it was**
46 **Resolved to start a regulation project to lump GIS, Photogrammetry, and**
47 **hydrographic surveying together with minimum standards of care into**

1 **one project and take the proposal to the professional society for review**
2 **and bring back to the Board at the August 2001 meeting.**

3
4 **There was no second to the motion and the motion died.**

5
6 Discussion followed.

7
8 Iverson stated that the Board's arena is licensing and not defining areas of practice.

9
10 Siemoneit agreed.

11
12 Clark indicated that there are no statutes that establish standards for surveying
13 but that most boroughs have set standards.

14
15 Mearig referred to AS 08.48.101, Regulations; bylaws; code of ethics. He felt that
16 standard of practice is not the same as ethics; that the standards rest with the
17 Legislature and not the AELS Board.

18
19 Davis felt those standards should be in the property code.

20
21 **On a motion duly made by Mearig, it was resolved that staff should**
22 **advise the bill sponsor that land surveying standards should be located in**
23 **a more appropriate jurisdiction, not the AELS board.**

24
25 **There was no second, and Mearig withdrew his motion.**

26
27 **On a motion duly made by Davis, it was resolved to request the**
28 **surveying group to generate language that addresses the standards**
29 **required for that boundary establishment, and to present specific**
30 **language that sets those standards. That language would be forwarded**
31 **from the AELS board to the bill sponsor to request insertion in the**
32 **property section of the Alaska statutes.**

33
34 **There was no second and the motion died.**

35
36 Kalen suggested the Board break for lunch and take up this matter after lunch.

37
38 Break for lunch: 12:10 p.m.

39
40 Reconvene: 1:30 p.m.

41
42 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Mearig, and adopted,**
43 **it was**

44
45 **RESOLVED that the AELS Board:**

1 **1) request that the Alaska Professional Land Surveyors**
2 **develop a minimum standard of care by a land surveyor for the**
3 **location of improvements within property boundaries; and**
4 **2) that this language be forwarded to the sponsors of Senate**
5 **Bill 212 and House Bill 227 with recommendation that it be**
6 **inserted into Alaska Statutes title relating to Property for the**
7 **purpose of aiding judicial enforcement of the standard of care**
8 **and AELS enforcement of its licensing laws and regulations.**
9

10 **There was no objection, and the motion passed.**

11
12 Cyra-Korsgaard joined the meeting at 1:38 p.m.

13
14 The Chair noted that McLane and Kalen would be bringing recommended changes
15 to the statutory definition of land surveying to include GIS, Hydrographic
16 Surveying, and Photogrammetry to the August 2001 Board meeting.

17
18 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, **15f, AKLS Workshop.**

19
20 Mearig stated he had suggested the Board separate the responsibility for the exam
21 from the professional society. The goal was to set up something similar to the other
22 national organization exam committees and use volunteers whose expenses are
23 covered. It apparently was not that simple to accomplish and became bureaucratic
24 to do so because of procurement policies.

25
26 The Executive Administrator explained that the process the State of Alaska (SOA),
27 DCED, uses for reimbursement requires name, address, and social security number,
28 which is a federal mandate, for reimbursement for travel. Although the
29 participants are volunteering their time as expert subject participants, they will
30 receive what could be perceived as a benefit, travel to Anchorage. Consequently,
31 the SOA cannot exceed \$5,000 total, including Board member participation for this
32 workshop. Test, Inc. has a contract to provide the workshop and these would be
33 volunteers who would participate at a one day, June 23rd, workshop, just as they did
34 last June.

35
36 Kalen indicated the need for a two-day workshop and said he erred when initially
37 presenting a workshop that fell just short of \$5,000. He noted that he later
38 submitted a budget under the \$8,000 that the Board authorized, but by then the
39 agency decided the workshop could not go over \$5,000.

40
41 Discussion followed.

42
43 The Board decided that the SOA will reimburse some land surveyor experts for
44 travel to Anchorage to participate in a workshop on June 23rd conducted by TEST,
45 Inc. (Volunteers are selected by ASPLS.) The group will review and develop AKLS
46 examination questions.
47

1 The Chair indicated they could take up future workshops in the budget discussion.

2
3 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, **Old Business, 15g.**

4
5 The Executive Administrator discussed the proposed regulation changes listed as
6 15g, 1-7 in the agenda.

7
8 1. Landscape Architect Registration Exam (LARE) deadline change under 12 AAC
9 36.050, adopted at the February 01 AEL Board meeting. The Executive
10 Administrator discussed the regulation requirement to accept LARE applications up
11 to 90 days before the exam. The proposed regulation change would require LARE
12 applications to be received 10 days before the February and August board meetings
13 for the June and December LAREs, respectively. The deadline is currently mid-
14 March and all applications received between the February board meeting and mid
15 March would require convening the Board for application approval. To copy files
16 and distribute them for a mail ballot or teleconference is time-consuming and Board
17 members must take time outside the regular meeting to review files. The Board
18 adopted this regulation at its February 2001 meeting and held it over.

