

STATE OF ALASKA  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING  
BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,  
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS

MINUTES OF MEETING

November 18-19, 2004

*Draft*

***These draft minutes were prepared by the staff of the  
Division of Occupational Licensing.  
They have not been reviewed or approved by the Board.***

By authority of AS 08.01.070 (2) and in compliance with the provision of AS 44.62, Article 6, the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors, (AELS) held a meeting at the Atwood Building, 550 W 7<sup>th</sup> Ave., Suite 602, Anchorage, AK 99501.

**Thursday, November 18, 2004**

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

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

Donald Iverson, PE, Electrical Engineer, Chair  
Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Vice-Chair  
Robert Gilfilian, PE, Civil Engineer, Secretary  
Clifford Baker, PLS, Land Surveyor  
Boyd Brownfield, PE, Civil Engineer  
Craig Fredeen, PE, Mechanical Engineer  
Richard Hughes, PE, Mining Engineer  
Kenneth Maynard, FAIA, Architect  
Scott McLane, PLS, Land Surveyor  
Kimberly Mills, Public Member  
Patricia Peirsol, Architect

Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator  
Eleanor Vinson, Licensing Examiner

Joining a portion of the meeting, in person were:

John R. Clark, Occupational Licensing Investigator  
George Weaver, Occupational Licensing Investigator  
Karen Hawkins, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Law  
Ron Thompson, Building Official, Municipality of Anchorage  
Max Schillinger, self

*Draft*

Monique Prozeralik, self  
Mike Prozeralik, self  
Dale Nelson, Alaska Professional Design Council  
Patrick Kalen, Alaska Professional Design Council

**Agenda Item 2 – Review/Revise Agenda:**  
**November 18-19, 2004:**

1. 9:00 a.m.	Call to Order/Roll Call	Chair/Examiner
2. 9:05 a.m.	<b>Review/Revise Agenda</b>	Chair/Board
3. 9:10 a.m.	Ethics Report	Chair/Board
4. 9:15 a.m.	Review/Approve Minutes Quarterly Board meeting (August mtg)	Chair/Board
5. 9:30 a.m.	<b>Correspondence: Complete list/Corr. in Public Packet</b> a. Letter of 9/17/04 from Muhammad Ashraf, IRR road inventory b. Email of 10/13/04 from Dr. Perkins, UAF, re: FE exam eligibility for Junior status c. Email of 10/14/04 :Max Schillinger, requesting review of engineer MS for PLS education credit d. Email of 10/14/04 from John Allison, IRR road inventory e. Email of 9/19/04 from Dick Armstrong on many issues.	Chair/Board
6. 9:45 a.m.	<b>Investigator Report</b> – John Clark ---Enforcement of: a. Requirement for Dating each time when Sealing Plans (.185) b. Electronic Seals (issues with electronic signatures). c. Residential structures (3 or more stories) d. Onsite: sealed but unsigned plans on the job site	Board/Clark
7. 10:15.a.m	<b>Subgroups:</b>	Chair/Board
	A. Engineering Disciplines (sub-disciplines) (a) Canadian Engineering Licensure (follow-up) Email from Bill Smith of 9/27/04 with concerns. (b) Control Systems Engineering- (follow-up)	Gilfilian/Board
	B. Incidental practice	Maynard/Board
	C. Host Committee, Western Zone May 19-21, 2005	Mills/Board
8. 11:15 a.m	Meet with Building Official- MOA- Ron Thompson	Board/Official
<b>12:00 noon</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
9. 1:15 p.m.	<b>Public Comment- Oral hearing on Proposed regulations public noticed</b> Other Public Comment	Chair/Board
10.2:15 p.m.	<b>Proposed Regulation changes</b> <u>Requested public noticing with Division (update on this project)</u> .185 Sealing Specification (clarification on stamping specs) .105 Canadian Comity (allows license with 5 yr. practice + PE Exam, Engr). .061 Architect Education Standard (technical, annual update) <u>New Drafts for discussion purposes (not public noticed):</u> Staff approval for engineer and architect comity record holders in order to expedite and allow licensure upon receipt:	Chair/Exec. Adm./ Board      Exec. Adm/Bd.

***Draft***

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• .105 (f) NCEES Model Law Engineer</li> <li>• .103 (b) NCARB Blue Book Certificate</li> <li>• .107 (d) NCEES Model Law Land Surveyor</li> <li>• ____ Continuing Education Discussion</li> <li>• .062 FE Eligibility, during Junior year</li> </ul>	Gilfilian/Subgroup Exec. Adm. /Board
11.3:15 p.m.	Application Reviews (Executive Session –until completed)	Chair/Board
<b>5:30- 6 p.m.</b>	<b>RECESS UNTIL 8:00 a.m. Friday, November 19, 2004</b>	

The Chair asked if there were any revisions to the agenda and there were none.

The Chair indicated there were no objections and the agenda was adopted.

### **Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Report**

The Chair asked if there were any ethics disclosures by members.

The Chair noted there were no ethics disclosures to report.

### **Agenda Item 4 – Review/Approve Minutes**

The Chair asked for any corrections or additions to the August 19-20, 2004 draft minutes.

Baker asked to have a closing comment he made to revisit the initial fine of \$1,000 for unlicensed corporate practice added to the August 2004 minutes.

**On a motion duly made by Maynard, seconded by Baker, and unanimously adopted, it was**

**RESOLVED to APPROVE the following motion, to adopt the minutes from the August 19-20, 2004 meeting, as amended.**

The Chair indicated the August 19-20, 2004 minutes were adopted, as amended.

### **Agenda Item 5 – Correspondence**

The Chair brought up correspondence:

In the supplemental packet were:

**Draft memo of 11/16/94 from Stan Foo, Mining Chief outlining the State DNR mining section policy on licensure.**

The Chair indicated there is a requirement for mining engineers to be licensed and the draft memo outlines the measures the agency will take. Hughes has taken the lead role to oversee the DNR permitting process with respect to professional mining engineering requirements.

***Draft***

1  
2  
3 **Email from Bill Kontess, AIA, with complaints about the NCARB process for**  
4 **obtaining council certificate.**  
5

6 The Chair noted problems associated with the process and the Executive Administrator  
7 will pass on his comments to the NCARB Council staff as appropriate feedback to  
8 NCARB. The Board recognizes NCARB oversees 55 jurisdictions, with large amounts  
9 of paperwork flowing back and forth, and that it can be frustrating for applicants to deal  
10 with mistakes and misinformation. The Board wants to provide personal service to its  
11 applicants and its staff is willing to assist applicants who are having difficulties.  
12

13 **Letter from Paul Reichardt, UAF Provost, announcing the UAF has a search**  
14 **committee.**  
15

16 Joan Braddock, Dean of the College of Natural Science and Mathematics is the chair,  
17 and has been advised the AELS Board requests the new Dean of the Department of  
18 Engineering and Mining be registered in Alaska, or be eligible for licensure within one  
19 year of appointment.  
20

21 Hughes advised the Board he serves on the search committee and the committee  
22 members do not all agree the new faculty should be licensed in Alaska.  
23

24 The Board held a brief discussion and supports its position that the new Dean is  
25 licensed in Alaska.  
26

27 **Email of November 8, 2004 from Chris Miller with comments on electronic seals,**  
28 **dating seals, and fire protection engineers.**  
29

30 The Board held a discussion about electronic seals and the Board's requirement to  
31 have a set of plans with a wet signature. The Chair indicated there is a subgroup  
32 assigned to continue to work on the issues surrounding technology.  
33

34 The Board discussed recent legislation would give the statutory authority to  
35 electronically submit documents. The type of documents the Board relies on are  
36 specific professional drawings, which are different than the types of documents the  
37 legislation (HB 285) addressed.  
38

39 The Chair felt what Mr. Miller describes probably meets the spirit of the regulation and  
40 noted in his practice, he removes his seal before scanning.  
41

42 The Board recognizes the technology exists for encrypted signatures, and electronic  
43 submissions of plans and seals. The Board wants to address the practical aspects for  
44 the professionals signing plans, but also wants to give protection to the licensed  
45 professional to ensure final plans are not altered or forged. Currently, the signature has  
46 provided proof an individual licensed professional has taken responsibility for the design  
47 work. The Board has a subgroup assigned to work on the issues and felt it should  
48 clearly address the matter of electronic seals, signatures, and electronic transmittal to  
49 give guidance to its registrants.

***Draft***

1  
2 The Chair moved to correspondence items in the Board packet:  
3

4 **a. Letter of 9/17/04 from Muhammad Ashraf, IRR road inventory**  
5

6 The Executive Administrator explained Mr. Ashraf asked to have the Board review his  
7 proposal to provide work for Native Corporations for road inventory and referred Board  
8 members to his proposal of work activities described.  
9

10 The Chair asked to have this held and discussed with the investigator.  
11

12 **b. Email of 10/13/04 from Dr. Perkins, UAF, re: FE exam eligibility for Junior status**  
13

14 The Chair indicated this would be discussed later on in the agenda, under New  
15 Business.  
16

17 **c. Email of 10/14/04 from Max Schillinger, requesting review of PLS education**  
18

19 The Executive Administrator referred to the email from Mr. Schillinger and advised  
20 board members the Board denied the applicant as a PLS by Comity because he did not  
21 have surveying education. The matter was appealed and the Board would be acting on  
22 the hearing officer decision later in the meeting. At this time, Mr. Schillinger is looking  
23 for guidance from the Board on specific programs he is considering. He is considering  
24 pursuing an advanced degree from the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) in civil  
25 engineering, or a master's degree from Kennedy-Western. She reviewed the tables  
26 under 12 AAC 36.065. The tables allow a 2 year education credit for an applicant  
27 holding an ABET accredited civil engineering degree. She outlined the discussion she  
28 had with Mr. Schillinger about the two options he was considering. The Board  
29 concluded if he obtained a master's degree from UAA, the Board could recognize the  
30 candidate met the undergraduate requirements for an ABET accredited degree in civil  
31 engineering. Since Kennedy-Western University does not have an ABET accredited  
32 undergraduate or graduate program, there is not a provision to allow credit for the  
33 degree so the Board would not give the education credit for a master's degree from  
34 Kennedy-Western.  
35

36 The Executive Administrator anticipates Mr. Schillinger will come to the meeting during  
37 the public comment period to discuss the tables.  
38

39 **d. Email of 10/14/04 from John Allison, Development/updating Tribal long-range**  
40 **transportation plans.**  
41

42 The Board held a brief discussion and decided to hold this over to discuss with the  
43 investigator.  
44

45 **e. Email of 9/19/04 from Dick Armstrong on many issues.**  
46

47 The Board appreciated the input from Mr. Armstrong.  
48

49 **Agenda Item 6 – Investigator's Report**  
50

*Draft*

1 The Chair indicated John Clark and George Weaver were both present, as well as  
2 Karen Hawkins, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Law.

