

Public members attending portions of the meeting:

None

Agenda Item 2 – Review/Revise Agenda

Gardner suggested that the Goals and Objectives be taken up when Davis is present which might require rescheduling the time.

Executive Administrator noted that under new business, there were staff proposed changes to the current regulations project; also, that there are draft regulations for the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying.

Kalen stated he had an item for “Old Business”: how the table of experience for land surveyors for Fundamentals of Land Surveying examination is applied.

Gardner suggested the agenda include a line item for “Old Business”, and Executive Administrator was instructed to add to subsequent agendas.

Gardner noted that she appreciated the website technology addresses that were distributed by email at the request of Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing.

McLane joined the meeting at 9:15 a.m.

Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Report

The Chair noted there were no reports by Board members.

Agenda Item 4 – Review/Approve Minutes

There were no corrections to the May 2000 minutes.

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

RESOLVED to approve the May 24-25, 2000 AELS Board meeting minutes.

Agenda Item 5 – Correspondence

The Chair noted that the first item was from:

Larry Whiting, Terra Surveys, regarding Hydrographic Surveying

1 Kalen stated this matter came up between meetings and that hydrographic
2 surveying is not necessarily a professional service. He defined Hydrographic
3 surveying as surveying the topography underwater and noted that it can be a very
4 complicated science.

5
6 McLane stated that when a hydrographic survey is done that details a mean high
7 water line or a high water line, or the 3 mile line between state and federal waters,
8 a boundary line, it must be done by a registered surveyor.

9
10 Miller added that the University of Alaska has added a hydrographic surveying
11 course to their Geomatics curriculum. It is highly technical and the National
12 Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has had that responsibility but
13 there is a trend to move away from (NOAA).

14
15 Mearig added that there is potential for public harm.

16
17 Miller agreed.

18
19 Kalen thinks this subject is worthy of an agenda item for some future discussion.

20
21 The Chair asked staff to prepare a response and coordinate it with Kalen and asked
22 to have the item added to the February agenda, with Kalen & McLane as lead board
23 members.

24
25 National Councils of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES) Letter
26 from Betsy Browne dated July 5, 2000 regarding Member Board Agreement

27
28 The Chair noted that would not be assigning a contract any longer and has gone to
29 an agreement.

30
31 Executive Administrator noted that the agreement had been forwarded to the
32 Department of Law for review. Brief discussion.

33
34 **On a motion duly made by Kalen and seconded by Mearig, it was**

35
36 **RESOLVED to endorse the NCEES examination agreement,**
37 **subject to the Department of Law's review.**

38
39 There were no objections and the motion carried unanimously.

40
41 MBA Response to Draft Member Board Agreement dated July 12, 2000

42
43 The Chair noted that this was for information purposes regarding concerns the
44 NCEES Member Board Administrators (MBA) had with the proposed agreement.

1 National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) Draft Architect
2 Registration by Examination (ARE) Contract Agreement
3

4 **On a motion duly made by Gardner, and seconded by Peirsol, it was**

5
6 **RESOLVED that the Board would continue to use the NCARB**
7 **ARE examination.**
8

9 There were no objections and the motion carried.
10

11 MBA Email Comments on Foreign Evaluation Services dated June 23, 2000
12

13 The Executive Administrator explained that staff recommends NCEES foreign
14 evaluation service for those applicants who have a foreign degree that would need to
15 be translated and evaluated for equivalency to the NCEES four year Accreditation
16 Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc. (ABET) accredited degree for
17 professional engineering licensure. The email notes that the service will have a fee
18 increase from \$225 to \$325. NCEES was soliciting information from boards about
19 this service.
20

21 Miller suggested that UAA is facing the same dilemma. Several private companies
22 offer this service but it is better to have NCEES oversight. Miller offered to look at
23 what the university is doing regarding foreign evaluation services and report back
24 to the Board.
25

26 **Council of Landscape Architectural Registration Boards (CLARB)**
27 **Correspondence.**
28

29 CLARB Score Reporting via Website
30

31 Executive Administrator explained that CLARB is going to post examination scores
32 on the website and needs a response from Boards if they want to decline this
33 service. Boards would still get written score reporting; the website service is in
34 addition to the standard service.
35

36 Short discussion.
37

38 Miller indicated the Board should suggest their concern about privacy and that
39 using a social security number alone may not provide that privacy and the CLARB
40 should also have a second number, like a PIN number or some other identifier.
41

42 June Examination Problems
43

44 The Chair noted that there were apparently some problems with the LARE
45 examinations and some candidates did not have complete examinations. Brief
46 discussion.

Executive Administrator would check to see if this posed a problem for Alaska examination candidates.

NCEES Correspondence

The Chair brought up the next item regarding computer based testing survey.

Kalen asked if all members had filled out their survey and advised that NCEES was interested in both the Boards members' individual opinions and also the administrator's opinion on replacing the pencil and paper examination with a computer based test. He added that NCEES had polled students and found a surprising number were negative about converting to computer based testing.

Gardner advised that the Board filled out the survey, that several members collaborated at the last meeting and some portion was filled out by the Executive Administrator.

Executive Administrator explained that that survey was submitted to NCEES and also, that at the MBA Forum at the NCEES annual conference there was widespread confusion about who was to fill out the survey. Concerns were expressed about examination security and examination cost since it may be more costly to candidates.

Kalen responded that NCEES was working to contain costs.

Miller expressed concern that students could not absorb additional costs for the Fundamentals of Engineering examination.

Davis arrived at 9:40 a.m.

The Chair asked for comments on ABET Correspondence, CLEAR Correspondence and APDC Correspondence, and Miscellaneous Correspondence and there were no comments.

The Chair noted that correspondence from Jeannie Sayre, an email of August 20, 2000, would be taken up under Old Business (6a).

Recessed at 9:47 a.m.

Reconvened: 10:02 a.m.

Agenda Item 6 – Review Goals and Objectives

Goal #1 – Increase Board's work efficiency

1 The Chair noted that, Objective #1, there are no new Board members.

2
3 Executive Administrator suggested that for Objective #5, Board Training, that she
4 pursue this and perhaps have someone observe a half day meeting and compress
5 the Board's agenda into one day to allow for Board Training. If there is enough
6 information to proceed, the Board could do this at the November 2000 meeting or
7 else in February 2001.

8
9 Goal #2 – Increase the Board's cost effectiveness

10
11 Gardner thought the target date should be February 2001 and the Board should be
12 able to bring this to closure by then.

13
14 The Chair noted that the current director, Catherine Reardon, has given increased
15 attention to the Board's needs, and the Board has additional resources.

16
17 Goal #3 – Ensure that all individuals practicing within the state are either
18 registered or fall within appropriate exemptions to registration.

19
20 Siemoneit stated he has made some additional calls and amassed some additional
21 information regarding advertising in the yellow pages. He noted that he has
22 contacted the publisher, Berry Company, and each directory is administered
23 separately and has different time schedules making it very difficult to try to put in
24 some type of disclosure about unlicensed advertising. He added that he continues
25 to work toward that goal.

26
27 Iverson stated that item #3, regarding building official's plan review, was completed
28 in May 00 and needs to be taken off as an objective.

29
30 Miller explained that it is beneficial to have engineering faculty registered and
31 believes that the university administration is supportive and encourages faculty to
32 register. Primarily, registering faculty teaching engineering courses consisting of
33 elements of interior design are ones that should be registered. It is less important
34 to register faculty teaching entry-level courses. However, Miller noted, registration
35 isn't a requirement for employment. One way to reach this goal would be to have a
36 regulation that requires faculty be registered but this would make recruiting more
37 difficult. Miller noted that at UAA/UAF the majority of faculty is registered.

38
39 Davis suggests rewording the objective because it currently implies we have an
40 exemption for faculty and are reconsidering the matter. Short discussion.

41
42 Change Objective #1 to read: Determine what action, if any, is necessary to
43 encourage University of Alaska engineering, architecture, and landscape
44 architecture faculty to be registered.

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

3
4 The Chair noted that Objective # 2 could be moved since it was completed in
5 February (AKLS examination questions).

