

1
2 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
3 Susan Frederick, Licensing Examiner
4

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

6
7 John R. Clark, Division of Occupational Licensing, Investigator
8

9 George Weaver, Division of Occupational Licensing, Investigator
10

11 Mike Kenny, representing Technical Engineering Local 959
12 520 E. 34th Dr., Anchorage, AK 99503
13

14 Dominic Lee, P.E., representing Little Susitana Construction Company
15 821 N. St., Suite 207, Anchorage, AK 99501
16

17 Scott Sandlin, representing AIA Alaska (President-Elect)
18 P.O. Box 242151, Anchorage, AK 99524
19

20 Monique Prozeralif, representing Proforma Design
21 11855 Wilderness Dr., Anchorage, AK 99516
22

23 Also joining by teleconference for part of the meeting:

24
25 Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing
26 Brad Brinkman, Assistant Attorney General, State of Alaska
27

28 **Agenda Item 2 – Review/Revise Agenda**
29

30 The Chair asked for revisions to the agenda, and the following revision was
31 suggested:
32

- 33 • Kalen suggested that Items 19 and 20 be reversed.
34

35 The Chair stated the agenda was posted to our website and someone may want
36 to come and hear the discussion and if the regulation items were reversed,
37 someone might come at the wrong time. The Chair suggested the agenda be
38 left as it is and make certain to stay on schedule.
39

40 Kalen agreed.
41

42 The Executive Administrator gave clarification about public notice. The
43 Executive Administrator explained public notice deadlines and stated that the
44 public comment period closed on November 5, 2001 and the only way to take
45 public comment on

1 those proposed regulation changes after the published deadline would be to
2 extend the public comment period. She went on to explain that if anyone
3 comes in to testify on the proposed Architect by Comity, or engineering non-
4 discipline specific regulation changes during the public comment time this
5 afternoon, the Board should state that the public comment period is closed.

6
7 Brief discussion followed.

8
9 **Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Report**

10
11 The Chair noted there were no reports by Board members.

12
13 **Agenda Item 4 – Review/Approve Minutes**

14
15 The Chair asked for any corrections or additions to the August 2001 minutes.

16
17 Kalen noted corrections to the August 2001 draft minutes:

- 18
19
 - Page 29, Item 15, motion made by McLane and seconded by Kalen for
20 AKLS workshop to be held in May 2002 was omitted. This was
21 carried unanimously by the Board without discussion.

22
23 The Chair noted that Lance Mearig joined the meeting at 9:22 a.m.

24
25 The Chair noted that Marcia Davis joined the meeting at 9:26 a.m.

26
27 The Chair noted these corrections to August 2001 draft minutes:

- 28
29
 - Page 40, line 22 – take out “the”
 - Page 41, line 7, Truitt said he would research that for the November
30 meeting. Since Truitt is no longer the Board’s attorney, the Chair would
31 like staff to pass this on to Brad Brinkman, the new attorney.
 - Page 41, line 40, should be “architect” not “engineer”.
 - Page 41, line 47, take apostrophe out of year’s, should just be years.

32
33
34
35
36
37
38 Peirsol noted these corrects to the August 2001 draft minutes:

- 39
40
 - Page 19, line 42, after, not trying to preculde, delete, ‘anyone’.
 - Page 19, line 48, sentence should read “so that assigned company would not
41 BE prevented
 - Page 22, line 12 should read, “to be used as a reference...”

- 1
- 2 • Page 22, line 13 delete “Civil”
- 3
- 4 • Page 22, line 47 should not be indented.
- 5
- 6 • Page 28, line 22 delete “of”
- 7
- 8 • Page 31, line 26 subsection D intact and delete the comma and the “and”
- 9
- 10 • Page 31, line 27 should read, “so that it is clear we are . . .”
- 11
- 12 • Page 31, line 33 delete “if written” and take out one of the “boths”
- 13
- 14 • Page 32, line 40 should read, “that the record reflects”
- 15

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

18

19 **RESOLVED to approve the August, 2001 AELS Board meeting**
20 **minutes, as corrected.**

21

22 **Agenda Item 5 – Correspondence**

23

24 The Chair referred the Board to the list of correspondence.

25

26 Brown discussed the Architectural Education Conference scheduled to be held
27 in conjunction with the Western Council of Architectural Registration Boards
28 (WCARB) meeting in Portland in March. She noted that Peirsol would be
29 attending the meeting. Brown will be attending as a WCARB Board member at
30 no cost to the Alaska Board and she encouraged any other Board member from
31 Alaska to attend.

32

33 The Chair discussed the Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and
34 Geophysicists of Alberta (APEGGA) meeting to be held in Edmonton, Canada on
35 December 5-7th. He stated it would be a very worthwhile meeting and hoped
36 one of the Board members could attend.

37

38 The Executive Administrator reminded the Board that since the Council of
39 Landscape Architectural Registration Board (CLARB) annual meeting was
40 cancelled, there is funding available for one more trip.

41

42 The Chair discussed the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and
43 Surveying (NCEES) memo announcing the President’s Assembly and MBA
44 conference in San Antonio in February 13-16th, 2002. The Chair and Executive
45 Administrator will attend that meeting.

46

47 The Chair addressed the memo NCEES, Phyllis Fenno regarding the electronic
48 transmittal of the council records to jurisdictions.

1
2 The Executive Administrator explained that the NCEES Council Records are
3 now being sent electronically as an attachment to an email and the staff can
4 print it off. Some jurisdictions have expressed concerns with this method of
5 sending the records because of the amount of time can take to print, and the
6 staff time to download files. Alaska does not have many applicants who submit
7 records, so this has not been an issue for us.

8
9 Iverson wondered with our blanket acceptance of experience and education
10 requirements for model law engineers, would staff need to print it all off or
11 would the board accept an overview.

12
13 Brown stated that National Council of Architectural Registration Boards
14 (NCARB) has asked that Boards accept one sheet to satisfy the 'blue book'
15 council record. NCARB provides an evaluation of the record in what they term
16 the 'short form' that shows that NCARB staff has verified experience, education
17 and other information which is summarized in the evaluation. The Board still
18 wants to review the full booklet, preferring to see the source documents
19 (transcripts or work experience, etc.). Brown felt at some point, the Board
20 would want to accept the one sheet, the 'short form' to satisfy its requirements
21 for applicants by comity.

22
23 Iverson felt that for applicants who have met the NCEES model law engineer
24 requirements, the Board would have no additional requirement and so staff
25 could review it on the screen instead of printing it off. Iverson felt it would save
26 paper and time and the electronic file could be kept instead.

27
28 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator if this was something staff could
29 do.

30
31 The Executive Administrator stated that staff could verify the 'model law
32 engineer' electronic record had been received and provide the evaluation form
33 prepared by NCEES to the Board, instead of a whole copy of the record, if that
34 was the desire of the Board.

35
36 The Chair asked that the Board address this again under "New Business", Item
37 21.

38
39 The Chair next discussed the memo from Council of Landscape Architectural
40 Boards (CLARB) regarding annual membership and dues. There are now two
41 levels of membership, Type 1 and Type 2. Type 1 includes travel costs as a
42 prepayment for registration fees for one Board member to attend the CLARB
43 annual meeting.

44
45 Brief discussion followed.

46
47 The Chair agreed the Board should discuss this with Reardon during the
48 teleconference on Friday.

1
2 The Chair brought up the next item, a memo from James Penrod, CLARB,
3 regarding a letter from the Chauncey Group about a scoring error for Section A
4 of the June 2001 L.A.R.E.

5
6 Cyra-Korsgaard stated Chauncey had a mechanical problem and two people in
7 Alaska were impacted by this.

8
9 The Executive Administrator explained the scoring errors. One candidate
10 showed on the CLARB website that he had passed the exam, but when scoring
11 letters came, they reported he had failed the exam. The Executive
12 Administrator called CLARB to determine what the candidate's score was and
13 was told that the letter was incorrect, that the candidate had passed.
14 Somehow there had been a programming error and scores were reported
15 incorrectly from the Chauncey Group. Since the Board reports the scores, the
16 candidate was never aware of the internal score-reporting problem. In a
17 separate instance, another candidate received notification that he had failed
18 the exam, and asked for a redline review of the exam. CLARB has a committee
19 process they use for redline reviews and the committee re-scored the
20 candidate's exam as a passing score.

21
22 Cyra-Korsgaard stated that she had talked to someone at CLARB and they
23 explained the process but did not admit that there was an error in that
24 instance, just that the re-scoring process worked.

25
26 The Chair asked what CLARB's refund policy was in these instances.

27
28 Cyra-Korsgaard stated that CLARB did refund his \$140 redline fee to the
29 candidate. She also suggested that the Board should write a letter to CLARB
30 stating its concern about these two candidate's scoring problems.

31
32 The Chair asked Cyra-Korsgaard to work with the Executive Administrator on a
33 letter and Cyra-Korsgaard agreed.

34
35 Peirsol asked if other groups refund review fees if the examinee prevails.

36
37 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to check on this but added that
38 for NCEES, all but the Electrical and Structural Engineers are multiple choice
39 exams which almost entirely eliminates exam reviews.

40
41 The Chair then brought up the next item which was a memo from CLARB
42 discussing the PAL (Partnership for the Advancement of Licensure) program
43 which formed a formal partnership between the American Society of Landscape
44 Architects (ASLA), CLARB, and the Council of Educators in Landscape
45 Architecture (CELA) to improve and expand licensure laws for landscape
46 architects.

1 Cyra-Korsgaard stated it was a step in the right direction to have the three
2 agencies working together.

3
4 The Chair next brought up the Spring CLARB regional conference in Cincinnati
5 that will be held March 1-3, 2002.

6
7 Mearig stated that he would like to attend since he was scheduled to go to the
8 CLARB conference in Salt Lake City that was cancelled in September.

9
10 The Chair agreed and noted that Mearig and Cyra-Korsgaard would attend the
11 CLARB conference in March.

12
13 Chair stated there were a number of other informational items.

14
15 Brown noted that one publication that was in the public packet from the
16 California Board of Architects was very informative and she stated she would
17 like to see all Board members on that mailing list.