3  
4 The Board and Clark held a discussion about the investigator's report.

5  
6 The Board asked Clark if his travel requests were approved as requested and Clark  
7 responded travel to Fairbanks (road system), Kodiak, Ketchikan, and Nome were  
8 denied.

9  
10 The Chair indicated he would like to bring up investigator travel under, (Tab 16) Meet  
11 with the Director, Rick Urion.

12  
13 Clark explained processes he uses to open a report, get initial review by a Board  
14 member and, if necessary, to hire an expert witness. If the complaint is determined to  
15 be unfounded, it goes no further, and frequently, the person under review is unaware of  
16 the allegation. The process becomes public if Board action is taken or a Cease and  
17 Desist Order is issued. If an advisory letter is issued, it is not placed in the registrant's  
18 file and is not public.

19  
20 Clark brought up the matter of the Board's requirement for dating documents when  
21 signing final plans, under 12 AAC 36.185, use of seals, which reads:

22 "(d) The registrant shall include the date each time the registrant signs and seals a  
23 document by inserting the date within the seal or in a close proximity to the seal."

24  
25 The Board held a lengthy discussion about the regulation change, and what would  
26 satisfy the regulation, the date in the title block and common practices in signing plans.

27  
28 The Chair reminded the Board the issue is protecting the public to ensure the registrant  
29 is licensed at the time the signature is applied. He felt requiring the date be applied in  
30 or near the seal was onerous for those signing lots of plans, and his view that the date  
31 on the plans should suffice.

32  
33 Clark indicated he initially asked to have the regulation changed to require a date be  
34 applied in order to determine final plan dates and when changes were made to existing  
35 plans. He indicated the date in the title block is not close enough to the signature to  
36 suffice, and does not indicate the date signed. The Board developed specific language  
37 "within the seal or in close proximity to the seal" which passed by a majority of the  
38 Board.

39  
40 Hughes confirmed it could be difficult to uphold at hearings if the signature is not in  
41 close proximity, and the date within the title block would not suffice.

42  
43 The Chair asked for a consensus of Board members with respect to the wet signature  
44 and the date.

45  
46 The Board members were asked if they were in favor of signing and placing the date in  
47 or near the seal when signing final plans, and the Board members responded, as  
48 follows:  
49

*Draft*

	In favor of sign & date in/near the seal	Not in favor of dating in/near seal
Mills	Yes	
Brownfield	Yes	
McLane	Yes	
Maynard	Yes	
Hughes	Yes	
Peirsol		No
Baker	Yes	
Cyra-Korsgaard	Yes	
Fredeen	Yes	
Gilfilian	Yes	
Iverson		No

The Chair indicated a majority of the Board favors the date to be in or near the seal, with two no votes.

The Chair shared a method of using AutoCAD to apply the date where the date changes automatically, rather than writing it in, and asked if it was acceptable.

Hughes felt this would satisfy the intent of the regulation since that is the date the professional is taking responsibility for the work. There were no objections.

Clark asked if the Board wanted to send a mass mailing to registrants to advise of the requirement to date when signing final plans.

Clark indicated he would send advisory letters to anyone who is not dating plans.

**On a motion by Maynard, it was**

**RESOLVED to recommend amending 12 AAC 36.185 (b) to read: the registrant shall include the date when the registrant signs a seal on a document by inserting the date in the seal or immediately adjacent to it.**

The motion died without a second.

The Board discussed the current practice of signing in various offices.

**On an amendment by Brownfield, it was**

**RESOLVED that it is the position of the Board that the registrant shall include his signature and the date of his signature on the seal or contiguous to the seal each time he signs a document.**

The amendment died without a second.

Cyra-Korsgaard felt the Board needed to have a position but not to require registrants buy a new seal in order to conform.

***Draft***

1 Mills would like the Executive Administrator to post the Boards intent on the website,  
2 and not go through a regulation project or require people to purchase a new seal or  
3 embosser.

4  
5 The Executive Administrator suggested the Board state a consensus and she would  
6 send a letter of the Board's intent on signing and dating seals to the professional  
7 organizations.

8  
9 The Chair reiterated the Board's interpretation that the date placed within the stamp or  
10 contiguous to the stamp is the date the registrant is taking professional responsibility for  
11 the drawing and that the date in the title block of the drawing will not suffice.

12  
13 The Board wants to use ways to get information to registrants without using the  
14 regulation process, and wants to eliminate potential costs to registrants and avoid  
15 requiring licensees to purchase new stamps to reflect the date within the seal.

16  
17 The Board discussed the cost of a mass mailing and ways to get information to the  
18 registrants through the website and professional societies.

19  
20 Mills reiterated it was the Board's intent to allow the date to be applied using AutoCAD,  
21 along with a wet signature. The normal date of the drawing is not sufficient.

22  
23 Cyra-Korsgaard asked to have the intent added to the Building Officials' Manual.

24  
25 Dale Nelson joined the meeting at 9:40 a.m.

26  
27 Break: 9:40 am

28 Reconvene: 9:55 am

29  
30 Clark advised the Board he sometimes encounters seals that are not readable and he  
31 will send an advisory letter to those individuals. It is important that the regulations and  
32 policies are consistently applied.

33  
34 The Board held a brief discussion.

35  
36 Clark brought up issues he has encountered with large residential structures with  
37 multiple levels.

38  
39 The Board held a discussion.

40  
41 **Letter of 9/17/04 from Muhammad Ashraf, IRR road inventory**

42  
43 Gilfilian brought up an item of correspondence to discuss with Clark about road  
44 inventories on native or tribal lands.

45  
46 Clark felt the work that Mr. Ashraf outlined he plans to do constitutes surveying and  
47 engineering work.

48  
*Draft*



1 The Executive Administrator explained Mr. Ashraf asked to have the Board review his  
2 proposal to provide work for Native Corporations for road inventory and referred Board  
3 members to his proposal of work activities described.

4  
5 The Board held a discussion about the proposed work as listed.

6  
7 The Chair indicated some work described fell into surveying and engineering and would  
8 require a licensed professional engineer or land surveyor to perform the necessary  
9 calculations and surveying.

10  
11 Brownfield stated Mr. Ashraf cannot do what he proposes to do, as written, without it  
12 being done under a professional engineer.

13  
14 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to send a letter to Mr. Ashraf.

### 15 16 **Unlicensed Corporate, LLC, and LLP Practice**

17  
18 Baker brought up the initial fine of \$1,000 for unlicensed practice for Corporations. He  
19 indicated he supported initiating a fine but has since heard from people in the  
20 Kenai/Soldotna area who think this is significant for those individuals who file for an "S"  
21 corporation for tax purposes, not realizing the implications for firm licensure. He  
22 expressed concern that someone might be disciplined for this oversight, and would then  
23 need to report this as a "disciplinary action". It could affect the individual from being an  
24 "expert witness" in cases.

25  
26 The Board held a short discussion.

27  
28 The Chair asked to hold this matter until later when taking up the rest of the  
29 Investigator's items.

30  
31 Ron Thompson, Building Official joined the meeting at 11:15 a.m.

### 32 33 **Agenda Item 8 – Meet with Building Officials**

34  
35 The Chair introduced Ron Thompson, Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) Building  
36 Official.

37  
38 The Board discussed the statutory exemption in AS 08.48.331 (6) for single family  
39 residences (for not more than three families) not more than two stories high. Single  
40 family residences that are much larger and more complex are being constructed now  
41 and the Board wanted feedback from the Building Official about any complications or  
42 safety issues.

43  
44 Thompson believes the exemption could be changed, possibly to a square footage less  
45 than 5,000 square feet. The MOA is not encountering problems with 2-story houses,  
46 but typically 3 or more story homes have a lot more open space. The MOA has  
47 problems with some residential designers who are not registered architects designing  
48 space in larger homes where structural issues arise.

1 The Board held a short discussion and felt the limit should be 3-story residences, not  
2 tied to square footage, but concern was raised that some owners are burying the  
3 outside walls so it doesn't appear to be 3-stories or higher.

4  
5 Thompson advised the MOA has height restrictions and the zoning code says you  
6 cannot load up soil or bury outside walls.

7  
8 Piersol asked for comments on Bed and Breakfasts (B&B).

9  
10 Thompson felt a 4-bedroom limit without constraints is appropriate but the MOA has not  
11 been having issues with B&Bs. He reiterated that the MOA has problems with some  
12 residential designers who are not registered architects designing space in larger homes  
13 where structural issues arise.

14  
15 **12:00 noon: Break for lunch.**

16 **1:15 p.m. : Reconvened.**

17  
18 **Agenda Item 9 – Public Comment**

19  
20 Pat Kalen, APDC; Dale Nelson, APDC; Monique and Mike Prozeralik joined the meeting  
21 during public comment.

22  
23 The Chair opened the meeting with an oral hearing on proposed regulations that were  
24 public noticed. Written comments can be submitted until December 17, 2004 but oral  
25 comments were taken at this time.

26  
27 The Chair asked if there were any comments on the proposed regulation change to  
28 12 AAC 36.185 and there were none.

29  
30 The Chair asked if there were any comments on the proposed regulation change to 12  
31 AAC 36.185 and Monique Prozeralik asked to comment.

32  
33 Monique Prozeralik asked for the requirements for the Engineer by Comity for Canadian  
34 engineers.

35  
36 The Executive Administrator advised the Alaska Board currently licenses Canadian  
37 engineers initially licensed in another U.S. jurisdiction. Those applicants fill out the  
38 application form, pay fees, provide verification of 24 months of responsible charge work  
39 experience in the engineering discipline applied for, and successful completion of the  
40 arctic course. The proposed change would allow Canadian P.Eng's with 5 or more  
41 years of work experience, to provide two letters of reference from U.S. or Canadian  
42 engineers in lieu of the work experience. The engineer must provide proof of passage  
43 of the professional engineer (P.E.) examination in the discipline applied for, or if the  
44 exam is in a sub-discipline, provide 10 years of post registration experience.