6
7 Peirsol suggested that Objective #5 is ongoing since it requires legislation to have a
8 letter of intent attached, but should be moved to Goal #1 since it is more
9 appropriate placement.

10
11 The Chair noted that item #6, NCARB publication reference, is included in the
12 current regulations project.

13
14 Goal #5 – Board will stay current on all competency, testing, and regulatory issues
15 of other jurisdictions to ensure that Alaska standards stay within the national
16 norms and its licensing systems are fair and applied uniformly.

17
18 The Chair noted that improved funding and authority to attend professional
19 conferences has helped to insure that Goal #5 is met.

20
21 Kalen asked that Objective #3, Investigation of drainage, soils analysis, GIS,
22 photogrammetry be placed on the board member report for the November 2000
23 meeting.

24
25 Goal #6 – Improve communications with applicants and licensed professionals.

26
27 Peirsol suggested adding an objective, time and means to track action items. Short
28 discussion.

29
30 The Chair suggested a May 2001 target date and staff could work with Peirsol to
31 accomplish this objective.

32
33 Peirsol suggested changing Objective #3 be corrected to read “access.”

34
35 Mearig stated Objective #3 refers to the application checklist.

36
37 The Executive Administrator advised that Objective #4 was completed August 2000;
38 AELS applications are now available on the AELS website.

39
40 Davis noted that item 6 referred specifically to 12 AAC 36.061, NCARB Council
41 publications and should have a target date of November 2000.

42
43 Chair notes the Board would take up the audit in the November meeting.

44
45 **Agenda Item 6a – Old Business**

1 Kalen explained that Richard Heieren, Fairbanks, had asked how to apply the PLS
2 table when evaluating experience. Mr. Heieren wanted the Board to do something
3 about it and was advised to write a letter, which he has not done yet.

4
5 E-mail from Jeanne Sayre

6
7 Mearig noted that staff responded to her appropriately.
8 Discussion followed.

9
10 Chair asked Siemoneit to prepare a draft second response.

11
12 **Agenda Item 7 – New Business**

13
14
15 **Agenda Item 7 – Annual Report**

16
17 The Chair brought up the Annual Report as the next agenda item.

18
19 Mearig asked that the expiration dates of board members be reviewed and updated
20 to reflect his expires in 2002. He noted he no longer serves on the NCEES law
21 enforcement committee.

22
23 Executive Administrator would check to see what date was used for the statistics
24 for the number of applicants.

25
26 The Chair asked that the audit be added to the November meeting.

27
28 **Agenda Item 7 – NCEES Examination Administration Service**

29
30 The Chair asked if examination review fees should be raised.

31
32 The Board discussed examination reviews, that ten reviews were done from the last
33 NCEES examination which require considerable staff time and board member
34 oversight in conducting reviews; and the perception examinees may have about
35 scoring.

36
37 Miller advised that just because an applicant got a 69 on an examination and 70 is
38 passing doesn't mean they need to get one more question right and they would pass
39 the examination.

40
41 Iverson asked if candidates could get more information from NCEES about the
42 examination scoring.

43
44 The Board discussed having NCEES or a private company administer exams and
45 noted a proposal by Mr. Cote.

Executive Administrator explained that the division (Occupational Licensing) is interested in having the service provided but would not be willing to contract out score reporting or application processes. However, Occupational Licensing is interested in having NCEES or a private company, such as Engineering Examination Services, provide the actual administering of the examinations, much as Sylvan Centers provide the examination service for architectural examinations. Discussion followed.

The Chair asked that Executive Administrator obtain more information on the proposed NCEES examination administration and Occupational Licensing costs for administering the NCEES examinations at the three sites, and report back at the November meeting.

Agenda Item 7 – Ombudsman Recommendation

The Chair noted that the next item of business is the memorandum from Catherine Reardon dated June 20, 2000 regarding the Ombudsman's recommendation.

The Chair explained that the renewal fitness questions we ask only pertain to the recent renewal cycle and the memo expressed concern that we might not be capturing all the disciplinary action on an individual.

Davis referred to AS 08.48.171, in terms of guidance, states that applicants must be of good character and reputation. She noted that there isn't anything explicit that states we can't grant a license to someone who has lost a license in another state and that it could affect them for comity but not for renewal. She advised that she doesn't have a concern about this.

Miller doesn't think they question any difference than a driver's license. If a licensee is doing something unsafe it is pertinent.

Short discussion followed.

The Chair asked Executive Administrator to bring to the next meeting a list of the fitness questions we ask applicants on their initial applications, and licensees on renewal forms.

She noted this is an item they could discuss with the Occupational Licensing director.

Agenda Item 7 – Digital Signatures

The Chair brought up the next item, Digital Signatures. Brief discussion about the federal law that passed and NCEES white paper. At this time the board would not be changing their policy to allow for digital signature and still would require a wet signature.

1
2 **Agenda Item 7 – Renewals/Lapsed and Expired License Renewal Letters**
3

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

6 Executive Administrator indicated that staff sent a letter to all those licensees
7 whose registration has lapsed to let them know their license will expire on 12/31/00.
8 The letter is a proactive effort to let people know that if their license is lapsed for
9 five years, it expires and they would need to reapply. Although the letter went out
10 recently already some registrants have responded, others are deceased, and there
11 have been no negative comments so far. Additionally, this is a good way to clean up
12 our database and insure that we have accurate information. For general renewals,
13 there have been instances where an applicant is under the impression that their
14 employer has been paying their registration fees and when they get a reminder
15 letter it provides valuable information that they can remedy. This is another type
16 of reminder that gives licensees an opportunity to respond before they would be
17 required to submit a new application.
18

19 **Agenda Item 7 – Retired Status/Expired License Fees**
20

21 The Chair brought up the next item, Retired status reactivation fees.
22

23 The Executive Administrator explained that by regulation we collect all back fees
24 when a person reactivates their retired status license whereas if a person allows
25 their license to lapse, we only collect the current renewal fees (since we don't
26 backdate licenses). In those instances, staff make a notation in the file of the period
27 of time the licensees' license was lapsed.
28

29 The board discussed what they considered as an equity issue, considering that
30 Alaska does not have a requirement for continuing education; the possibility of
31 imposing a penalty equal to the lapsed fees; and if another status of license such as
32 an inactive license should be issued.
33

34 Davis suggested that if lapsed licensees and retired licensees are to be treated
35 equitably, that 12 AAC 36.115 (b) (2) be deleted.
36

37 Short discussion followed.
38

39 **On a motion duly made by Mearig, and seconded by Iverson, it was**
40

41 **RESOLVED that the Board would initiate a regulations project**
42 **to delete 12 AAC 36.115(b)(2), regarding collection of fees from**
43 **retired status licensees.**
44

1 Short discussion followed in terms of encouraging licensees to register and
2 clarifying that people cannot stamp but could certainly work for a licensed
3 professional.

4
5 There was one objection.

6
7 **The Board had a show of hands as follows to support the motion:**
8

	In Favor	Opposed
Brown	X	
Gardner	X	
Iverson	X	
Kalen		X
McLane	X	
Mearig	X	
Miller	X	
Peirsol	X	
Siemoneit	X	

9
10 and the motion carried.

11
12 **Agenda Item 7 – Arctic Engineering Waiver**

13
14 The Chair noted the next item was the Arctic Engineering waiver.

15
16 Mearig stated he was not in favor of waiving the requirement for completion of an
17 arctic engineering course. He wanted to bring up that at the annual NCEES
18 meeting there was a discussion about temporary license. Our statutes allow us to
19 have a temporary license but we have never adopted regulations to do.

20
21 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard explained that she had a landscape architect request a
22 waiver of the arctic engineering course and since she has served on the Board it
23 seems that the Board has felt very strongly about not offering a waiver for the
24 course. However, there are many people who have worked in Alaska for many years
25 and feel they have gained the expertise, and maybe we should reconsider this
26 policy.