18
19 The Executive Administrator said she would advise the California Board of the
20 mailing addresses of Board members.

21
22 **Agenda Item 6 – Staff Reports**

23
24 The Executive Administrator gave an overview of her administrator's report.
25 She reported that on-line renewals started on November 6th. To date, she
26 indicated that 320 registrants have renewed on-line. The on-line renewal
27 process has not been totally without problem, but she felt that overall it was
28 going fairly smoothly. There are some people who are not able to load the
29 software, or have reported trouble printing, or that the screen won't load.
30 Some of the problems may be due to internal computer configurations, or
31 firewall issues that we won't be able to resolve. In those instances, the parties
32 can renew by paper renewal. She noted that some people who were able to
33 renew on-line expressed thanks.

34
35 The Executive Administrator also reported that the October NCEES exams
36 went well at all sites, Juneau, Fairbanks, and Anchorage, and thanked Kalen
37 and Miller for their assistance as lead proctors for the exams.

38
39 Brown asked that staff track out of state renewals to see if there is much
40 impact on Alaska registrants due to unemployment and to track potential
41 slowdown in the lower 48 economy and its impact on Alaska.

42
43 The Executive Administrator stated staff would do that for the statistical report
44 for the February 2002 meeting.

45
46 Brown stated that she wanted to mention that Texas is considering doing away
47 with NCARB exams and doing their own state specific exam and that California

1 did their own exam for awhile, but is again using the NCARB Architectural
2 Registration Exams (ARE).

3
4 Break 10:20 a.m.

5
6 Reconvene 10:40 a.m.

7
8 **Agenda Item 7 – Subgroup Breakouts**

9
10 The Chair welcomed John R. Clark, Division of Occupational Licensing
11 investigator to the meeting and Clark introduced George Weaver, a new
12 investigator with the Division of Occupational Licensing. Clark and Weaver will
13 join the Board in the Subgroup Breakout discussions.

14
15 The Chair brought up the next item, Subgroup Breakouts, and the Board
16 members broke up into three groups at 10:45 a.m.

17
18 The subgroups were:

- 19
- 20 • Incidental Practice of Minor Importance: Miller, Siemoneit, Iverson,
21 Brown, and Weaver (Division of Occupational Licensing Investigator);
 - 22
 - 23 • Building Officials Handbook: Cyra-Korsgaard, Peirsol, Executive
24 Administrator, and Clark; and
 - 25
 - 26 • Work Verification: Mearig, McLane, and Davis.
 - 27

28 Kalen left the meeting at 10:51 a.m.

29
30 **Agenda Item 8 – Subgroup Reports**

31
32 The Chair brought the Board back to order at 11:30 a.m. and asked for
33 subgroup reports.

34
35 Davis reported on the Work Verification subgroup. The subgroup had concerns
36 about Board consistency in looking at work verifications on applications. She
37 discussed the requirement for work experience verification for responsible
38 charge time that must be signed by a professional, registered in the area of
39 expertise that the applicant is applying for. Subprofessional work verifications
40 are not required, except for land surveyors because professional and
41 subprofessional work must be verified by a licensed land surveyor.

42
43 Davis stated she felt the Board should ask Brad Brinkman, the Assistant
44 attorney general, if the Board could have different requirements for different
45 occupations when applying the same regulation.

46
47 McLane stated the reason why land surveyor work experience needed to be
48 verified by a professional land surveyor (even for subprofessional work). It was

1 because many land surveyors were applying with experience only, and had no
2 formal education. He noted the regulations are changing and in 2002 all land
3 surveyors will be required to have a minimum of 2 years of college course work.
4 Once the new requirement goes into effect, subprofessional work may be
5 looked at differently. He noted there will be a transition period and at its
6 February Board meeting they will have some applicants who applied under the
7 old regulations, and some applying under the new regulations.

8
9 Short discussion followed.

10
11 The Chair reported on The Incidental Practice of Minor Importance subgroup
12 and stated the group would like the Executive Administrator to solicit
13 comments from the public to find out if this is something the public is
14 concerned about. The Chair stated the group would also like to find out how
15 other states handle overlap between professions.

16
17 The Chair asked to add Specialty Contractor and exemptions under #21, New
18 Business, to consider potential statutory changes to AS 08.48.331.

19
20 The Chair noted that the subgroup felt the public occupancy exemption was
21 not very clear and that 'public occupancy' needed to be defined.

22
23 Brown suggested we put that as a sub group item at the February Board
24 meeting.

25
26 Mearig out 11:55 a.m.

27
28 Cyra-Korsgaard reported on the Building Official Handbook subgroup and
29 indicated the group would like to have a draft before the full Board at the
30 February meeting. Each group member has tasks to accomplish. The group
31 recommended that the Building Official Handbook should be printed as 8.5x11
32 instead of the smaller booklet. The Executive Administrator could ask the
33 division about printing costs for the larger format.

34
35 Cyra-Korsgaard stated the group also talked about dating stamp signatures
36 and felt this should be discussed.

37
38 The Chair suggested the Board discuss this under Item #21, New Business.

39
40 Cyra-Korsgaard agreed.

41
42 Break for lunch at 12:00 p.m.

43
44 Reconvene 1:21 p.m.

45
46 All back except Kalen, Mearig, and Cyra-Korsgaard.

47 **AGENDA ITEM 9 – Public Comment**

1 The Chair welcomed Dominic Lee, P.E., of Little Susitana Construction
2 Company.

3
4 Kalen returned at 1:25 p.m.

5
6 Mr. Lee explained he came to the Board to voice his concerns about the
7 investigation procedures he has witnessed through the Department of
8 Community and Economic Development (DCED). He stated he was reported to
9 the State of Alaska for a licensing violation, and as a result was investigated
10 for over a year. Finally, just recently, he received a letter from the DCED
11 stating the investigation was completed.

12
13 Mearig returned at 1:30 p.m.

14
15 Mr. Lee further explained that he later reported to DCED that a civil engineer,
16 Chief of Design for the Park Service, stamped and signed architect drawings ,
17 mechanical drawings, and landscape drawings but he is only licensed as a civil
18 engineer. He could stamp civil engineer work, but shouldn't have stamped
19 other work out of his discipline and area of expertise. The engineer advised
20 that he stamped for funding purposes only. Mr. Lee further explained he filed
21 a formal complaint, but the DCED investigator quickly dismissed the
22 complaint. Mr. Lee stated he felt there was a double standard going on and he
23 wanted to make the Board aware of this practice.

24
25 The Chair thanked Mr. Lee for bringing this to the Board's attention.

26
27 Brown suggested the Board add this to the agenda under New Business.

28
29 The Chair agreed and the item was added to Agenda Item, 21, New Business.

30
31 The Chair then explained that Mr. Sandlin and Ms. Prozeralik were here to
32 comment about the Architect by Comity. The Chair noted that the Executive
33 Administrator had stated earlier that the Regulations Specialist had advised
34 that Architect by Comity comments had to be received by November 5, 2001, at
35 5:00 p.m. The Board could extend the comment period, but the Chair felt the
36 extension would have to be public noticed. The Chair explained that testimony
37 received after the comment period closed cannot be considered in the Board's
38 decision making process.

39
40 Brown stated she was unclear why we couldn't take testimony now. She stated
41 this was a public meeting.

42
43 Davis stated she had never heard of complaints that public comment period
44 was too long of a timeframe.

45
46 Kalen agreed that he would like to hear their comments.

1 Peirsol said she felt it was inappropriate to not take testimony after it was
2 public noticed.

3
4 Iverson stated that he agreed and had never seen a closure before the meeting
5 date.

6
7 The Chair stated the Board always has a Public Comment time at each
8 meeting.

9
10 Davis explained she was not worried about the legalities of extending the public
11 comment time period.

12
13 The Executive Administrator reiterated that the Regulations Specialist advised
14 that the Public Comment for the proposed regulation changes, including those
15 to the Architect by Comity regulations ended on November 5, 2001 at 5p.m.
16 and that the Board could not take public comment on those issues without
17 first extending the public comment period. She indicated that the Regulation
18 Specialist runs newspaper advertisements posting the public comment time.

19
20 The Chair stated there was a majority of the Board who desires to hear the
21 additional public comment.

22
23 The Chair welcomed Monique Prozeralik of Preforma Design.

24
25 Prozeralik commented on the proposed regulation changes under 12 AAC
26 36.103, being considered for Architect by Comity applicants. She discussed
27 the minimum qualifications for architect by comity applicants. She suggested
28 that the Board as a minimum require a BA or BS in any major, 10 year's
29 experience, and no disciplinary action taken against applicant. In addition,
30 she proposed that another alternative would be for the Board to require a 2-
31 year degree in architecture or engineering, or a 4-year degree in any major;
32 three year's experience in Alaska, or five year's of work experience in the
33 jurisdiction where the applicant is currently practicing; and two letters of
34 recommendation from Alaskan architects.

35
36 Iverson asked why she suggested allowing a two-year degree.

37
38 Prozeralik answered she felt there were a number of applicants with partial
39 degrees and her proposal would attempt to address those applicants by
40 allowing for less than a 4-year degree for the education component.

41
42 Peirsol asked for clarification whether Prozeralik meant a two-year degree or
43 two years of education.

44
45 Brown indicated she knew of no two-year architectural programs. She was
46 aware of some two-year drafting programs, but not architectural programs.

47
48 Prozeralik stated she was not sure about the programs that were offered.

1
2 The Chair thanked Ms. Prozeralik for coming in and addressing the Board.

3
4 The Chair welcomed Scott Sandlin, President Elect of AIA-Alaska.

5
6 Sandlin referred the Board to the email that the Board members received in
7 their packet from him as part of the public comment on the proposed changes
8 to the Architect by Comity regulations. Sandlin stated he felt the education
9 language needed to be clarified in terms of accredited programs. He went on to
10 explain there are many different types of degrees, not just BA or BS.

11
12 Sandlin explained AIA felt the requirement for 10 years experience was probably
13 too long because it would result in total experience between 17 and 22 years
14 experience in architectural practice before one could qualify for an application
15 for comity.