45  
46 Prozeralik felt the requirements for Canadian engineers were similar to the proposal for  
47 regulation changes to the Architect by Comity. She has been practicing for 20 years in  
48 Alaska, and was initially registered in Washington D.C. She suggested the Board allow  
49 a combination of education and experience rather than the requirement of the NCARB

***Draft***

1 “Blue Book” Council certificate. She asked the Board to consider the similarity and  
2 apply similar combinations of education and experience to Architects by Comity.

3  
4 Cyra-Korsgaard explained there are different governing bodies nationally with  
5 jurisdiction over the professional examinations. Alaska adopted the NCARB model  
6 standard for education in 1984 and has held this standard since then.

7  
8 Prozeralik advised there are different requirements among states and limiting the  
9 entrance to Architect by Comity by the means of only the council certificate limit  
10 professionals from practicing the full scope of their profession. She asked the Board to  
11 reopen the discussion to consider experience and education combinations, which is  
12 virtually the same as the engineering proposal under consideration.

13  
14 Iverson explained the issue is the NCARB “Blue Book” Council certificate requires either  
15 a 5-year NAAB Accredited degree or the applicant must obtain the “Blue Book” Council  
16 certificate by going through the Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) process. What  
17 has happened most recently is the NCARB has gone back to the BEA process and  
18 streamlined it. There are costs involved but the process is available. Alaska is not  
19 proposing to accept Canadian engineers equally but is expecting them to pass the  
20 NCEES professional engineering (PE) exam. What Ms. Prozeralik is asking is for the  
21 Board to accept less education requirements.

22  
23 Prozeralik stated she works for herself and has done contract work for military bases.  
24 She has billed over 8000 hrs of work directly related to being a professional over the  
25 past 8 years, but this only counts as 4 years experience in the BEA process. She  
26 cannot advertise as an architect, but must advertise as a residential architectural  
27 designer.

28  
29 The Board held a short discussion.

30  
31 Prozeralik explained she discussed her qualifications with Michel Bourdrez, NCARB,  
32 and because she bills directly under her own business license, she fell short of the 8  
33 years of work experience required, and her file never made it to the committee for  
34 review.

35  
36 Mike Prozeralik asked to testify. He has a license in Washington D.C. also, and is not  
37 able to qualify for licensure. He described his office and asked the Board to consider  
38 allowing qualified architects the ability for licensure in Alaska.

39  
40 The Chair asked if there were additional comments on 12 AAC 36.105. There were  
41 none.

42  
43 The Chair asked if there were comments on 12 AAC 36.061, Architect Education  
44 Standards.

45  
46 The Chair indicated there were no comments.

47  
48 The Chair asked if there were any additional comments on the proposed regulations  
49 and there were none. He closed the oral hearing at 1:35 p.m.

*Draft*

1  
2 The Chair asked if there were additional persons wishing to comment under public  
3 comment.

4  
5 Max Schillinger asked to comment on the professional land surveying tables under  
6 12 AAC 36.065. He explained that he holds a PLS license in California, has a degree  
7 from Humboldt University in engineering, has been trying to gain licensure as a PLS in  
8 Alaska, and has passed the Fundamentals of Engineering exam.

9  
10 Schillinger described his education. He does not hold an ABET accredited B.S. Civil  
11 degree so he falls short of the education requirement. He discussed the table and how  
12 California assesses education and experience to allow more flexibility in assessing  
13 eligibility. He believes he has already passed stringent requirements in California, grew  
14 up in a surveying family and acquired many skills, yet he cannot qualify in Alaska. He  
15 discussed the narrow limits of the changes to the PLS tables he would propose. He has  
16 no issue that the table changed to require some education, but felt the new table should  
17 read, "course work in board approved curriculum." If the Board changed this it would  
18 help many qualified people to get licensed in Alaska because it would recognize an  
19 education in engineering. Schillinger stated the tables do not currently allow for any  
20 specific credit for those holding a Master's degree in engineering.

21  
22 The Board held a discussion with Mr. Schillinger.

23  
24 Schillinger outlined programs he has considered taking. Among them Norwich  
25 University has an ABET accredited master's degree program but it is very costly, about  
26 \$30,000. The UAA has a master's degree program, and the Kennedy-Western  
27 University has a distance learning master's degree program that is not an ABET  
28 accredited degree.

29  
30 The Board held a short discussion.

31  
32 The Chair suggested a Geomatics program may be also be an option for him, and many  
33 programs allow students to test out of courses, and gain credit towards the 2-year  
34 course work required.

35  
36 McLane explained his experiences at UAA and the availability of land surveying  
37 courses.

38  
39 Brownfield commented Mr. Schillinger has a method to obtain licensure in the current  
40 tables.

41  
42 Baker outlined seminars that also allow for specific college credit if the person taking the  
43 course pays the fees for credit.

44  
45 The Chair outlined for Mr. Schillinger that the Board has accepted a Master's degree in  
46 Civil Engineering to qualify as credit for a PLS, if the university has an ABET accredited  
47 undergraduate degree.

48  
49 The Board held a short discussion.

*Draft*

1  
2 Dale Nelson, APDC described changes in the land surveying programs nationwide and  
3 fewer courses are required to complete the program.  
4

5 The Chair advised the Board the national trend is to move to require a Master's degree  
6 as the minimum qualification for engineers, and to require a 4-year degree for land  
7 surveying.  
8

9 The Chair thanked Mr. Schillinger.  
10

### 11 **Agenda Item 10 – Proposed Regulation Changes** 12

13 The Chair brought up proposed regulation changes. He advised the first items were the  
14 regulations that are currently public noticed, and the Board held an oral hearing to take  
15 comments on the proposed regulations that were public noticed: Sealing Specifications,  
16 Canadian Comity licensure, and Architect Education Standards. He mentioned the  
17 public can forward any written comments through December 17, 2004, and the  
18 proposed regulation changes would come back to the Board for final action.  
19

20 The Chair brought up the next item. The Board had asked the Executive Administrator  
21 to prepare draft proposed regulations that would allow staff to process applications for  
22 model law architect, engineer, land surveyors without the applications coming to the  
23 Board for review, much the same way they process corporate authorizations. The  
24 AELS Board staff would use a checklist to determine if the applicant has met the  
25 requirements in the specific instances when the applicant submitted national council  
26 certification.  
27

28 The Executive Administrator had prepared drafts and circulated them, and she outlined  
29 the requirements for each and then reviewed three rough draft versions of regulations  
30 she had circulated to Board members.  
31

32 **On a motion by Mills, seconded by Gilfilian, and unanimously adopted, it was**  
33

34 **RESOLVED to adopt the revised draft regulations for architects holding an**  
35 **NCARB “Blue Book” Council record; engineers holding an NCEES council**  
36 **record stamped “model law engineer”, and surveyors holding an NCEES**  
37 **council record stamped “model law surveyor” for public noticing to**  
38 **interested parties.**  
39

40 The Executive Administrator read the draft proposed regulation change to Engineer  
41 Registration by Comity, 12 AAC 36.105 (f).  
42

43 The Chair asked if there were any questions or objections to the engineering checklist  
44 and there were none.  
45

46 The Executive Administrator read the proposed regulation change to Architect  
47 Registration by Comity, 12 AAC 36.103 (b).  
48

49 The Chair asked if there were any comments or questions about this checklist and there  
50 were none.

***Draft***

1 The Executive Administrator provided the Land Surveyor Board members a copy of the  
2 proposed regulation changes to 12 AAC 36.107 (d), which was reviewed, as edited to  
3 reflect "surveyor" instead of "land surveyor".  
4

5 The Chair asked if anyone had any questions or comments on this proposed regulation  
6 change.  
7

8 Baker wanted to review the draft to edit the title and make suggested changes to the  
9 checklist to conform to the checklists for Architect by Comity, and Engineer by Comity.  
10

11 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to circulate the final edited version to the  
12 Board prior to requesting the proposed checklists be public noticed but indicated  
13 conceptually, the draft language is appropriate. Under the proposed changes, staff will  
14 review the application and the verified information contained in the council record.  
15 Once applicants have also met all provisions for state requirements the license would  
16 be issued by staff and not require board review. Although there are not many  
17 applications with model law certification, the process will remove any delays for  
18 architects, engineers, and land surveyors by comity who hold certificates, much in the  
19 same way corporate licensure happens.  
20

21 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the motion to public notice the  
22 proposed regulation changes for architect, engineer, and surveyors by comity to  
23 interested parties, and there were no objections.  
24

25 The Chair also mentioned the Executive Administrator brought to his attention the letter  
26 of explanation that the Board has asked the Executive Administrator to prepare to  
27 accompany all regulations projects. The regulations attorney points out the letter may  
28 provide more detail, but in doing so, if the direction of the board changes on an issue,  
29 the Board may not have the flexibility to make changes in the final adoption process.  
30 The Chair felt it was important to the Board to fully inform registrants and the public the  
31 reasons for the proposed changes. The Board may have to re-notice some regulations  
32 if additional changes are required, but having an explanation that is written to briefly  
33 describe the reason for the change may provide clarity to the public and far outweighs  
34 the flexibility or legal challenge that may result from an error or omission. The  
35 explanations provide a history of Board's intent, and consequently the Executive  
36 Administrator will ask Board members to carefully review the explanatory letter when it  
37 is circulated.  
38

39 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none.  
40

41 The Chair brought up the email from Dr. Perkins, in Tab 5 (b), requesting engineering  
42 students to be allowed to sit for the Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) exam.  
43

44 Gilfilian referred to the table in 12 AAC 36.062, and the language that reads ABET  
45 accredited B.S. degree in engineering for 4 years of education, yet one provision is  
46 course work (3 years) requiring 3 years of work experience. Dr. Perkin's draft language  
47 shows changing from 75 % to 62.5% completion of course work.  
48

49 The Executive Administrator explained Dr. Perkins updated his information. The  
50 information in the packet was based on the initial request by the UAF. One way for staff

***Draft***

1 to have a definitive way to assess when a student is eligible is the UAA and UAF  
2 provide a 75% letter. If the Board chose to go to "Junior year" status, the regulation  
3 would be changed to reflect either the percent change or simply "Junior year status" and  
4 the UA would send us a list of eligible students based on the UAF determination. Staff  
5 never makes a determination at what point a student has reached the 75% level, the  
6 university makes that assessment. Most of our candidates for the FE exam are  
7 University of Alaska UAF or UAA candidates. If a candidate is not, they likely hold their  
8 degree or staff would ask the specific university to do so. Very few candidates come in  
9 with experience and education combinations.