19
20 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Iverson, and adopted**
21 **unanimously, it was**

22 **RESOLVED that the AELS Board public notice this proposed**
23 **regulation change to change the application deadline date for**
24 **landscape architects by exam under 12 AAC 36.050.**

25
26 **There was no objection and the motion passed.**

27
28 2. Cross reference Architect by Comity education standards under 12AAC 36.061;

29
30 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Mearig, and adopted**
31 **unanimously, it was**

32 **RESOLVED that the AELS Board public notice this proposed**
33 **regulation change to cross reference Architect by Comity education**
34 **standards under 12AAC 36.061.**

35
36 The Executive Administrator explained the Board had taken up this matter at the
37 February 2001 AELS Board meeting and asked Ken Truitt, the assistant attorney
38 general to comment on the Department of Law (DOL) revisions to a prior regulation
39 project to 12 AAC 36.061. Truitt had commented that the DOL couldn't specifically
40 reference the future education standards but that he could work on language to do
41 so. The Executive Administrator had worked with Truitt and the regulation
42 specialist to develop new language. That language was handed out as a supplement
43 to the May AELS packet and references the "NCARB Education Standard" but does
44 not reference a specific date.

45
46 There was no objection and the motion passed.

47
48 3. Revise PLS Table A, to delete "or related engineering sciences" (12 AAC 36.065);

1
2 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by McLane, and adopted**
3 **unanimously, it was**

4 **RESOLVED that the AELS Board public notice this proposed**
5 **regulation change to revise the PLS Table A, delete “or related**
6 **engineering sciences” under 12 AAC 36.065.**

7
8 The Executive Administrator explained that the Board had made the suggested
9 change at the February AELS Board meeting and the draft language was in their
10 May Board packet as item #3.

11
12 **There was no objection and the motion passed.**

13
14 4. Reinstatements for all disciplines under 12 AAC 36.165, adopted at February 01
15 AELS meeting.

16
17 The Executive Administrator outlined the regulation change for reinstatement
18 under 12 AAC 36.165(b). This regulation was reviewed at the last meeting and
19 approved by the Board, but held over for additional regulation changes. This
20 change would make it so applicants applying for reinstatement are not required to
21 re-test. Subsection (d) makes it clear that engineers have to meet the requirement
22 under 12 AAC 36.100, which refers to the NCEES exam. So long as they have met
23 that requirement (tested), they do not need to retest. There is no reference to date,
24 so if the exam changed, retesting is not necessarily required. The proposed changes
25 under subsection (b) broaden this reinstatement requirement to the other
26 professions (architects, land surveyors, and landscape architects). The effect of the
27 regulation change would be that no one would need to retest.

28
29 Davis suggested some technical changes to ensure that applicants would be
30 required to pay the appropriate fees. They way the regulation was re-worked (b)
31 and (d) was ambiguous.

32
33 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Mearig, and adopted**
34 **unanimously, it was**

35 **RESOLVED that the AELS Board public notice this proposed**
36 **regulation change to revise the regulation for reinstatements**
37 **under 12 AAC 36.165 as amended.**

38
39 **There was no objection and the motion passed.**

40
41 5. Downloadable seal, website design, under 12 AAC 36.180, adopted at the
42 February 01 AELS meeting.

43
44 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by McLane, and adopted**
45 **unanimously, it was**

46 **RESOLVED that the AELS Board public notice this proposed**
47 **regulation change to revise the regulation for seals under 12**
48 **AAC 36.180 as amended.**

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

The Executive Administrator explained the Board had discussed revising the regulation to allow for a reasonable facsimile of the board seal to be used. That seal would also be available for downloading from the AELS website.

Short discussion followed.

Davis suggested that instead of “reasonable” to replace with, “substantially similar”. There was no objection to the amendment.

There was no objection and the motion passed.

- 6. Disciplinary sanctions (12 AAC 36.320(g)(h)), previously adopted at February 2001 AELS meeting, and were held over to the May meeting.

**On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by McLane, and adopted unanimously, it was
RESOLVED that the AELS Board public notice the proposed regulation change to revise the regulation for disciplinary sanctions under 12 AAC 36.320 (g) and (h).**

Mearig objected.

Short discussion for clarification. This regulation change would allow the State to discipline registrants who had disciplinary actions in another jurisdiction. The AELS Board discussed and adopted this regulation at its February meeting. The Board did not wish to participate in what has been considered “piling on” actions, where registrants with routine disciplinary actions are fined. However, the Board wanted the authority to take action if they decided an action in another jurisdiction did warrant further action in Alaska.

Mearig removed his objection.

There was no further objection and the motion passed.

- 7. Retired status definition, under 12 AAC 36.990, adopted at the February 01 AELS meeting.

**On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Iverson, and adopted unanimously, it was
RESOLVED that the AELS Board withdraw from the proposed regulation project the proposed definition for retired status since the statutes adequately define the retired status registrant.**

Short discussion.

1 There was no objection, and the motion passed.

2
3 **Agenda Item 16, Review Goals and Objectives**

4
5 There were no changes made to the Goals and Objectives list in the packet.

