

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

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

15
16
17
18

MINUTES OF MEETING

19
20

AUGUST 23-24, 2001

21
22
23
24

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

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

By authority of AS 08.01.070 (2) and in compliance with the provision of AS 44.62, Article 6, the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors, (AELS) held a meeting August 23-24, 2001 at the Atwood Building, Room 1270, Anchorage, Alaska 99501.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Roll Call

Robert Miller, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

Robert Miller, Chairperson, Civil Engineer
Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer
Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor
Scott McLane, Land Surveyor
Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer
Kathleen Gardner, Vice-Chairperson, Mechanical Engineer
Daphne Brown, Architect
Patricia Peirsol, Architect
Ernie Siemoneit, Secretary, Mining Engineer

Not present at roll call, but joining the meeting were:

Marcia Davis, Public Member
Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member

Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
Susan Frederick, Licensing Examiner
Kevin Glaesman, Licensing Examiner

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

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 John R. Clark, Division of Occupational Licensing, Investigator

3
4 Bob Butcher, Division of Occupational Licensing, Investigator

5
6 Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing

7
8 Dwayne Adams, representing self
9 13231 Reef Place, Anchorage, AK 99515

10
11 Terry Schoenthal, representing the American Society of Landscape Architects, Alaska
12 Chapter (President), 3410 Levarin Bay Circle, Anchorage, AK

13
14 Scott Sandlin, representing The American Institute of Architects (AIA) Alaska Chapter
15 (President-Elect)
16 PO Box 242151, Anchorage, AK 99524

17
18 Vicki Sterling, representing Alaska Professional Design Council (APDC)
19 PO Box 10-3115, Anchorage, AK 99510

20
21 Monique Prozeralik, representing self
22 11855 Wilderness Drive, Anchorage, AK 99516

23
24 Mike Prozeralik, representing self
25 11855 Wilderness Drive, Anchorage, AK 99516

26
27 Hai On, representing self
28 735 K. St, Apt. J, Anchorage, AK 99501

29
30 Also joining by teleconference for part of the meeting was:

31
32 Ken Truitt, Assistant Attorney General, State of Alaska

33
34 **Agenda Item 2 – Review/Revise Agenda**

35
36 The Chair noted that Marcia Davis joined the meeting at 9:05 a.m.

37
38 The Chair asked for revisions to the agenda, and revisions were made as follows:

39
40 Kalen asked to take up Alaska Land Surveying exam (AKLS) under Old Business #15. Kalen
41 wanted a few minutes to discuss the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and
42 Surveying (NCEES) April exam administration in Fairbanks.

43
44 The Chair noted that Linda Cyra-Korsgaard joined the meeting at 9:11 am.

45
Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 Cyra-Korsgaard asked that stamping requirements for landscape architects be moved on agenda
2 from Item #15, Old Business, to Item #13, Budget Summary Report to be taken up at 8:15 a.m.
3 on Friday.
4

5 Brown commented she was interested in implementing regulations because there are no
6 regulations clearly defining landscape architect stamping.
7

8 Kalen noted that Mike Kinney, a Teamster member, currently on the agenda under Item # 9,
9 Public Comment, would not be able to attend and that he would discuss this issue under Item
10 #18, Regulation Projects. Mr. Kinney, representing the Teamsters union, would like to be placed
11 on November agenda. Kalen will also request something in writing from Mr. Kinney.
12

13 Peirsol stated she received a series of questions from an engineer in Fairbanks about retirement
14 status and would like to discuss these questions under Old Business, agenda item #15.
15

16 Brown would like to talk about hosting the Western Conference of Architectural Registration
17 Board (WCARB), Region 6, Meeting for 2003 under Item #21, New Business.
18

19 Mearig would like to talk about a matter brought up last meeting during Board Member
20 Comments, to consider offering the AKLS exam and arctic engineering course as a take home
21 exam, similar to how the Idaho Board offers their ethics exam.
22

23 **Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Report**

24

25 The Chair noted there were no ethic reports by Board members.
26

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

28

29 The Chair asked for any corrections or additions to the May 2001 minutes.
30

31 Kalen noted corrections to the May 2001 draft minutes:
32

- 33 • Page 18, Line 44, should read: Based on model law language for surveyors and engineers.
- 34 • Page 23, Line 33, should say: Board then took up subject of survey standard raised by HB
35 227.
36

37 Peirsol noted these corrections to May 2001 minutes:
38

- 39 • Page 12, line 33, about 2/15/2002 should add ON efforts....
- 40 • Page 27, line 7, second sentence – delete Y in they – should read THE....
- 41 • Page 30, line 27 – delete the “she” in “the Chair she has served...”
- 42 • Page 34, line 32 and page 35, line 1 – Doesn’t read correctly and it seems there is something
43 missing. (Executive Administrator to listen to the tape and correct various edits.)
44

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

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

3
4 **RESOLVED to approve the May 17-18, 2001 AELS Board meeting minutes,**
5 **as corrected.**

6
7 **Agenda Item 5 – Correspondence**

8
9 The Chair noted that the first item was email from:

10
11 Chris Dowse regarding comments on Engineer Registration by Comity, from a non-discipline
12 specific state working in Control Systems engineering;

13
14 Iverson stated Control System in Alaska is multiple discipline. Mr. Dowse feels Control System
15 should be in a separate discipline.

16
17 Short discussion followed.

18
19 Iverson questioned if there is a Bachelor of Science degree in Control Engineering.

20
21 Miller indicated he would check on the BS for Control Engineering.

22
23 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to draft a letter to Mr. Dowse and let him know we
24 are in the process of public noticing regulations for a non-discipline specific Professional
25 Engineering license.

26
27 The Chair brought up the next item, email from John Metzler regarding comments on Engineer
28 Registration by Comity

29
30 The Chair indicated he is asking basically same questions as the first email.

31
32 Short discussion followed.

33
34 Miller asked Executive Administrator to write a letter to Mr. Metzler stating that the Board is
35 looking at process of public noticing regulations for a non-discipline specific Professional
36 Engineering license and that he should apply for registration under comity, note his work
37 experience and Board will consider his application.

38
39 The Chair brought up the next item, which is an email from:
40 Scott Haan regarding Engineering Statutory Exemptions.

41
42 Brown stated she thought it was time to take up exemptions and study them, that they have been
43 place for five years or longer and that it may be time for changes to the exemptions

44
45 Short discussion followed.

46
Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to respond.

2
3 Chair stated there were a number of other informational items on the list and in the packet.

4
5 Discussion followed as to whether the miscellaneous correspondence should be included in
6 Board packet. The consensus was to keep them in the public packet that is brought to each
7 meeting and items could be copied as requested by individual board members.

8
9 **Agenda Item 6 – Staff Reports**

10
11 The Executive Administrator briefly reviewed the administrator’s report and tasks assigned and
12 progress made on these items.

13
14 **TASK LIST AELS BOARD MEETING AUGUST 2001:**

15

1) Research how many states have term limits for board members and if they count serving a partial term against the total terms served.	Done, Term Limits tab 6-2
2) Check with Oregon engineering Board to find out if they contract out the regulation attorney reviews.	Done, Oregon Board uses AG
3) Informally advise Boards & Commissions that Board members due for reappointment are seeking 2 nd term.	Done, in May 2001.
4) Prepare reimbursement sheets for AKLS expert subject participants for June 23 rd workshop based on ASPLS list.	Done, June 2001
5) Request AG to research specialty contractor exemption under AS 08.48.331 (7) for history and interpretation behind statutory exemption.	Done, email to Ken Truitt, on Aug agenda
6) Start a regulation project to create a Continuing Education Program based on the ASPLS presentation model and working with board members for each profession.	Draft, looked at NCEES, NCARB, AIA analysis, ASPLS, & various states, draft in Aug packet
7) Start a regulation project to revise the current Engineering licensure to implement a non-discipline specific licensing system, with tracking in the database for specialty. All 8-hr NCEES exams (currently 17 specialties) would be offered in Alaska.	Draft in Aug packet
8) Start a regulation project to create an alternative path to Architect by Comity based on a modified version of the AIA-AK proposed regulation change.	Draft in August packet
9) Start a regulations project to accept responsible charge and responsible control work experience gained under a Canadian registered engineer as acceptable for engineering licensing in Alaska.	Draft in Aug packet

16
17 One item the Board had asked for was if other states have Term Limits, summarized in the Board
18 packet under Tab 6:

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
 2 TERM LIMITS, Per the NCEES Survey in 1999:
 3

Term & # terms allowed	Total	#s	Jurisdiction
6 yr, 1 term (6 yrs total)	6	1	landscape architect
4 Yr., 2 term (8 years total)	8	16	AK, CA, CO, DE (PE), FL (PE), GU, HI, KY, MI, MN, MO, UT, VA, OR, WI
3 Year, 3 term (9 yrs total)	9	1	IA
5 year, 2 term (10 years total)	10	10	ID, N. H., NJ, NM, NY, NC, OH, RI, VT, landscape architecture, WA
4 year, 3 term (12 years total)	12	2	KS, MT
6 yr, 2 terms (12 years total)	12	1	PA
NO Maximum Number of terms, terms vary from 3-6 yrs	None	20	AL, GA, Maryland, W VA, SC, TN, IN, DC, ME, MA, MS, NE, SD NV, ND, NM, SD, OK, TX, WY

4
 5 The Executive Administrator queried other Member Board Administrators (MBAs) in July 2001,
 6 and 11 jurisdictions responded. Of those, 7 jurisdictions specified partial terms do not count
 7 towards a full term (OR, NY, FL, CA, CO, NC, ID).

8
 9 Additionally, the Kentucky Board indicated a partial term would count, but that lag time between
 10 appointments is generally minimal. Washington indicated members serve until a replacement is
 11 appointed. Hawaii indicated Board members cannot serve more than a total of 8 years. New
 12 Mexico indicated their terms are for 5 years, and begin on July 1, regardless of the appointment
 13 date.

14
 15 The Board held a short discussion regarding term limits.

16
 17 Kalen asked Executive Administrator to pick two states, one being Florida, and check and see
 18 how term limit statutes are worded.

19
 20 The Chair noted that since term limits was something that effects all Boards, not just AELS,
 21 Chair will ask Director of the Division of Occupational Licensing tomorrow to address the
 22 concern the Board has about partial limits.