10  
11 She explained Dr. Perkins provided the Board with a summary of why the UAF is  
12 interested in the change and provided the chart from NCEES showing other  
13 jurisdictions' requirements and some do allow applicants to sit for the FE exam in the  
14 "Junior year".

15  
16 The Chair noted the Board has always given special dispensation to allow students to  
17 take the exam while a senior and during the process they will get the degree, but there  
18 is no follow-up for assurance students complete the degree.

19  
20 The Board held a short discussion.

21  
22 The Chair indicated the Board does not support a change to move the time to a "Junior  
23 status." He asked if there were any objections and there were none.

## 24 25 **Agenda Item 7 – Subgroups**

26  
27 The Chair suggested taking up subgroups later in the day, at 3:15 p.m. but further  
28 moved the group meeting until 8:00 a.m. on Friday, November 19, 2004.

## 29 30 **Agenda Item 11 – Application Reviews**

31  
32 **On a motion duly made by Gilfilian , seconded by Mills, and adopted**  
33 **unanimously, it was**

34  
35 **RESOLVED to go into executive session for the purpose of reviewing**  
36 **applicant files at 2:38 p.m.**

37  
38 The Board went into executive session at 2:38 p.m.

39  
40 The Licensing Examiner placed a sign on the door that the Board was now in Executive  
41 Session.

42  
43 The Board recessed at 5:10 p.m. and is in recess until 8:00 a.m. November19, 2004.

44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
***Draft***

1                                   **STATE OF ALASKA**  
2       **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**  
3                                   **DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING**  
4       **BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS & LAND SURVEYORS**  
5                                   **Atwood Building, 550 W 7<sup>th</sup> Ave, Suite 602**  
6                                   **Anchorage AK 99501**  
7  
8

9       **Friday, November 19, 2004**

10  
11       **Agenda Item 12 – Call to Order/Roll Call**

12  
13       The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. The Chair asked if there were any  
14       applications that needed further review or discussion and there were none.

15  
16       The Board came out of executive session at 8:05 a.m. and the Licensing Examiner  
17       called the roll.

18  
19       Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

20  
21               Donald Iverson, PE, Electrical Engineer, Chair  
22               Linda Cyra-Korsgard, Landscape Architect, Vice-Chair  
23               Robert Gilfilian, PE, Civil Engineer, Secretary  
24               Clifford Baker, PLS, Land surveyor  
25               Boyd Brownfield, PE, Civil Engineer  
26               Richard Hughes, PE, Mining Engineer  
27               Ken Maynard, Architect  
28               Scott McLane, PLS, Land Surveyor  
29               Kimberly Mills, Public Member  
30               Patricia Peirsol, Architect  
31               Craig Fredeen, PE, Mechanical Engineer joined the meeting at 8:10 a.m.

32  
33       Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

34  
35               Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator  
36               Eleanor Vinson, Licensing Examiner

37  
38       Joining a portion of the meeting, in person, were:

39               Gary Powell, Fire Marshal  
40               John R. Clark, Occupational Licensing Investigator  
41               George Weaver, Occupational Licensing Investigator

42  
43       Participating for a portion of the meeting by teleconference was:

44  
45               Rick Urion, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing

46  
47       The Chair reverted back to subgroups, as the item was not previously taken up due to  
48       time constraints.

49  
50                                   ***Draft***



## 1    **Agenda Item 7 – Subgroups**

2  
3    The Chair moved to break out into subgroups at 8:10 a.m.

4  
5    The Chair reconvened the meeting at 9:05 a.m.

6  
7    Maynard reported on the Incidental Practices subgroup. He indicated the group is  
8    reviewing what each discipline is allowed to do within each license. Tennessee has a  
9    good model of delineation between land surveyors and engineers to help define the  
10    roles of the land surveyor and engineer. He is researching each state for information on  
11    overlap between disciplines. New Jersey divides between building types. His subgroup  
12    is working on overlap as a whole in an effort to develop guidelines for architects,  
13    engineers, land surveyors, and landscape architects. He expects the subgroup to meet  
14    prior to the February Board meeting.

15  
16    Gilfilian reported on the Engineering subgroup. He commented on the email from Bill  
17    Smith of 9/27/04. The subgroup does not believe the work on Canadian Engineering  
18    licensure, which represents at least five years of effort by the Board, will affect the  
19    Board with respect to foreign licensure and force the Board to license foreign engineers.  
20    The Board has met with Canadian representatives on numerous occasions to make  
21    determinations about the Canadian licensure system. The Executive Administrator has  
22    indicated currently some Canadian Engineers obtain initial U.S. licensure in other  
23    jurisdictions, such as Washington state, where work experience under a Canadian  
24    engineer is accepted, then the applicant will apply for licensure in Alaska as an  
25    Engineer by Comity. Our regulations are very specific, and Canadian engineers  
26    obtaining licensure in Alaska are currently taking the U.S. professional engineering  
27    examination and no change to those provisions are being considered at this time.

28  
29    Gilfilian noted the subgroup is also considering if additional engineering disciplines  
30    should be offered in Alaska. There have been some Control Systems engineers who  
31    would like licensure in their specific field. The subgroup suggests the Board consider a  
32    proposal for licensure of Geological Engineers, Control Systems Engineers,  
33    Environmental Engineers, and possibly Fire Protection Engineers.

34  
35    The Chair cautioned the subgroup to be certain to consider the crossover between  
36    disciplines and the numerous engineers currently practicing in those fields and to not  
37    limit those practitioners.

38  
39    Mills reported on the Host Committee Subgroup. She submitted a draft budget for the  
40    Western Zone Meeting to be held May 19-21, 2005, and explained Board members will  
41    need to do some fundraising and to work to keep costs down. She stated that this is a  
42    wonderful opportunity for us to showcase south central Alaska. She and the Executive  
43    Administrator met with the Marriott staff to review the meeting room space and  
44    hospitality suite. The site visit helped visually, and she recommends the Board host the  
45    reception outside the hotel. She indicated the subgroup has a speaker for the Friday  
46    lunch to give a presentation on the 1964 earthquake. She thought other presentations  
47    or models for oil development and the Alyeska Pipeline could be made and would be  
48    very interesting to the group. This meeting is also important because many of the same  
49    people will attend the NCEES national meeting in Anchorage in September 2006.

***Draft***

1  
2 The Board discussed possible sites for a reception and board member involvement  
3 necessary. Board members felt the goal of raising \$3,000 would be manageable.  
4

5 The Chair thought the Board should ask the Director to allow more Board members to  
6 attend the Western Zone meeting. In other jurisdictions, the host members play a  
7 significant role.  
8

9 The Chair asked to move forward to read the applications into the record, Agenda Item  
10 21, and come back to the Administrator's report.  
11

12 **Agenda Item 21 – Read Applications into the Record**  
13

14 **On a motion duly made by Gilfilian, seconded by Mills, and unanimously adopted,**  
15 **it was**  
16

17 **RESOLVED to APPROVE the following list of applications for comity and**  
18 **examination as read, with the stipulation the information in the applicant's**  
19 **file will take precedence over the information in the minutes:**  
20

21 The Licensing Examiner, Eleanor Vinson, read the following applications into the record  
22 as applicants are approved for professional exams, or for comity, as follows:

APPLICANT	DISCIPLINE	EXAM-COMITY	BOARD ACTION
1. Auer, Thomas	Architect	Comity	Conditionally approved pending Arctic Course
2. Glatstein, Howard	Architect	Comity	Approved
3. Loudon, Robert	Architect	Comity	Approved
4. Rhodes, David	Architect	Comity	Conditionally approved pending Arctic Course
5. Stevenson, Michael	Architect	Comity	Approved
6. Williams, Jeffrey	Architect	Comity	Approved
7. Yoder, Roy	Architect	Comity	Approved
8. Ambourn, Christopher	Land Surveyor	Comity	Approved to take AKLS & for comity pending passing AKLS exam
9. Mason, Ted	Land Surveyor	Comity	Approved to take AKLS and Conditionally approved for comity pending passing AKLS
10. Abbate, G. Michael	Landscape Architect	Comity	Approved
11. Leonetti, Edward	Landscape Architect	Comity	Conditionally approved pending Arctic Course
12. Bian, Weiming	PE-Civil	Comity	Approved
13. Clark, Mark	PE-Civil	Comity	Approved
14. Enayat, Wahid	PE-Civil	Comity	Conditionally approved pending Arctic Course
15. Harrington, Michael	PE-Civil	Comity	Denied for Comity; Conditionally approved for PE-Civil exam pending Arctic Course
16. Kikuta, Jason	PE-Civil	Comity	Approved
17. Kovac, Christopher	PE-Civil	Comity	Conditionally approved pending Arctic Course
18. Kovel, Lance	PE-Civil	Comity	Approved
19. Lama, Patrick	PE-Civil	Comity	Approved
20. Lindamood, Brian	PE-Civil	Comity	Conditionally approved pending Arctic Course
21. Melocik, Bradley	PE-Civil	Comity	Approved
22. Middleton, Patrick	PE-Civil	Comity	Approved
23. Paranjpye, Niranjana	PE-Civil	Comity	Approved
24. Ringert, John	PE-Civil	Comity	Approved
25. Ulrich, Cecil	PE-Civil	Comity	Approved
26. Wachholz, Matthew	PE-Civil	Comity	Approved
27. Erickson, Dean	PE-Electrical	Comity	Conditionally approved pending Arctic Course
28. Farrell, Steve	PE-Electrical	Comity	Conditionally approved pending Arctic Course
29. Hicks, Gary	PE-Electrical	Comity	Approved
30. Hilger, Peter	PE-Electrical	Comity	Approved
31. Kelly, Peter	PE-Electrical	Comity	Approved
32. Millard, Jeffrey	PE-Electrical	Comity	Approved