6
7 The Chair moved to the next item on the agenda, under New Business, NCEES
8 exams and Canadian Proctor.

9
10 **Agenda Item 17, New Business**

11
12 The Licensing Examiner discussed the NCEES exams and Canadian Proctor issue.
13 She informed the Board that there have been some requests to have NCEES exams
14 proctored in Canada. Some other states have allowed this and NCEES has no
15 objections but it is the individual jurisdictions' responsibility to ensure exam
16 security and absorb any additional costs for mailing and proctoring. So far the
17 requests have entailed using the Canadian Engineering Association as proctors.
18 There are some additional costs for shipping involved.

19
20 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Peirsol, and adopted**
21 **unanimously, it was**

22 **RESOLVED that the AELS Board allow candidates for NCEES**
23 **exams to have their exams proctored in Canada.**

24
25 Short discussion followed.

26
27 **On an amendment duly made by Iverson, and seconded by Peirsol, to**
28 **pass through any additional costs for shipping by tracked method or**
29 **proctoring costs to candidates.**

30
31 **There was no objection and the amendment passed.**

32
33 **The main motion was taken up and there was no objection, and the motion**
34 **passed.**

35
36 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, under New Business, NCEES
37 exam reviews. The Executive Administrator mentioned that staff discovered there
38 was a policy change to NCEES exam reviews. Previously, the NCEES allowed
39 jurisdictions to set their own time limits for exam reviews. Consequently, the AELS
40 Board has a policy dating back to 1988 and readopted in 1998, that allows
41 candidates a one hour review of failed exams. Under the most recent NCEES
42 Manual of Policy and Position Statements revised in August 2000, EP 25 is now
43 silent on this matter. However, the NCEES Administrative Procedures Manual
44 outlining exam reviews allow substantially more than one hour in some cases. The
45 Licensing Examiner has prepared a one-page synopsis, in the board meeting
46 packets packets, of the allowable times.

47
48 **The Board amended their policy on exam reviews and directed staff to**
49 **follow the NCEES guidelines for exam reviews.**

1 The Chair moved to the next agenda item, Canadian Engineering Reciprocity. The
2 Canadians from APEY have expressed interest in increased mobility between
3 Canada and the United States.

4
5 Davis thought one area that could be modified would be Alaska's requirement that
6 work experience be gained under a U.S. registered engineer and asked if that could
7 be expanded to include work gained under a Canadian registered engineer.

8
9 Iverson expressed interest in pursuing this but would like to have Miller's thoughts
10 on this because Miller is the educator and may have some insights on requirements.

11
12 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Kalen, and adopted**
13 **unanimously, it was**

14 **RESOLVED to start a regulation project to allow responsible**
15 **charge and responsible control work experience gained under**
16 **registered Canadian engineers for Engineer by Comity**
17 **licensing.**

18
19 Short discussion followed.

20
21 The Chair instructed the Executive Administrator to bring back proposed
22 regulations to the August AELS board meeting for review, and indicated this
23 regulation project would not yet be going out for public comment.

24
25 The Chair indicated the Board would start a subgroup on Canadian Reciprocity to
26 work with APEY and other Canadians to establish a means for reciprocity, and
27 assigned Miller, McLane and Iverson to the group, with Davis to provide assistance.

28
29 The Chair brought up the next item for discussion, NCEES Exam Administration.
30 She indicated that the Executive Administrator provided the Board with staff costs
31 for exam administration and asked the Board for comments.

32
33 Mearig indicated that there would not be savings, but turning over the function to
34 NCEES would free up staff time. He suggested that the Board continue to
35 administer exams.

36
37 Kalen agreed and added that Alaska has three sites that are quite geographically
38 separated from the NCEES headquarters and that he would like to see more
39 jurisdictions administered by NCEES before a switch would be made.

40
41 Break: 2:45 p.m.

42
43 Reconvene: 2:50 p.m.

44
45 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, **AELS Officer Elections.**

46
47 The first item is to elect a new chair. The Chair she has served for two years and is
48 not interested in another term.

1 **On a motion duly made by McLane and seconded by Davis, it was**
2 **RESOLVED to nominate Pat Kalen to serve as AELS Board**
3 **Chair.**

4
5 **On a motion duly made by Iverson and seconded by Peirsol, it was**
6 **RESOLVED to nominate Robert Miller to serve as AELS Board**
7 **Chair.**

8
9 The Chair asked staff to distribute ballots for a secret ballot.

10
11 **The Executive Administrator and Licensing Examiner counted ballots and**
12 **announced that Robert Miller was elected to serve as the AELS Board**
13 **Chair.**

14
15 The Chair brought up the next election, AELS Board Vice-Chair.

16
17 **On a motion duly made by McLane and seconded by Davis, it was**
18 **RESOLVED to nominate Pat Kalen to serve as AELS Board**
19 **Vice-Chair.**

20
21 **On a motion duly made by Mearig and seconded by Iverson, it was**
22
23 **RESOLVED to nominate Kathy Gardner to serve as AELS**
24 **Board Vice-Chair.**

25
26 The Chair asked staff to distribute ballots for a secret ballot.