16
17 Short discussion followed about the NCARB Intern Development Program (IDP)
18 and NCARB 'Blue Book' Council Record certification requirements.

19
20 Brown asked Mr. Sandlin if there should be a requirement for an applicant to
21 document their practice in Alaska.

22
23 Sandlin responded that he thought it could be viewed as an either/or situation.
24 He wondered it perhaps an applicant would need less experience if the practice
25 was done in Alaska. He added that he thought there would be some value in
26 having direct practical experience in Alaska. AIA views initial licensure
27 requirements with no Alaskan requirement component as a weakness in the
28 initial requirement for architectural applicants.

29
30 Peirsol read an excerpt from the AELS August Board meeting where the Board's
31 attorney, Mr. Truitt, had commented that he didn't think experience gained in
32 Alaska working for a firm would count as valid experience because the
33 applicant would not be licensed at the time work experience was gained.
34 Peirsol noted that Truitt was going to look into that matter for the Board but
35 since he has been reassigned there are still questions the Board has about
36 what experience would be counted towards the work experience requirement.

37
38 Sandlin replied he felt it goes back to the definition of responsible charge, and
39 whether responsible change can be gained working in one's jurisdiction of
40 registration or in another jurisdiction working under a registered architect.
41 Sandlin stated that his interpretation of responsible charge would be that the
42 work experience would count, as long as that experience is gained while
43 working under a licensed professional.

44
45 Sandlin also wondered if the Board would consider it helpful to have him
46 participate when the proposed regulation changes for Architect by Comity was
47 discussed tomorrow.

1 Peirsol and Brown both indicated they felt it would be helpful.

2
3 The Chair stated Sandlin was welcome to attend any part of the meeting that
4 was open to the public but advised him that the Board would not be accepting
5 any public comment.

6
7 The Chair thanked Mr. Sandlin for his participation.

8
9 The Chair then welcomed Mike Kenny from Technical Engineers Local 959.

10
11 Mr. Kenny stated that he represents land surveyors statewide and wanted to
12 discuss the new education requirements for land surveyors that will be phased
13 in effective January 2002, and how the Teamster's apprenticeship program
14 might qualify for the education requirements. Kenny explained that the
15 apprentice program has been in effect for seven years. The focus of the
16 program has been for rural Alaskans, not exclusively, but primarily to assist
17 rural residents in pursuing a land surveyor's career. Kenny explained that their
18 program consists of a 4-year apprenticeship, followed by a two-year party chief
19 school. They envision that students participating would also get some
20 preparation towards sitting for the Fundamentals of Land Surveying exam,
21 although none of the students in this program has done so as yet.

22
23 McLane asked where the apprenticeship programs were offered.

24
25 Kenny responded that the program was offered in Anchorage right now, but
26 that there are long term plans to have a long-distance education.

27
28 Kenny explained the handout given to the Board members listing the
29 curriculum. He advised that this program requires a total of 600 hours of
30 classroom study, approximately 150 hours each year in the classroom. At end
31 of the four years, the student goes out in the field as an Associate Party Chief,
32 a journey. After two years working as an associate party chief, the student
33 would achieve a party chief ranking. He added that he hopes this program will
34 tie in this year with the National Society of Professional Surveyors Foundation,
35 Inc.(NSPS) and the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping (ASM)
36 certification for construction party chiefs and instrumentmen.

37
38 Davis left at 2:20 p.m.

39
40 The Chair asked what the minimum requirements were to qualify for this
41 program.

42
43 Kenny responded that applicants must possess either a high school diploma or
44 their GED.

45
46 The Chair asked about the pass rate for the students when taking the
47 fundamentals of land surveying exam.

1 Kenny stated that none had taken the exam yet.

2
3 Davis rejoined the meeting at 2:26 p.m.

4
5 Kenny stated he wanted to explain this program to the Board and perhaps the
6 Board would consider giving education credit to the land surveyor applicants
7 participating in this program.

8
9 The Chair thanked Mr. Kenny for coming in and stated the Board would talk
10 about this under #21, New Business.

11
12 The Chair moved to the next item on the agenda.

13
14 **Agenda Item 10 – Review Goals and Objectives**

15
16 The Chair brought up Goals and Objectives for discussion.

17
18 The Board held a discussion on the following Goals and Objectives:

19
20 Goal #6, Objective 4 – Created a work subgroup for this today.

21
22 Goal #2, Objective 2 – Change date to 2/2002.

23
24 Goal #2, Objective 4 – Change date to 2/2002.

25
26 Goal #3, Objective 2 – Advertise AS 08.48.295 provision for civil penalty
27 for unregistered and unauthorized practice.

28
29 Kalen left the meeting at 2:53 p.m.

30
31 Kalen returned at 2:55 p.m.

32
33 Siemoneit reported he has spoke to the Berry Company who publish the
34 Anchorage, Juneau, Fairbanks telephone books. The Board could purchase a
35 small piece of advertising, one-inch high column space, as a reference point for
36 public outreach. In addition to the advertisement in these telephone
37 directories, the Board would also have access to an advertisement on a site at
38 www.acsyellowpages.com. He suggested that the Board could set up a new hot
39 key that would directly link the public to information about AELS licensing.
40 The public could determine if their architect, engineer, or land surveyor is
41 currently registered in Alaska. The total cost for this type of advertising would
42 be around \$3300 a year and the deadline is January 11, 2002 to place the ad
43 in the Anchorage portion of the directory. Again, the fee would include all
44 major phone directories, a yellow page supplement for the Bush areas, and the
45 yellowpage.com, all of which would be an educational site for the public.

1 The Chair stated the Board had received approval from Reardon conceptually
2 about additional yellow page advertising, but suggested that the Board bring
3 up the matter more specifically tomorrow.

4
5 Cyra-Korsgaard stated she felt the minutes should reflect this project is a huge
6 step toward educating the public about the requirement for design
7 professionals to be licensed, how to find registered architect, engineer, land
8 surveyor and landscape architects. This expenditure will go a long way to meet
9 many of the Board's goals for public outreach and help curb unlicensed
10 activity.

11
12 Short discussion followed.

13
14 **On a motion duly made by McLane, seconded by Kalen, and carried**
15 **unanimously, it was**

16
17 **RESOLVED that \$3,500 be appropriated for Yellow Page**
18 **advertising.**

19
20 Break at 3:00 p.m.

21
22 Reconvened 3:09 p.m.

23
24 Mearig not present when the Board reconvened.

25
26 Goal #5, Objective 3 and 4 – Change both to 2/02.

27
28 Objective 5 – Cyra-Korsgaard and Executive Administrator will discuss
29 later in agenda. Change to ongoing.

30
31 Mearig rejoined the meeting at 3:12 p.m.

32
33 Goal #7, Objective 2 - Executive Administrator will send letter to Ombudsman.

34
35 After discussion the revised Goals and Objectives are, as follows:

36
37 **Goal #1 – Increase Board's work efficiency.**

38

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) 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.	Miller	Ongoing
2) Update and maintain goals and objectives.	Davis, & Ex. Adm.	Ongoing
3) 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.		
4) Automate AELS application and licensing process by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributing and receiving applications electronically Structuring database so that it minimizes manual data entry Structuring database so that it can answer queries easily. 	Staff oversee and track	Ongoing
5) Pursue training for Board and staff.	Board and Staff	Ongoing
6) Pursue strategic planning.	Brown, & Ex. Adm.	Ongoing
7) Provide letter of Board's intent and understanding relating to any proposed legislative changes; develop procedures for doing the same.	Board	Ongoing
8) Establish subcommittee work at each meeting.	Chair	Ongoing

1
2
3
4

Goal #2 – Increase Board’s cost effectiveness.

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) All Board members or administrators who attend a regional or national professional function on behalf of board shall submit a written report to rest of board to share knowledge gained.	Attending Board member and/or Staff	Every board meeting; ongoing
2) Examine financial feasibility of Board autonomy.	Gardner	2/2002
3) Obtain and analyze board budget. annually and request audit of income or expenses as appropriate.	Mearig, & Ex. Administrator	Ongoing
4) Develop regulations that cover “minor importance” overlap between Engineers, Architects professional practice.	Davis, Miller	Ongoing 2/2002

5
6
7
8
9

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

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Determine what action, if any is necessary to encourage registration of University of Alaska architects,	Miller	Ongoing

landscape architects, land surveyors and engineering faculty.		
2) Advertise AS 08.48.295 provision for civil penalty for unregistered and unauthorized practice.	Siemoneit ; Ex. Administrator	

1
2 **Goal #4 – Ensure all materials used to establish competency in the**
3 **professions are appropriate for use within Alaska.**
4

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Review Arctic Course.	Miller	5/2002
2) Update AKLS Exam.	Kalen	Ongoing
3) Audit National Standards for exams and certification.	Board and Ex. Administrator	Ongoing

5
6 **Goal #5 – Ensure that Alaska standards stay within the national norms,**
7 **and its licensing systems are fair and applied uniformly.**
8

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Monitor and review latest federal regulations, state board decisions, and national organization policies relating to NAFTA.	Board and Ex. Administrator	Each board meeting; ongoing
2) Obtain adequate funding to send “discipline specific” board members/ licensing examiner to National, and Zone meetings to ensure Alaska stays informed on national issues and can influence policy issues affecting their professions.	Board and Ex. Administrator	Ongoing
3) Investigate drainage, soils analysis, and hydrographic surveying under the definition of land surveying.	Kalen and McLane	2/2002
4) Investigate GIS and photogrammetry.	Kalen and McLane	2/2002
5) Research CLARB council record.	Ex. Administrator, Mearig, Cyra-Korsgaard	Ongoing
6) Stay current on all competency and regulatory issues of other jurisdictions		Ongoing

9
10 **Goal #6 – Improve communications with applicants and licensed**
11 **professionals.**

1

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Structure databases so that applicants can access application via internet and answer queries easily (for application checklist).	Cyra-Korsgaard and staff	2/2002
2) Update AELS Web Page, including postings of commonly asked questions (FAQs).	Licensing Examiner	Ongoing
3) Update Goals and Objectives.	Davis	Ongoing
4) Provide Experience Worksheet to Applicants to assist supervisors in documenting applicant's work experience.	Mearig	2/2002

2
3
4
5

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

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Issue Public Service Notice with contact information for complaints.	Executive Administrator	Ongoing/ Website
2) Letter to BBB/Ombudsman re: contact for complaints.	Executive Administrator	11/2003
3) Educate Public about Benefit of using Licensed Professionals (in Public Service Notices).	Mearig & Executive Administrator	Ongoing/ Website

6

The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, Old Business.