*Draft*

33. Setala, John	PE-Electrical	Comity	Conditionally approved pending verification of PE & current license & proof of 5 years registration after PE
34. Sharif, Cyrus	PE-Electrical	Comity	Conditionally approved pending Arctic Course
35. Jaafar, Abdou	PE-Mechanical	Comity	Approved
36. Kahout, Francis	PE-Mechanical	Comity	Approved
37. Knaevelsrud, Hans	PE-Mechanical	Comity	Approved
38. Lonneman, Robert	PE-Mechanical	Comity	Approved
39. Spata, Anthony	PE-Mechanical	Comity	Conditionally approved pending transcripts and verification of PE and current license & proof of 5 years experience after PE
40. Deak, Tamas	Architect	EXAM	Approved
41. Beck, Paul	FE	EXAM	Approved pending fees
42. Epps, Lewis	FE	EXAM	Approved
43. McLeod, Bradley	FE	EXAM	Approved
44. Prinzhorn, David	FE	EXAM	FE Waiver approved
45. Van Alstine, John	FE	EXAM	Conditionally approved for FE pending 75% letter & fees paid
46. Wittwer, Inna	FE	EXAM	Approved
47. Beane, Aric	PE-Civil	EXAM	Conditionally approved pending Arctic Course, payment of fees and passing FE exam
48. Rhee, Scott	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved pending receipt of letter re general information questions saying his answers are "no", not "yes"
49. Yerkes, Michael	PE-Civil	EXAM	Approved
50. Babcock, Bradley	PE-Electrical	EXAM	Approved

On a motion by Gilfilian, seconded by Mills, and unanimously adopted, it was

**RESOLVED** to find **INCOMPLETE** the following list of applications for comity and examination as read, with the stipulation that the information in the applicant's file will take precedence over the information in the minutes:

<b>Wood, Matthew</b>	<b>PE Mechanical</b>	<b>EXAM</b>	<b>Requires mentoring documents from mechanical PE or 14 months responsible charge under mechanical engineer</b>
----------------------	----------------------	-------------	--

### **Agenda Item 13 - Administrator's Report**

The Chair indicated it was time to move on to the Director and this item would be taken up later.

***Draft***

1  
2 **Agenda Item 14 – Budget Summary Report**

3  
4 The Chair indicated it was time to move on to the Director and this item would be taken  
5 up later.

6  
7 **Agenda Item 15 – Meet with David Brower, Attorney (by teleconference)**

8  
9 The Chair asked if there were any questions for the attorney and there were none. The  
10 Executive Administrator indicated she has advised the attorney the Board had no  
11 questions at this time.

12  
13 **Agenda Item 16– Meet with Rick Urion, Director (by teleconference)**

14  
15 The Director, Rick Urion joined the meeting at 10: 05 a.m. by teleconference.

16  
17 The Chair brought up Western Zone meeting and his request to have the majority of the  
18 Board present. Many of the Board members reside in the Anchorage area, so the costs  
19 should not be too high, probably not more than it usually costs to send several  
20 representatives to attend the Western Zone meeting outside. He asked for the  
21 Director's support.

22  
23 Urion said he did not see a problem with this request.

24  
25 The Chair expressed interest in attending the President's Assembly in Kansas City in  
26 February, and there is no cost to the State.

27  
28 Urion advised the Chair to submit the travel requests prior to making reservations to  
29 travel.

30  
31 The Executive Administrator explained the information has not yet arrived but should be  
32 forthcoming and the Chair was looking for conceptual approval for the travel since all  
33 expenses are covered by the NCEES.

34  
35 The Chair requested the Director allow the investigators travel to do site inspections. In  
36 the past the investigator has found several unsafe situations that likely would not have  
37 been detected without the site inspection.

38  
39 The Chair thanked the Director for his participation.

40  
41 Fredeen asked if staff would be allowed to attend the Western Zone meeting and staff  
42 the registration desk.

43  
44 Urion explained he would do what was required.

45  
46 The Chair invited the Director to attend at least part of the Western Zone meeting.

47  
48 Urion asked if the Board was going to help the architects seeking licensure.

49  
50 The Chair stated it was still on the table.

***Draft***

1  
2 Fredeen explained the Board has a regulatory requirement to date and sign plans, and  
3 the Board has found out recently that many licensees are not dating the plans at the  
4 time of signing. The date is important to provide a clear history of when the registrant is  
5 taking responsibility for the plans. The Board may wish to send out an informative  
6 mailing and would like to know if the agency would authorize the cost of the mailing.

7  
8 Urion suggested the Board gather email addresses.

9  
10 The Executive Administrator explained the ListServe policy is in draft form, and once  
11 implemented it will assist the Board in better communications. There are a variety of  
12 ways to inform the public, and the Board tends to want to send each registrant a letter  
13 so they are fully informed about the regulation but there are costs involved so the Board  
14 is seeking guidance from you.

15  
16 The Chair thanked the Director for his time and consideration.

17  
18 Fredeen asked if the letter could accompany the regulation project.

19  
20 The Executive Administrator explained the proposed regulations project is scheduled to  
21 go to the interested party's list only, which is a smaller group of registrants and public  
22 members. She suggested the ListServe is a good alternative to keep people informed  
23 and the list will be optional, accessed and subscribed through the website. She  
24 described the ListServe for Board members.

25  
26 Break: 10:20 a.m.

27 Reconvene: 10:45 a.m.

28  
29 The Chair reverted to Old Business, Agenda Item 17.

30  
31 The Chair indicated the Land Surveyor Subdivision issue was being handled as part of  
32 the Incidental Practices subgroup, who is looking at the Tennessee method of defining  
33 the scope of services.

34  
35 The Chair brought up Electronic Transmittals and Signatures since the investigator was  
36 present.

37  
38 Clark explained problems he has with Electronic transmittals and the practice of having  
39 one set of plans with a "wet signature". He suggested the Board not accept electronic  
40 or encrypted signatures that could possibly be stamped by someone else in the office.

41  
42 The Chair described a process where the electronic signature is applied to all drawings  
43 used in the field but there is also one wet signature set in the office.  
44 He asked if that helped the investigator.

45  
46 Clark indicated when he encounters an encrypted signature he asks to see the "wet  
47 signature" set of drawings.

48  
*Draft*

Clark explained when he sends an advisory letter, he can add a provision so the party will know the action is not being reported to any organization and so it is clear the action is not going to require them to report or disclose the action taken.

The Chair brought up the item added by Baker, initial fine of \$1,000 for unlicensed corporate practice. The Board acted on this last meeting and it was added to the current agenda for reconsideration.

#### Initial Fine for Unlicensed Practice

The Board held a discussion about the consistency of application for disciplinary action, and the length of time it might take for an entity to comply.

Clark felt allowing two months was adequate for the entity to meet and take the necessary action to facilitate taking action to provide amendment to bylaws or resolutions required.

The Executive Administrator explained there could be delays if the entity has not filed with the Division of Banking, Securities, and Corporations, and there could be backlogs. Realistically, the AELS staff can normally process a completed application within a day or so of receiving it, unless staff is on leave or out of town. There are no backlogs and there have not been backlogs for firm licensing requests in five years.

Clark indicated his advisory letter could advise the parties they would have 60 days to comply.

**On a motion by Gilfilian, seconded by Peirsol, and unanimously adopted it was**

**RESOLVED to APPROVE the following motion:**

**The investigator should first provide a warning letter to Corporations, LLCs, and LLPs practicing without an AELS “certificate of authorization” allowing them 60 days to become approved for Corporate, LLC, or LLP authorization.**

**On an amendment by Brownfield, seconded by Gilfilian and approved unanimously, to add, after allowing them 60 days to become approved for Corporate, LLC, or LLP authorization, “to issue a minimum fine of \$1,000”.**

A short discussion followed and there was no objection to the amendment.

**The Chair restated the motion:**

**The investigator should first provide a warning letter to Corporations, LLCs, and LLPs practicing without an AELS “certificate of authorization” allowing them 60 days to become approved for Corporate, LLC, or LLP authorization (firm license), and if the Corporation, LLC or LLP does not comply, to issue a minimum fine of \$1,000.**

The Board held a discussion if the party should have a fine or a cease and desist order.

***Draft***

1 **On an amendment, by Fredeen, to add “and/or cease and desist order”.**

2  
3 He suggested the investigator could fine the party, and also do a cease and desist  
4 order.

5  
6 A short discussion followed and the amendment died for lack of a second.

7  
8 The Chair asked if there were objections and there were none.

9  
10 The Chair moved on to the next item.

11  
12 Design Competitions:

13 The Executive Administrator explained she received a call from the City and Borough of  
14 Juneau (CBJ) with respect to a design competition for the proposed capitol building.  
15 She spoke to the investigator and Board Chair and determined the regulations are silent  
16 on the issue. The Board could go on the record in favor of supporting the ability of  
17 design professionals to enter in design competitions in Alaska and not require  
18 registration unless the bid was awarded to them. The reason this has merit is because  
19 it allows a wide range of design proposals to be considered, yet is not onerous to the  
20 individual or firm entering the competition unless they are awarded the contract. The  
21 CBJ has architects and engineers who are aware of the state’s requirements, but they  
22 want to be certain CBJ can have a wide range of competitors for the initial conceptual  
23 designs. Given the advice of the investigator and Board Chair, CBJ was advised to  
24 move forward but it is important the Board is in agreement on any future design  
25 competitions.

26  
27 Clark explained the party is not offering up the design work, just the conceptual design.

28  
29 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none.

30  
31 The Executive Administrator asked if the Board wanted this as policy or to clarify in  
32 regulation.

33  
34 The Chair reiterated the Board offers this interpretation that design competitions are  
35 allowed but if the individual or firm is selected, they must get licensed or collaborate with  
36 a local, state-licensed firm before doing the design work.

37  
38 The Board held a short discussion about design builds.

39  
40 Peirsol brought up an Old Business item, Bed and Breakfasts (B&Bs), as this was  
41 discussed at the last meeting, and she shared a response from Steve Shuttleworth.  
42 She explained the Fairbanks City Building Department is not having a problem with the  
43 issue of B&Bs being built as single family homes, as far as the building codes were  
44 concerned.