1
2 Iverson advised he wasn't in favor of waiving the arctic engineering requirement.
3 He added that the course isn't particularly difficult, but provides important
4 information for licensees, but recognizes that it is time consuming to complete.
5

6 The Chair noted that there are many courses available for applicants to comply
7 with this course and at this time there is no provision for a waiver.
8

9 Break for lunch at 11: 45a.m.
10

11 Reconvene from lunch: 1:19 p.m.
12

13 The Chair noted for the record that Peirsol was out ill, Cyra-Korsgaard and Davis
14 were not back yet, and that there was no one from the public present at this time
15 but the Board would reconvene.
16

17 **Agenda Item 7 - Interior Designers Practices** 18

19 The Chair brought up under Tab 7, Interior Designers. The Chair noted that in
20 other jurisdictions interior designers are organizing and initiating licensure by
21 going to their respective legislatures for licensing laws. Concerns have been raised
22 by NCARB and by the American Institute of Architects (AIA) about the public being
23 protected in terms of health and life safety issues. While the interior designer
24 profession is trying to elevate the level of their profession, there are concerns about
25 the education they receive being insufficient to adequately protect the public. Brief
26 discussion.
27

28 **Agenda Item 7 - Continuing Education** 29

30 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda.
31

32 Miller explained that this item was on the agenda at his request. Miller explained
33 that some of the professional organizations require continuing education as
34 mandatory and wanted to know if the Board was interested in pursuing a
35 requirement for continuing education for all registrants. Miller also wondered from
36 a practical perspective about administering a program.
37

38 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard re-joined the meeting.
39

40 Kalen stated that he believed that there is a national trend to provide requirements
41 for continuing education but that there has not been any interest by land surveyors
42 to have this requirement.
43

44 Iverson indicated he thought this was primarily a bookkeeping measure and that it
45 would be easy for registrants to meet the requirements.
46

1 Kalen added that the legislative audits have recommended the Board require
2 continuing education (CEU), however, the Board has not felt that there would be
3 benefits in doing so.

4
5 Miller thought that the Board might want to address this. He noted that when he
6 attended the NCARB meeting, he found the AIA, the professional organization does
7 require members to have some CEU. Miller continued that while members support
8 the concept of CEU, they question whether this should be a mandatory
9 requirement.

10
11 Executive Administrator explained that other states' administrators indicated there
12 is no easy way to insure that a person benefited from a seminar or course and
13 administrators did not find CEU to be a valuable tool. There generally is no
14 examination for the types of courses or seminars that satisfy CEU so a person
15 satisfies this requirement by signing up for a seminar. The registrant could attend
16 a course, read the paper during the course, and then leave without ever having
17 benefited from attending the course. There has been no demonstrated benefit for
18 registrants.

19
20 Miller explained that some jurisdictions that have imposed CEU have found that
21 the number of registrants decreased. He suggested that the Board could take a
22 position that the burden of continuing education falls in the realm of the societies.

23
24 Kalen noted that the nationwide American Congress on Surveying and Mapping
25 (ACSM) is in favor of CEU and sponsors programs to accomplish this.

26
27 The Chair recapped that the Board would not be taking any action at this time
28 and would rely on the professional organizations to require ongoing continuing
29 education for its members. The AELS Board is concerned about the administrative
30 costs associated with initiating CEU and that the number of registrants could
31 decrease if CEU were imposed.

32 33 **Agenda Item 7 - Staff Proposed Changes to the Regulations Project**

34
35 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda.

36
37 Executive Administrator indicated that the staff proposed changes were in bold and
38 that these regulations have already been public noticed. The staff changes
39 recommended clarify what documents the Board would accept for conditionally
40 approved applications. When the regulations were revised, the Board drafted some
41 changes. Upon reviewing the proposed regulations, staff felt that some of the
42 regulations deleted actually helped clarify which applications the Board would
43 consider as complete. For example, an applicant could pay the application and
44 examination fees but not be required to submit the registration fees until they
45 actually passed the examination and prior to licensing.

1 The Executive Administrator explained that 12 AAC 36.010 (i), outlines the types of
2 documentation that are not required to be in the file for conditional approval by the
3 Board, and those items are quite helpful to the public. The recommended changes
4 merely clarify the current requirements the Board currently would give conditional
5 approval of to applicants. For example, the Board currently will give approval to an
6 application pending completion of the arctic engineering course and the proposed
7 changes clarify the current procedures and policy. None of the changes
8 recommended would alter or change the way the staff has processed or the Board
9 has approved applications. The staff proposed regulatory language does not in any
10 way give staff any discretion, nor would the changes require any subjectivity on the
11 part of staff.

12
13 Miller wanted to clarify that geomatics is considered part of land surveying.

14
15 Kalen suggested that there is a national debate over the use of the word “geomatics”
16 and that the important thing is that the applicant must have a degree in land
17 surveying. He suggested that the regulation under 12 AAC 36.010 (i) (1)(B), a BS
18 degree in an ABET accredited or curriculum in land surveying”.

19
20 Mearig suggested that under 12 AAC 36.010(i) (1) (C) (3) verification of successful
21 completion of a board approved university level course in arctic engineering.

22
23 **On a motion duly made by Kalen and seconded by McLane and**
24 **unanimously carried, the Board adopted the regulations project,**
25 **previously public noticed.**

26
27 The Chair asked for clarification if the regulations project had been public noticed
28 and if any of the proposed changes would need to go back for additional public
29 notice.

30
31 Executive Administrator indicated that the regulations project had been public
32 noticed and that no additional public notice would be necessary as the changes fell
33 within the noticing language.

34
35 **On a motion duly made by Miller and seconded by Kalen and**
36 **unanimously carried, the Board accepted the staff recommended**
37 **changes as amended.**

38
39 There were no objections and the motion carried.

40
41 (See attachment A for regulations text with amendments)

42
43 **Agenda Item 7 – Regulations Project, NCEES “Blue Book”**

44
45 The Chair noted the next item would be the NCEES “Blue Book” Council Record.

1 Executive Administrator explained that at the February meeting the Board had
2 asked to start a regulations project that would accept the NCEES “Blue Book”
3 Council Record stamped “model law” engineer in lieu of the education and
4 experience requirement for Engineer by Comity applicants. This proposed
5 regulation would accomplish this.

6
7 **On a motion duly made by Iverson and seconded by Mearig, the**
8 **Board asked staff to add into the regulations project the proposed**
9 **regulations that accept the “NCEES ‘Blue Book’ Council Record”**
10 **stamped “model law” engineer in lieu of the education and**
11 **experience requirement for Engineer by Comity applicants.**

12
13 **Motion amended by Mearig, seconded by Iverson to insert “NCEES**
14 **Council Record” and strike “Blue Book”.**

15
16 Iverson asked for clarification if the Board would require 24 months responsible
17 charge time to be verified by a registered engineer in addition to the NCEES
18 Council record.

19
20 Mearig responded it wouldn’t be required because the NCEES “model law” engineer
21 requirements satisfy the responsible charge time. He explained that the council
22 record does not require the time be stamped but it is verified experience.

23
24 The Chair advised that if adopted, it could be the first step in streamlining the
25 comity application process so that staff could receive an application, council record,
26 collect the fees and issue the license.

27
28 **There was no objection and the amended motion carried unanimously.**

29
30 **Agenda Item 7 - Limited Liability Companies and Partnerships**

31
32 Executive Administrator indicated that HB 130 passed the Legislature last session
33 and became law on August 7. Regulations need to be adopted to provide the
34 mechanism to issue certificates of authority to limited liability companies and
35 partnerships just as we currently issue for corporations. There would be no
36 additional requirements and the application and process would be the same.

37
38 Davis rejoined the meeting at 1:49 p.m.

39
40 **On a motion duly made by Mearig, and seconded by Miller, and**
41 **carried unanimously, the Board asked staff to add into the new**
42 **regulations project the proposed regulations for issuing certificates**

1 **of authority for limited liability companies and partnerships, and**
2 **that the regulations project be noticed.**

3
4 There was no objection and the motion carried.

5
6 The Chair indicated that the Board had set aside the idea of expanding the
7 engineering disciplines to a future meeting.