8

Agenda Item 11 – Old Business

10

The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, under Old Business, LARE exam sites.

12

LARE Exam Sites:

14

The Executive Administrator stated that Cyra-Korsgaard was going to speak with membership and see where they would like to take the exam. Cyra-Korsgaard stated that membership would like to keep the exam offered in all three sites.

16

17

18

19

20

The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, under Old Business, Statutory Exemption Review.

21

22

23

1 The Chair stated the Board would talk about Specialty Contractors tomorrow.
2 The Subgroup previously discussed the industrial exemption. The Board will
3 talk about this tomorrow also under #21 New Business in order to try to
4 further define this exemption.

5
6 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, under Old Business,
7 Landscape Architect Interim Policy.

8
9 Brown asked if this had gone forward for regulation language.

10
11 The Executive Administrator responded the proposed changes had already
12 been public noticed as a regulation, that the public comment period closed on
13 November 5, 2001, and the matter was scheduled for action by the Board
14 tomorrow under #19, Regulation Projects.

15
16 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, under Old Business,
17 Financial Feasibility of Board Autonomy.

18
19 The Chair stated the Board would likely put this off until February because
20 Gardner is out today.

21
22 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, under Old Business, GIS/
23 Photogrammetry.

24
25 The Chair noted that Kalen had asked to move this item to the February 2002
26 Board meeting agenda.

27
28 **Agenda Item 12 – Application Reviews**

29
30 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, Application Reviews.

31
32 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Iverson, and carried**
33 **unanimously, it was**

34
35 **RESOLVED to go into executive session for the purpose of**
36 **reviewing applications.**

37
38 The Board went into executive session at 3:20 p.m.

39
40 Authorities for executive session are noted as AS 44.62.310(c.)(3) and
41 AS 08.48.071(d).

42
43 The Board came out of executive session at 4:40pm and promptly recessed
44 until Friday, November 16, 2001.

1 **Friday, November 16, 2001**

2
3
4 **Agenda Item 12 – Convene/ Roll Call**

5
6 Robert Miller, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:06 a.m.

7
8 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

9
10 Robert Miller, Chairperson, Civil Engineer
11 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member
12 Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer
13 Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor
14 Scott McLane, Land Surveyor
15 Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer
16 Kathleen Gardner, Vice-Chairperson, Mechanical Engineer
17 Daphne Brown, Architect
18 Patricia Peirsol, Architect
19 Ernie Siemoneit, Secretary, Mining Engineer
20

21 Not present at roll call, but joining the meeting shortly thereafter was:

22
23 Marcia Davis, Public Member
24

25 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

26
27 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
28 Susan Frederick, Licensing Examiner
29

30 Joining a portion of the meeting, in person, were:

31
32 John R. Clark, Division of Occupational Licensing Investigator
33
34 Scott Sandlin, representing AIA Alaska (President-Elect)
35 P.O. Box 242151, Anchorage, AK 99524
36

37 Also joining a portion of the meeting, by teleconference, were:

38
39 Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing
40 Brad Brinkman, Assistant Attorney General, State of Alaska
41

42 The Chair asked if there were any concerns about files that needed to be
43 addressed and there were none.

1
2 **Agenda Item 14 – Budget Summary Report**
3

4 The Chair asked if any member had questions about the budget report.
5

6 Kalen noted that supplies expenditures have increased.
7

8 Mearig indicated that he had previously requested to have the expense report
9 listed to reflect a four year period for easier tracking.
10

11 Brown suggested that the Executive Administrator be more involved in the
12 budget process.
13

14 The Chair noted that the Board could discuss reviewing the AELS budget, and
15 staff's involvement in the budget process for AELS with the Division of
16 Occupational Licensing Director when they spoke to her later that morning.
17

18 Kalen left the room at 8:15 a.m.
19

20 The Chair asked if there were additional comments and there were none.
21

22 **Agenda Item 14 – Investigator's Report**
23

24 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, the Investigator's Report.
25 Mr. Clark gave a summary of the Investigator's report and asked for questions
26 from the Board.
27

28 Kalen returned at 8:22 a.m.
29

30 Clark indicated that he is trying to do a couple more trips in the spring to
31 Southeast Alaska, Kodiak, and Fairbanks.
32

33 Clark stated there were several investigations in which hearings would be held
34 and he briefly discussed the hearing process.
35

36 Brown noted that Mr. Dominic Lee brought in drawings that had all been
37 signed and sealed by an engineer working for the State of Alaska, Department
38 of Natural Resources, but the scope of the project extended beyond his
39 expertise.
40

41 Clark responded that the drawings were submitted solely for budget
42 consideration, and not for construction. He explained that when the actual
43 work is done, the drawings would be reviewed and sealed by the appropriate
44 design professional.
45

46 The Board discussed stamping by design professionals.
47

1 Brown asked that the discussion be held for the consideration of stamping
2 practices for design professionals not on any one specific case.

3
4 The Board continued their discussion on stamping.

5
6 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Kalen, it was**

7
8 **RESOLVED to ask the investigator to write a letter to Mr.**
9 **Daryl Haggstrom, State of Alaska, Division of Parks and**
10 **Outdoor Recreation, Design and Construction, expressing the**
11 **Board's concern about global stamping of plans for state**
12 **projects. Further, the letter should indicate that registrants**
13 **are required to stamp within their own area of expertise per**
14 **AELS regulations, and the investigator should ask for a**
15 **response from the agency.**

16
17 The Chair indicated he would work with John Clark on the language for this
18 letter.

19
20 The Chair asked if the Board agreed. There were no objections or additional
21 comments.

22
23 Kalen stated that considerable caution be used when approaching this matter.
24 Kalen advised that the Investigator and Chair have all of the facts when
25 authoring this letter.

26
27 Davis joined the meeting at 8:45 a.m.

28
29 Discussion followed.

30
31 The Chair noted that the Board is interested in the generic format of letters the
32 investigator uses. Clark indicated he would furnish the Board with a copy of
33 his standard response.

34
35 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the motion. There were none
36 and the motion passed unanimously.

37
38 Clark asked the Board for clarification of Site Adaptation under 12 AAC
39 36.195. He asked if was practical for someone to review the full set of plans
40 and do recalculations for the entire set as he interprets the requirement under
41 12 AAC 36.195 (3).

42
43 Iverson responded that it was not practical. His interpretation was that the
44 design professional would review, do whatever calculations were necessary and
45 once he stamped them, he was assuming responsibility for the content.

46
47 Discussion followed about site adaptation scenarios.

1 Brown indicated that the regulation change came about to address problems
2 with plan stamping in Alaska.

3
4 Davis suggested that an alternative may be for the design professional to
5 provide a cover letter indicating they have reviewed and verified all
6 calculations, have found them appropriate, and sign and seal the plans.

7
8 Iverson agreed but reiterated that it isn't practical to redo each calculation, just
9 to review them and he suggested that the name be added to the title block.

10
11 Brown disagreed and stated a new title block should be added.

12
13 Clark agreed that a new title block was preferable.

14
15 **On a motion duly noted by Brown, and seconded by Iverson, it was**
16
17 **RESOLVED to create a new regulations project to address site**
18 **adaptation.**

19
20 Brown withdrew the motion. The second concurred.

21
22 Break: 9:20

23
24 Reconvene: 9:35 a.m.

25
26 The Board continued its discussion on site plan adaptation.

27
28 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Iverson, it was**
29 **unanimously**

30
31 **RESOLVED to start a regulation project to amend 12 AAC 36.**
32 **195 (3) to read: (3) independently performs all calculations**
33 **and maintains them on file or affixes to the calculations to be**
34 **site adapted the following sealed statement, "I certify that I**
35 **have reviewed these calculations and they comply with all**
36 **applicable codes and regulations."**

37
38 There was no additional discussion.

39
40 The Chair asked if there was any objection and there were none, and the
41 motion was adopted.

42
43 The Chair indicated the Board had some time before its next item on the
44 agenda, the teleconference with its attorney, Brad Brinkman, and asked to
45 move to Agenda Item-21, New Business.

1
2 **Agenda Item-21, New Business.**

3
4 The Chair asked to take up the next item under New Business, Specialty
5 Contractors.

6
7 **On a motion by Brown, seconded by Peirsol, it was**

8
9 **RESOLVED to request a statute change to AS 08.48.331 (7) to**
10 **delete, “or designing systems for work within the specialty to**
11 **be performed or supervised by the specialty contractor.”**

12
13 Discussion followed.

14
15 Brown stated that any project, even design-build, should have a mechanical
16 engineer stamping the drawings.

17
18 Mearig suggested deleting all of subsection (7), not just a portion of it.

19
20 Brown responded that amending it instead of removing it entirely would allow
21 for shop drawings.

22
23 Discussion followed.

24
25 John Clark, investigator, stated that subsection (7) is a problem for
26 investigations. He indicated that there are instances where specialty
27 contractors are designing systems without the professional expertise to do so.

28
29 Discussion continued about the Board’s understanding of the need for
30 specialty contractors to do their construction using shop drawings in the field
31 but the necessity for design work to be done by the professionals who have the
32 expertise to do the work.

33
34 The Chair indicated that the Board wanted to address the apparent loophole
35 with this statutory exemption, yet allow for specialty contractors to do their
36 work. He indicated that it may be sufficient to convey the Board’s concern
37 about public safety if specialty contractors are doing work that should be done
38 by architects or engineers.

39
40 The Board continued its discussion.

41
42 The Chair restated the motion:

43
44 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Peirsol, it was**

45
46 **RESOLVED to request a statutory change to AS 08.48.331 (7)**
47 **to delete, “or designing systems for work within the specialty**
48 **to be performed or supervised by the specialty contractor.”**

1
2 The Chair indicated that the motion passed, with Mearig opposed.