45  
46 Clark had concerns about the safety aspect for exiting the building in case of a fire, if  
47 provisions have not been made for the number of occupants in the building.

48  
49 The Board held a discussion.

***Draft***



1  
2 The Chair asked that the topic of a potential statute change be on the February agenda  
3 for residential single family dwellings up to 4 stories not requiring mechanical or  
4 electrical engineers.

5  
6 Maynard asked for clarification of yellow page advertising.

7  
8 Clark responded non-architects are currently able to advertise for residential services  
9 because there is an exemption. He consulted with the attorney general's office for  
10 clarification.

11  
12 **Agenda Item 18- Fire Marshal**

13  
14 The Chair introduced Gary Powell, State Fire Marshal, to the Board members and staff  
15 and explained the Board wanted to open up dialogue between the Fire Marshal and the  
16 Board. He mentioned an issue such a B&B with 5 bathrooms built as a single-family  
17 residence with one exit.

18  
19 Powell explained there has been a turnover and Bill Bettick, who has a military  
20 background, has taken over for Kelly Nicolello as the Assistant Fire Marshal. The Fire  
21 Marshal's office has been reorganized primarily to focus on plan review. He is in the  
22 process of updating policy manuals and he can give the Board a copy of the manual,  
23 probably out in January. The Fire Marshal adopted in August the 2003 International  
24 Mechanical Code.

25  
26 Powell indicated the concerns his office has with licensure are not significant but that his  
27 staff struggle with the lines of overlap between architect and engineer.

28  
29 The Chair stated that the Board is working on this and it will take some time to complete  
30 its work.

31  
32 Maynard indicated the Board will want to public notice any recommendations it has.

33  
34 The Board held a brief discussion.

35  
36 Gilfilian asked about fire protection systems because the NCEES adopted a policy that  
37 this is done under the supervision of a registered PE.

38  
39 Powell indicated there are National Institute for Certification in Engineering  
40 Technologies (NICET) certification levels with one or more levels that allow design  
41 work. There may be a dollar threshold for projects.

42  
43 The Board held a short discussion about the National Institute for Certification in  
44 Engineering Technologies (NICET) and the issue of what activities need to be done by  
45 an engineer and those done by NICET certified personnel in determining fire sprinkler  
46 systems performance specifications, design and shop drawings.

1 Fredeen indicated the NICET trained individuals are qualified to prepare shop drawings,  
2 and unless an engineer is specifically trained in those areas he should not design the  
3 specific system. The Public Safety regulations  
4 12 AAC 50.035 outlines the NICET level and what can be done but nothing in the  
5 regulations requires a PE to be involved.

6  
7 Powell indicated he would follow-up with the Board. He felt one area that might help  
8 could be the recognition of Fire Protection engineers.

9  
10 The Chair thought that the shop drawings could be prepared by the NICET certified  
11 personnel but a PE has to review the shop drawings.

12  
13 The Board held a discussion about enforcement in areas around the state, that  
14 Deputies under the Fire Marshal do not always require the appropriate professional  
15 involvement.

16  
17 The Fire Marshal assured the Board he supports deputies in all areas of the state to  
18 follow the statutory requirements, and briefly discussed the process for site  
19 investigations.

20  
21 The Board and Fire Marshal discussed the Ice Hotel, and Fire Marshal involvement in  
22 the project, and probable future project.

23  
24 The Board and Fire Marshal discussed other specific projects and the Board's concern  
25 that some B&Bs are being built as residences with 12 rooms and 5 bathrooms, without  
26 an architect or engineer. The Fire Marshal indicated the owner must live on the  
27 premises and have no more than five rentable rooms.

28  
29 Clark introduced himself and spoke about improved relationships with the State Fire  
30 Marshal in the past few years and the Fire Marshal agreed the Board and his office  
31 should continue to work together.

32  
33 The Chair thanked the Fire Marshal for his participation.

34  
35 McLane reported on Model Law Surveyor, and indicated at the NCEES meeting model  
36 rules were adoption that phase in photogrammetrists and GIS. The August AELS  
37 minutes include the model rules. He felt the Board should adopt the model rules.

38  
39 The Chair asked McLane and Executive Administrator to come back to the February  
40 2005 meeting with a proposal.

41  
42 Break for lunch: 12:00 p.m.  
43 Reconvene: 1:07 p.m.

44  
45 **Old Business- Agenda Item 17 (Continued)**

46  
47  
48  
49  
*Draft*

1 Architect by Comity

2  
3 The Chair brought up the Architect by Comity licensure and advised the Board has  
4 worked on this issue for some time and decided not to make changes to the minimum  
5 requirements for licensure.

6  
7 Cyra-Korsgaard felt the Board has moved along a path to accept the minimum  
8 qualifications for education, experience, and exam, and the architects have been out  
9 front in raising minimum standards. She did not feel it was necessary to go backwards  
10 and accept less education than has been required in Alaska since 1984. She  
11 recognizes the national council, NCARB, has worked to streamline the process for the  
12 Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) so architects who do not meet the minimum  
13 qualifications can obtain the council certification.

14  
15 Peirsol stated that the Board should take on the responsibility to determine alternative  
16 comity requirements instead of leaving that to NCARB. Possibly the Board could  
17 commence a State BEA process in which the Board could have more control and yet  
18 allow applicants a less onerous process to obtain comity. NCARB is trying to increase  
19 architectural registration and mobility but the State of Alaska, by requiring the NCARB  
20 certificate as the only possible means to registration, has created an impediment to both  
21 of those concepts.

22  
23 Maynard urged the Board to keep the rules as established. There is a process for  
24 licensure, it is attainable, and the rules have been in place for 20 years.

25  
26 Brownfield would like to see the BEA process.

27  
28 The Board held a discussion about the applicant who commented to them and had her  
29 handout. It was not clear to the Board why she was not qualified for the BEA process  
30 given her 19 years of experience.

31  
32 The Chair suggested he would write a letter to the NCARB to inquire the status and  
33 reasons why she was not eligible for the BEA process and to copy Ms. Prozeralik.

34  
35 The Executive Administrator indicated she would assist.

36  
37 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to see if she could have Mr. Bourdrez  
38 participate by teleconference at the February 2005 AELS meeting.

39  
40 Emergency, Temporary or Courtesy License

41 The Executive Administrator reported she sent an email to find out more information but  
42 has not yet heard back from Mr. Stewart.

43  
44 Gilfilian responded the purpose of the license is not just for people to obtain a courtesy  
45 license but for forensic licensure.

46  
47 **Agenda Item 19 – Goals and Objectives**

48  
49 The Board did not review its Goals and Objectives, currently listed as follows:

50  
*Draft*

**Goal #1 – Increase Board’s work efficiency.**

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Lead Responsibility</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
a) Establish an orientation program for new Board members to assist in getting up to speed as quickly as possible. Provide Sample applicant files to new members.	Chair	Ongoing
b) Update and maintain goals and objectives.	Chair & Exec. Adm.	Ongoing
c) Update and maintain clear record of Board operating policies and procedures previously adopted by the Board. Date and track progress of all proposed changes to these policies and procedures.	Chair & Exec. Adm.	Ongoing
d) Automate AELS application and licensing process by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distributing and receiving applications electronically</li> <li>• Structuring database so that it minimizes manual data entry</li> <li>• Structuring database so that it can answer queries easily.</li> </ul>	Staff oversee and track	Ongoing
e) Pursue training for Board and staff.	Board and Staff	Ongoing
f) Pursue strategic planning.	Chair and Exec. Adm.	Ongoing
g) Provide letter of Board’s intent and understanding relating to any proposed legislative changes; develop procedures for doing the same.	Board	Ongoing
h) Establish subcommittee work at each meeting.	Chair	Ongoing
i) Increase dedicated attorney time.	Chair	Ongoing

**Goal #2 – Increase Board’s cost effectiveness.**

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Lead Responsibility</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
a) All Board members and the executive administrator who attend regional and national professional functions on behalf of Board shall submit a written report to rest of Board to share knowledge gained.	Attending Board member and Executive Administrator	Every Board meeting; ongoing
b) Examine feasibility of Board autonomy.	Brownfield, Gilfilian	Ongoing
c) Obtain and analyze Board budget annually and request audit of income or expenses as appropriate.	Chair & Exec. Administrator	Ongoing

**Goal #3 – Ensure that all individuals practicing within state are either registered or fall within appropriate exemptions to registration.**

***Draft***

1

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Lead Responsibility</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
a) Determine what action, if any is necessary to encourage registration of University of Alaska architects, landscape architects, land surveyors and engineering faculty, state and federal design professionals.	Chair	Ongoing
b) Advertise AS 08.48.295 provision for civil penalty for unregistered and unauthorized practice.	Chair; Exec. Administrator	Ongoing
c) Review “minor importance” overlap between professions (Incidental Practice Subgroup)	Subgroup: Maynard (Ch), Baker, Brownfield, and Cyra-Korsgaard	Ongoing
d) Send letter to general contractors, electrical and mechanical administrators annually.	Chair, Executive Administrator	Ongoing
e) Adequately fund investigators to pursue unlicensed activity, including site investigation	Chair/Board	Ongoing
f) Seek additional dedicated attorney time for prosecution of unlicensed practice	Chair/Board	Ongoing
g) Review Possible Engineering Disciplines (Engineering Discipline Subgroup)	Gilfilian (Ch), Iverson, Hughes, Fredeen, & McLane	
h) Research Implementing issuance of courtesy or emergency license (for disasters), and for use by forensic engineers	Gilfilian, Peirsol	Ongoing

2

3

4

5

**Goal #4 – Ensure all materials used to establish competency in the professions are appropriate for use within Alaska.**

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Lead Responsibility</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
a) Review Arctic Course.	Board and Ex. Admin.	5/2006
b) Update AKLS Exam.	McLane, Baker	Ongoing
c) Update educational standard references for NCARB publications in regulations.	Board and Exec. Administrator	Annually (November)

6

7

8

9

**Goal #5 – Ensure that Alaska standards stay within the national norms, and its licensing systems are fair and applied uniformly.**

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Lead Responsibility</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
a) Monitor and review latest federal regulations, state Board decisions, and national organization policies relating to NAFTA.	Board and Exec. Administrator	Each Board meeting; ongoing
b) Obtain adequate funding to send “discipline	Board and Exec.	Ongoing