27
28 **The Executive Administrator and Licensing Examiner counted ballots and**
29 **announced that Kathy Gardner was elected to serve as AELS Board Vice-**
30 **Chair.**

31
32 The Chair brought up the next election, Board Secretary.

33
34 **On a motion duly made by Gardner and seconded by Mearig, it was**
35 **RESOLVED to nominate Ernie Siemoneit to serve as AELS**
36 **Board Secretary.**

37
38 **On a motion duly made by Iverson and seconded by Davis, it was**
39 **RESOLVED to nominate Patricia Peirsol to serve as AELS Board**
40 **Secretary.**

41
42 **The Executive Administrator and Licensing Examiner counted ballots and**
43 **announced that Ernie Siemoneit was elected to serve as AELS Board**
44 **Secretary.**

45
46 The Chair congratulated the new officers and indicated that they would begin
47 serving their new positions at the beginning of the new fiscal year.
48

1 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, the **web site course for**
2 **Arctic Engineering CE 603.**

3
4 The Administrator explained that Dr. Miller suggested to Dr. Orson Smith that the
5 AELS Board might be interested in an update on the web based arctic engineering
6 course since it is a new course being offered. The regular review of arctic courses
7 will be held at the May 2002 meeting. Dr. Smith provided an update and his
8 assessment that the course had gone well.

9
10 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, under New Business, **Host**
11 **NCEES Western Zone regional meeting.**

12
13 Iverson stated that the decision was made at Western Zone meeting to have its
14 meeting in Anchorage in May 2005, and unless the Board decided otherwise, the
15 meeting planning would proceed.

16
17 Gardner felt it was great to have the meeting in Anchorage and thought it would be
18 a positive step toward encouraging the national meeting participation. If they
19 decide to hold the NCEES annual meeting in Anchorage, positive reactions from the
20 smaller group's conference of about 100 would encourage delegates to attend the
21 national conference.

22
23 Kalen thinks there is flexibility in the date of the conference, so it is possible to hold
24 it in late May when there may be warmer weather in Anchorage.

25
26 Iverson suggested a committee be formed now to work on hosting the conference
27 and he offered to serve on the committee.

28
29 Short discussion followed.

30
31 The Chair asked who else would like to serve on the committee for Host Western
32 Zone 2005, and Gardner and Kalen volunteered. She also added Miller and asked
33 Gardner to Chair the committee.

34
35 The Board indicated their support for the Anchorage Visitor and Convention
36 Bureau's proposal for hosting the NCEES annual committee in Anchorage in 2006
37 and asked the Executive Administrator to forward their support. The Board hoped
38 she would be able to attend the meeting in Little Rock, Arkansas in August 2001 to
39 garner support for this important meeting.

40
41 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to furnish the Anchorage Visitor and
42 Convention Bureau's staff with contacts for NCEES Western Zone, WCARB and
43 NCARB. The architects have considered Alaska and if the Anchorage Visitor and
44 Convention Bureau's staff could forward information about Alaska to them it would
45 be helpful in the quest to host a meeting in Alaska.

46
47 The Chair moved to the next item on the agenda, **Term Limits**, an item added from
48 yesterday's discussions.

49
50 Kalen suggested that the Board consider pursuing a statute change to change the
51 term limit law so partial terms of less than 24 months would not count against two
52 full terms.

53
54 The Executive Administrator suggested it be added to the legislation request in the
55 Annual Report that will come before the board in August 2001.

1 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Gardner, and adopted**
2 **unanimously, it was**

3 **RESOLVED to add to the legislation request in the Annual**
4 **Report, a request for legislation to change the term limit**
5 **statute so partial terms of less than 24 months would not count**
6 **as one of the two terms board members can serve.**

7
8 There was no objection and the motion passed.

9
10 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, **Architect by Comity**
11 **alternate path.** The Chair explained that the Board has heard a request from the
12 AIA-Alaska Executive Committee with a proposal to change the requirements for
13 Architect by Comity licensure in Alaska. They have asked the Board to provide an
14 alternative route to comity applicants other than NCARB certification (which does
15 provide its own alternate path to certification for non-degreed applicants in the
16 Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) process).

17
18 The Chair provided an historical perspective for Board members on Architectural
19 Registration in Alaska. Prior to 1984 the state administered an NCARB qualifying
20 exam (a two-day exam) for those without a professional degree. Once passed,
21 candidates would take the professional exam. In 1984, NCARB eliminated the
22 qualifying exam and replaced it with education requirements. Because of its small
23 size, the Alaska Board elected years ago to follow NCARB standards, educational
24 requirements, and guidelines for the licensure of architects, whether by exam or
25 comity. Since 1984, the Board has accepted the NCARB education standards
26 (generally requiring a professional architectural degree). Some Architect by Comity
27 requirements were written Board policy but had not been adopted into regulation.
28 After the policies were contested, it was recommended the Board to adopt its policy
29 and practices into regulations. Regulations changes to Architect by Comity were
30 finalized in 1999. What changed in the industry were the architectural education
31 programs in the universities. Many architectural schools in the 70s and 80s
32 eliminated their 5-year professional degree programs and began offering only 4-year
33 non-professional degrees and graduate school professional degree programs. Some
34 states did not require a degree. Some architects were licensed in states other than
35 Alaska with a 4-year degree. As building boomed in the 1980s, they moved to
36 Alaska, but were not eligible for reciprocity in Alaska, due to their lack of a
37 professional architecture degree.