3
4 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Kalen, it was**

5
6 **RESOLVED to request a statutory change to AS 08.48.331 (7)**
7 **delete “specialty” in the second clause before, “contractor”, so**
8 **it would read, “....or a contractor preparing shop or field**
9 **drawings for work that the contractor has contracted to**
10 **perform”.**

11
12 Mearig asked for an explanation of the purpose of the motion.

13
14 Davis suggested that it might be easier to amend the statutory exemption
15 rather than to delete it in its entirety.

16
17 Short discussion followed on the motion.

18
19 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the motion. The Chair noted
20 that the motion passed with Mearig and McLane opposed.

21
22 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Kalen, it was**

23
24 **RESOLVED to revise the request for a statutory change to**
25 **AS 08.48.331(7) to read: “a person preparing shop or field**
26 **drawings for work designed by a professional architect,**
27 **engineer, or landscape architect.”**

28
29 **The exemption would read:**

30
31 **(7) a specialty contractor licensed under AS 08.18 while**
32 **engaged in the business of construction contracting or a**
33 **person preparing shop or field drawings for work designed by a**
34 **professional architect, engineer, or landscape architect.**

35
36 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the motion. The Chair noted
37 that the motion passed, with Mearig and McLane opposed.

38
39 The Chair also noted this motion supercedes the last two motions made by
40 Brown and Davis regarding specialty contractors.

41
42 Brown suggested that there be a letter of intent to forward through Catherine
43 Reardon, Division of Occupational Licensing, to the Legislature if this request
44 for a statutory exemption moves forward so that the Legislature understands
45 the concerns of the Board and she asked Clark to provide examples.

46
47 The Chair brought up the Board Autonomy and Gardner asked to have that
48 moved to the February agenda.

1
2 Break: 10:25 a.m.

3
4 Reconvene: 10:35 a.m.

5
6 Kalen absent from the room.

7
8 **Agenda Item 17 – Teleconference with Brad Brinkman, Assistant Attorney**
9 **General.**

10
11 The Assistant Attorney General, Alaska Department of Law, Brad Brinkman,
12 joined the meeting at 10:40 a.m. by teleconference.

13
14 The Chair welcomed Mr. Brinkman to the meeting and the Board introduced
15 themselves to the attorney recently assigned to the Division of Occupational
16 Licensing.

17
18 Brinkman advised the Board that he was working part-time for the AELS Board
19 and part-time in his old position until the agency is able to fill his position.

20
21 The Chair indicated that there are a number of issues that they would be
22 asking for advice.

23
24 Kalen back at 10:45 a.m.

25
26 The Chair noted that one issue was the NCEES professional engineering, non-
27 discipline specific system that the Board was considering tying to the NCEES
28 Group I and Group II exams and noted that the exams offered could change.

29
30 Brinkman suggested that could be problematic when NCEES can change the
31 branches for professional engineer offered and the Alaska Board accepts the
32 list without being able to public notice the changes.

33
34 Brown asked if the Board could adopt the NCARB education standards for
35 architects by reference.

36
37 Brinkman advised that the problem with that method is that the candidate
38 could conceivably select which booklet to use as their standard, instead of the
39 current one. Once again, it also means that NCARB would be determining the
40 standards and while the Board may be reviewing and making the policy
41 decision to accept the standards, the public isn't given an opportunity to
42 comment on the education standards.

43
44 Brinkman discussed the question the Board had regarding how the work
45 verifications are reviewed for land surveyor and engineering applicants. He
46 noted that the requirements for each profession are different and that so long
47 as the Board treated candidates in an equal, fair and impartial manner that
48 there is no equal protection issue.

1
2 Brown asked if the Board could have different standards for architects by exam
3 and architects by comity and discussed a memo from the NCARB attorney that
4 suggested that was an acceptable practice.

5
6 Brinkman agreed that it would be a policy decision and that so long as there is
7 a rational, reasonable reason for the decision that it would be fine.

8
9 The Chair brought up the public comment that the Board decided to take on
10 the Architect by Comity regulation changes it was considering. The public
11 comment period had already closed on November 5, 2001 for the proposed
12 regulation changes but the Board had two people who asked to make
13 comments on the regulations yesterday. The Board decided it would go ahead
14 and accommodate the public and heard from two people who previously had
15 commented on Architect by Comity regulations.

16
17 Brinkman agreed that once the public comment period had closed the Board
18 should not have taken oral comments and discussion followed regarding the
19 public process and public noticing.

20
21 Davis left the meeting at 11:05 a.m. and returned at 11:10 a.m.

22
23 The Chair asked if some of the regulations could move forward and only the
24 ones affected by the public comment could be held over for further public
25 noticing.

26
27 Brinkman indicated he would check on this for the Board.

28
29 The Chair thanked Mr. Brinkman for his participation.

30
31 The Board discussed briefly public noticing and that for future noticing that
32 the Executive Administrator could make sure that the oral hearing extended
33 through the Board's regular public comment time.

34
35 **Agenda Item 18 – Director's Comments**

36
37 Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing, joined the
38 meeting at 11:15 a.m.

39
40 Davis left the meeting at 11:15 a.m. and returned at 11:20 a.m.

41
42 Reardon discussed the on-line renewal process and explained that
43 approximately 335 people have renewed since November 6. She noted that
44 there have been some problems, but the process seemed to be going well.

45
46 The Chair noted that the Board was happy that the on-line renewals were
47 happening this cycle and indicated this was the direction they have wanted to
48 move in for some time.

1
2 Siemoneit explained the yellow page advertising proposal for expenditures of
3 about \$3500 to advertise in telephone directories and web-based directories.
4 He explained the Board envisioned that they would have an approximate one-
5 inch advertisement and within it could be a link to a webpage associated with
6 the AELS site. This site would not contain information about how to become
7 licensed but would have links to the search function and hold information
8 about public protection. He also noted that John Clark, division investigator,
9 was willing to be the contact for any questions that may arise as a result of this
10 public outreach.

11
12 Reardon explained that she was supportive of the expenditure, but that the
13 Board would need to identify what portion of the \$106,000 increment in the
14 allocation plan that they would not be spending. She indicated that the design
15 for the webpage link to the webbased directory would be developed by Diane
16 Somers, the agency web person.

17
18 Reardon also explained that the Executive Administrator had expressed
19 interest in the costs and a new size for the Building Official's Manual that the
20 Board is revising.

21
22 Short discussion.

23
24 Reardon explained that the printing charges for the 500 or so copies would be
25 charged to the Board, but since the Board is continuing its work on the
26 manual, it would not likely be printed until late spring, possibly in the next
27 fiscal year. She also suggested that it may not be necessary to print as many
28 copies by putting it on the website as well.

29
30 Reardon discussed the financial overview for Fiscal Year 2001-2002. Based on
31 figures from FY 2000-2001 and projections for FY 2001-2002, Reardon
32 suggested fees should stay as they are now, and discussed the budget
33 summary.

34
35 Brown asked if the Board could see a budget for AELS, and not an expenditure
36 plan.

37
38 Reardon explained the budget process and the pros and cons of individual
39 program budgeting and that the agency doesn't do a budget for individual
40 programs but tracks the expenditures by program.

41
42 The Chair asked if Reardon had a preference regarding payment of CLARB
43 dues. He explained that the Board had received a billing for membership fees
44 and they could choose to have prepaid travel included in the billing or choose
45 not to do so.

46
47 Reardon suggested that the Board not have the 3rd party reimbursement
48 because it gives the Board more flexibility when choosing to attend a meeting.

1 One year they may prefer to send the additional person to an engineering or
2 architectural meeting instead.

3
4 The Chair noted that the Board is interested in having the exemption for
5 specialty contractors revised in statute and explained the problem was that
6 some specialty contractors were doing design work and the Board has ongoing
7 public safety concerns.

8
9 Reardon explained that the Executive Administrator could fill out a legislative
10 proposal form and she'd see if there would be any interest by the Governor in
11 introducing a bill. If not, the Board could work to find a legislator who may be
12 interested in this.

13
14 Kalen left at 11:49 a.m. and returned at 11:55 a.m.

15
16 Kalen asked about term limits and the concern the Board had with partial
17 terms counting against a full term.

18
19 Reardon indicated that there wasn't any support for extending the terms
20 beyond 8 years but that she thought the Governor's office was fine with the
21 idea of not counting partial terms towards the full term.

22
23 Short discussion.

24
25 Brown asked if the Executive Administrator could report directly to the
26 Director. She indicated that the Board was interested in there being more
27 autonomy and they were comfortable with the Executive Administrator
28 discussing matters at the Division of Occupational Licensing Director level.

29
30 Reardon explained that it was actually to the Board's interest to have the
31 Executive Administrator reporting to the Program Coordinator because of time
32 constraints the director has and also because there is generally more turnover
33 with directors and it gives the Board better continuity.

34
35 Reardon explained that a classification study is going on right now of the whole
36 range of licensing staff and noted that the Department of Administration
37 completed desk audits. The next step would be the Division of Personnel would
38 set the classification specifications.

39
40 The Chair asked if she would be at their next meeting, in Juneau, in February
41 and she said she would attend.

42
43 Break for lunch: 12:00 p.m.

44
45 Reconvene: 1:15 p.m.

46
47 All members were present, except Cyra-Korsgaard and Kalen.

1 **Agenda Item 18 – Regulation Projects**

2
3 The Chair referred to the Regulations Projects that have already been public
4 noticed.

5
6 Brown noted there was one individual who advised they sent an email timely
7 but the email was not part of the packet of public comment.

8
9 Executive Administrator stated that she would check with Kurt West,
10 Regulations Specialist to see if it was received.

11
12 Miller asked if there were any comments about the public comment that had
13 been received. He added that his observation was that the comments
14 discussed inconveniences with the current requirements but that there were no
15 comments that outlined or impacted any public health, safety or welfare issues.

16
17 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Mearig,**

18
19 **RESOLVED to adopt the regulations project 12 AAC 36.103, as**
20 **public noticed, for Architect by Comity proposed regulations**
21 **changes.**

22
23 Brown noted that she made the motion for purposes of discussion.