***Draft***

specific” Board members/ Executive Administrator to National, and Zone meetings to ensure Alaska stays informed on national issues and can influence policy issues affecting their professions.	Administrator	
c) Develop regulations to implement model law surveying.	McLane	Ongoing
d) Research CLARB council record.	Exec. Administrator, Cyra-Korsgaard	Ongoing
e) Stay current on all competency and regulatory issues of other jurisdictions	Board and Exec. Administrator	Ongoing
f) Research implementation and support for CE program	Brownfield (Ch), Maynard, and McLane	Feb. 2005
g) Establish Checklist for staff to approve license for those holding council certification (Architect NCARB Blue Book, Engineer MLE)	Maynard, Peirsol	Feb. 2005

#### **Goal #6 – Improve communications with applicants and licensed professionals.**

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Lead Responsibility</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
a) Update AELS Web Page, including postings of commonly asked questions (FAQs).	Licensing Examiner	Ongoing
b) Develop outreach program for educational institutes using the NCEES “Speakers Kit”	Gilfilian	Ongoing

#### **Goal #7 – Improve communication with public about Licensing Benefit and Problem Resolution Process**

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Lead Responsibility</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
a) Issue Public Service Notice with contact information for complaints.	Executive Administrator	Ongoing/Web site
b) Educate Public about Benefit of using Licensed Professionals (in Public Service Notices).	Mills & Executive Administrator	Ongoing/Web site

#### **Agenda Item 20 – New Business**

The Chair brought up hearing officer decisions and indicated the Board members have the decisions and asked if members have read the decisions.

The Chair brought up George Scott Crowther, Proposed Hearing Officer Decision, Case No. 0154-04-001.

The Executive Administrator explained Mr. Crowther holds a civil engineering license and had applied for a Land Surveyor’s license but was denied and he appealed the

***Draft***

1 decision. The Hearing Officer, David G. Stebing, stated in his decision that Mr. Crowther  
2 is a competent and qualified civil engineer but lacks the sufficient qualified work  
3 experience to be able to sit for the land surveyor examination. Mr. Stebing  
4 recommended George Scott Crowther's application for licensure be denied based on  
5 his failure to meet the work experience requirements of 12 AAC 36.064 (a) (2)(A),  
6 thereby upholding the Board's decision.

7  
8 The Executive Administrator read the three options the hearing officer, Mr. Stebing,  
9 outlined in his decision for George Scott Crowther, as listed on page 14 of the decision.

10  
11 **On a motion by McLane, seconded by Brownfield, and unanimously adopted, it**  
12 **was**

13 **RESOLVED to APPROVE the following motion:**  
14 **Adopt the recommendation for George Scott Crowther, Case No. 1054-04-**  
15 **001, "Option 1-adopts the proposed decision in its entirety under AS**  
16 **44.62.500 (b)."**

17  
18 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none.

19  
20 The Executive Administrator gave the Chair the decision to sign and he signed the  
21 order.

22  
23 The Chair brought up the next item, the Proposed Hearing Officer decision for Max  
24 Schillinger, Case # 0154-04-002.

25  
26 The Executive Administrator Max Schillinger applied for land surveyor by comity, and  
27 was denied by the Board. He appealed the denial, and in his decision, the Hearing  
28 Officer, Mr. Stebing, indicated Mr. Schillinger did not prove by a preponderance of  
29 evidence that he is entitled to sit for the Alaska Land Surveyor examination to obtain a  
30 license, as he lacks the necessary educational experience. The hearing officer  
31 recommended the application for a professional land surveyor by examination be  
32 denied based on his failure to meet the minimum education requirements of 12 AAC  
33 36.065 (a)(2), upholding the Board's decision.

34  
35 She read the three options outlined by the hearing officer.

36  
37 **On a motion by Baker, seconded by Mills, and unanimously adopted, it was**

38  
39 **RESOLVED to APPROVE the following motion:**  
40 **In the Max Schillinger, Case # 0154-04-002, to adopt Option 1- adopt the**  
41 **proposed decision in its entirety under AS 44.62.500 (b).**

42  
43  
44 Peirsol asked for clarification with respect to Mr. Schillinger's education.

45  
46 The Chair noted the Board will accept the BSCE ABET program, a Master's degree in  
47 Civil, so long as the university has an ABET undergraduate program, or he could obtain  
48 sufficient course work in a Geomatics program.

49  
*Draft*

Peirsol would like a letter with a copy in his file so there is a record for future board members to have with respect to guidance the Board has given him.

The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none.

The Executive Administrator indicated she would draft a letter for the Board Chair to sign and a copy will go in the applicant's file.

The Executive Administrator gave the Chair the decision to sign and he signed the order.

Cyra-Korsgaard asked for clarification on prior hearing officer cases with respect to Architect by Comity. The Chair noted the only case he was familiar with was one that was decided in Superior Court. In that instance the regulations were not specific to the certification needed and the applicant held an NCARB council record, buff cover, instead of the certification which is the NCARB "Blue book" or blue cover. Subsequent to the decision, the Board revised its regulations to clarify the minimum requirement.

The Chair brought up the next matter for discussion, a request for a web-based arctic course by the UAF.

**On a motion duly made by Gilfilian, seconded by Brownfield, and unanimously adopted, it was**

**RESOLVED to APPROVE the following motion: to accept the web based arctic engineering course proposed by UAF.**

The Chair asked if there were any objections, and there were none.

The Chair brought up the next item, Sunset Audit Review.

The Chair explained he received a confidential management letter and anticipates the Legislative Auditor to forward a report, which will also be confidential, initially, and the Board may need to hold a teleconference, or else take up the matter at the February 2005 meeting.

The Executive Administrator reiterated the process of the sunset review of the Board.

The Chair brought up the next item, the Mining Engineer Board Member.

Hughes indicated this was addressed in a subgroup. There are only about 33 mining engineers registered in Alaska and it is difficult to find Board members to serve. One option the subgroup considered is the possibility of including a Petroleum engineer for the seat, but the statute is not currently written in that way. Another solution would be to create a registration and a seat for a Geological Engineer on Board and he will work on a proposal to initially present to professional societies, and bring back to the Board in February. He will work with the Executive Administrator who will assist him in obtaining information from other jurisdictions on descriptions.

***Draft***



1 The Chair asked how many potential geological engineers there might be for  
2 registration.

3  
4 Hughes thought there would be about 50 potential geological engineers.

5  
6 The Chair noted there are a small number of states that offer discipline specific  
7 licensure.

8  
9 The Board held a discussion about the possibility of adding geological engineers and  
10 there were no objections.

11  
12 The Board discussed changing the specific composition of the Board. The sunset audit  
13 bill will be introduced and acted on by the legislature with input from professional  
14 societies and the Board.

15  
16 The Board discussed adding other disciplines such as control systems and the  
17 subgroup will continue its work.

18  
19 **d. Email of 10/14/04 from John Allison, Development/updating Tribal long-range**  
20 **transportation plans.**

21  
22 The Chair brought up the John Allison letter, held over from yesterday. Allison's request  
23 is to develop the long-range transportation plan for Alaskan Native villages and if that  
24 would require licensure.

25  
26 Brownfield advised the Board that the process of developing a 20-year transportation  
27 plan covers a wide spectrum of transportation needs, from technical services to bike  
28 paths but the overall broad spectrum of long range transportation planning does not get  
29 to the point of design work. He mentioned he is aware of only one U.S. jurisdiction that  
30 issues licenses to planners.

31  
32 The Board held a brief discussion.

33  
34 **On a motion duly made by Brownfield, seconded by Gilfilian and unanimously**  
35 **adopted, it was**

36  
37 **RESOLVED to APPROVE the following motion:**  
38 **The Board adopt as its position that long range transportation planning**  
39 **does not require a professional engineering license.**  
40

41 The Chair asked if there were any objections, and there were none. He reaffirmed this  
42 is the Board's interpretation.

43  
44 **Agenda item 13 - Administrator's Report**  
45

46 The Executive Administrator referred to the written report in the packet. She now has  
47 trained staff, performing well, giving very good customer service to registrants and the  
48 public, and allowing her more time to devote to Board member requests for research.  
49

***Draft***

1 She explained she submitted a request for the Board to have an email ListServe. The  
2 website will have a specific disclaimer on its website that the ListServe is not a formal  
3 "Interested Parties List" but is a means for the public to keep informed by receiving  
4 emails with information such as the draft agenda, or about topics the Board is currently  
5 discussing. There will be a subscribe/unsubscribe function on the website. The  
6 ListServe policy is currently being formulated by the agency and once it is final she will  
7 inform the Board.

8  
9 The Executive Administrator explained the Board has been doing some Outreach to the  
10 public and referred specifically to a professional society meeting she attended, the  
11 ASHRAE/SAME, in October with Fredeen. She found it beneficial to meet with officers  
12 and spoke to several potential applicants about the application process. It helped give  
13 them a personal contact with the Board staff to make the process of getting information  
14 easier than reading the requirements and interpreting what they needed to do for  
15 licensure. Several presentations have been made to students and groups and it gives  
16 the Board more visibility and the proactive work can help the Board to garner feedback  
17 on issues.

18  
19 She noted she attended the NCARB administrator's meeting in Washington D.C. which  
20 was very helpful to her in terms of networking with other administrators. The personal  
21 contacts are helpful and she has excellent contacts with NCARB staff.

#### 22 23 **Agenda Item 14 – Budget Summary Report**

24  
25 The Chair asked if the Board had any comments.

26  
27 The Executive Administrator suggested the fees would not be set until after the end of  
28 the fiscal year, and the process is the agency reviews the revenues and expenditures  
29 and adjusts the fees.

30  
31 Brownfield would like to review the expenditure reports for the past few years and get a  
32 better understanding of the budget.

33  
34 There were no other comments and the Chair moved forward to the next item not yet  
35 addressed.