38
39 The Chair explained that the WCARB and NCARB members have been working on
40 the Nebraska proposal for an alternate path to NCARB certification for architects
41 who do not hold an NCARB Council Record (Blue Book) and cannot easily qualify
42 for one. The Chair presented a handout that outlined the BEA, Nebraska Model,
43 Nebraska Current comity, and AIA-AK proposal.

44
45 Architect by Comity

46

	Alaska Current Comity	Alternatives to Certification		Nebraska's Current Comity	Proposed AIA-Alaska Executive Committee
		NCARB BEA	Proposed Nebraska Model		
Education	Meet NCARB Education Standard	None required	4 yr. degree	n/a	None

	(or have 5 yr. or Master's degree - NAAB accredited)				
Training	IDP (3 yr.)	7-10	IDP	n/a	IDP
Exam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
License	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Additional Work Exp.(Post Registration)	No	10 yr.	10 yr.	15 yr.	6 yr.
Interview	No	Yes	No	No	No
Disciplinary Action	Varies		None		None within 4 years
Blue Book NCARB Certificate	Yes	Yes (receives)	Yes (receives)	No	No

Note: Only 17 Jurisdictions of 55 do not require an accredited degree.

Additionally, the Chair handed out a mark-up of the AIA-Alaska proposal as a modified AIA-Alaska/Nebraska model:

Item 2, "be currently licensed in another jurisdiction" was kept the same as Alaska's current regulation.

Change Item 4, to "or submit evidence of the following:

- a. minimum 4 year BA or BS degree from an accredited institution of higher learning.
- b. Not less than 10 years experience, subsequent to licensure; and
- c. No disciplinary action taken."

Delete #5.

Delete B, because in architecture there is not a requirement for responsible charge work experience.

**On a motion duly made by McLane, seconded by Peirsol,
it was**

RESOLVED to propose a regulation project to change the Architect by Comity requirements based on the modified AIA-Alaska Executive Committee proposal.

The Chair mentioned that the Board does have some applicants with a blue book NCARB Council record (certificate) applying for licensure, post 1990 licensed, but they did not go through the IDP program because their state did not require it. We do require this of our first time applicants. This is another issue to be taken up later.

The Board held a discussion on the various components of the models.

**On an amendment duly made by Iverson, and seconded by Davis,
to require an architecture related degree .**

1 Davis stated that the profession is more like the law profession in that someone can
2 obtain an undergraduate degree in almost anything and still pursue a law degree.

3
4 **Mearig objected because he felt it was an unnecessary burden for the**
5 **Board to evaluate architectural courses and degrees for applicability.**

6
7 Iverson stated that he felt that without adding the requirement for architectural-
8 related degree would be moving away from the Board's direction to require formal
9 education. He indicated that land surveyors and engineers require
10 engineering/surveying related degrees, and this would be stepping back in terms of
11 architecture.

12
13 Mearig agreed and interprets the proposal to show they have gone through some
14 form of higher education and he would vote against the amendment.

15
16 Short discussion followed.

17
18 Roll Call Vote on the amendment:

19

	Yea	Nay
Brown		X
Davis	X	
Gardner		X
Iverson	X	
Kalen		X
McLane	X	
Mearig		X
Peirsol		X
Siemoneit		X

20
21 **The Chair indicated the amendment failed.**

22
23 The Chair restated the main motion:

24
25 **On a motion duly made by McLane, seconded by Peirsol,**
26 **it was**

27 **RESOLVED to propose a regulations project to change the**
28 **Architect by Comity requirements based on the modified AIA-**
29 **Alaska Executive Committee proposal.**

30
31 The Chair stated she did not support the motion because this proposal is stepping
32 back significantly at a time when the Board is pushing for higher educational
33 standards for Engineers and Land Surveyors. This would set up a whole category of
34 applicants that have different requirements than first time exam applicants. She
35 indicated that she felt within two years there should be an alternative means to
36 obtain an NCARB Council Record. Currently there is an alternative, the BEA, for
37 people to pursue NCARB certification.

1
2 Peirsol mentioned that this was discussed at the WCARB regional meeting that the
3 range of time required to complete a BEA is 19-26 years, for the Nebraska model a
4 range of 17-22 years, and the model law process totals about 8 years. Jurisdictions
5 are trying to increase mobility. She thinks the Board should start a process to
6 consider a proposal.