24
25 Brown suggested that the regulations be tabled until the February 2002
26 meeting because of problems with the public comments.

27
28 Davis noted that she thought the Board should extend the public comment
29 period.

30
31 Peirsol suggested that the oral comment be extended through the first day of
32 the February meeting to accommodate those wanting to appear in the normal
33 public comment portion of the meeting.

34
35 Miller suggested the merits of the proposed regulations be taken up in
36 February.

37
38 Mearig asked to discuss the matters while the proposal was current.

39
40 Cyra-Korsgaard rejoined the meeting at 1:26 p.m.

41
42 Mearig expressed interest in keeping the Architect by Comity regulations as
43 presently in regulation, requiring the “blue book” council record for Architect
44 by Comity.

45
46 Davis supports the proposed regulations changes for requirements for Architect
47 by Comity.

1 **On an amendment to the motion duly made by Davis, seconded by**
2 **McLane, it was**

3
4 **RESOLVED to amend the proposed regulation 12 AAC 36.102**
5 **(B)(ii) to read: “at least ten years of responsible charge**
6 **experience subsequent to initial licensure in another**
7 **jurisdiction as verified by an architect registered at the time**
8 **of providing the supervision”**

9
10 Brown states that the motion is clear that the Board intends that the
11 responsible charge time be under a registered architect while the applicant is
12 doing architectural work.

13
14 Brief discussion.

15
16 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none and the
17 amendment to the motion passed. Kalen was absent for the vote.

18
19 Davis noted that there were comments made about “accredited” being vague
20 and parties weren’t sure if the accreditation needed to be from the National
21 Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB).

22
23 **On a motion, duly made by Davis, seconded by Brown, it was**

24
25 **RESOLVED to amend the proposed regulation 12 AAC**
26 **36.103(B)(i) to reflect, “BA or BS degree from an institution of**
27 **higher learning accredited by an organization recognized by**
28 **the Board.”**

29
30 Brief discussion followed.

31
32 **On a motion by McLane, seconded by Mearig, it was**

33
34 **RESOLVED to table the Architect by Comity proposed**
35 **regulation changes until February, 2002.**

36
37 The Chair called for a roll call vote and the vote was taken as follows:
38

1

Board Member:	Yea:	Nay:
Brown		x
Davis		x
Gardner		x
Iverson	x	
Kalen	absent from vote	
McLane	x	
Mearig	x	
Miller	x	
Peirsol		x
Siemoneit		x

2

3 The Chair noted the vote was 4-5 and the vote to table the motion had failed.

4

5 The Chair restated the motion by Davis, seconded by Brown:

6

7 **On a motion, duly made by Davis, seconded by Brown, it was**

8

9 **RESOLVED to amend the proposed regulation 12 AAC**
10 **36.103(B)(i) to reflect: “BA or BS degree from an institution of**
11 **higher learning accredited by an organization recognized by**
12 **the Board.”**

13

14 The Chair called for a vote on motion. The Chair asked if there were any
15 objections, and noted that the motion passed, with Mearig opposed, and Kalen
16 was absent.

17

18 Brown suggested that two year’s experience should be in Alaska.

19

20 **On a motion, duly made by Brown, seconded by Davis, it was**

21

22 **RESOLVED to amend the proposed regulation 12 AAC 36.103**
23 **(B)(ii) require a minimum of 10 year’s responsible charge time,**
24 **of which two year’s work experience must be in Alaska for**
25 **Architect by Comity proposed regulation changes.**

26

27 Mearig observed that the effect of the amendment would be to lower the
28 standards but to benefit those applicants living in Alaska.

29

30 Discussion followed.

31

32 Kalen re-joined the meeting at 2:03 p.m.

33

34 Iverson spoke in opposition of the amendment, noting that it was inappropriate
35 to require an Alaskan work location.

36

1 The Chair asked for a vote and the Board rejected the amendment and the
2 amendment failed unanimously.

3
4 **On an amendment duly made by Peirsol, seconded by Davis it was**

5
6 **RESOLVED to add to the proposed regulation changes for**
7 **Architect by Comity, 12 ACC 36.103(5) after, “proving IDP**
8 **completion, or other.”**

9
10 Discussion followed.

11
12 Peirsol noted that there were several states that don’t require completion of the
13 Intern Development Program (IDP).

14
15 Brown spoke in opposition to the amendment. She noted that many more
16 states are changing requirements and the trend is to require IDP.

17
18 The Chair asked for a vote and the amendment failed 1-9, with Peirsol as the
19 Yea vote.

20
21 Davis noted that Barbara Gabier had expressed concern about a loophole for
22 those applicants with disciplinary action taken against them. Davis also noted
23 that the proposed language has already been adopted and public noticed for
24 comment but that the language could be tightened up.

25
26 **On an amendment duly made by Davis, and seconded by Gardner, it**
27 **was**

28
29 **RESOLVED to revise 12 AAC 36.103 (4) (B)(iv) to read:**

30
31 **Verification of good standing in all jurisdictions in which the**
32 **applicant is currently licensed and that the applicant has not been**
33 **disciplined for conduct described in 12 AAC 36.320 in any**
34 **jurisdiction.**

35
36 Brief discussion followed.

37
38 Mearig left the room at 2:15 p.m. and returned at 2:17 p.m.

39
40 **On a suggestion from Gardner, Davis amended her amendment, seconded**
41 **by Gardner, it was**

42
43 **RESOLVED to revise 12 AAC 36.103(4)(B)(iv) to read:**

44
45 **That the applicant has not been disciplined for conduct**
46 **described in 12 AAC 36.320 in any jurisdiction and**
47 **verification of good standing in all jurisdictions in which the**
48 **applicant is currently licensed;**

1
2 Brief discussion followed.

3
4 The Chair asked if there were any objections, and there were none, and the
5 amendment passed unanimously.

6
7 Brown noted that Kalen was not present for most of the discussion and asked
8 that he abstain from voting on the main motion.

9
10 Davis suggested the Board hold off until the February 2002 meeting from
11 adopting the Architect by Comity regulation changes since the Board has
12 decided to extend the public comment period.

13
14 Brief discussion followed.

15
16 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Iverson, it was**

17
18 **RESOLVED to carry forward the proposed regulation for**
19 **Architect by Comity, 12 AAC 36.103, as amended today, to the**
20 **February 21-22, 2002 AELS Board meeting, and to extend the**
21 **oral public comment period through February 21, 2002, to**
22 **coincide with the normal public comment time. The AELS**
23 **Board asks the Division of Occupational Licensing Regulations**
24 **Specialist to extend the written public comment period.**

25
26 The Chair asked if there were any objections, and there were none. The Chair
27 noted that Kalen abstained from voting.

28
29 Brief discussion about costs and the mailing.

30
31 Brown asked to have all the public comments in the November packet re-
32 copied and inserted in the February AELS Board packets and the Executive
33 Administrator noted it would be part of the packets.

34
35 The Chair brought up the proposed changes to regulations under 12 AAC
36 36.990 (35) and noted that the definition the Board had adopted for aspect of
37 landscape architect was overly broad in terms of "irrigation".

38
39 **On a motion duly made by Cyra-Korsgaard, seconded by Brown, and**
40 **unanimously passed, it was**

41
42 **RESOLVED to add, "landscape" before irrigation on proposed**
43 **regulation change 12 AAC 36.990(35).**

44
45 Short discussion followed.

46
47 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the motion, and there were
48 none.

1
2 The Chair brought up the proposed changes to regulations under 12 AAC
3 36.990(17) defining the engineering exams that would be offered in Alaska as
4 those listed as Group I and Group II exams offered by the national
5 organization, NCEES. He explained the effect would be to broaden the
6 branches of engineering that would be licensed in Alaska based on the
7 professional engineer exams offered by NCEES.
8

9 Discussion followed about the small number of comments received overall with
10 some expressing concerns about purchasing a new stamp if the system were to
11 change.
12

13 Discussion continued about which branches of engineering might have interest
14 by some engineers wishing to practice that discipline in Alaska.
15

16 Siemoneit expressed an interest in narrowing the scope of the branches being
17 considered to be offered.
18

19 **On a motion duly made by Mearig, seconded by McLane , it was**
20

21 **RESOLVED to amend the regulation project for engineer by**
22 **non-discipline specific to add only environmental (EN), fire**
23 **protection (FP), and control systems (CS) and to replace**
24 **12 AAC 36.180(b), to revert back to the original language as**
25 **follows:**

26 **EC – Chemical Engineer**
27 **CE – Civil Engineer**
28 **EE – Electrical Engineer**
29 **ME – Mechanical Engineer**
30 **EM – Mining Engineer**
31 **EP – Petroleum Engineer**
32

33 **And to add three new designations to this list in 12 AAC**
34 **36.180(b), as follows:**

35 **EN –Environmental Engineer**
36 **CS – Control Systems Engineer**
37 **FP – Fire Protection Engineer**
38

39 **Additionally, to revise 12AAC 36.990(a)(17) to read**
40 **“professional engineering” includes the branches of:**

41 **(A) Chemical Engineering**
42 **(B) Civil Engineering**
43 **(C) Electrical Engineering**
44 **(D) Mechanical Engineering**
45 **(E) Mining Engineering**
46 **(F) Petroleum Engineering**
47

1 **And to add three new designations to the list in 12AAC 36.990**
2 **(a)(17) as follows:**

- 3 **(G) Environmental engineering**
- 4 **(H) Control Systems engineering**
- 5 **(I) Fire protection engineering.**

6
7 Discussion followed.

8
9 Miller indicated that there is not an academic degree in control systems or fire
10 protection.

11
12 Davis supported expanding to those disciplines that don't fit anywhere else.

13
14 Discussion followed.

15
16 Brown suggested that the Board look at the engineering disciplines in
17 February.

18
19 **On an amendment by Mearig, seconded by McLane , it was**

20
21 **RESOLVED to drop “fire protection engineering and control**
22 **systems engineering” from the regulation project.**

23
24 **On a substitute motion by Brown, and seconded by Siemoneit, it was**

25
26 **RESOLVED to bring back the engineering non-discipline**
27 **specific regulation project with new language, as amended, to**
28 **the February 2002 AELS Board meeting, not public noticed but**
29 **for discussion purposes, and to define “environmental**
30 **engineering.”**

31
32 Kalen wondered if this was replacing Mearig's motion and amendment
33 including the new language.