8
9 The Executive Administrator indicated that the Board had decided to take up
10 engineering disciplines at its November 2000 meeting.

11
12 Short discussion followed about expanding the disciplines to include nuclear
13 engineers, environmental engineers and possibly others not currently recognized in
14 Alaska; or going to a generic professional engineering license but that it would be on
15 the November agenda.

16
17 The Chair asked Executive Administrator to compile some information about how
18 many states license non-disciplined engineers.

19
20 **Agenda Item 8 - Public Comment**

21
22 There was no public comment.

23
24 **Agenda Item 16 - Member Board Reports**

25
26 The Chair brought up member board reports.

27
28 Mearig discussed the NCEES annual meeting report that was prepared by staff
29 with his additional comments added. He highlighted several issues, one was that
30 industrial exemptions are raised at each meeting, and the consensus is that Boards
31 are concerned about this but none is taking a proactive role. The next issue of
32 interest was mobility, the ability for engineers and land surveyors to practice in
33 other jurisdictions. He indicated there is interest by NCEES toward nearly
34 instantaneous mobility for comity applicants. Comity applicants registered in one
35 jurisdiction should be able to gain licensure in any jurisdiction quickly and easily.
36 NCEES is also looking at international practice and mobility among professionals in
37 other countries, particularly Canada and Mexico. Other topics that garnered
38 interest were computer-based technology and exams.

39
40 The Chair indicated that the Director of Occupational Licensing, Catherine
41 Reardon, would be attending the meeting tomorrow and members should think of
42 any items that they want to discuss.

43
44 Mearig expressed his concern about fluctuations in fees. He stated that under
45 Budget, Tab 12, contractual services, it appeared that there was a surplus of

1 \$163,000 and that should be encumbered or it could mean that licensing fees would
2 fluctuate.

3
4 Break: 2:10 p.m.

5
6 Reconvene: 2:29 p.m.

7
8 **Agenda Item 9 – Application Reviews**

9
10 **On a motion duly made by Iverson and seconded by McLane, and**
11 **unanimously carried, the Board went into executive session at 2:29**
12 **p.m. for the purpose of application review.**

13
14 **Authorities for executive session are noted as AS 44.62.310(c)(3) and**
15 **AS 08.48.071(d).**

16
17 The Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

1 **Friday, August 25, 2000**

AELS BOARD MEETING

2
3 **Agenda Item 10 – Roll Call**

4
5 Daphne Brown, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.

6
7 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

8
9 Daphne Brown, Chair, Architect
10 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member
11 Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer
12 Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor
13 Scott McLane, Land Surveyor
14 Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer
15 Kathleen Gardner, Secretary, Mechanical Engineer
16 Robert Miller, Vice-President, Civil Engineer
17 Patricia Peirsol, Architect
18 Ernie Siemoneit, Mining Engineer
19

20 Absent: Marcia Davis, Public Member

21
22 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

23
24 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
25 Ginger Morton, Licensing Examiner
26

27 Joining a portion of the meeting by teleconference was:

28
29 Ken Truitt, Assistant Attorney General, Alaska Department of Law.
30

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

32
33 Catherine Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing
34 Larry Kemp, Occupational Licensing Data Processing Analyst Programmer
35 John R. Clark, Occupational Licensing Investigator
36

37 The Chair asked if there were any concerns about files that needed to be addressed
38 and there were none.
39

40 **Agenda Item 12 – Budget Summary Report**

41
42 The Chair asked if there were any comments about the Budget Summary Report.
43

44 Mearig wondered what charges are reflected in the report, if there are outstanding
45 expenses not yet processed and that could be raised with the Occupational
46 Licensing Director. He brought up the budget increment approved last legislative

1 session and the surplus, and indicated that there were items for which funding
2 could be spent, such as replacement computers for staff, including a good laptop
3 computer for use at meetings. He also expressed concern that the AELS program
4 absorbs indirect costs and that overhead is about 24%, up from about 13.5%.
5 Davis is present at 8:09 a.m.

6
7 Kalen expressed concern about fee fluctuations.

8
9 McLane expressed concern about fewer registrations for this renewal period.

10
11 Mearig noted that the next renewal cycle would be during a new administration.

12
13 Kalen agreed that the political climate could change and it could have an adverse
14 impact on this board in terms of administration staff changes.

15
16 Gardner commented that division websites she visited looked good.

17
18 Davis agreed that the websites looked good and she was surprised at the speed in
19 maneuvering within the website.

20
21 Kalen indicated he would have a draft AKLS report for October including some
22 ideas for a winter workshop. Additionally, he commented that it was nice to have
23 staff and board member coverage at the NCEES annual meeting.

24
25 Peirsol stated that she attended the NCARB annual meeting and there were a
26 number of resolutions of interest to Alaska. Of those, the most contentious was the
27 opposition to interior designer licensing, primarily due to concerns that their
28 education was insufficient in areas of public safety concerns for structural issues.
29 She detailed the resolutions that were also in her NCARB report.

30
31 Executive Administrator gave a brief summary of her NCARB report and the areas
32 of interest to member board administrators (MBAs). There are a number of states
33 that are facing issues that are of interest to Alaska and the MBA forums are
34 particularly helpful in finding resources and materials to bring back.

35
36 Executive Administrator gave a summary of the administrator's report and
37 indicated staff sent out reminder letters and hoped to continue to improve customer
38 service provided to licensees. She suggested that many of the non-action items from
39 the national organizations and professional organizations are duplicative letters
40 and would not be duplicated for board member packets. Instead, staff would make
41 one packet for the public packet.

42
43 Miller agreed that the information items could be made part of the public packet.
44 Miller asked how many reminder letters for expired licenses went to in-state
45 licensees and staff indicated they would report back. (Note: 9/6/00 staff reported
46 that 58 were sent to instate licensees).

1
2 Iverson and McLane agreed that eliminating those informational items from
3 packets could reduce the packet size.
4

5 Kalen suggested that a letter could be sent to people who are close to taking five
6 exams within five years. He applauded staff for their initiative in sending these
7 letters.
8

9 Peirsol agreed that sending reminder letters was a good thing to be doing.
10

11 Recessed at 8:55 a.m.
12

13 Reconvened at 9:07 am
14

15 Kalen not present.
16

17 **Agenda Item 13 – Investigator’s Report, Discussion Items**
18

19 The Occupational Licensing investigator, John R. Clark, joined the meeting.
20

21 The Chair asked Clark about the fitness questions on the application form and
22 actions that Clark takes.
23

24 Clark indicated that his action would be to write the individual an informational
25 letter to advise them that the violations in other states would be considered in
26 violation of Alaska law as well.
27

28 Discussion followed concerning piling on penalties, an area of concern at the
29 national level; responsibility to protect the public from licensees who may have had
30 their license revoked by another jurisdiction and public safety concerns.
31

32 Miller suggested that the matter be discussed with Ken Truitt, Department of Law
33 when he appears before the Board, in terms of jurisdictional issues.
34

35 Kalen returned to the meeting at 9:15 a.m.
36

37 Discussion continued.
38

39 Clark brought up the Memorandum of Agreement, Case number 0102-95-009 for
40 action.
41

42 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Mearig, and carried**
43 **unanimously, it was**
44

45 **RESOLVED to approve the proposed Memorandum of**
46 **Agreement.**

1
2 Brief discussion.

3
4 There was no objection and the motion carried.

5
6 Clark gave a summary of the investigator's report that is included in the Board's
7 packet. He indicated that there are 36 open files. Of those, three are ready to close.

8
9 Miller asked about the referred cases to the attorney general's office. Clark
10 indicated that Truitt has reviewed cases 104961 and 104982, and has sent a draft.
11 Clark was not certain of the status.

12
13 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard brought up Jeannie Sayre's questions on construction
14 drawings.

15
16 Clark indicated that construction drawings are not specified in statute or
17 regulation. If a project is under construction there should be sealed drawings on
18 site. That project is being built based on the professional's design standards and
19 those standards should be sealed.