23
 24 The Executive Administrator briefly discussed the Executive Administrator report. She stated
 25 her primary focus right now has been training new staff and working with programmer on
 26 on-line renewals, which is on target for the December 2001 renewal cycle.

27
 28 The Board held a discussion about site for Council of Landscape Architecture Registration
 29 Boards (CLARB) and Landscape Architect Registration (LARE) exam.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 Brown suggested that the examination continue to be offered twice a year since June, when the
3 entire examination is offered, is such a busy time for people. Having at least December for some
4 portions gives the examinees this opportunity to split out portions of the examination.

5
6 The Chair thought it would be better for staff to have some flexibility rather than for the Board to
7 pass a motion on when and where the examination would be offered, particularly since the
8 planning and coordination of the exams is time-consuming.

9
10 Since the number of people applying to sit for the exam are decreasing, it was tentatively decided
11 to hold the December LARE in Anchorage only.

12
13 The Chair asked that Cyra-Korsgaard contact the Alaska Society of Landscape Architects
14 (ASLA) for their input and that the LARE exam be taken up again at the November AELS
15 meeting.

16
17 Break 10:15 a.m.

18 Reconvene 10:30 a.m.

19
20 The Chair brought up the Exam review process. The Board held a short discussion about the
21 National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES) exam review policy.

22
23 The Executive Administrator stated the under current guidelines for the engineering and Land
24 Surveyor exams NCEES offers, the length of time for each exam review varies. However, the
25 NCEES strongly advises that jurisdictions limit the review to one hour, and in the case of
26 multiple choice exams, to eliminate the review. Further, the NCEES is in the process of
27 eliminating the exam review completely once the essay exams are converted to multiple choice.
28 Currently, structural, mechanical and electrical exams are essay exam formats.

29
30 Discussion followed.

31
32 The Chair requested staff send Board members copy of diagnostic report given to failed test
33 candidates.

34
35 **AGENDA ITEM 7 – Subgroup Breakouts**

36
37 The Chair brought up the next item, Subgroup Breakouts, and the Board members broke up into
38 three groups at 10:50 a.m.

39
40 Gardner left at 10:55 a.m.

41 Clark, Division of Occupational Licensing Investigator joined the meeting at 10:56 a.m.

42
43 The subgroups were:

44
45 Regulatory and Legislative Issues: Davis, Kalen, and staff (Glaesman, Licensing Examiner);

46
Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 Incidental Practice of Minor Importance: Miller, Siemoneit, Iverson, and Division of
2 Occupational Licensing Investigator;

3
4 Landscape Architecture Practice: Cyra-Korsgaard, Mearig, Brown, Peirsol, and staff (Frederick,
5 Licensing Examiner).

6
7 **AGENDA ITEM 8 – Subgroup Reports**

8
9 The Chair brought the Board back to order at 11:40a.m.and asked for updates on the work.

10
11 Davis reported on The Regulatory and Legislative Issues subgroup and indicated the group had
12 looked at some regulations, Architect by Comity, in particular. The group wanted to clarify the
13 ARE examination requirement in the current proposal and it was decided that from a protocol
14 standpoint this change would need to be adopted by the Board before sending it out for public
15 comment. The group discussed the statutory exemptions’ history for the new licensing
16 examiner’s benefit. The members found the subgroup helpful and would like to continue
17 breakouts for future meetings.

18
19 Miller reported on The Incidental Practice of Minor Importance subgroup and indicated this
20 group felt “minor importance” is very minor, but the subgroup had trouble coming up with a set
21 definition. Would like to get together again in November to work on the definition of “minor
22 importance”.

23
24 Cyra-Korsgaard reported on The Landscape Architecture Practice subgroup and indicated the
25 group looked at ways to determine when stamping is required. Short discussion followed. The
26 issue of landscape architecture stamping would be talked about in detail on Friday. The
27 consensus was that the subgroup could become a committee to move ahead with regulations or
28 policy issues.

29
30 Break for lunch at 11:55 a.m.

31 Reconvene 1:15 p.m.

32
33 All members are present except Davis.

34
35 The Chair welcomed new Division of Occupational Licensing investigator, Bob Butcher, who
36 joined the meeting at 1:15 p.m.

37
38 **AGENDA ITEM 9 – Public Comment**

39
40 The Chair welcomed Scott Sandlin, President-elect of the American Institute of Architects
41 (AIA), Alaska Chapter.

42
43 Mr. Sandlin said the AIA-Alaska, Executive Board reviewed the AELS Board’s proposed
44 changes to the AIA-Alaska’s proposal for regulation changes for the licensing of Architects by
45 Comity (12 AAC 36.103) initially presented at the May 2001 AELS meeting. Mr. Sandlin first
46 stated that AIA-Alaska Executive Board’s overall goal was to provide a more reasonable

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 provision within the regulations to allow for mobility between jurisdictions for architects who
2 are licensed in another recognized jurisdiction who choose to live in Alaska. Mr. Sandlin stated
3 that this proposal recognized that provisions in Alaska regulations are especially restrictive
4 because there are not any architecture programs available to residents who might need to meet
5 some of the requirements for the licensure by comity as the way it is written now. There simply
6 is not an easy way for Alaska residents to meet the education requirement for a 5-year degree.
7

8 Mr. Sandlin stated AIA-AK understands Board's concern about first-time applicants who may
9 use the system to get licensed in another jurisdiction, never practicing there, who would apply
10 for license by comity here. AIA feels that there could be built into the regulation substantive
11 requirements without being overly restrictive, to prevent this from happening.
12

13 Mr. Sandlin explained that of the 55 member Boards in the country, 35 of them have provisions
14 for reciprocal registration where the National Council of Architectural Registration Board
15 (NCARB) certificate, or the Blue Book Council Record, is not the sole means for reciprocal
16 registration. These jurisdictions have provisions for alternatives to licensure other than the
17 NCARB certificate.
18

19 Mr. Sandlin presented AIA-AK's comments to the proposed changes to 12 AAC 36.103:
20

21 Under Item 2, revise language that said "be currently registered or licensed in another
22 jurisdiction". The Board chose not to follow this suggestion, which was intended to make it
23 more specific about what the current registration or license in another jurisdiction meant,
24 mandating consideration of licenses from other countries. AIA-AK recommended revising that
25 language to read "hold a certificate of registration authorizing applicant to practice architecture
26 in the State, territory, or possession of the United States or District of Columbia" as a suggestion,
27 modeled after similar language in other jurisdictions.
28

29 Mearig commented that the reason this language was omitted was because "jurisdiction" is
30 otherwise defined in statute.
31

32 Brief discussion about mobility with Canada followed.
33

34 The second recommended change was experience under an Alaskan architect. AIA suggested
35 the requirement for candidates to gain experience under supervision of Alaskan architect
36 working on Alaskan projects due to the unique circumstances in which architects practice in
37 Alaska.
38

39 Brown indicated the Board did not include that change because the Board did not want to create
40 a special class and since Alaska requires arctic engineering or an equivalent course, it would be
41 consistent with requirements for other candidates, even those with an NCARB Blue Book.
42

43 Discussion followed.
44

45 Mr. Sandlin referred to Item A, in the proposed regulation. AIA-Alaska thinks education
46 requirements should be refined to say, "four year baccalaureate program (BA) in architecture or
47

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 environmental design that is part of a National Architectural Accreditation Board (NAAB)
2 accredited degree professional degree program” in order to be more specific.

3
4 Mr. Sandlin referred to the requirement for the 10-year experience subsequent to licensure that
5 relates directly to the NCARB provisions for the Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) process.
6 He noted that there was some discussion in the May AELS minutes that the Board discussed the
7 length of time it takes to go through that process, and that 17-22 years is a significant part of
8 one’s career. He discussed the BEA process, and costs involved to go through that process and
9 mentioned approximately \$2300 fees without any assurance that an applicant would be accepted.

10
11 Concerning comments from Board members that a reduction in education requirements might be
12 stepping back too far, Mr. Sandlin stated that AIA-Alaska feels this is not the case. An exchange
13 of just one-year of additional education, which is generally what would be required to get a
14 Bachelor of Architecture at an accredited institution beyond what other four-year baccalaureate
15 programs that mentioned might require, architects would have additional requirements for
16 experience. AIA-Alaska doesn’t think an exchange for documented relevant post-licensure
17 experience steps too far back in terms of education requirements.

18
19 Mr. Sandlin reminded the Board that the proposal applied only to comity applicants, not first
20 time applicants, but to experienced applicants who have already been licensed in another
21 jurisdiction.

22
23 Mr. Sandlin mentioned that the last provision, under item 5, is the Intern Development Program
24 (IDP) record. The AIA proposal struck out the language “with application for jurisdiction
25 registration with Council certification” because the IDP record would be the buff color, not the
26 green cover, but that might be a matter of semantics.

27
28 Brown outlined that under discussions about the Nebraska model, the NCARB attorney said
29 there could be different requirements for first-time registrants from those for comity applicants.
30 The Nebraska model requires that the 10 years post-licensure be gained in the State where
31 license is issued and once registrants have met that requirement then reciprocity is granted. The
32 distinction is that Alaska is considering 10 years post-licensure experience for architects who are
33 not registered in Alaska. Applicants applying for comity may be working for a firm, under a
34 licensed architect, and not be stamping work.

35
36 Mr. Sandlin commented that that was another reason AIA-Alaska suggested the language related
37 to working in a position of responsible charge under the direct supervision of a legally practicing
38 Alaska architect, figuring that would work in lieu of having practiced in the jurisdiction of
39 licensure.

40
41 Mr. Sandlin stated that AIA-Alaska suggests it might make more sense to include any changes to
42 education standards under 12 AAC 36.061, where the other architect education regulatory
43 requirements are located and just cross reference it in the new comity requirements under
44 12 AAC 36.103.

45
46 The Chair thanked Mr. Sandlin for his comments.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 **AGENDA ITEM 10– Review Goals and Objectives**

3
4 The Chair moved to the next item on the agenda, and the Goals and Objectives were reviewed
5 and discussed.

6
7 Davis returned at 1:45 p.m.

8
9 Those objectives the Board moved to the completed Goals and Objectives list were as follows:

10
11 Goal #1, Objective 8 – Obtain a legal opinion on the Open Meeting Law, the implications of
12 using the ListServer as group email communication.