34
35 Brown said her motion was a substitute motion for Mearig's motion. Brown
36 noted that the Board would have the engineering non-discipline specific
37 language that was public noticed in August 2001 before them, as well as this
38 language (that has not been public noticed) which would add one discipline,
39 “environmental engineering” before them at the February 2002 meeting for
40 discussion purposes.

41
42 Davis further explained that no action was needed to be taken by the Board in
43 regards to the Regulation project that had gone out for public comment. Davis
44 went on to say the Board could work on the new language, and there would be
45 two parallel ideas the Board can review at its February meeting: a non-
46 discipline specific regulation project including all 17 branches of engineering
47 listed in NCEES, and an expansion of the number of branches of engineering
48 disciplines the Board currently licenses (civil, chemical, electrical, mechanical,

1 mining and petroleum) to add in “environmental” or any additional branches
2 the Board decides. The Board could take one path or the other at the February
3 meeting. The Board will not be able to adopt the draft version in February
4 because it will not yet have been public noticed.

5
6 Mearig spoke in opposition to Brown’s amendment because he felt the Board
7 was still within the scope of the original regulation project, and that the
8 proposed changes to expand the number of disciplines, (whether it was from 1,
9 3 or 11) would not require re-noticing the project.

10
11 **Brown withdrew her substitute amendment, and Siemoneit agreed as the**
12 **second.**

13
14 Iverson left the meeting at 3:05 p.m. and returned at 3:10 p.m.

15
16 Mearig stated he would like to leave his motion on the table and ask that
17 someone make a motion to postpone until February so that the wording would
18 remain in the motion.

19
20 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Gardner it was**

21
22 **RESOLVED to holdover the Engineering non-discipline specific**
23 **regulation project for consideration at the February 2002**
24 **AELS Board meeting, using a definition of “environmental**
25 **engineering” as defined by NCEES, if it is defined in their**
26 **model law.**

27
28 The Chair asked if there were any objections, and there were none and the
29 motion passed.

30
31 The Chair indicated he would work with Mearig on the language for the
32 definition of environmental engineering and the Executive Administrator could
33 email it to Board members.

34
35 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Davis, it was**

36
37 **RESOLVED to adopt the proposed regulation change for the**
38 **definition of landscape architect in 12 AAC 36.990(33), and**
39 **aspect of landscape architect in 12 AAC 36.990(35), as**
40 **previously amended today.**

41
42 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none, and the
43 motion passed.

44
45 Break: 3:15 p.m.

46 Reconvened: 3:30 p.m.

47
48 Davis was absent.

1
2 Brad Brinkman, Assistant Attorney General, joined the meeting by
3 teleconference at 3:31 p.m.
4

5 The Chair asked Brinkman about the public noticed regulations project. The
6 Chair advised Brinkman that the Board had decided to take additional public
7 comment and wanted to know could the regulations project be split out and
8 who would be receiving the re-noticed packet for the Architect by Comity
9 portion of the project.
10

11 Davis rejoined the meeting at 3:33 p.m.
12

13 Brinkman advised that the project would have to be re-mailed out to all parties
14 again. He suggested that as long as a portion was going out for re-noticing, it
15 may make sense to re-notice the entire project, particularly if the language had
16 changed, and the Board wanted to be sure the public was fully aware of the
17 proposed regulation changes.
18

19 The Chair thanked Brinkman and reiterated that it appears that the Board will
20 need to re-notice and mailout to all parties the proposed regulations changes.
21

22 The Chair brought up the next proposed regulations change, the continuing
23 education proposal and asked if anyone had comments. He added that he
24 brought the matter up before the Alaska Society of Professional Engineers, a
25 statewide group, and they expressed concerns about a mandatory requirement
26 for continuing education. One member mentioned he dropped his Oregon
27 registration when they required documentation of continuing education.
28

29 Iverson agreed with the Chair that most of the people he had talked to about
30 the proposed continuing education program were not in favor of a mandatory
31 program. Iverson asked if the Board has had a problem develop where the
32 need for this program has arisen.
33

34 Gardner suggested that Iverson was one of the Board members who had
35 suggested the Board consider developing a continuing education program.
36

37 Iverson indicated that he felt there wasn't a business in Alaska that isn't
38 currently doing continuing education because you have to do so in order to be
39 competitive. He felt that a mandatory education program would be an exercise
40 in bookkeeping.
41

42 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to explain the program.
43

44 The Executive Administrator explained that she had taken information from
45 CLARB, NCARB, the NCEES and other organizations, including the proposal
46 from the Alaska Professional Society of Land Surveyors (ASPLS), and AIA and
47 many had similar requirements. She noted that the ASPLS model was very
48 similar to the NCEES model, with a few changes.

1
2 The Chair indicated that the legislative audit has brought this recommendation
3 to the Board to adopt a program for each profession. He stated that it is
4 important for the Board to have considered developing a program and that it
5 may be our determination that continuing education is occurring within the
6 professions and it is up to us to report back to the legislature our findings.

7
8 Kalen suggested that the Board needed to have time to fully discuss this and
9 suggested it be moved to the February agenda.

10
11 The Chair asked if anyone had comments about a voluntary program.

12
13 Kalen responded that the engineers are evenly divided with perhaps the nays a
14 little more vocal.

15
16 Brown suggested that continuing education be brought up on the first day of
17 the February meeting.

18
19 The Chair indicated that he, Kalen and the Executive Administrator would
20 work on a response letter to the legislative audit recommendation.

21
22 The Chair brought up the proposed regulations change for work experience
23 under a Canadian registered engineer to be accepted by the Alaska Board as
24 equivalent to work experience under a U.S. registered engineer in terms of
25 engineer by comity regulation requirements for experience.

26
27 Iverson suggested that the work experience be treated like the mentoring
28 provisions, where four years work would be counted as two year's experience.

29
30 Siemoneit suggested the Canadian exam be treated as equivalent to the
31 Fundamentals of Engineering.

32
33 Miller responded that the Canadian exam is based on ethics and not on the
34 practice of engineering.

35
36 The Chair noted that the Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and
37 Geophysicists of Alberta (APEGGA) is holding a conference on December 5-7th
38 and that the Board can send a representative to this meeting. The purpose of
39 the meeting is to familiarize administrators and other jurisdictions about the
40 Canadian requirements. Washington and Idaho also plan on sending
41 representatives to the meeting.

42
43 The Chair brought up re-adoption of the order certifying the changes to
44 regulations having to do with application deadlines, education and experience,
45 reinstatement, disciplinary guidelines and seals previously adopted at its
46 August 2001 Board meeting.

47
48 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Kalen, it was**

1
2 **RESOLVED to readopt the regulations project having to do**
3 **with application deadlines, education and experience,**
4 **reinstatement, disciplinary guidelines and seals previously**
5 **adopted with proposed changes to regulations: 12 AAC 36.050,**
6 **12 AAC 36.061(a)(2), 12 AAC 36.065(a)(2)(A); 12 AAC 36.165(b),**
7 **and (d), 12 AAC 36.180, and 12 AAC 36.320(g) and (h).**
8

9 The Executive Administrator stated that the Regulations Specialist indicated
10 the Department of Law did its initial review and the regulation pertaining to the
11 reference to the NCARB education standard publication was generic and
12 needed to be changed to specifically reference the publication under 12 AAC
13 36.061(a)(2). That new language was currently before the Board today.
14

15 The Chair noted that the Board had previously considered public comments
16 and paid special attention to the cost to private persons of the regulatory action
17 being taken and found no additional cost to the public.
18

19 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the motion, noted there were
20 none, and the motion passed.
21

22 Brown noted that this regulation would need to be done each year to keep in
23 step with the current NCARB education standards.
24

25 The Chair brought up the next order of business, New Business.
26

27 **Agenda Item 21 – New Business**

28

29 The Chair brought up the first item, Develop regulations that cover defining
30 minor importance in terms of overlap of professions.
31

32 The Chair handed out an article on a court decision he found.
33

34 Brief discussion followed.
35

36 The Chair brought up the next item for consideration, the mark-up of the
37 Board's current policies and procedures.
38

39 The Executive Administrator explained that she was asked to post the interim
40 policies on the website and that led her to review the current list of polices and
41 procedures which is provided in the packet. She asked that the Board
42 members provide her with any suggested changes and the final version would
43 be posted to the website.
44

45 Brown suggested that a reference to a statute or regulation would be helpful.
46

47 The Chair brought up the next item for consideration, requiring a date along
48 with the signature when sealing documents.

1
2 Iverson indicated that it could be cumbersome for those who have to sign
3 multiple pages of many documents.

4
5 Short discussion about voluntary dating plans followed and no action was
6 taken.

7
8 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, Board member reports.

9
10 **Agenda Item 22 – Board Member Reports**

11
12 The Chair asked if anyone had reports and there were none.

13
14 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, Board member comments.

15
16 **Item 23 – Board Member Comments**

17
18 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda and asked members to
19 make any comments.

20
21 McLane had no comments.

22
23 Mearig had no comments.

24
25 Gardner had no comments.

26
27 Brown stated she thought it was a good meeting, long, but discussion were
28 good. February will be a tough meeting. She commented she hoped some of
29 the more complicated issues, such as the regulation projects, could be
30 scheduled for the first day.

31
32 The Chair stated that was the plan.

33
34 Executive Administrator indicated that February meeting would include
35 possibly 120 files to consider. That is why typically regulation projects on the
36 second day.

37
38 Gardner wondered if the Board could do Public Comment earlier.

39
40 The Executive Administrator stated that the reason for doing Public Comment
41 at that time is because the public gets accustomed to that time slot.

42
43 Discussion followed about next meeting's agenda.

44
45 Peirsol had no comment.

46
47 Cyra-Korsgaard had no comment.

1
2 Iverson had no comment.