20
21 The Chair added that it is confusing. You could interpret the construction drawing
22 to mean the sealed drawings for the standards or the shop drawing from the
23 manufacturer that is providing some of the equipment. So it makes it difficult to
24 answer her questions until we determine what her reference is.

25
26 Iverson agreed.

27
28 Clark stated he is willing to discuss the specifics with Sayre.

29
30 Siemoneit added that if the projects she mentions falls under an exemption the
31 sealing questions are moot.

32
33 The Chair asked Siemoneit to draft a letter with staff to send to Sayre, along with a
34 regulation booklet.

35
36 The Chair asked Clark about unlicensed advertising in telephone directory yellow
37 pages.

38
39 Clark indicated that unlicensed advertising is being dealt with on an ongoing basis.
40 He felt it certainly could strengthen the cases when there are notices in the yellow
41 pages, such as the ones that Siemoneit is working on developing.

42
43 Brief discussion about hearing officer timeframes.

44
45 Short discussion about general investigative fieldwork conducted and work load.
46

1 **Agenda Item 15 - Director's Comments**

2
3 Catherine Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing, and Larry Kemp,
4 Occupational Licensing Data processing Analyst Programmer

5
6 Reardon indicated that the Legislature approved an increment the Board requested
7 for technology improvements in the amount of \$106,000. She was soliciting
8 guidance from the Board about how they would like to see the funding spent and to
9 gain information about the Board's priorities for website technology. She indicated
10 that she brought along Larry Kemp, the Occupational Licensing division's top
11 budget programmer, to discuss options and answer questions the Board may have.

12
13 Reardon explained that AELS staff had several meetings with data processing, the
14 program coordinator, and herself to discuss options and the result was a ranking
15 list for discussion purposes, and is included as part of the Board's packet.

16
17 She reviewed the options listed briefly as:

18

Option
1. Fill-out-able forms, mail in
2. Oracle enhancements: Applicant entered for comity/examination at time of receipt
3. Score or other reporting
4. Equipment enhancements: (new computers, preferably one laptop/station)
5. On-line access-checklist
6. On-line renewal
7. Scanned in documents/applicant review file
8. On-line direct application
9. Improvements to the home page

19
20 Reardon indicated that the forms are now fill-out-able forms and can be accessed
21 via the website, filled out on-line, printed off, and mailed in. At this time a
22 signature is required so applicants must still mail in the application, along with
23 their fees.

24
25 She indicated that staff has ranked the technology improvements but the Board
26 may have a preference for other priorities and if so, she would like to know them.

27
28 Iverson indicated that the scanned documents the agency sent came through fine
29 but he felt this option could be used for emergencies, not routinely, since the Board
30 relies quite heavily on interaction.

31
32 Mearig indicated he thought it would be more advantageous for staff to streamline
33 work for use when the Board reviewed files rather than trying to review files
34 outside the Board meetings.

1
2 The Board generally discussed options and decided that scanning would be a low
3 priority.
4

5 The Board discussed having the division provide programming time to develop an
6 on-line website checklist for applicant access. The checklist would show the date
7 each item, such as work verifications and transcripts were received by the agency so
8 they could assess how complete their file was and what items were missing. Using
9 a checklist could also have benefits in reducing in routine telephone calls.
10

11 The Board discussed having a board member, Mearig, provide expertise and
12 direction between meetings, and Executive Administrator as lead staff to work with
13 data processing as technology enhancements proceed.
14

15 Reardon strongly supported having the programming work done in-house using
16 existing staff, Kemp, and felt there would be built-in timesaving mechanisms since
17 the programmer has the institutional knowledge, is familiar with Oracle, the data
18 base, the AELS existing program, the flexibility, and would be readily accessible,
19 on-site, to AELS staff. Reardon envisioned that the programming would be
20 accomplished as a special project using overtime for the existing programmer. She
21 also discussed contracting out as another option and cautioned that the detail of the
22 contract would need to be worked out ahead of time.
23

24 The Board held a lengthy discussion about computer upgrades for staff and if the
25 computers should be laptops, and various configurations, whether to purchase or
26 lease and the importance of powerful computer systems to handle the multi-
27 programs staff uses that would assist them as the computer technology
28 enhancements occur.
29

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

33 **RESOLVED that the Board requests that Occupational**
34 **Licensing division purchase three new computers: two laptops**
35 **with docking stations and one standard computer, all with 22**
36 **inch monitors, for AELS staff.**
37

38 There was no objection and the motion carried.
39

40 The Board held a lengthy discussion about computer technology enhancement and
41 the mechanics and security of information storage.
42

43 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard asked if item #5, ability to download the database
44 enhancements would come out of the AELS budget.
45

1 Reardon indicated these enhancements would not come out of the program's budget
2 but the general division budget.

3
4 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard asked if improvements to the homepage would be ranked
5 ahead of #6, scanned in documents and #7, on-line direct applications.

6
7 Reardon indicated that the homepage improvements would happen simultaneously
8 and did not need to be ranked ahead of #6 and #7.

9
10 Mearig brought up the searchable database and his view that there is considerable
11 white space and it might be helpful to have the codes listed.

12
13 Reardon agreed.

14
15 Kemp and Reardon discussed enhancements to searching the database, cold fusion
16 and Adobe Acrobat.

17
18 Reardon discussed the roster capabilities and the constraint limits to 500 entries
19 due to size of database.

20
21 Kalen asked questions about old licensee database and wanted search capabilities
22 to be able to search the monument number.

23
24 Reardon indicated that staff maintains a manual chronological list of licensees, and
25 those parties needing specific registration information could contact staff to look up
26 the number when necessary.

27
28 Reardon discussed the business licensing on line program and problems that were
29 encountered and solutions found.

30
31 The Chair noted that the Board is trying to improve its communications with
32 licensees and building officials and ultimately want to have handbooks on the
33 website.

34
35 The board discussed various ways to improve the application process, the initial
36 point for applicant data entry; renewal automation process using pin numbers; and
37 return receipts by email.

38
39 Reardon indicated staff would work with data processing, Larry Kemp, who would
40 be available beginning in October to begin technology enhancements. Reardon
41 would report back to the Board in November about the progress on the Technology
42 ranking.

43
44 Reardon moved the discussion to the total increment and asked for guidance. She
45 anticipated the maximum amount that would be spent for data processing would be
46 about \$40,000 by the end of the fiscal year, plus the computer equipment at about

1 \$10,000, or perhaps more. Other fiscal items included \$2,000 for proctors for
2 examinations, \$4,000, perhaps less, for the LARE administration for two
3 examinations; \$8,000 for the AKLS workshops.

4
5 Kalen indicated that he anticipated there would be about 15 people total; of those 5
6 to 6 would need air travel.

7
8 Reardon suggested that there would be 12 people (6 winter, 6 summer) for about
9 \$6,000 total for travel, lodging and meal allowance, beyond the amount for the
10 Warner Brothers contract.

11
12 Reardon suggested that the Board might need about \$8,000 to \$15,000 for strategic
13 planning or Board training and that Executive Administrator would work on
14 developing those figures. She suggested that the Board might want to earmark
15 about \$5,000 for printing and mailing to allow for mailing a newsletter or targeted
16 mailings to groups.

17
18 Reardon advised that there is also an increment for an attorney and a paralegal
19 that would be filled in September.

20
21 Reardon explained the expenditure authority versus the budgeted and how
22 additional Board travel would impact the surplus and wouldn't show up until next
23 year. She suggested the Board discuss the fees next year when they would be
24 having discussions and could talk about fee stability at that time.

25
26 The Chair indicated the Board continues to be interested in salary increases for
27 staff, primarily to help reduce staff turnover.

28
29 The Board discussed various staff increases. The Board could consider requesting
30 additional funding in the annual budget.

31
32 Reardon suggested that requesting an additional Licensing Examiner could help
33 maintain some impact in staff turnover within the unit as it would be unlikely that
34 two licensing examiners would leave at the same time.

35
36 Mearig suggested that there be established a Licensing Examiner I and a Licensing
37 Examiner II. Once staff was trained they could be eligible for the higher level
38 licensing examiner position, which would provide mobility for staff.