7
8 Davis indicated that engineers by comity could get licensed from another state with
9 10 years experience and two letters of recommendation, even if it is in a specialty
10 we do not recognize,. Twenty years represents a whole career and that seems like
11 an inordinate amount of time to require for licensure. Davis supports moving
12 forward with a proposal, even if it is not a final solution.

13
14 Iverson, stated he could not support what is currently on the table because it steps
15 back too far in terms of educational requirements. He agrees the Board should
16 move forward with a process but would vote against this particular proposal.

17
18 The Chair stated that this process is not just being used by comity applicants, in
19 that some first time exam applicants living and working in Alaska come into the
20 system without a degree. Those applicants take the exam proctored by a state
21 which does not require a professional degree and once licensed in that state, apply
22 for comity licensure in Alaska.

23
24 Peirsol commented that the NCARB annual meeting will be in June and there
25 would be discussions about alternatives. Information about that process can be
26 used at the August AELS Board meeting.

27
28 Short discussion followed.

29
30 **On a motion duly made by Cyra-Korsgaard, seconded by Davis,**
31 **it was**

32 **RESOLVED to add back in the provision requiring IDP.**

33
34 The Chair indicated that there was no objection and IDP is in the main motion.

35
36 **On a motion duly made by Kalen and seconded by Davis,**
37 **it was**

38 **RESOLVED to remove the specific language in the IDP**
39 **provision as stated in the AIA-Alaska proposal deleting**
40 **“application for Jurisdiction Registration with Council**
41 **Certification”.**

42
43 **There was objection.**

44
45 **The Board had a show of hands to adopt this amendment and the**
46 **amendment passed, 7-2, with Peirsol and Davis opposing the amendment.**

1 The Chair stated the amendment passed and moved back to the main motion.

2
3 Mearig stated he thinks the proposal is a step backward and does not support the
4 motion.

5
6 The Chair asked for a show of hands.

7
8 The Chair noted the motion passed 6-3, with Mearig, Iverson, and Brown opposing
9 the motion.

10
11 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda.

12
13 **Agenda Item 16, Board Member Reports.**

14
15 The Chair noted that there are reports in the packet from the following: Mearig,
16 who attended the CLARB Regional meeting; the Executive Administrator and
17 Peirsol, who attended the WCARB regional meeting in Boise in March; Dr. Miller,
18 who attended the APEGGA meeting in Calgary; and members just returned from
19 the Western Zone meeting in Maui.

20
21 Kalen mentioned that attending the meeting as part of a delegation was very
22 effective. The NCEES studied Computer Based Testing but concluded that the
23 Council is not ready to move forward with it.

24
25 Gardner added that the cost for the switch would be borne by exam candidates and
26 there just wasn't support for it.

27
28 The Chair brought up the Delegation Credentials letter for the annual meeting.
29 Peirsol, Brown, Gardner, and the Executive Administrator would be attending. She
30 asked for support to be the voting delegate since she is the Board Chair. There was
31 no objection.

32
33 The Chair returned to Agenda Item 12 for Board action.

34
35 **Agenda Item 12 - Budget Summary Report**

36
37 **On a motion duly made by Gardner, seconded by McLane,**
38 **it was**

39 **RESOLVED to add \$3,000 for Board Training to the Proposed**
40 **FY 02 Budget allocation of the \$106,000 increment previously**
41 **presented.**

42
43 **There was an objection by Kalen.**

44
45 The Chair asked for a show of hands and the motion passed 8-1, with Kalen a nay
46 vote.

47 **On a motion duly made by Peirsol, seconded by McLane,**
48 **it was**

1 **RESOLVED to add \$3,000 for AKLS workshop to the Proposed**
2 **FY 02 Budget allocation of the \$106.0 increment previously**
3 **presented.**
4

5 The Chair indicated there was no objection and this would bring the total amount to
6 \$8,000 for the FY02 Budget for the AKLS Workshop.

7
8 **On a motion duly made by Mearig and seconded by Iverson,**
9 **it was**

10 **RESOLVED to approve the AELS Allocation Plan for FY02 as**
11 **amended.**
12

13 The Chair moved to the next item on the agenda.

14
15 **Agenda item, 19, Board Member Comments**

16
17 Mearig would like to see the Board investigate the possibility of having an internet
18 or take home exam for the arctic engineering requirement and the AKLS exam.
19 The purpose of the arctic requirement and the AKLS exam is to expose candidates
20 to the arctic requirements and the legal questions in terms of land surveying. It
21 seems appropriate to move to an exam similar to the state specific exam that Idaho
22 currently has, which is a take home exam.

23
24 The Chair asked this to be placed on a future agenda.

25
26 Kalen mentioned he attended the Registration Board Forum in late March and it
27 was a good meeting.

28
29 McLane thanked the APEY Canadian engineers for their attendance at the
30 meeting.

31
32 Iverson stated he felt this had been a good meeting.

33
34 Davis stated she thought the subgroups were very productive.

35
36 Peirsol agreed that the subgroups were helpful.

37
38 Cyra-Korsgaard would like to set aside an hour on the August agenda for landscape
39 architectural stamping.