13
14 The Executive Administrator discussed the use of a group email with Ken Truit, Assistant
15 Attorney General who indicated the ListServer would not violate the Open Meetings Act since
16 emails could be public.

17
18 Goal #2, Objective 4 – Obtain additional investigator time.

19
20 The Chair noted that Bob Butcher is the new Division of Occupational Licensing investigator
21 assigned to AELS, in addition to John R. Clark.

22
23 Goal #5, Objective 6 – Review retired/inactive status regulations.

24
25 Executive Administrator stated this regulation was revised and is final (12 AAC 36.115).

26
27 Goal #6, Objective 1 – Investigate the feasibility of notifying applicants who fail licensing
28 examination of their areas of weakness.

29
30 NCEES provides failed applicants with diagnostics reports.

31
32 Goal #6, Objective 2 – Establish goals and timetables for board communications to applicants by
33 shortening:

- 34
- 35 • Time to Process applications
 - 36 • Time to notify applicant after board decision
 - 37 • Time to respond to applicant challenge of test
 - 38 • Time to notify applicants of examination results
 - 39 • Time and means to track action items and respond to inquiries

40 The Executive Administrator stated staff is very timely in responding to applicants and
41 registrants, and there currently is no backlog of pending applications that have not been
42 processed.

43
44 Goal #6, Objective 5 – Add downloadable professional seal to website.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 Mearig noted that he provided the formatted seals and they are currently posted to the website
2 and he would check to see that they are functional.

3
4 The Board held a discussion on the following Goals and Objectives:

5
6 Goal #3, Objective 2 – Advertise AS 08.48.295 provision for civil penalty for unregistered and
7 unauthorized practice.

8
9 Siemoneit suggested one way to address this would be to place a notice in yellow pages in five
10 major phone books in the state and the cost would be approximately \$450-900 per month.

11
12 Short discussion followed.

13
14 Gardner thought this might be classified as a public service announcement (PSA).

15
16 Siemoneit noted he would continue to work on this issue and will contact the Anchorage
17 directory to see if there could be some type of PSA.

18
19 Goal #5, Board will stay current on all competency, and regulatory issues of other jurisdictions
20 to ensure that Alaska standards stay within the national norms, and its licensing systems are fair
21 and applied uniformly.

22
23
24 **On a motion duly made by Peirsol, seconded by Brown, and carried unanimously, it**
25 **was**

26 **RESOLVED that Goal # 5 be changed to read:**

27 **Ensure that Alaska standards stay within the national norms, and its**
28 **Licensing systems are fair and applied uniformly.**

29 **And to create a new Objective to read:**

30 **Stay current on all competency and regulatory issues of other**
31 **jurisdictions.**

32
33 Goal #5, Objective 1: Monitor and review latest federal regulations, state board decisions, and
34 national organization policies relating to NAFTA.

35
36 The Chair stated that in regard to NAFTA, our focus has been on Canada, but NAFTA involves
37 all of North America, and reminded Board members not to forget that Mexico is also included.

38
39 Short Discussion followed.

40
41 The revised Goals and Objectives are:

42
43 **Goal #1. Increase Board's work efficiency.**
44

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

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 feasibility of Board autonomy.	Gardner	11/2001
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 11/01

4
5
6
7
8

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

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Determine what action, if any is necessary to encourage registration of University of Alaska architects, landscape architects, land surveyors and engineering faculty.	Miller	ongoing
2) Advertise AS 08.48.295 provision for civil penalty for unregistered and unauthorized practice.	Siemoneit ; Ex. Administrator	

1
2
3
4

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

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

5
6
7
8

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

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	11/2001
4) Investigate GIS and photogrammetry.	Kalen and McLane	11/2001
5) Research CLARB council record.	Ex. Administrator, Mearig; Cyra-Korsgaard	11/2001
6) Stay current on all competency and regulatory issues of other jurisdictions		Ongoing

9
10
11

Goal 6. Improve communications with applicants and licensed professionals.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Structure databases so 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

1
2 **Goal 7- Improve communication with public about Licensing Benefit and Problem**
3 **Resolution Process**

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	11/2002
3) Educate Public about Benefit of using Licensed Professionals (in Public Service Notices).	Mearig & Executive Administrator	Ongoing/Website

4
5 Mearig discussed work experience verification (Goal 6, Objective 4) briefly.

6
7 The Chair asked if there should be a subgroup at the November meeting and there was no
8 objection.

9
10 **AGENDA ITEM 11 – Application Reviews**

11
12 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, Application Reviews.

13
14 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by McLane, and carried unanimously,**
15 **it was**
16 **RESOLVED to go into executive session for the purpose of reviewing**
17 **applications.**

18
19 Authorities for executive session are noted as AS 44.62.310(c)(3) and AS 08.48.071(d).

20
21 The Board came out of executive session at 5:00 p.m. and promptly recessed until Friday,
22 August 24, 2001.

23
24 **Friday, August 24, 2001**

25
26 **Agenda Item 12 – Convene/ Roll Call**

27
28 Robert Miller, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:07 a.m.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

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

Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

- Robert Miller, Chairperson, Civil Engineer
- Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member
- Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer
- Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor
- Scott McLane, Land Surveyor
- Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer
- Kathleen Gardner, Vice-Chairperson, Mechanical Engineer
- Daphne Brown, Architect
- Patricia Peirsol, Architect
- Ernie Siemoneit, Secretary, Mining Engineer

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

- Marcia Davis, Public Member

Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

- Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
- Susan Frederick, Licensing Examiner
- Kevin Glaesman, Licensing Examiner

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

- John R. Clark, Division of Occupational Licensing Investigator
- Bob Butcher, Division of Occupational Licensing Investigator
- Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing

- Dwayne Adams, representing Self
13231 Reef Pl. Anchorage, AK 99515

- Terry Schoenthal, representing the American Society of Landscape Architects, Alaska
Chapter (President), 3410 Levarin Bay Circle, Anchorage, AK

- Scott Sandlin, representing AIA Alaska (President-Elect)
PO Box 242151, Anchorage, AK 99524

- Vicki Sterling, representing Alaska Professional Design Council
Box 10-3115, Anchorage, AK 99510

- Monique Prozeralik, representing Self
11855 Wilderness Dr. Anchorage, AK 99516

- Mike Prozeralik, representing Self

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 11855 Wilderness Dr., Anchorage, AK 99516

2
3 Hai On, representing Self
4 735 K. St, Apt. J Anchorage, AK

5
6 Also joining by teleconference for a portion of the meeting was:

7
8 Ken Truitt, Assistant Attorney General, State of Alaska
9

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

12
13 The Chair stated that there was a change in agenda, and that they would now take up Item # 15,
14 Old Business, Landscape Architect Stamping first.

15
16 **Agenda Item 15 – Old Business**

17
18 Landscape Architect Practice:

19
20 The Chair voiced the Board’s concern that there has been confusion within the community as to
21 when landscape architect stamping is necessary.

22
23 Davis joined the meeting at 8:14 a.m.

24
25 Cyra-Korsgaard introduced two visitors, Terry Schoenthal, President, American Society of
26 Landscape Architects, Alaska (ASLA), and Dwayne Adams, here to help facilitate the discussion
27 about landscape architect stamping.

28
29 Cyra-Korsgaard directed the Board to the exemptions under Alaska Statute AS 08.48.331 (b),
30 which reads:

31
32 The requirement to be registered as a landscape architect under this chapter only applies to a
33 person who practices an aspect of landscape architecture that the board has determined affects
34 the public health or safety.

35
36 Cyra-Korsgaard stated it has been left up to the Board to determine what affects the public health
37 or safety. She indicated that the Board would also like to give the investigators, building
38 officials, and the public clarification when landscape architecture stamping is necessary. She
39 thought that the landscape architect practice involves some land use planning, general planning,
40 natural environment planning, or studies that don’t necessarily turn into final construction
41 documents, so they wouldn’t require a stamped document but would require a registered
42 landscape architect to prepare.

43
44 Two options were introduced by Cyra-Korsgaard that Davis assisted in identifying where the
45 definition could be listed in regulations and some draft language. These options were listed:
46

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 Option #1, as potential draft language for a new section, 12 AAC 36.069:

2
3 The following conduct affects public health and safety, and pursuant to AS 08.48.331 (b) any
4 person engaging in such conduct shall be required to register as a landscape architect:

- 5
- 6 Walkways
- 7 Trails
- 8 Pedestrian and vehicular systems
- 9 Plantings
- 10 Irrigation
- 11 Landscape lighting
- 12 Landscape grading
- 13 Drainage & stormwater systems
- 14 Erosion and sediment controls
- 15 Playgrounds
- 16 Recreational facilities
- 17 Signage
- 18 Outdoor furnishings

19
20 Option #2, as potential draft language change to 12 AAC 36.990 (a) (34):

21 Aspects of landscape architecture affecting public health and safety as used in AS 08.48.331 are
22 the following practices:

- 23
- 24 Walkways
- 25 Trails
- 26 Pedestrian and vehicular systems
- 27 Plantings
- 28 Irrigation
- 29 Landscape lighting
- 30 Landscape grading
- 31 Drainage and stormwater systems
- 32 Erosion and sediment controls
- 33 Playgrounds
- 34 Signage
- 35 Outdoor furnishings

36
37 Dwayne Adams stated he didn't think the two options were much different in content, just stated
38 differently and felt that Option #1 was preferred. Adams added that the concern would be for
39 health and safety issues, and not trying to preclude anyone an architect or engineer from doing
40 landscape architecture, as long as they are working in their professional capacity. The real issue
41 is to be clear who needs to be licensed so that activities such as plantings that won't affect public
42 safety or health can be identified, and not to restrict trade of those not licensed. Adams
43 explained public health and safety could be described as those that happen in public right of way.
44 Adams wanted to be sure that the definitions would be clear enough so that a sign company
45 would not prevented from installing a sign that an owner would not be prevented from putting a
46 trash can outside their steps or plant outside of an establishment.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 He noted public health and safety would include visual issues, safety issues, and familiarity with
3 the “green book” and “Roadside Design Guide” that are important tools for design within the
4 public rights-of-way. Those tools require familiarization with those documents and would
5 require a registered landscape architect.

6
7 A lengthy discussion followed.