39
40 The Chair suggested that since there is a position authorized for an investigator slot
41 that it might not be necessary to ask for position authority, just for funding.

42
43 The Board held a lengthy discussion about travel.

44
45 Reardon indicated that if a travel authorization is not submitted for third party
46 travel, then the board member would not be covered under the state's insurance.

1 She described third party travel as being where a board member serves on a
2 committee (such as the NCEES law enforcement committee), the NCEES pays the
3 hotel and airfare and provides for incidental expenses. If a travel authorization
4 would be prepared, the board member would submit costs to NCEES for third party
5 reimbursement to the State of Alaska.

6
7 Reardon added that if a board member chooses to travel without going through the
8 travel authorization process, the board member would need to so indicate in a memo
9 to her prior to traveling. By indicating their acceptance that they would not be
10 covered under the State of Alaska's insurance or in any fashion be traveling under
11 the auspices of the State, the board member would not be required to submit forms.

12
13 This third party travel would be separate from the NCEES and NCARB travel
14 where the respective contract allows for reimbursement to the State. In those
15 instances, staff would submit the travel authorization on behalf of the board
16 member. Once the travel authorization is submitted it counts as the authorized trip
17 for the board member. The only caveat to that would be in instances where staff is
18 traveling to a committee meeting and the only expenses reimbursed are incidental
19 expenses. Since the trip would be incidental expenses, Reardon would absorb the
20 costs from the overall budget.

21
22 The Chair indicated the Board would have discussions later in the day about travel.

23
24 Miller asked the director if she had any philosophical barrier against the State
25 taking action if a violation happens in another state.

26
27 Reardon responded she would need to consult with the attorneys in those instances.

28
29 Break for lunch at 12:03 p.m.

30
31 Reconvene from lunch at 1:29 p.m.

32
33 Kalen absent.

34
35 The Board held a lengthy discussion about travel.

36
37 Peirsol and Davis indicated an interest in attending the Western Conference of
38 NCARB (WCARB) meeting in Boise in March 2000 and possibly the NCARB annual
39 meeting in Seattle in June.

40
41 The Chair noted that Iverson, Gardner, Mclane and Kalen were interested in
42 attending the Western Zone NCEES meeting in Maui, in May 2000.

43
44 The Chair indicated that Mearig and Davis were interested in attending the
45 CLARB meeting in 2001, (place and date to be announced).

1 Miller expressed interest in attending the President's Assembly to be held in
2 Arizona in February, not using a travel authorization.

3
4 The Chair indicated the travel discussion would continue later.

5
6 **Agenda Item 16 – Attorney Comments**

7
8 Joining a portion of the meeting by teleconference at 1:35 p.m. was Ken Truitt,
9 Assistant Attorney General, Alaska Department of Law.

10
11 Truitt indicated he had looked at Davis' suggested changes and referred to page 2.
12 The change to 12 AAC 36.061 (b)(2) is a technical change and could be done without
13 a regulation project as a typographical error. The rest of the suggestions looked fine.

14
15 Truitt discussed the plan review exemption in terms of the Alaska Department of
16 Environmental Conservation since HB 130 passed during the last legislative
17 session.

18
19 Miller indicated that the reason for the change was to accommodate building
20 officials doing plan review. He indicated that plan reviewers don't review drinking
21 water standards. He felt the Board would be in favor of having people review plans
22 for safe drinking water in terms of design but not for a baseline assessment.

23
24 Reardon joined the meeting at 1:47 p.m.

25
26 Truitt indicated that DEC has to approve since their regulations require the work
27 must be done by a registered design professional under AS 08.48.

28
29 The Chair stated it was clear that the Board did not exempt the ADEC staff in the
30 course of developing the plan review exemption under AS 08.48.

31
32 Truitt responded that the exemption is under AS 08.48.331 (10). The rationale is
33 that drinking systems go way beyond the core scope of what plan reviewers do so
34 they are not exempt. Truitt indicated he would respond.

35
36 The Chair asked Truitt about indemnification from NCARB and explained that they
37 no longer have a contract but Alaska uses their examinations under NCARB's
38 conditions. The agreement has been forwarded to the Department for review.

39
40 Truitt responded that he would need to look at the agreement and someone from
41 the Department of Law would need to look at the NCARB agreement in terms of
42 procurement issues.

43
44 The Chair asked Truitt to respond to the Executive Administrator on the
45 indemnification issue.

1 The Chair asked Truitt about the reference to the requirement for engineering
2 experience gained under an engineer registered in the United States. She
3 explained that in terms of mobility issues there are many Canadians who seek
4 reciprocity. Is it really necessary for the experience to be under U.S. registered
5 engineers?

6
7 Davis interjected that education and experience are being viewed by NCARB and
8 NCEES as equivalent.

9
10 Truitt felt that the provision is defensible and not unconstitutional.

11
12 The Chair asked if the provision is left in that there be additional discretionary
13 language added for those who have gained experience elsewhere so that the Board
14 could consider that experience and could count it if the Board felt it was equivalent
15 experience gained under a U.S. registered engineer.

16
17 Truitt responded that was a possible solution.

18
19 The Chair brought up the matter of fitness questions on applications and renewals
20 and asked what is fair and reasonable to ask.

21
22 Truitt indicated that some professions expressly state being disciplined in another
23 state is grounds for disciplining in this state. Truitt advised that certainly keeping
24 informed is good information to have so asking the questions seems appropriate but
25 that the AELS statutes and regulations do not expressly address this.

26
27 Miller explained that what currently happens is the investigator sends a letter to
28 the applicant but no licensing action is taken in terms of their Alaska registration.

29
30 Miller referred to AS 08.48.111 in terms of license revocation and asked if the
31 offenses would need to occur in Alaska.

1
2 Truitt indicated it was up to the Board to clarify the statutes and could be done by
3 regulation. He indicated that there is a regulation regarding the code of conduct
4 and, depending on the provision, the action might be in violation of those
5 regulations. However, it would be clear if there were a regulation that specifically
6 states that disciplinary action taken in another state is also grounds for disciplinary
7 action in Alaska.

8
9 Reardon indicated that the AELS board would be undergoing their sunset review
10 this year and as a result there would be a vehicle for statutory changes if the Board
11 wished to address this or other statutory changes. She indicated that most of the
12 health licensing statutes has a specific provision that addresses other states'
13 disciplinary actions.

14
15 The Chair asked if the Board would have the discretion of revoking some licenses
16 but not all licensees.

17
18 Truitt explained the general process currently in place. Currently, the investigator
19 would determine that an applicant had a violation or revocation in another state
20 that warranted review. Those cases would be referred to the Department of Law
21 (AG) for review. If the AG agreed, it would go through a hearing process and the
22 applicant's attorney could suggest areas of mitigation, and a hearing officer would
23 ultimately make the finding.

24
25 At 1:57 p.m., Kalen returns and Davis leaves.

26
27 The Chair asked that the Executive Administrator review this with Truitt and
28 present in November how other board areas have dealt with this issue.

29
30 Truitt is off line at 2:07 p.m.

31
32 The Chair moved to take up revisions to the annual report under
33 **Agenda Item 7, Annual Report.**

34
35 The Chair asked if the Occupational Licensing could pick up travel costs for the
36 temporary board member.

37
38 Reardon indicated that she had considered that possibility and decided that given
39 the language in the enabling legislation for Landscape Architects, she could not
40 reimburse travel costs.

41
42 Discussion followed.