40
41 Siemoneit would like to see alternatives to so many regulation projects and
42 expressed concern that the first solution seems to be a regulatory change and he
43 would like to explore other options.

44
45 The Chair suggested that a subgroup be formed to explore other solutions for the
46 August meeting. She indicated the subgroup idea came out of training. The
47 NCARB is looking at the effect IDP has on reciprocity and she would bring this to
48 the next meeting.

49
50 Gardner thanked the Chair for her two-year tenure as Chair.

1 Executive Administrator expressed her thanks to the Chair for her leadership
2 abilities and support for staff. She felt that the Chair always made time to deal
3 with issues, no matter how busy her own work schedule might have been.

4
5 The Chair took up the next item on the agenda.

6
7 **Agenda Item 20 – Read Applications into Record**

8
9 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Iverson, and carried**
10 **unanimously, it was**

11 **RESOLVED to approve the following list of applications for**
12 **comity and examination as read into the minutes, with the**
13 **stipulation that the information in the applicant’s file will take**
14 **precedence over the information in the minutes:**

15
16 The Licensing Examiner read the applications into the record:

17
18 **COMITY APPLICANTS**

19

#	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	DISCIPLINE	BOARD ACTION
1.	Aschenbach	Don R.	AKLS	Approved for AKLS exam, conditional approval for land surveyor registration pending passing AKLS
2.	Springberg	Craig S.	AKLS	Approved for AKLS exam, conditional approval for land surveyor registration pending passing AKLS
3.	Carey	Maureen J.	Architect	Approved
4.	Dovolis	Dean J.	Architect	Approved
5.	Hansen	John O.	Architect	Approved
6.	Johnson	Carolyn P.	Architect	Approved
7.	Lee	Steven A.	Architect	Approved
8.	Overbey	Christian D.	Architect	Approved
9.	Stuff	William R.	Architect	Incomplete. Needs IDP
10.	Tomlinson	Richard F.	Architect	Conditional approval pending arctic
11.	Blue	Karen A.	PE/Chemical	Approved
12.	Barcomb	Joseph	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending arctic
13.	Christianson	Derek	PE/Civil	Approved
14.	Delacroix	Homer M.	PE/Civil	Approved
15.	Erpelding	Christopher J.	PE/Civil	Incomplete, needs 24 months responsible charge experience in civil engineering
16.	Fares	Sameer S.	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending arctic
17.	Funk	John W.	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending verification of 8 months professional work experience
18.	Hemphill	Dallas C.	PE/Civil	Approved
19.	Howard	Robert W.	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending receipt of transcripts and completing arctic requirement
20.	Jaddi	Ahmed M.	PE/Civil	Approved
21.	Kuckertz	Thomas H.	PE/Civil	Approved
22.	Phair	Christopher B.	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending arctic
23.	Poorman	Dale E.	PE/Civil	Approved
24.	Robb	James J.	PE/Civil	Approved

25.	Rogers	Janelle D.	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending verification of current registration
26.	Salemann	Victor L.	PE/Civil	Approved
27.	Schenk	Roderick K.	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending payment of fees
28.	Sherwood	Michele L.	PE/Civil	Approved
29.	Smiley	Mark A.	PE/Civil	Approved pending arctic
30.	Speirs	Alexander	PE/Civil	Approved
31.	Willis	Kenneth S.	PE/Civil	Approved
32.	Wodrich	Victoria	PE/Civil	Conditional approval. Needs engineering education transcripts prior to masters, or verification of at least 2 years work experience
33.	Zufelt	Jon E.	PE/Civil	Approved. Waiver of arctic requirement granted
34.	Jack	Jay B.	PE/Electrical	Approved
35.	Lane	Keith	PE/Electrical	Approved
36.	Stratton	Kathleen M.	PE/Electrical	Conditional approval pending arctic
37.	Bausch	David B.	PE/Mechanical	Conditional approval pending arctic
38.	Clark	Raymond J.	PE/Mechanical	Conditional approval pending arctic
39.	Gentry	Matthew C.	PE/Mechanical	Approved
40.	Pope	Kevin G.	PE/Mechanical	Conditional approval pending arctic
41.	Ryan	Paal K.	PE/Mechanical	Approved
42.	Sammonds	Ronald Jr.	PE/Mechanical	Approved
43.	Volmoeller	Scott P.	PE/Mechanical	Approved

1
2
3

EXAM APPLICANTS

#	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	DISCIPLINE	BOARD ACTION
1.	Hala	Scott C.	FE	Approved after staff review
2.	Mendez	Johnny	FE	Approved after staff review
3.	Rhodes	Melanie A.	FE	Approved after staff review
4.	Koziura	Jaroslaw J.	FE	Approved
5.	Merkel	Heike	FE	Conditional approval pending verification of 4 months work experience.
6.	Craig	Brian T.	FLS	Approved after staff review
7.	Cottrell	Michael P.	PE/Civil	Incomplete, needs 6 months professional experience after 10/99
8.	Gault	Michael	PE/Civil	Approved for FE & PE exams. Request for FE waiver denied
9.	Kraemer	Russell P.	PE/Civil	Approved
10.	Motis	Julianne M.	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending verification of 14 months work experience
11.	Nardini	Matthew J.	PE/Civil	Approved
12.	Savatgy	David	PE/Civil	Incomplete. Needs 10 months responsible charge experience
13.	Reiss	John	PE/Electrical	All work experience verified to date is subprofessional