8
9 The Chair asked if it would only be in the public right of way and Adams stated it would not but
10 that public right of way would be an area that would be easily identifiable.

11
12 The other aspect would be commercial areas, and the statute provides an exemption, AS
13 08.48.331(6), that allows a person to design a 4-plex not more than two stories high. He
14 described some situations where public health and safety could pose a problem when we are
15 putting plantings at entryways that obscure views into parking lots that may cause security or
16 safety issues related to design, that exemption may not suffice, and how sidewalks are designed
17 is important to safety.

18
19 Adams noted that in Anchorage the building codes do address those issues and so long as they
20 are meeting the building code, that would be an appropriate guideline.

21
22 Brown asked for clarification because if the work falls under the definition of landscape
23 architecture and there isn’t an exemption, it would require a licensed landscape architect, even if
24 the party followed the code. She added that there currently is no distinction between work done
25 on a public or private building for architects or engineers.

26
27 Short discussion followed.

28
29 Handouts were passed out.

30
31 Cyra-Korsgaard noted she looked at the definition of landscape architect, and referred the Board
32 to AS 08.48.341(14): “practice of landscape architecture” means professional services or creative
33 work in site investigation, reconnaissance, research, planning, design, and preparation services
34 related to drawings and construction documents, observation of construction, and location,
35 arrangement, and design of incidental and necessary tangible objects and features for the purpose
36 of

- 37 (A) preservation and enhancement of land uses and natural land features;
- 38 (B) location and construction of aesthetically pleasing and functional approaches for
39 structures, roadways and walkways;
- 40 (C) establishing or maintaining trails, plantings, landscape irrigation, landscape lighting,
41 and landscape grading; or
- 42 (D) generalized planning of the development of land areas in a manner that is sensitive to
43 the area’s natural and cultural resources;”

44
45 Cyra-Korsgaard explained that she researched the CLARB website and looked at how other
46 states have described the work of landscape architects.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 Davis stated the intention was to focus on public health and safety such as school plantings, areas
3 where there are intersections, and retaining walls. There wasn't time for the legislature to
4 identify all aspects of landscape architecture that may affect public health or safety so they left it
5 to the Board to determine aspects of landscape architect that affect public health or safety.
6

7 Davis strongly recommended option #1, as a starting point and to identify the specific areas that
8 would require a landscape architect without precluding the public from doing plantings or other
9 landscaping. She indicated that option #1 is more direct and explicit, and option #2 is a little
10 more oblique. She recommended the list be substantially honed to establish the specific areas
11 and locations.
12

13 Gardner asked how the proposed 12 AAC 36.069 would integrate with the requirements in AS
14 08.48.341(14).
15

16 Davis explained that the statute provides the broad requirements and that the regulation would
17 provide the subset.
18

19 Short discussion followed about placement of the regulation, in definition, disciplinary action,
20 general provisions, or in the Building Officials Handbook, or begin by placing it in policy, refine
21 it and put it in regulations.
22

23 Brown noted the title 'Landscape Architect' cannot be used unless you are registered.
24 Schoenthal stated that the Executive Board of the ASLA met earlier this week and they made
25 some general comments. The Executive Board felt that the boundaries and overlap between
26 professions are still being determined and they hoped there would be flexibility within the
27 system and that consensus items could be identified for policy.
28

29 Discussion followed about methods to identify landscape architecture, perhaps projects done
30 within the rights-of-way, threshold of square footage for projects, or identifying residential
31 versus commercial projects.
32

33 Mearig felt that the Board's goal is to provide guidance for those involved in the profession, and
34 goes beyond stamping to capturing what defines the practice of landscape architecture.
35

36 The Chair gave an example of residential plantings where someone planted a tree that then
37 obscured sight distance to the intersection as affecting public safety.
38

39 Brown suggested that the Board not get bogged down trying to identify every aspect of
40 landscape architecture and to take an incremental approach instead. She suggested that
41 guidelines, a "Frequently Asked Questions" could be posted in the Building Officials' Manual
42 and be posted on the website, and could be refined, in conjunction with the regulations project.
43

44 Discussion followed.
45

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 Davis recapped that the information in the Building Officials Handbook would be considered the
2 policy of the board as areas that affect public health and safety, at the same time obtain public
3 input from the regulations project.

4
5 McLane suggested that the list be placed in the Building Officials Manual for now to be used a
6 reference to what aspects are considered landscape architecture or would require a professional
7 stamp, either by a landscape architect or a civil engineer.

8
9 Short discussion followed.

10 Brown referred to list 2, minus the paragraph beginning as “Planting plans for private
11 commercial development” move forward as policy and made the following motion:

12
13 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Seimonit, it was**

14
15 **RESOLVED that the definition for “landscape architect” as policy, read as follows:**

16
17 **The stamp of a professional landscape architect is required for all construction documents**
18 **that are developed for work involving the grading, or shaping of land, development of**
19 **planting plans, and the design of outdoor structures to serve the needs of the public where**
20 **the following occurs:**

21
22 **Public funds are expended for construction.**

23
24 **Work is to be within the public right-of-way but outside of the edge of the travel way or**
25 **back of curb;**

26
27 **Work is for commercial/retail developments or residential structures serving four or more**
28 **families;**

29
30 **Work includes design of play apparatus and fall zones and is accessible to the general**
31 **public.**

32
33 **This in no way precludes other licensed professions from providing design and engineering**
34 **services for production of construction documents for work that they are licensed and**
35 **trained to provide.**

36
37 Discussion followed.

38
39 Mr. Schoenthal asked that two categories be added to list 2, for the requirement of a landscape
40 architect stamp to include irrigation and clearing.

41
42 **On an amendment duly made by Brown, and seconded by Siemoneit, and adopted**
43 **unanimously, it was**

44
45 **Resolved to change the language to incorporate the suggestion, in the first paragraph as**
46 **follows:**

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 **“The stamp of a professional landscape architect is required for all construction documents**
3 **that are developed for work involving the grading, clearing or shaping of land, irrigation,**
4 **development of planting plans, and the design of outdoor structures to serve the needs of**
5 **the public where the following occurs:”**
6

7 The Chair noted there were no objections.

8
9 Mearig made a substitute motion to amend the first paragraph by striking language up to “work”
10 and wrote the language on the bulletin board.

11
12 **On a substitute motion duly made by Mearig, and seconded by Brown, and adopted**
13 **unanimously, it was**

14
15 **RESOLVED, to read as follows, the definition for aspect of landscape architecture:**

16
17 **Design or creative work involving the grading, clearing or shaping of land,**
18 **irrigation, development of planting plans, and the design of outdoor structures, play**
19 **apparatus and fall zones are aspects of landscape architecture that affects public**
20 **health and safety, and pursuant to AS 08.48.331 (b).**
21

22 Lengthy discussion followed.

23
24 Mearig reviewed list two (handout), and explained that he did not think public funds needed to
25 be considered. He thought the Board did not need to confine this definition to the public right of
26 way because it would be any area the public traverses. He thought that “work for commercial
27 and retail developments, planting plans, and the construction documents are covered under the
28 current statutory exemptions, but that some definition to cover “play apparatus and fall zones”
29 should be included.

30
31 Davis noted that the exemptions don’t match up well and a lengthy discussion followed.

32
33 The Chair asked for a vote on the substitute motion and there were no objections and the motion
34 passed.

35
36 **On an amendment to the substitute motion duly by McLane, and seconded by Davis to add,**
37 **after work, “in public spaces” to read:**

38
39 **Design or creative work in public spaces involving the grading, clearing, or shaping**
40 **of land, irrigation, development of planting plans, and the design of outdoor**
41 **structures are aspects of landscape architecture that affect public healthy safety and**
42 **pursuant to AS 08.48.331 (b).**
43

44 Short discussion followed about “public spaces”.

45
Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 The Chair asked for a roll call on the amendment to the substitute motion:

2

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

3

4 The Chair stated the amendment to the substitute motion failed 4-6.

5

6 Davis asked whether “play apparatus and fall zones” might be the same as outdoor structures.

7

8 Discussion followed.

9

10 **On an amendment to the substitute motion, duly made by Davis, seconded by Peirsol, and**
11 **adopted, it was**

12

13 **Resolved to strike “play apparatus and fall zones.”**

14

15 Iverson stated he was opposed to dropping “play apparatus and fall zones” from the definition
16 because it is one of the major areas of importance for landscape architects.

17

18 The Chair asked for a show of hands and indicated that the motion passed 7-3, with Iverson,
19 Brown and McLane opposed.

20

21 **On an amendment to the substitute motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Brown, and**
22 **unanimously adopted it was**

23

24 **Resolved to insert “play apparatus” after, “development of planting plans”, and**
25 **adopted unanimously to read as follows, the definition for aspect of landscape**
26 **architecture:**

27

28 **Design or creative work involving the grading, clearing, shaping of land, irrigation,**
29 **development of planting plans, play apparatus, and the design of outdoor structures**
30 **are aspects of Landscape Architecture that affect public health and safety and**
31 **pursuant to AS 08.48.331 (b).**

32

33 The Chair asked if there was any discussion and there was none.

34

1 The Chair called for a vote and noted that the amendment passed unanimously.

2
3 **On an amendment duly made by Mearig, seconded by Brown, and unanimously adopted, it**
4 **was**

5
6 **Resolved to delete, “the design of” after “play apparatus, and before “outdoor structures”,**
7 **to read as follows, the definition for aspect of landscape architecture:**

8
9 **Design or creative work involving the grading, clearing, or shaping of land,**
10 **irrigation, development of planting plans, play apparatus, and outdoor structures**
11 **are aspects of Landscape Architecture that affect public health and safety and**
12 **pursuant to AS 08.48.331 (b).**

13
14 The Chair asked if there was any discussion and there was none.

15
16 Brown asked for the cite location for the proposed regulation.

17
18 Discussion followed.

19
20 Mearig asked to defer the decision about placement and asked staff and Regulations Specialist to
21 find an appropriate place for a regulation change to landscape architecture practice.

22
23 The Chair asked if there was any objection and there was none.