3
4 Siemoneit only wanted to thank staff for their efforts and stated he was pleased
5 that the Board progressed on the Architect by Comity issues.

6
7 Davis stated she felt it was a good, productive meeting, and was also was
8 pleased to be meeting our new attorney.

9
10 Kalen asked if the Board would like to meet in the Butrovich Building, Board of
11 Regents' Conference Room in May.

12
13 The Chair agreed that the Board would meet there.

14
15 Cyra-Korsgaard wanted to address whether or not the Board should require
16 CLARB Council Records for landscape architects by comity, similar to the
17 current requirement for architects to have the "Blue Book" Council Record.
18 Cyra-Korsgaard stated she had checked with CLARB and there are only seven
19 states that require CLARB Council Record for licensure. She noted there are
20 numerous fees candidates must pay in order to acquire a CLARB certification
21 and to have the record submitted to jurisdictions. A registrant has to maintain
22 that CLARB certification by paying \$75 annually. Cyra-Korsgaard went on to
23 say that if candidates drop the record then the registrant has to pay all back
24 dues. Cyra-Korsgaard suggested that while this might be something to
25 consider in the future, CLARB has not always provided services to registrants
26 in a timely matter and further suggested that this might not be something the
27 Board would like to consider yet.

28
29 The Chair suggested this could be revisited again, sometime after the CLARB
30 annual meeting.

31
32 Cyra-Korsgaard also explained that she was unable to go the recent Licensing
33 Summit that CLARB hosted, but Dwayne Adams attended and she distributed
34 a report he prepared for the Board.

35
36 Brown reminded the Board that no decision had been made about the options
37 on the CLARB dues.

38
39 Short discussion followed.

40
41 **On a motion duly made by Davis and seconded by Brown, it was**

42
43 **RESOLVED to pay the higher rate \$5,200, for CLARB dues,**
44 **that includes the travel costs since CLARB will keep it on**
45 **account if the board doesn't use it all.**

46
47 Siemoneit reminded members that the director stated that she would prefer
48 not to include the prepaid travel in the dues, but left it up to the discretion of

1 the Board and unless there are very strong feelings to the contrary, the Board
2 should respect Reardon's opinion.

3
4 Discussion followed.

5
6 Mearig stated he was opposed to the motion since the Board didn't budget for
7 the higher rate.

8
9 **The Chair called for a vote and the motion was unanimously voted down.**

10
11 The Chair noted that the motion failed unanimously, and stated the Board
12 would pay the lower rate without the prepaid travel for CLARB.

13
14 Brown suggested the Board revisit this issue in another two years because
15 there may be changes that could make the higher rate advantageous.

16
17 The Chair reminded the Board that no action had been taken on the Teamster
18 Educational Proposal.

19
20 Kalen stated he was getting one of the trainees in his office so he would see
21 first hand. Kalen felt the Board should look into this.

22
23 Davis stated she felt Teamsters was trying to work within the existing
24 regulations and were petitioning the Board to be listed as a "Board approved
25 curriculum".

26
27 The Chair stated he would talk to the Geomatics professor at the University of
28 Alaska in terms of the courses listed in the proposal. The Chair further noted
29 that he would contact Mr. Kenny to solicit the needed detail on the classes as
30 well as field instruction.

31
32 Iverson remarked it would be advantageous if the University of Alaska and
33 Teamsters could work together and develop a common two-year degree
34 program.

35
36 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda.

37
38 **Agenda Item 24 – Read Applications into Record**

39
40 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Siemoneit, and**
41 **carried unanimously, it was**

42
43 **RESOLVED to approve the following list of applications for**
44 **comity and examination as read, with the stipulation that the**
45 **information in the applicant's file will take precedence over**
46 **the information in the minutes:**

1
2 **COMITY APPLICANTS**
3

Last Name	First Name	Discipline	Board Action
1. Shaw	Lawrence M.	Architect	Approved.
2. Smith	Janet E.	Architect	Approved.
3. Haaland	Ole E.	PE Mech	Approved pending receipt of transcript, exam verification, and reg. verification.
4. Hartsock	Douglas R.	PE Mech	Approved pending 8 months additional responsible charge and arctic.
5. Holt	Bruce E.	PE Mech	Approved pending arctic.
6. Sibilla	Vic A.	PE Mech	Approved.
7. Smith	Gregory C.	PE Mech	Approved.
8. Ashley	Thomas M.	PE Chemical	Approved.
9. Heffner	David A.	PE Chemical	Approved pending arctic.
10. Andrade	German X.	PE Civil	Approved pending verification civil exam passed.
11. Byrne	John R.	PE Civil	Approved pending arctic.
12. Chapman	Kenneth R.	PE Civil	Approved pending arctic.
13. Gray	Mathew W.	PE Civil	Approved.
14. Rogers	Robert W.	PE Civil	Approved.
15. Smith	John N.	PE Civil	Approved.
16. Krivonen	Wesley	PE Civil	Approved pending arctic.
17. Lee	David C.	PLS/AKLS	Approved.

4
5
6 **EXAM APPLICANTS**
7

Last Name	First Name	Discipline	Board Action
1. Scully	Christopher	Architect	Approved.
2. Adams	Michael K.	FE	Approved.
3. Coop	Leland R.	FE	Approved after staff review.
4. Horn	James L.	FE	Approved after staff review.
5. Jin	Huijun	FE	Approved after staff review.
6. Parrott	Mark A.	FE	Approved after staff review.
7. McKee	Edith J.M.	FE	Approved after staff review.
8. Dewilde	Victor J.	FLS	Approved.
9. Shelt	Bruce M.	FLS	Approved after Staff review.
10. Kinney	Clark E.	PLS/AKLS	Approved.
11. Gibson	Susan	PLS/AKLS	Approved.
12. Wentworth	Richard L.	PLS/AKLS	Approved.
13. Drzewiecki	Gregory	PE Civil	Approved Pending arctic course.
14. Emerson	Mathew R.	PE Civil	Approved.
15. Begenyi	Barry J.	PE Electrical	Approved.
16. Peterson	Jason M.	PE Electrical	Approved pending 7 months Responsible Charge and arctic course.
17. Davis	Elena Y.	PE Mech	Approved with FE waiver granted.

8
9
10 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Iverson, and carried**
11 **unanimously, it was**
12

1 **RESOLVED to deny the following list of applications for**
2 **examination as read, with the stipulation that the information**
3 **in the applicant's file will take precedence over the**
4 **information in the minutes:**

5
6 EXAM APPLICANTS

7

Last Name	First Name	Discipline	Board Action
1. Crapps	John E.	FE	Incomplete.
2. Spangler	Micheal E.	PLS/AKLS	Denied.
3. Burton	Timothy J.	PE Electrical	Denied for Comity, Approved for PE Exam.
4. Reiss	John P.	PE Electrical	Incomplete, needs 15 months responsible charge experience.

8
9
10 **Item 25 – Review Calendar of Events**

11
12 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda; the tentative schedule for
13 the quarterly AELS 2001/2002 board meetings:

14
15 February 21-22, 2002 - Juneau
16 May 16-17, 2002 - Fairbanks

17
18 The Chair stated that WCARB would be held in Portland, Oregon March 21-23,
19 2002. Peirsol and Brown will be attending, as well as the Executive
20 Administrator. Brown noted that she will be attending as a WCARB Board
21 Member.

22
23 The Chair stated CLARB delegates Mearig and Cyra-Korsgaard would be going
24 to Cincinnati, Ohio March 1 and 2, 2002, to attend the regional meeting since
25 the CLARB annual meeting had been cancelled.

26
27 The Chair also stated that Western Zone (NCEES) meeting will be held in Sun
28 Valley, Idaho on May 2-4, 2002. Gardner will attend, the Executive
29 Administrator will attend, and either Kalen or McLane will attend the meeting.

30
31 Davis left the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

32
33 The Chair stated Cyra-Korsgaard would try to attend the APEGGA meeting in
34 December and Peirsol would be the alternate if Cyra-Korsgaard is unable to
35 attend.

36
37 **Agenda Item 26 – Review Task List**

38
39 The Executive Administrator will compile task list from the minutes and
40 distribute to all Board Members.

Executive Administrator	Respond to Correspondence.
	Copy Public comment from Nov. packet and insert in Feb. Board packet (Brown).
	Poll Washington state for definition of “environmental engineer” (Mearig).
	Respond to Legislative Audit letter of intent (Chair)
	Send a letter to CLARB expressing concern about score reporting and exam grading (Cyra-Korsgaard)
	Ask NCEES if they refund exam challenge fees or review fees if a candidate prevails (Peirsol) (done 11/01)
	Solicit from professional organizations and the public definition “of minor importance” and the statutory reference (Board)
	Agenda item. Add “Public Occupancy” as a subgroup (Brown)
	Update What’s New to reflect regulation changes (Board)
	Add Board members to mailing list for California Board of Architects publications (Done 11/01).
	Work with Siemoneit and Reardon on yellow page ads and additional webpage.
	Cyra-Korsgaard
	Work with Executive Administrator on letter to CLARB re score reporting and exam grading.
Gardner	Report on Financial feasibility of Board autonomy at February 2002 meeting.
Kalen	Report on Photogrammetry and GIS at Feb. 2002 mtg.
	Designee for Western Zone meeting (or Mclane).
Mearig	Work with Executive Administrator to develop definition of “environmental engineering”(check NCEESmodel law and other states’ definitions).
	Designee for CLARB regional meeting.
Miller	Work with Clark, on letter to DNR on stamping issues.
	Work with Executive Administrator on response letter to Legislative letter of intent attached to SB 9.
Peirsol	Alternate to attend APEGGA meeting in December.
	Designee for NCARB annual meeting.
Siemoneit	Work with Executive Administrator to accomplish yellow page advertising and webpage link.
Catherine Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing	Provide 4 years expenditure reporting on Budget Summary
	Pass on legislative request for changes to AS 08.48 re “specialty contractor” exemption revisions.

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

Agenda Item 27 – Housekeeping

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

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

RESOLVED to adjourn the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

Nancy Hemenway, Executive

Administrator

Approved:

Robert Miller, Chairperson, Civil Engineer
Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers and Land Surveyors

Date: _____