4
5
6

OTHER APPLICATIONS

#	NAME		BOARD ACTION
1	True North Surveys, LLC	Certificate of Authority	Conditional approval pending resolution designating person in responsible control for

			land surveying
--	--	--	----------------

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

On a motion duly made by Mearig, seconded by Iverson, and carried unanimously, it was RESOLVED to deny the following list of applications for comity, as read into the minutes, with the stipulation that the information in the applicant's file will take precedence over the information in the minutes:

DENIED

1.	Zartman	Greg J.	PE/Civil Comity	Denied. Needs 100 months civil engineering experience or proof of having passed PE-Civil exam. Is approved for the PE-Civil exam.
----	---------	---------	-----------------	---

Agenda Item 21 - Review Calendar of Events

The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, the tentative schedule for the quarterly AELS 2001/2002 board meetings:

- August 23-24, 2001 - Anchorage
- November 15-16, 2001 - Anchorage
- February 21-22, 2002 - Juneau
- May 30-31, 2002 - Fairbanks

The Chair indicated that they have 12 trips. A tentative plan for Board participation at the NCEES, CLARB, WCARB, Western Zone, and NCARB meetings was discussed.

Agenda Item 22 - Review Task List

The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda.

The Executive Administrator indicated she would forward the task list, outlining each person's tasks as assigned at this meeting, as part of the minutes.

Executive Administrator	1) Research how many states have term limits for board members and if they count serving a partial term against the total terms served.
	2) Check with Oregon engineering Board to find out if they contract out the regulations attorney reviews.
	3) Informally advise Boards & Commissions that Board members due for reappointment are seeking 2 nd term.
	4) Prepare reimbursement sheets for AKLS expert subject participants for June 23 rd workshop based on ASPLS list.
	5) Request AG to research specialty contractor exemption under AS 08.48.331 (7) for history and interpretation behind statutory exemption.
	6) Start a regulations project to create a Continuing Education Program based on the ASPLS presentation model and working with board members for each profession.
	7) Start a regulations project to revise the current Engineering licensure to implement a non-discipline specific licensing system, with tracking in the data base for specialty. All 8-hr NCEES exams (currently 17 specialties) would be offered in Alaska.
	8) Start a regulations project to create an alternative path to Architect by Comity based on a modified version of the AIA-AK proposed regulation change.
	9) Start a regulations project to accept responsible charge and responsible control work experience gained under a Canadian registered engineer as acceptable for engineering licensing in Alaska.
Brown	1) Attend NCARB annual meeting.
	2) Work with Executive Administrator on Architect CEU.
	3) Serve on Incidental Practice Subgroup.
Cyra-Korsgaard	1) Serve on Building Officials subgroup.
	2) Work on landscape architect stamping, will be Aug. Agenda item.
Davis	3) Work with Ken Truitt on specialty contractor exemption.
	4) Serve on Canadian Reciprocity subgroup (provide assistance).
	5) Serve on Term Limit Subgroup.
Gardner	1) Attend NCARB annual meeting.
	2) Serve on Western Zone Host Committee.
Iverson	1) Serve on Western Zone Host Committee.
	2) Serve on Contractor Specialty subgroup.
	3) Serve on Incidental Practice subgroup.
Kalen	1) Lead on AKLS workshop June 23-24 th , coordinate workshop with ASPLS and AELS staff.

	2) Work with Executive Administrator on Land Surveyor CEU.
	3) Continue to work with McLane and ASPLS on GIS, Photogrammetry, hydrographic surveying changes to definition of land surveying.
	4) Serve on Term Limit Subgroup.
	5) Serve on Western Zone Host Committee
McLane	Attend AKLS workshop on June 23-24 2001.
	1) Serve on Canadian Reciprocity subgroup.
	2) Work with McLane and ASPLS on GIS, Photogrammetry, hydrographic surveying changes to definition of land surveying.
Mearig	1) Work with Executive Administrator on professional engineering nondiscipline specific regulations project.
	2) Work with Executive Administrator on engineering CEU. 3) Serve on Term Limit subgroup.
Miller	1) Serve on Canadian Reciprocity subgroup.
	2) Serve on Western Zone Host Committee.
Peirsol	1) Attend NCARB annual meeting in Seattle in June.
	2) Serve on Term Limit Subgroup.

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

Agenda Item 23 – Housekeeping

The Board members signed wall certificates and submitted travel reports as completed.

On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by McLane, and carried unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to adjourn the meeting at 4:42 p.m.

There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator

Approved:

Daphne Brown, Chair

1
2
3
4
5
6

Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers and Land Surveyors

Date: _____