24
25 The Chair asked that the proposed regulation be read into the record, and Davis read the motion:

26
27 **Davis read the proposed regulation for a regulations project, to define aspect of landscape**
28 **architecture as follows:**

29
30 **The design or creative work involving the grading, clearing, or shaping of land,**
31 **irrigation, development of planting plans, play apparatus, and outdoor structures**
32 **are aspects of landscape architecture that affect public health and safety, and**
33 **pursuant to**
34 **AS 08.48.331 (b).**

35
36 **On an amendment to the substitute motion, duly made by Mearig, seconded by Peirsol, and**
37 **unanimously adopted, it was**

38
39 **RESOLVED to strike “development of”.**

40
41 The Chair noted there was no objection to the amendment.

42
43 **On the main substitute motion, duly made by Mearig, seconded by Brown, and adopted**
44 **unanimously it was**

45
Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 **RESOLVED that the Board proceed with a Regulations Project for the proposed**
2 **regulation to read as follows, the definition for aspect of landscape architecture:**

3
4 **The design or creative work involving the grading, clearing, or shaping of**
5 **land, irrigation, planting plans, play apparatus, and outdoor structures are**
6 **aspects of landscape architecture that affect public health and safety, and**
7 **pursuant to AS 08.48.331 (b).**

8
9 The Chair asked if there was any discussion.

10
11 The board held a short discussion whether the proposed regulation changes should tie back to the
12 statutory exemptions.

13
14 Kalen noted that the statutory exemptions stand-alone and no reference needed to be made.

15
16 The Chair asked for a roll call vote on the motion. The Licensing Examiner called the roll and
17 the motion passed unanimously.

18
19 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Peirsol, and adopted unanimously, it was**

20
21 **RESOLVED that the Board adopt the proposed regulation as written interim**
22 **policy, that it be posted on the AELS Website, and that the Board work to develop**
23 **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) for insertion in the Building Officials**
24 **Handbook.**

25
26 Brown stated the intent for this was to get this posted on the website so the Board could get
27 feedback by the November AELS meeting while the Board begins this regulations project.

28
29 Short discussion followed about consulting with the Department of Law about developing the
30 policy for landscape architecture stamping without the regulations project being public noticed.

31
32 The Chair stated the Board could ask Mr. Truitt when he addresses the Board during Agenda
33 item, 16.

34
35 Cyra-Korsgaard asked to be excused from the duration of the meeting. She indicated she might
36 be able to join the meeting later in the afternoon subject to her business.

37
38 Break at: 9:30 a.m.

39 Reconvened: 9:50 a.m.

40
41 **Agenda Item 13 – Budget Summary Report**

42
43 The Chair stated the number of people wanting to be registered has increased in six months from
44 4800 to 5400. If this trend continues, the Board may want to think about lowering fees.
45 Continuing education requirements may affect the number of registrants.

46
Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 The Chair asked for any Board comments.

2
3 Mearig stated it looked as if the Board was going to have a \$100,000 surplus even though the
4 expenditures weren't accounted for yet.

5
6 Brown voiced concern over staff salaries and wondered what the Board could do to increase
7 salaries for staff.

8
9 The Chair suggested that matter be brought up with Reardon, Director of Division of
10 Occupational Licensing when she joins the meeting later, under Agenda item, #17.

11
12 Brown suggested if there would be a surplus, the Board could consider contracting to an agency
13 to put together the Building Officials handbook and do some public outreach through advertising
14 unlicensed practice.

15
16 The Chair felt agreed but suggested the Board should wait and see what the final numbers are.

17
18 **Agenda Item 14 – Investigator's Report**

19
20 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, the Investigator's Report.

21
22 Mr. Clark gave a summary of the Investigator's report and asked for questions from the Board.

23
24 Brown asked to have Disciplinary Action listed on the AELS Website after each Board meeting.

25
26 The Executive Administrator indicated that currently the Investigator's report is posted as an
27 attachment to the Quarterly Board Meeting Summary. Executive Administrator will work with
28 Clark and Brown to consider other ways to post the disciplinary action.

29
30 Clark discussed with the Board an upcoming case that may need to have a levy of civil penalty
31 before the regular November Board meeting that may require action via a teleconference. A
32 discussion followed about a specific case where a person held himself out as an engineer, built a
33 ramp to move a dredge and an investigation ensued.

34
35 The Chair brought up of specialty contractor's exemptions in the regulations under AS 08.48.331
36 (7).

37
38 Brown voiced concern that this exemption is currently being used by specialty contractors, who
39 ultimately are doing design work, professional engineering work and are citing this exemption.

40
41 Clark stated that he has encountered this problem, and noted that the Construction Contractor's
42 regulations have a provision for rough carpentry that could allow them to do be doing civil
43 engineering work.

44
45 Clark gave an example of cases that have involved shops that were built without an electrical or
46 mechanical engineer. He stated there is an Attorney General opinion from 1986 that states that

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 an electrical administrator cannot design electrical systems. However, under the Contractors
2 regulations, if an owner hires an electrical administrator, there is nothing to prevent the electrical
3 administrator from doing the design work, although he may not be qualified to do this work since
4 it would be electrical engineering.

5
6 Davis wondered if there was specific language under the contractor's statutes, AS 08.18, to
7 define the practice construction contracting.

8
9 Clark responded that the statutory language was not explicit.

10
11 Davis indicated another option might be to get that statute revised so that is precisely defined.

12
13 Clark stated that by contractor regulation, it says exactly what a specialty contractor work
14 involves.

15 Executive Administrator stated that Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational
16 Licensing does have oversight for the statutes and regulations since there is no Board governing
17 Construction Contractors.

18
19 Davis felt the Board might also need to look at Contractor Regulations when addressing this
20 concern.

21
22 Discussion followed.

23
24 Clark then addressed the concern that engineers who are licensed in another jurisdiction testify
25 in a court case in Alaska, but are not licensed in Alaska and wondered if that testimony would
26 be considered practicing engineering without a license.

27
28 Short discussion followed.

29
30 The Chair indicated it was a consensus of the Board that an engineer registered in another
31 jurisdiction would not be performing engineering in Alaska since he would just be rendering his
32 opinion.

33
34 **Agenda Item 15- Old Business**

35
36 The Chair noted that Landscape Architect Practice was addressed earlier and moved to the next
37 item on the revised agenda, the Alaska Land Surveyor's Workshop (AKLS) held in June 2001 in
38 Anchorage.

39
40 Kalen presented a handout and discussed his report. Kalen stated that six new test questions
41 were created during this workshop. Kalen recommended a two-day workshop next year to allow
42 for a more thorough workshop and referred to the \$8000 budget for this workshop that was
43 approved at the May 2001 meeting.

44
45 The Chair moved to the next item on the revised agenda, and asked Peirsol to speak about retired
46 status licenses.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 Peirsol brought questions from an engineer who would like to cut back on his engineering work
3 and asked if he must go into retired status or let his registration lapse. She asked for the status of
4 the regulations project that revised the retired status licenses as equivalent to lapsed licenses in
5 terms of reinstatement.

6
7 Davis stated that the revisions to retired status under 12 AAC 36.115 had been adopted, were
8 finalized in December 2000, and became effective in March 2001. She noted that the Board
9 would take up reinstatements under Agenda item, 18, as a draft regulation change to 12 AAC
10 36.165. Those proposed changes would affect retired status registrants and would not require re-
11 testing in most instances for reinstatements.

12
13 Short Discussion followed.

14
15 The Board then discussed what work could be done when an engineer is in retired status.

16
17 Iverson asked for clarification for an applicant who met the Arctic engineering requirement
18 twenty-five years ago when he initially registered in Alaska, but who let his license lapse. He
19 asked if the applicant would be required to meet this requirement or provide proof of having met
20 the requirement.

21
22 Short discussion followed.

23
24 The Chair stated that there was a general consensus that satisfying the Arctic Engineering
25 requirement never expires and that the Board would presume that the applicant had met the
26 requirement, either by examination or by treatise, at the time of initial registration.

27
28 **Agenda Item-16, Teleconference with Ken Truitt, Assistant Attorney General.**

29
30 The Assistant Attorney General, Alaska Department of Law, Ken Truitt, joined the meeting at
31 10:50 a.m. by teleconference.

32
33 The Chair welcomed Mr. Truitt to the meeting.

34
35 The Chair voiced the Board's concern about the Specialty Contractor's exemptions in AS
36 08.48.331.

37
38 Truitt stated he had discussed this with the investigator and he concurs that the specific
39 exemption is the "rough carpenter" specialty contractor that is pretty broad and includes trusses.
40 When you read the exemptions in conjunction with the exemption, it is possible that person is
41 exempted from having the registration. He stated the only way to resolve this would involve a
42 statute change, removing the exemption from statute.

43
44 The Chair indicated that the Board would like to keep the exemption but would like to narrow
45 the exemption.

46
Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 Truitt agreed that narrowing the exemption and making it more specific would be a more
2 desirable option than doing away with the statutory exemption altogether. The exemption came
3 about in 1972, along with the current Practices Act in AS 08.48.
4

5 Brown stated that Board was also considering working with the division to revise the
6 contractor's regulations and the Board would like to discuss this approach with Catherine
7 Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing.
8

9 Truitt agreed that the Specialty Contractor's regulations could be reviewed. He indicated that
10 both mechanical and electrical administrators fall under the specialty contractor regulations.
11

12 The Chair moved to the next item for Mr. Truitt, the Department of Law edits to the regulations
13 project with regard to the Engineer by Comity regulation changes to 12 AAC 36. 105.
14

15 Truitt spoke regarding 12 AAC 36.105, accepting the NCEES model law engineer in lieu of
16 education and experience. Truitt indicated that the regulation attorneys acknowledge that the
17 edits were substantive in nature, that the public notice is still viable, and by a motion from the
18 Board, the Board could readopt the initial language sent over to the Department of Law, they
19 refer to it as stale or not stale, and change it to the initial language the Board adopted.
20

21 The Chair asked Truitt about the proposed regulations changes to 12 AAC 36.165, for applicant
22 re-testing and asked for clarification. These regulations were public noticed and he suggested
23 the language the Board was considering was essentially copying subsection (d) into subsection
24 (b), thereby making it consistent among all professions, and to delete subsection (d). Truitt
25 further clarified that he felt that would work but suggested the Board mirror the language in (b)
26 but leave (d) intact. Truitt stated that subsection (d) has already been reviewed by the
27 Department of Law.
28

29 Davis reiterated the suggested change. She clarified that the Board could leave subsection (d)
30 intact, and since that subsection applies only to engineers, and then mirror the language in
31 subsection (b) to other professions, that it is clear we are just consolidating the language.
32

33 Davis noted that one reason was also to clarify that an applicant reinstating would not have to
34 pass the examination again, and referred to "passing" the examination.
35

36 Truitt stated he thought it would be best if written if both subsections were both in the past tense.
37

38 Davis indicated the Board would work more on the regulation.
39

40 The Chair reiterated the action the Board had taken to define in regulation the aspects of
41 landscape architecture, and is moving towards a regulation project and asked if it was advisable
42 to develop the written policy that could provide some guidance now while the Board continues to
43 develop the Regulations Project.
44

1 Truitt stated that any time there is a written policy that affects the public it should be adopted as
2 a regulation and he suggested that the Board make some projection about the timeframe of the
3 regulation.