43
44 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, and seconded by Miller, that the**
45 **temporary member continue to serve on the Board with would have**
46 **voting privileges.**

1
2 Mearig objected because there has been little movement in the landscape architect
3 community for obtaining registration.
4

5 Discussion followed.
6

7 Iverson indicated he felt that extending the temporary position was a good idea.
8 The Board is still working on gearing up for this program and needs the temporary
9 member to help provide guidance. He expressed interest in providing travel
10 reimbursement for costs to attend Board meetings.
11

12 **On an amendment duly made by Iverson and seconded by Peirsol, to**
13 **extend the temporary non-voting landscape member and to provide**
14 **travel reimbursement.**
15

16 The Chair noted there were no objections and so the amendment passed.
17

18 **On an amendment duly made by Peirsol and seconded by Gardner, to**
19 **extend the landscape architect member to correspond with the**
20 **Board's sunset date.**
21

22 Brief discussion followed about the typical sunset date.
23

24 The Chair noted there were no objections and so the amendment passed.
25

26 The Chair asked that the amended main motion be read as follows:
27

28 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, and seconded by Miller, that the**
29 **temporary non-voting landscape architect member continue to serve**
30 **on the Board through the Board sunset date and be reimbursed for**
31 **AELS Board travel.**
32

33 **The Board had a show of hands as follows to support the motion:**
34

	In Favor	Opposed
Brown	X	
Gardner	X	
Iverson	X	
Kalen		
McLane	X	
Mearig		X
Miller	X	
Siemoneit	X	
Peirsol	X	

35
36 The Chair noted that the motion passed.

1
2 **On a motion duly made by Iverson and seconded by Mearig, and**
3 **passing unanimously, it was**

4
5 **RESOLVED to add to the annual report a request for**
6 **expenditure authority for funding a second licensing**
7 **examiner.**

8
9 The Chair noted there was no objection and the motion passed.

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

13
14 **RESOLVED to accept the revisions proposed by Davis to the**
15 **regulations project that was previously public noticed, as**
16 **recommended by the assistant attorney general.**

17
18 The Chair noted there was no objection and the motion passed.

19
20 **Agenda Item 14 - Travel (Continuation)**

21
22 The Chair brought up travel. She indicated that the Board is authorized 12 trips
23 and staff is authorized to take six trips. Of those, three board member trips have
24 been used and two staff trips: Two board members traveled to NCEES annual
25 meeting in Chicago in August and the Executive Administrator attended. One
26 board member will be traveling to CLARB annual meeting, Mearig and staff,
27 Morton would also attend.

28
29 Discussion followed.

30
31 The Chair recapped that Peirsol and Davis plan to attend the regional WCARB
32 meeting and staff would attend; Kalen, Iverson and staff would attend Western
33 Zone meeting; Peirsol, Gardner, Mearig and staff would attend the NCARB annual
34 meeting; Davis and Mearig would attend the CLARB meeting.

35
36 The Chair indicated that both the Executive Administrator and the Licensing
37 Examiner would be attending the MBA Conference in Washington D.C. in
38 November 2000 because it would provide excellent training opportunities for staff.

Agenda Item 17 – Board Member Reports

The Chair brought up Board Member comments.

Kalen wanted to discuss computer based testing. He cautioned that at the NCEES conference there was much discussion about student's adverse reaction to switching from paper and pencil exams. The NCEES committee was surprised at this, however, members noted that many students are accustomed to working out the problems long hand and that the computer testing didn't work as well for them. NCEES is also concerned about the trend of fewer Fundamentals of Engineering examinations being given and how computer based testing might affect overall tests being given. Brief discussion followed.

Peirsol indicated she was glad to see that Board members are being allowed to travel to the national conferences and that in spite of heavy work schedules Board members are committed to participate on behalf of the Board.

Mearig commended staff on the condition of the files at this meeting.

Miller agreed about file condition and also thanked the Occupational Licensing Director, Reardon for attending portions of the meeting.

Gardner extended her appreciation for staff's effort.

Recessed at 3:05 p.m.

Reconvene at 3:20 p.m.

Agenda Item 19 – Read Applications into Record

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

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

Comity Applicants

#	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	DISCIPLINE	BOARD ACTION
1.	Powers	John	AKLS	Approved for registration pending passing AKLS, for which he is approved, and verification of current licensure.
2.	Sadler	Douglas	Architect	Approved.

3.	Thomson	Steven	Architect	Approved.
4.	Deak	Tamas	Landscape Arch.	Approved.
5.	Vogan	Fredrick Don	Landscape Arch.	Approved.
6.	Vallaster	William	PE/Chemical	Conditional approval pending Arctic requirement.
7.	Aisaka	Steven K.	PE/Civil	Approved
8.	Albani	Thomas	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending Arctic requirement.
9.	Bartholomew	Michael	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending Arctic requirement.
10.	Bartolomucci	Thomas	PE/Civil	Approved.
11.	Chow	Chi	PE/Civil	Approved.
12.	Conway	William	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending PE/current licensure.
13.	Grub	Hal	PE/Civil	Approved.
14.	Hailey	Jeremy	PE/Civil	Approved.
15.	Hurtz	Allen	PE/Civil	Approved.
16.	Huzjak	Robert	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending Arctic requirement.
17.	Kroll	Richard	PE/Civil	Approved.
18.	Krueger	Kurt	PE/Civil	Approved.
19.	Magid	Michael	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending Arctic requirement.
20.	Murray	Leonard	PE/Civil	Approved.
21.	Roberts	Robert	PE/Civil	Approved.
22.	Batchison	Stephan	PE/Electrical	Approved.
23.	Hable	Gary	PE/Electrical	Conditional approval pending Arctic requirement.
24.	Khan	Joe	PE/Electrical	Conditional approval pending Arctic requirement.
25.	Hueni	Gregory	PE/Petroleum	Conditional approval pending Arctic requirement.

Exam Applicants

#	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	DISCIPLINE	BOARD ACTION
1.	Arnolds	Melanie	FE	Approved after staff review
2.	Baus	Brian	FE	Approved after staff review
3.	Begay	Marcel	FE	Approved after staff review
4.	Black	Jean	FE	Approved after staff review
5.	Bray	Matthew	FE	Approved after staff review
6.	Casanova	Jonathan	FE	Approved after staff review
7.	Champlin	Lozem	FE	Approved after staff review
8.	Cline	Joshua	FE	Approved after staff review
9.	Gould	Stephanie	FE	Approved after staff review
10.	Engle	Jennifer	FE	Approved after staff review
11.	Horton	Kelly	FE	Approved after staff review
12.	Johnson	Avery	FE	Approved after staff review
13.	Kehrer	Kelly	FE	Approved after staff review

14.	Larson	Blake	FE	Approved after staff review
15.	Lease	Lon	FE	Approved after staff review
16.	LeClerc	Steve	FE	Approved after staff review
17.	Lindquist	Elizabeth	FE	Approved after staff review
18.	Lowe	Jeffrey	FE	Approved after staff review
19.	Mason	Thomas	FE	Approved after staff review
20.	Mayer	Jessica	FE	Approved after staff review
21.	Neumier	Sally	FE	Approved after staff review
22.	Park	Chong	FE	Approved after staff review
23.	Phillips	Brian	FE	Approved after staff review
24.	Rescober	John	FE	Approved after staff review
25.	Shin	Seung-Kyah	FE	Approved after staff review
26.	Smith	Carla	FE	Approved after staff review
27.	Smith	Nichelle	FE	Approved after staff review
28.	Smith	Rebecca	FE	Approved after staff review
29.	Steele	Marie	FE	Approved after staff review
30.	Stirling	Alison	FE	Approved after staff review
31.	Turpin	Griffith	FE	Approved after staff review
32.	Venner	Jyl	FE	Approved after staff review
33.	Watts	Michael	FE	Approved after staff review
34.	Weakland	Robert	FE	Approved after staff review
35.	Whitmer	Kyle	FE	Approved after staff review
36.	Young, III	Rex	FE	Approved after staff review

1

1.	Brown	Gary	FLS	Approved after staff review
2.	Eid	Marc	FLS	Approved after staff review
3.	Eischens	Kevin	FLS	Approved after staff review
4.	Globis	Keith	FLS	Approved after staff review
5.	Graves	Lea	FLS	Approved after staff review
6.	Harten	Brian	FLS	Approved after staff review
7.	Lukshin	Michael	FLS	Approved after staff review
8.	Palmer	Todd	FLS	Approved after staff review

2

1.	Eid	Marc	PLS/AKLS	Approved.
2.	Lumpkin	Robert	PLS/AKLS	Approved.

3

1.	Bartlett	James	A.R.E.	Approved.
2.	Jorgensen	Lawrence	A.R.E.	Approved.
3.	Ridenour	Timothy	A.R.E.	Approved.

4

1.	Mertl	Christopher	L.A.R.E.	Approved.
----	-------	-------------	----------	-----------

5

1.	Clausen	Richard	PE/Chemical	Conditional approval pending 1 month responsible charge experience.
----	---------	---------	-------------	---

6

1.	Casey	Kevin	PE/Civil	Approved.
2.	Cederstrom	Elaine	PE/Civil	Approved.
3.	Ellis	Wade	PE/Civil	Approved.
4.	Fontaine	Eric	PE/Civil	Approved.
5.	Hammond	Stephen	PE/Civil	Approved.
6.	Helgeson	Karen	PE/Civil	Approved.
7.	Lane	Robert	PE/Civil	Approved.