#### 36 37 **Agenda Item 22 – Board Member Reports**

38  
39 Cyra-Korsgaard advised the Board she attended the CLARB Annual Meeting in  
40 September 2004 held in Philadelphia and referred to her written report. She was  
41 elected to the nominating committee to help make selections for future nominations to  
42 the CLARB Board. She noted the CLARB financial report. CLARB has had a role in  
43 Continuing Education through its non-profit branch, C2ED, which offers online courses  
44 to off-set testing and exam costs, but does not currently offer record keeping for CEUs.  
45 NCEES was initially involved in the continuing education C2ED but has since decided  
46 not to continue. CLARB is doing well financially at this point. CLARB had two  
47 resolutions for revisions to model law and model regulations in order to give states  
48 guidelines and national standards for minimum continuing education. CLARB offered  
49 two test sections of the LARE in June and had problems in many testing sites. CLARB

***Draft***

1 and the Chauncey group studied the various problems. In California, for example, there  
2 were not enough computer terminals for candidates, in other instances the computer  
3 program did not work, and as a result, CLARB gave candidates an opportunity to  
4 choose to re-test prior to grading their examination. Member Boards requested CLARB  
5 use another testing company instead of LaserGrade, and as a result, CLARB will switch  
6 to another company.

7  
8 Brownfield reported on the work the subgroup is doing on Continuing Education. He  
9 has put together a working document for the subgroup. The first step is to decide if the  
10 Board will embrace CE as a matter of state policy. If so, the subgroup will move forward  
11 to identify a logical matrix of information by profession, including positions and opinions  
12 from the professional societies on a continuing education program. Once that decision  
13 is made, the group would recommend the requirements for each profession. The  
14 subgroup has information compiled on other jurisdictions' requirements by profession.  
15 The subgroup will continue its work and will report to the full Board its  
16 recommendations, or if it should proceed, and the Board can make a decision at the  
17 February 17-18, 2005 Board meeting.

18  
19 The Chair advised once the Board has made a decision it is important to get the  
20 recommendations out to the community to get feedback.

21  
22 Gilfilian brought up item 20 (e) Consulting Engineering.

23  
24 Hughes explained the outside influence companies have on mining engineering and  
25 complete disregard from outside mining companies for Alaska law. He also commented  
26 on Canadian Engineering companies with respect to the registration and business  
27 licensing of mining engineers. He has begun a program to educate them through the  
28 Division of Mining that does the permitting. He referred to Tab 5, memo to Stan Foo,  
29 and the specific statutes and regulations attached that will be distributed by the agency.  
30 He says it will take some enforcement action and there is at least one instance where a  
31 company has totally disregarded the statutes. He explained mining engineering  
32 encompasses many branches of engineering. He asked if the Board agrees with his  
33 approach and if there were any objections.

34  
35 The Chair asked if there were any objections, and there were none. He thinks working  
36 with the permitting agency is a good start.

37  
38 **Agenda Item 23 – Review Calendar of Events, Confirm AELS Meeting Dates**

39  
40 The Chair confirmed the AELS Meeting dates, after the Board held a discussion:

41  
42 **2005 AELS Tentative Board Meeting Dates:**

43  
44 February 17-18 – Juneau  
45 June 2-3 – Fairbanks  
46 Aug 18-19– Anchorage  
47 Nov 17-18 – Anchorage  
48

***Draft***

1 Cyra-Korsgaard asked to attend the CLARB spring meeting in February. In doing so  
2 she felt she had a good chance of being elected to a committee that has specific  
3 funding to send delegates.

4  
5 The Chair noted the Western Zone meeting is May 19-21, 2005 and the Board  
6 discussed the possibility of combining the dates with the Anchorage meeting but the  
7 Board members felt it would take too much time in one week from their practices.

8  
9 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to discuss with the Western Zone officials  
10 what functions the Board members have, and if members could pay guest fees if just  
11 attending social functions.

12  
13 The Executive Administrator asked for potential proctors for the LARE as the exams  
14 span two days.

15  
16 Maynard noted he serves on the NCARB the ARE Construction Document Subcommittee.

17  
18 Peirsol noted she serves on the NCARB Professional Development Committee.

19  
20 The Board reviewed the calendar and added NCEES annual meeting to calendar

21  
22 **Agenda Item 24 – Board Member Comments.**

23  
24 The Chair brought up the next agenda item, Board Member Comments, Task List, and  
25 Housekeeping:

26  
27 The Chair applauded the Board members for the Outreach efforts, and gave the  
28 Executive Administrator thanks for her excellent job. He thinks the subgroups are  
29 effective and thanked the Board members willing to Chair the subgroups.

30  
31 Gilfilian asked about the method of recording the meeting.

32  
33 The Executive Administrator explained she is using a program called “Total Recorder”  
34 to tape the meetings using her laptop and microphones we’d normally use with the  
35 cassette recorder. Once she returns to Juneau, Data Processing will burn the  
36 information onto CDs so the entire meeting will be on one CD. This time, the Licensing  
37 Examiner taped the meeting also.

38  
39 Gilfilian would like the AELS statute and regulation booklet updated, as the old tables  
40 still appear.

41  
42 The Executive Administrator explained she has requested it but the regulation project  
43 had not been promulgated so the old portion was not officially deleted. A new booklet is  
44 forthcoming.

45  
46 Gilfilian appreciated Fredeen’s input on fire protection engineers and the work he has  
47 done, and to have the Fire Marshal attend the meeting.

48  
49 Cyra-Korsgaard thanked the Executive Administrator for the report she drafted for  
50 CLARB and the summary on the Architect by Comity history. She found the history

***Draft***

1 helpful and it is this type of summary that helps keep the Board moving forward on  
2 issues. She appreciates this type of staff support to the Board.

3  
4 Fredeen felt it was a good meeting and felt the Board is moving forward on issues. He  
5 thanked the Executive Administrator and staff for the amount of work they accomplish.

6  
7 Baker appreciated the architect history, and really appreciated having the Fire Marshal  
8 at the meeting and the trend to have the Building Officials present at each meeting.

9  
10 Peirsol appreciated having the Fire Marshal attending also, and the Outreach the Board  
11 has been doing. She is glad the Board is willing to take another look at the Architect by  
12 Comity issues and may have some more research done by the next meeting.

13  
14 Hughes complimented staff. He extended his comments on Mining Engineering and felt  
15 that much could be attributed to the companies hiring consultants for not insisting on  
16 registration and in selecting companies from Canada, because they can get them for  
17 less due to the exchange rate.

18  
19 McLane thanked staff for a great job, and also commended the new Board members for  
20 coming up to speed so quickly on issues.

21  
22 Brownfield enjoyed the Board meeting. He thanked the Executive Administrator for her  
23 professional assistance which goes beyond any he has previously experienced. He  
24 appreciated the research she provided on Continuing Education, already catalogued,  
25 which will help him.

26  
27 Mills thanked the Executive Administrator for her work on the Western Zone and draft  
28 budget with a short timeframe. She said the Board has great staff and she appreciated  
29 their work so the Board could move forward on issues.

30  
31 Maynard appreciated the research the Executive Administrator provides for the staff and  
32 the knowledge of institutional memory. He felt this was a good meeting and the Board  
33 is moving forward on issues.

34  
35 The Chair asked the Board to pass in the travel reports to the Executive Administrator.

36  
37 Subgroup Assignments:

38 Continuing Education to make recommendations to the Board. Brownfield, Chair, and  
39 Fredeen, Maynard, and McLane.

40  
41 Electronic Transmittals and Signatures, Fredeen (Chair) Peirsol, Gilfilian, and Maynard.

42  
43 Incidental Practice Subgroup: Maynard (Chair) and Baker, Brownfield, and Cyra-  
44 Korsgaard.

45  
46 Engineering Discipline Subgroup: Gilfilian (Chair) and Iverson, Hughes, Fredeen, and  
47 McLane.

48  
49 Host Committee Subgroup: Mills, (Chair) Iverson, Brownfield, Cyra-Korsgaard, Peirsol.

*Draft*

1  
2 Task List:  
3

Iverson (Chair)	Correspondence.
	Serve on Engineering Discipline, and Host Committee Subgroups.
Baker	Serve on Incidental Practices Subgroup.
Brownfield	Review travel and budget for the Board.
	Chair, Continuing Education Subgroup, Serve on Host Committee Subgroup.
Cyra-Korsgaard	Serve on Host Committee, Incidental Practice Subgroups.
Fredeen	Serve on Subgroup for Continuing Education.
	Chair, Electronic Submittals and Signatures Subgroup.
Gilfilian	Serve on Subgroups: Engineering Disciplines (Chair), Incidental Practice, Electronic Submittals and Signatures.
Hughes	Serve on Engineering Discipline Subgroup.
McLane	Serve on Subgroups: Incidental Practice, and Engineering Disciplines.
	Bring back draft of Model rules for adoption.
Maynard	Chair, Subgroup on Incidental Practice. Serve on Continuing Education Subgroup.
Mills	Chair the Western Zone Host Subgroup.
Peirsol	Serve on Electronic Submittals and Signatures Subgroup and Host Committee Subgroup.
Executive Administrator	Assist the Chair with general correspondence. Prepare letter to NCARB for Executive Administrator and Chair signature on Architect by Comity.
	Move regulation project forward to public notice to interested parties: Checklists for architects by comity, engineers by comity, and land surveyors by comity.
	Develop draft regulations for surveyor model rules adoption.
	Agenda items to add: Continuing Education (Old Business) Architect by Comity (Old Business) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Host Western Zone Meeting 2005 (Old Business)</li> <li>• Temporary License for Emergencies (Old Business)</li> </ul> Research emergency license procedures. Contact Dr. Bess Funk to gain more information about the emergency license processes.
	Invite the Building Official and Fire Marshal to the 2005 Board meeting in Juneau.
	Invite M. Boudrez, NCARB to address BEA process at the February meeting.
	Request 3 draft regulations be forwarded for public noticing.
	Send a letter of the Board's intent on signing and dating seals to the professional organizations.

***Draft***

	Add a FAQ for the intent of 12 AAC 36.185 (d) to the Building Officials' Manual.
	Add The Chair asked the topic of a potential statute change be on the February agenda for residential single family dwellings up to 4 stories should not require mechanical or electrical engineer.

Cyra-Korsgaard thanked the Chair for keeping the Board on track.

**On a motion by Baker, seconded by Mills, and unanimously adopted, it was**

**RESOLVED to adjourn the meeting at 3:10 p.m.**

There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donald J. Iverson, P.E., Chair  
Board of Registration for Architects,  
Engineers, and Land Surveyors

Date: \_\_\_\_\_