4
5 The Board held a short discussion.

6
7 Brown suggested that the Board could post on its website that the Board has defined aspects of
8 landscape architecture that affect public health and safety for consideration of adoption at the
9 November meeting for a public hearing.

10
11 Davis added that the Board could state on its website that it determined at its August Board
12 meeting that these are the practices that affect health and safety and has initiated a regulations
13 project; that this would provide a factual basis for the Board's actions.

14
15 Truitt agreed that this approach would be fine.

16
17 The Chair asked Brown to explain to Truitt the Board's questions and concerns about the
18 Architect by Comity regulation project.

19
20 Brown asked Truitt if the Board could propose draft regulation's changes to modify Architect by
21 Comity requirements using a different criteria than for initial applicants by examination, adding
22 that the proposed regulation would not stay within the guidelines of the NCARB education
23 standards for issuing an NCARB certificate.

24
25 Truitt indicated he didn't think there would be a problem with that change, and that the Board
26 could determine if a certain number of years of experience would give an applicant the same type
27 of competence as passing the examination.

28
29 Brown then asked if the Board could consider time gained while working under a registered
30 architect but prior to registration in Alaska toward the proposed 10 year's experience
31 requirement for comity applicants.

32
33 Truitt didn't think the time would count but indicated he would check into that further for the
34 November meeting.

35
36 Truitt brought up the subject of Canadian regulations and indicated he had discussed with the
37 Executive Administrator proposed regulation changes to accept work experience done under a
38 Canadian engineer, a matter the Board would be taking up under Agenda item, # 18, Regulations
39 Projects.

40
41 Truitt stated that the Board has the authority to make a determination in the regulations to accept
42 an applicant's experience gained under a registered Canadian engineer to qualify for registration
43 in Alaska. The Board must be certain when the regulation is adopted the record reflects that the
44 Board reviewed Canadian registration requirements and in the opinion of the Board, those
45 requirements are generally equivalent to the Alaska requirements.

46
Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 Brown indicated that with the Architect requirements, the Board didn't specify the equivalency
2 but the national organization, NCARB, recognizes the Canadian requirements, and their colleges
3 are NAAB accredited.

4
5 The Chair asked Truitt if the Board could accept Canadian registered engineer's work
6 verifications, and if the Board would be determining that the Canadian applicant has met our
7 requirements.

8
9 Truitt answered that since there are no regulations governing that issue right now, the Board
10 could decide on a case-by-case basis. Currently the applicant has the burden to show their
11 experience is equivalent. However, if the Board makes a regulation change to say the experience
12 is recognized, the burden would be placed on the Board to show it made the determination that
13 the Canadian system is equivalent.

14
15 Short discussion followed about the requirements for examination since the requirement for work
16 experience under an U.S. registered engineer is contained in the examination provisions under
17 12 AAC 36.063.

18
19 Truitt explained that the provision would also apply to engineering applicants by comity because
20 the comity regulations refer to AS 08.48 and this chapter, which is 12 AAC 36.

21
22 Short discussion followed.

23 24 **Agenda Item 17 - Director's Comments**

25
26 Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing, joined the meeting at
27 11:15 a.m.

28
29 Gardner left the meeting at 11:20 a.m.

30
31 Reardon discussed the financial overview from Fiscal Year 2000-2001 and projections for Fiscal
32 Year 2001-2002. Based on figures from FY 2000-2001 and projections for FY 2001-2002,
33 Reardon suggested fees should stay as they are now, and discussed the budget summary.
34 Davis left the meeting at 11:32 a.m.

35
36 Reardon reviewed the costs built into FY 2001-2002 Budget.

37
38 Brown asked about budget for increase in staff salary.

39
40 Reardon explained that a classification study is going on right now of the whole range of
41 licensing staff, that desk audits are being done by the Department of Administration and are to be
42 completed by November.

43
44 Short discussion followed.

45
46 Reardon would make the position description qualifications available to Board members.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 Brown asked if funds were available for use for Public outreach and advised her that the Board
3 was considering spending \$10,000 on yellow page advertisements, and would consider
4 contracting out revising the Building Officials Handbook.

5
6 Reardon indicated Board would need to prioritize funding projects, and identify the funding
7 source, consider what funding in its allocation plan it would want to eliminate in order to do
8 other projects such as advertising. She reviewed briefly the budget plan the Board had
9 considered at its May 01 meeting.

10
11 The Chair asked to have the FY 02 budget as an agenda item for the November 2001 meeting for
12 reconsideration.

13
14 Brown explained the Board's concern over the Specialty Contractor exemption and the broad use
15 of this exemption and that the Board thought it might be appropriate to address the Contractor
16 Regulations at the same time. She referred to the exemption, and read AS 08.48.331(7) "a
17 specialty contractor licensed under AS 08.18 while engaged in the business of constructing
18 contracting or designing systems for work within the specialty to be performed or supervised by
19 the specialty contractor, or a contractor preparing shop or field drawings for work that the
20 specialty contractor has contracted to perform." Brown emphasized the language that was of
21 concern.

22
23 Reardon indicated the statutory review would be a worthwhile project and the Board's input
24 would be helpful. She wanted to make sure that plumbing contractors or other contractors could
25 do their work, but there may be ways to modify the exemption to make it clear that we allow
26 them to be construction workers but not architects or engineers.

27
28 Brown discussed "design-build" briefly, noting that in those instances architects and engineers
29 are on staff for the firm. She emphasized the Board's concern was that if a specialty contractor
30 was doing plumbing design, they would need to either have a registered engineer on staff or
31 would contract it out.

32
33 Reardon noted that the goal would be to close the loophole for unlicensed practice, define the
34 design of electrical and plumbing systems, and yet still ensure that specialty contractors could do
35 the necessary plumbing and electrical work.

36
37 Short discussion followed.

38
39 The Chair introduced the subject of term limits for Board members with regard to fractional and
40 partial appointments.

41
42 Reardon explained that in order to make any changes it would take a statute change to 08.01.100,
43 and she would pass on the Board's concern about a partial term counting as a full term to the
44 Governor's office.

45
46 Short discussion followed.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 Brown brought up Board’s concern about the interpretation of the industrial exemption, in terms
3 of defining “public occupancy”. She noted that one concern of the Board is the application of
4 the industrial exemption to an employee. She noted that the firm does not employ a contract
5 employee yet this exemption is being applied to contract employees.

6
7 Short discussion followed.

8
9 Mearig asked for a “roll forward tracking” from prior history, just one box, on the budget
10 summary reports to better identify the surplus or deficit.

11
12 Reardon indicated she would provide that information on future reports. She briefly discussed
13 indirect costs that show some stability.

14
15 Break for lunch: 12:05 p.m

16
17 Reconvene: 1:20 p.m.

18
19 All members were present except Cyra-Korsgaard and Gardner.

20
21 Three guests, Mike Prozeralik, Monique Prozeralik, and Hai On joined the meeting at 1:20 p.m.

22
23 **Agenda Item 18 - Regulation Projects**

24
25 The Chair referred to the Regulations Projects that have already been public noticed.

26
27 Executive Administrator explained the regulation projects that have been public noticed.

28
29 Discussion followed.

30
31 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Kalen, and unanimously passed, it was**

32
33 **RESOLVED that the Regulation Project, Part II, Reference Department of Law**
34 **#993-010-0054 be adopted using the initial language submitted to the Department of**
35 **Law for changes to 12 AAC 36.105 dated October 13, 2000.**

36
37 The Chair asked if there were any objections and there were none.

38
39 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Kalen, it was**

40
41 **RESOLVED that the following changes be made to Regulations Project that was**
42 **public noticed:**

43
44 **12 AAC 36.165:**
45

1 Expired Certificates. (a) A certificate of registration or corporate, limited Liability
2 Company, or limited liability partnership authorization that is not renewed for a
3 period of five years expires at the end of that period.

4 (b) An expired certificate of registration may be reinstated by

5 (1) applying for reinstatement on a form provided by the department, paying the
6 appropriate fee and providing adequate proof of having passed an examination
7 that:

8 (A) meets the applicable requirements of 12 AAC 36.100;

9 (B) the applicant for registration of an expired engineer certificate took to
10 qualify for registration in this state before April 1967; or

11 (C) the applicant took to qualify for registration in another licensing jurisdiction;
12 or

13 (2) reapplying to the board for registration by comity as required by 12AAC 36.103
14 – 12 AAC 36.109 and paying the appropriate fee.

15
16 (c) An application for reinstatement who has been sanctioned for any of the conduct
17 described in 12 AAC 36.320 in the 10 years preceding the application for
18 reinstatement may be required to be re-examined under 12 AAC 36.100.
19

20 Davis further explained that this is a new subsection (c). Davis advised that the conduct referred
21 to in subsection (c) might be conduct in another jurisdiction such as gross negligence,
22 incompetence, fraud in obtaining a registration, and deceit; essentially malfeasance, not
23 something simple as a lapsed license. Davis reiterated that this would not preclude the Board's
24 ability to require re-examination if an applicant has performed this type of conduct in another
25 jurisdiction.

26 Discussion followed.

27
28
29 **On an amendment duly made by Davis, seconded by Kalen, and unanimously passed, it**
30 **was**

31 **RESOLVED to revise subsection (c) to read:**

32 **c) The Board may, in its discretion, require an applicant for reinstatement who has**
33 **been sanctioned for any of the conduct described in 12 AAC 36.320 in the 10 years**
34 **preceding the application for reinstatement to be re-examined under 12 AAC**
35 **36.100.**
36

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

38
39 The Chair restated the main motion and called for a vote.