8.	Randelia	Cyrus	PE/Civil	Approved.
9.	Riopelle	Tyde	PE/Civil	Approved.
10.	Robinson	Vincent	PE/Civil	Approved.
11.	Ryll	Christian	PE/Civil	Approved.
12.	Shrieves	Jennifer	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending receipt of transcripts.
13.	Watt	Duncan	PE/Civil	Approved.
14.	Witta	James	PE/Civil	Approved.
15.	Wright	Norman	PE/Civil	Approved.

1.	Bassler	Thomas	PE/Electrical	Approved.
2.	Fultz	Dee	PE/Electrical	Approved.
3.	Williams	Matthew	PE/Electrical	Approved.

1.	Bindon	Philip	PE/Mechanical	Approved.
2.	Krupa	Trevor	PE/Mechanical	Approved.
3.	Fredeen	Craig	PE/Mechanical	Approved.
4.	Gries	Jeffrey	PE/Mechanical	Approved.
5.	Matiringe	Kumbirai	PE/Mechanical	Approved.
6.	Park	Chong	PE/Mechanical	Conditional approval. Needs to properly complete application.
7.	Rogers	Peter	PE/Mechanical	Approved.
8.	Saengsudham	Surath	PE/Mechanical	Approved.
9.	Tonkins	Scott	PE/Mechanical	Approved.

1.	Atta Darkwah	Samuel	PE/Petroleum	Approved.
2.	Balkenbush	Justin	PE/Petroleum	Approved.
3.	Ibele	Lyndon	PE/Petroleum	Approved. (FE waived; + 20 years experience)
4.	Kanady	Randall	PE/Petroleum	Approved.
5.	Warren	Michael	PE/Petroleum	Approved.

Staff read the names of the applicants approved, or conditionally approved pending receipt of necessary documents:

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

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

1.	Hutchinson	Andrew	FE	Incomplete. Needs verification of one year work experience.
2.	Toney	Robert	PE/Chemical	Incomplete. Needs 2 months responsible charge experience verified by a chemical engineer or non-discipline specific engineer.
3.	Lust	Scott	PE/Mechanical	Incomplete. Needs 2 months work experience.
4.	Neighbors	James	PE/Mechanical	Incomplete. Needs 8 months work experience.
5.	Hutchinson	David	PE/Petroleum	Incomplete. Needs 24 months responsible charge experience.
6.	Dollard	Anne	PLS/AKLS	Incomplete. Needs 4 months additional work experience.
7.	Palmer	Todd	PLS/AKLS	Incomplete. Needs 13 months additional work experience.

3 Staff read the names of the applicants found incomplete into the record.

5 **Agenda Item 20 – Calendar of Events/Confirm Meeting Dates**

7 The Chair reconfirmed travel dates and preliminary interest for upcoming
8 meetings:

10	CLARB	9/21-24/00	Richmond, VA
11			Mearig and staff, Licensing Examiner would
12			attend.
13	NCARB	11/3-4/00	Washington, D.C.
14	MBA		Executive Administrator and Licensing
15			Examiner to attend.
16			
17	NCEES	2/2-3/01	NCEES MBA/combine with President's
18			Assembly
19	MBA		(3 rd Party Reimbursed) Executive
20			Administrator to attend; incidental trip
21			
22	NCARB	2/9-2/10/01	NCARB MBA Committee
23	MBA Committee		(3 rd Party Reimbursed) Executive
24			Administrator to attend; incidental trip.
25			(Miller to attend on own).
26			
27	WCARB	3/23-25/01	Boise, ID
28			Peirsol and Davis expressed interest in
29			attending; Staff to attend.

NCARB 6/19-24/01 Seattle, WA
Annual Meeting Peirsol, Gardner, and Davis expressed
interest in attending, possibly Brown would
use travel authorization;
Staff to attend.

Western 5/3-5/01 Maui, HI
Zone Iverson, Gardner, McLane, and Kalen
expressed interest in attending; Staff to
attend.

For FY02 meetings:

Mearig, Peirsol and Davis expressed interest.

All attending Western Zone were interested in attending the NCEES annual
meeting.

The tentative schedule for the quarterly AELS board meetings are:

November 16-17, 2000	Anchorage
February 15-16, 2001	Juneau

Agenda Item 21 - Review Task List

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

Executive Administrator	1) Respond to correspondence to Larry Whiting, Terra Surveys re Hydroponic surveying.
	2) Add agenda item "Old Business" to future agendas.
	3) Notify CLARB that the Board is concerned about candidate's privacy regarding website score reporting.
	4) Check to see if problems were experienced during June LARE examination (note: the proctor did report booklets had some information missing but it was remedied and replaced prior to the examination. This irregularity report was submitted to CLARB).
	5) Work with Peirsol to develop tracking action items, for May 01 meeting (Goal 6, Objective 2).
	6) Revise Goals and Objectives and track completed items in a separate list.
	7) Check date used for statistical information in the annual report.

	8) Prepare information about examination reviews for the Board.
	9) Include in the public packet only, routine correspondence items in order to reduce copying.
	10) Insert a task list in each board packet.
	11) Compile examination administrative costs and obtain quotes from NCEES.
	12) Ask NCEES if additional information is available for candidates on score reporting on failed examinations.
	13) Copy list of fitness questions asked of applicants and licensees on application and renewal forms.
	14) Public notice the regulations project for NCEES council record, Limited Liability Companies & Partnerships, and "retired status" back fees.
	15) Work with Director to update Oracle to list codes on search database (less white space).
	16) Start a regulation project addressing lapsed licenses, as the Board discussed earlier.
	17) Public notice the regulations project
	18) Research other states that have non-discipline specific registration and what testing requirements they have in terms of discipline specific exams.
	19) Work with Truitt on possible regulation for disciplinary action taken by other states; specifically look at other Board regulations to see how handled.
	20) Add discuss investigator position to November agenda.
	21) Investigate board training possibilities and report to the board.
	22) Provide status report on agency technology advancements
	23) Attend MBA meeting in Washington D.C.
	24) Investigate what other states issue temporary licenses.
	25) Work with Board and Licensing examiner to consider targeted mailings for professions.
	26) Develop historical perspective for exams.
Kalen	1) Bring up under Board member Reports at the November meeting, GIS, photogrammetry under the definition of land surveying
	2) Work with Executive Administrator to respond to Hydrographic email
Miller	Check on UAA foreign evaluation service-use NCEES or other service.
Peirsol	Develop tracking action items with staff, for May 01 meeting (Goal 6, Objective 2).
Siemoneit	Continue work on unlicensed advertising.
Morton	1) Attend CLARB and MBA Workshop.
	2) Work with Executive Administrator on developing targeted mailouts.

1 **Agenda Item 22 – Housekeeping**

2
3 The Board members signed wall certificates and submitted travel reports as
4 completed.

5
6 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Iverson, and carried**
7 **unanimously, it was**

8
9 **RESOLVED to adjourn the meeting at 3:26 p.m.**

10
11 **There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned.**

12
13
14 Respectfully submitted:

15
16
17
18
19 _____
20 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator

21
22 Approved:

23
24
25
26
27 _____
28 Daphne Brown, Chair
29 Board of Registration for Architects,
30 Engineers and Land Surveyors

31
32 Date: _____
33