40
41 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Kalen, and unanimously passed, it was**

42
43 **RESOLVED that the following changes be made to Regulations Project that was**
44 **previous public noticed:**
45

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 **12 AAC 36. 165. Expired Certificates. (a) A certificate of registration or corporate, limited**
2 **Liability Company, or limited liability partnership authorization that is not renewed for a**
3 **period of five years expires at the end of that period.**

4 **(b) An expired certificate of registration may be reinstated by**

5 **(1) applying for reinstatement on a form provided by the department, paying the**
6 **appropriate fee, and [PASSING THE CURRENT PROFESSIONAL PORTION OF**
7 **THE ARCHITECT, ENGINEER, LAND SURVEYOR, OR LANDSCAPE**
8 **ARCHITECT EXAMINATION REQUIRED IN 12 AAAC 36.100 AND PAYING**
9 **THE APPROPRIATE FEE] providing adequate proof of having passed an**
10 **examination that**

11 **(A) meets the applicable requirements of 12 AAC 36.100;**

12 **(B) the applicant for registration of an expired engineer certificate took to qualify**
13 **for registration in this state before April 1967; or**

14 **(C) the applicant took to qualify for registration in another licensing jurisdiction; or**

15 **(2) reapplying to the board for registration by comity as required by 12AAC 36.103 –**
16 **12 AAC 36.109 and paying the appropriate fee.**

17 **(c) The board may, in its discretion, require an applicant for reinstatement who has been**
18 **sanctioned for any of the conduct described in 12 AAC 36.320 in the 10 years preceding**
19 **the application for reinstatement to be re-examined under 12 AAC 36.100.**

20
21 **(c) [c] An expired certificate of corporate, limited liability Company, or limited liability**
22 **partnership authorization may not be reinstated. A Corporation, limited liability**
23 **company, or limited liability partnership whose certificate of corporate, limited liability**
24 **company, or limited liability partnership authorization has expired must apply for a**
25 **new certificate of corporate, limited liability partnership authorization under AS**
26 **08.48.241.**

27 **(e) [FOR AN APPLICANT FOR REINSTATEMENT OF AN ENGINEER**
28 **CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION THE BOARD WILL ACCEPT AN**
29 **EXAMINATION THAT**

30 **(1) MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF 12 AAC 36.100(C);**

31 **(2) THE APPLICANT TOOK TO QUALIFY FOR REGISTRATION IN THIS STATE**
32 **BEFORE APRIL 1967; OR**

33 **(3) THE APPLICANT TOOK TO QUALIFY FOR REGISTRATION IN ANOTHER**
34 **LICENSING JURISDICTION.]**

35 **(f) An applicant for reinstatement of an expired certificate of registration shall meet the**
36 **requirements of 12 AAC 36.110 (a) unless the applicant was originally registered in the**
37 **state based on an acceptable treatise.**

38
39 **The Chair called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously.**

40
41 **On a motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Kalen, and unanimously passed,**
42 **it was**

43
44 **RESOLVED that the Board adopt the regulations as amended, for changes to**
45 **12 AAC 36.050; 12 AAC 36.061; 12 AAC 36.065; 12 AAC 36.165; and 12 AAC 36.180.**
46

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 Short discussion followed.

2
3 The Chair called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously.

4
5 The Chair then moved to Regulation Projects not yet public noticed, but in the packet for
6 preliminary Board consideration.

7
8 The Chair brought up the Regulation Project by Legislative recommendation for Architect by
9 Comity. The Chair asked if the three visitors were here for this discussion on proposed changes
10 to the Architect by Comity regulations and they acknowledged they were.

11
12 The Chair asked Davis to address this project.

13
14 Davis explained the edits to the proposed regulations project to amend Architect by Comity
15 under 12 AAC 36.103. She noted that at the May 2001 meeting the Board reviewed a draft
16 proposal by the AIA, Alaska Chapter, Executive Board, and in the course of doing so, there were
17 a couple of items that are in the language in our packet that need to be clarified. The Executive
18 Administrator amended the draft proposal with the Chair (Brown) and there are still a couple of
19 areas that need to be adopted by the Board as a whole. The Board discussed the revisions to 12
20 AAC 36.103.

21
22 Davis brought the Board's attention to language changes under subsection (a), to add "and", to
23 delete "to be eligible for", and under subsection (c) to add "meets the requirements of 12 AAC
24 36.100 (b). She noted that she also has a suggested language change for subsection (d) which
25 refers to disciplinary action, to read "sanctioned for" instead of "convicted of", since they are not
26 criminal matters.

27
28 **On a motion duly made by Kalen and seconded by McLane it was**

29
30 **RESOLVED that the Board adopt the proposed regulation changes to 12 AAC 36.103,**
31 **as modified.**

32
33 The Chair asked for any discussion.

34
35 Davis asked for clarification of the requirement for 12 AAC 36.100(b), which would be having
36 passed the A.R.E. (ARE) Examination.

37
38 Brown clarified that the applicants for Architect by Comity would have met the requirement of
39 taking the ARE Examination.

40
41 Brown referred to 12 AAC 36.103(a)(5) and indicated that the requirement is not for the council
42 certification, but verification from NCARB that the applicant has met IDP training requirements.
43 This requirement would show that an applicant has met the 3-year training requirement for IDP.

44
45 **On an amendment to the motion duly made by Brown, seconded by Davis, it was**

46
Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 **RESOLVED to delete “Council Certification” to read, “provide an NCARB Record**
2 **proving IDP completion”.**

3
4 Short discussion followed.

5
6 **On an amendment to the amendment, duly made by Kalen, seconded by McLane, and**
7 **unanimously passed**
8 **it was RESOLVED to amend the language to read:**

9
10 **“for an applicant for architect registration by comity who obtained initial registration after**
11 **January 1, 1990, provide an NCARB record proving IDP completion.”**

12
13 **Discussion followed.**

14
15 Monique Prozeralik commented it was quite a simple matter to document an applicant’s work
16 experience to NCARB to establish a council certificate. A council record (Blue Book) is
17 different because it requires a higher standard of education, and the difference is the IDP
18 standard of experience, plus the higher education standard.

19
20 Brown noted that as a housekeeping measure the regulations attorney could reference the correct
21 term for the appropriate council record. She noted that there are three books: the buff colored
22 record is a repository of training, work experience and education information; the green book
23 NCARB recommends the candidate for examination because they met the IDP training and the
24 NCARB education standards; and the Blue book that means an architect, licensed in another
25 jurisdiction, has met NCARB education standards and the IDP training requirements.

26
27 Discussion followed about the some Blue Book council record holders that do not meet IDP
28 requirements.

29
30 Brown noted that the Board reviews each applicant’s Blue Book Council record to ensure that
31 they have met the IDP since there are some exceptions where an applicant can obtain a council
32 record without having met IDP requirements.

33
34 The Chair called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously.

35
36 Davis stated the numbering of this proposed regulation needs to be clarified. Davis explained
37 how she felt the numbering should be in this proposed regulation.

38
39 Discussion followed.

40
41 **On an amendment by Mearig, seconded by Kalen, it was**

42
43 **RESOLVED to replace subsection (b) “Ten years experience subsequent to**
44 **licensure that meets the minimum requirements under AS 08.48.191” to read “10**
45 **years of responsible charge experience subsequent to initial registration in another**
46 **licensing jurisdiction. An applicant must gain responsible charge experience while**

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 **the under the responsible control of a professional architect.” And to amend,**
2 **12AAC 36.990 (30) the definition for “responsible control” include architect.**
3

4 Discussion followed about whether an architect could gain work experience in Alaska, under a
5 registered architect, in order to gain experience for licensure in Alaska, or if the architect would
6 have to work in another state as a registered architect, stamping work, in order to qualify.
7

8 The Board identified work experience gained as a registered architect, working in a lower 48
9 jurisdiction, and an architect who holds a current registration in another jurisdiction, who is
10 working under an Alaskan registrant.
11

12 Mearig thought there would be a distinction between gaining work experience as an architect for
13 a firm prior to Alaska registration and work gained as a licensed architect in another jurisdiction.
14 He highlighted an instance where two architects (registered in another jurisdiction) could work
15 for a firm in Alaska and verify each other’s work experience to meet the requirement for 10
16 years of experience.
17

18 Peirsol thought that the Board could consider work experience gained outside Alaska, and work
19 experience gained under an Alaskan firm, with her preference for work gained under the Alaskan
20 firm since they would gain knowledge about the arctic building conditions.
21

22 Brown stated that the Board already asked Ken Truitt today and he initially responded he doesn’t
23 think the experience gained in Alaska working for a firm would count because the applicant
24 would not be licensed at the time work experience was gained. Truitt would research that matter
25 for the November meeting. She said the matter was similar to his example of an attorney
26 preparing a brief and not being able to count that work unless he was licensed in the State.
27

28 Peirsol referred to language that supports increased mobility and was developed by the NCARB
29 licensure workshop, and read:

30 “The intent of certification through licensure is to decrease impediments to reciprocity for
31 registrants in non-accredited degree states seeking registration in degree states.”
32

33 Peirsol stated that there was also language developed by the NCARB licensure workshop. She
34 read, “The architect became registered and practiced in a member board jurisdiction for 10 years
35 during which time the architect satisfactorily complied with the laws and rules of the member
36 board and had no disciplinary action.”
37

38 Brown clarified they these architects have to practice within the State where they are licensed.
39

40 Discussion followed.
41

42 Brown stated that NCARB recommends a five-year degree (Bachelor of Architecture) and three
43 years of IDP. NCARB calls it training but it is responsible charge work. Brown further
44 explained that prior to IDP being instituted the regulation required two-years’ responsible charge
45 work experience. However, once IDP was instituted, this regulation was changed to read meet
46 IDP’s requirements before registration.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 Davis noted that when the AIA submitted their initial proposal it called for evidence of not less
3 than 6-year's experience in a position of responsible charge subsequent to licensure in the
4 alternate jurisdiction, of which not less than 4-year's experience shall have been obtained on
5 work located within the State of Alaska under the direct supervision of a legally practicing
6 Alaska registered professional engineer.

7
8 The Chair asked if there should be a committee assigned to work on this for the next Board
9 meeting.

10
11 Davis stated that part of the process of developing the regulation change is public comment,
12 which would be helpful to the Board. She recapped that what is currently under consideration is
13 not less than 10 year's experience. What was discussed was instead of 10 years, require
14 responsible charge for some required work. So far, the only two issues that haven't really been
15 decided are how we characterize the 10 years, should it be 6 years, or 8 years, and the other is are
16 we correctly referencing the IDP.

17
18 Brown added that the third issue would be if you could practice under your own stamp or if you
19 could work for a firm under a registered architect.

20
21 Iverson stated he felt as long as the time was post-registration experience, it didn't matter
22 whether it was under applicant's own stamp or working for someone else.

23
24 Mearig noted that in order to support the proposal he would need a definition for "work
25 experience".

26
27 Davis stated that "responsible charge" doesn't mean it has to be under someone else, and she
28 read the definition.

29
30 Mearig agreed.

31
32 **On an amendment to his original amendment duly by Mearig, seconded by Kalen, and**
33 **unanimously adopted, it was**

34
35 **RESOLVED to replace subsection (b) "Ten years experience subsequent to licensure that**
36 **meets the minimum requirements under AS 08.48.191" to read "10 years of responsible**
37 **charge experience subsequent to initial registration in another licensing jurisdiction."**

38
39 The three visitors left at 2:30 p.m.

40
41 Discussion followed.

42
43 Iverson stated that what still will need to be addressed is the length of time in responsible
44 charge" in the proposed regulation because it really is longer than 10 years.

45
46 Peirsol noted it is more like 17-22 years total experience.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 Brown reminded members this would be an alternative path to NCARB Blue Book requirement;
3 the Broadly Experienced Architect model exists, and the NCARB continues to look at the
4 Nebraska model. The Board has previously dealt with Architect by Comity requirements but
5 some AIA members are not happy with the outcome.

6
7 The Chair asked if the Board felt this proposed regulation was ready to go to Public Comment or
8 if further clarification was needed.

9
10 Discussion followed.

11
12 Gardner stated that the next AELS Board Meeting would be in Anchorage and it would be a
13 good time for public comment.

14
15 Davis agreed.

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

18
19 **RESOLVED that the Board send the proposed regulation 12 AAC 36.103, as**
20 **amended, for public comment.**

21
22 Discussion.

23
24 Peirsol stated she would be willing to work on this proposed regulation over the next three
25 months before sending it out to public comment.

26
27 **Kalen withdrew his motion and moved to table this subject to the next meeting.**

28
29 Davis stated that would mean the Board would get no public comment at the next meeting.

30
31 Discussion followed.

32
33 The Chair called for a straw poll on the Architect by Comity proposed regulation changes, as
34 revised, for public comment and the Board unanimously commented they were ready to send to
35 public comment:

36
37 Davis agreed it should go out for public comment.

38 Kalen agreed it should go out for public comment.

39 Siemoneit agreed it should go out for public comment because the comment could serve as a tool
40 for the Board's ultimate decision on this matter, and if there is major dissatisfaction the
41 professional societies would be available in Juneau in February to discuss this with the Board
42 and the Legislature.

43 Brown agreed it should go out for public comment, primarily for the public health, safety and
44 welfare issues and not at the request of the professional societies.

45 Mearig agreed it should go out for public comment but was not sure he could support the
46 concept.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 Gardner agreed it should go out for public comment.
2 McLane agreed it should go out for public comment.
3 Peirsol agreed it should go out for public comment but thinks there are still issues.
4 Iverson agreed it should go out for public comment.

5
6 The Chair asked for volunteers for a committee to work on this proposed regulation while it is
7 out for Public Comment.

8
9 The Chair announced the committee would consist of Peirsol, Brown, and Gardner.

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

13
14 **RESOLVED that the Board send the proposed regulation 12 AAC 36.103, as**
15 **amended, for public comment:**

16
17 **12 AAC 36.103 was repealed and readopted to read:**

18
19 **To be eligible for registration as an architect by comity without taking the examination**
20 **specified in 12 AAC 36.060 and 12 AAC 36.100, an applicant must**

21 **(1) submit an application for registration by comity in compliance with 12 AAC 36.010;**

22 **(2) be currently registered or licensed in another jurisdiction;**

23 **(3) satisfy the arctic and seismic requirements of 12 AAC 36.110; and**

24 **(4)**

25 **(A) submit verification of applicant's education and experience by submitting an**
26 **NCARB Council Certificate, which is commonly known as the "NCARB Blue**
27 **Book"; or**

28 **(B) submit satisfactory evidence of the following:**

29 **i. B.A. or B.S. degree from an accredited institution of higher learning;**

30 **ii. not less than 10 years of responsible charge experience subsequent to**
31 **initial licensure in another jurisdiction;**

32 **iii. satisfaction of the requirements of 12 AAC 36.100 (b); and**

33 **iv. being in good standing in all jurisdictions in which licensed, having**
34 **not been sanctioned for any of the conduct described in**
35 **12 AAC 36.320;**

36 **(5) for an applicant for architect registration by comity who obtained initial registration**
37 **after January 1, 1990, provide an NCARB record proving IDP completion.**

38
39 Break: 2:45 p.m.

40 Reconvene: 3:00 p.m.

41
42 The Chair reconvened the meeting and all Board members were present except Cyra-Korsgaard.

43
44 Davis left the meeting at 3:01 p.m.

45
46 **On a motion duly made by Mearig and seconded by McLane, it was**

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 **RESOLVED to hold over Continuing Education draft regulations until the**
3 **November AELS meeting.**

4
5 The Chair asked if there was discussion and there was none.

6
7 Kalen objected.

8
9 The Chair asked for a vote and announced that the motion passed, 9 –1
10 with Kalen casting the nay vote.

11
12 **Item 19 – Other Regulation Changes**

13
14 The Chair then brought up 12 AAC 36.063 proposed changes to the Non-Discipline specific
15 engineering license.

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

18
19 **RESOLVED that the Board send proposed regulation changes for 12 AAC 36.063**
20 **and 12 AAC 36.990 for public comment.**

21
22 Discussion followed.

23
24 Mearig asked for clarification for the language for the draft regulations.

25
26 The Executive Administrator responded that the information in the packets came from polling
27 other states and was a draft proposal for consideration.

28
29 **On an amendment duly made by Mearig, seconded by Brown, and unanimously adopted, it**
30 **was**

31
32 **RESOLVED to strike, in the fourth line of the underlined text, “The applicant may then**
33 **practice any branch of engineering in which the applicant has proven proficiency by reason**
34 **of education and experience, and in which the applicant is willing to accept full legal,**
35 **financial and professional responsibility.”**

36
37 Short discussion followed.

38
39 Kalen noted that the Alaska Society of Professional Engineers (ASPE), Fairbanks Chapter, were
40 distinctly cool to the idea of changing the current system.

41
42 Mearig noted that when he presented the proposal to the ASPE Board the response was
43 favorable.

44
45 Iverson commented that there are pluses and minuses to the proposal but the Board is looking for
46 public comment in order to decide if the support for a change is warranted.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 The Chair asked for a vote on the amendment.
3 The Chair noted there were no objections, and the amendment passed.
4

5 **On an amendment duly made by Mearig, and seconded by Brown, it was**
6 **RESOLVED to delete 12 AAC 36.990 (17) and to revise 12 AAC 36.063 to read:**

7
8 **() An applicant who has passed a Group I or Group II professional engineering**
9 **examination offered by NCEES will be granted registration as a professional engineer.**

10
11 Discussion followed.

12
13 The Executive Administrator reminded the Board that they do define the six disciplines, not just
14 in this section, but also in AS 08.48.341.

15
16 Gardner asked how a non-discipline specific license would impact current registrants.

17
18 Discussion followed.

19
20 Kalen left the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

21
22 **Mearig withdrew his amended motion to 12 AAC 36.990 (17).**

23
24 **On an amendment duly made by Iverson, seconded by Brown, and adopted unanimously, it**
25 **was**

26
27 **RESOLVED to define 12 AAC 36.990 (17), “professional engineering” includes the**
28 **branches of profession engineering offered as Group I and Group II professional**
29 **engineering examinations by the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and**
30 **Surveying (NCEES).**

31
32 Discussion followed.

33
34 The Chair asked if there were any objections to the amendment and there were none and the
35 amendment passed.

36
37 The Chair asked if there were any objection to the amended main motion and read the main
38 motion as:

39
40 **On an amendment duly made by Mearig and seconded by Brown, and unanimously**
41 **adopted, it was**

42 **RESOLVED to revise the proposed changes to 12 AAC 36.063 to read:**

43
44 **() An applicant who has passed a Group I or Group II professional engineering**
45 **examination offered by NCEES will be granted registration as a professional engineer.**

46
Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 The Chair asked if there were any objections, and there were none and the motion passed.

2
3 The Chair asked if there was an objection to sending this out for public comment and there was
4 none. He indicated that staff would work with the regulations specialist to put the changes in the
5 appropriate place.

6
7 The Chair then brought up the proposed regulation change to 12 AAC 36.063 that would allow
8 the board to accept work experience under a Canadian engineer for examination and comity
9 applicants.

10
11 Iverson stated he didn't feel the Board was ready to take any action on this. The Board set up a
12 subgroup Canadian Engineering Reciprocity, with Miller as Chair. The subgroup needs to do
13 some work with the Canadian engineering group before the regulation proposal could move
14 forward.

15
16 Brown suggested that Board should postpone this.

17
18 The Chair asked if there were any objections to postponing this matter and there were none.

19
20 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to put Canadian engineering work experience on
21 the agenda for the November meeting.

22
23 The Board agreed.

24
25 Kalen back 3:19 p.m.

26
27 Brown asked if that the two regulations that were approved today to go out for Public Comment
28 could be mailed to all licensed architects and engineers.

29
30 Executive Administrator stated currently proposed regulations for Public Comment have gone
31 out to an interested parties list and not to the whole group.

32
33 Brown stated she felt this should go out and cover on the outside should boldly state,
34 "CHANGES TO ARCHITECTURAL COMITY/CHANGES TO ENGINEERING
35 DESIGNATION, DO NOT THROW AWAY".

36
37 Brown stated another way to address this would be to direct the architects and engineers to the
38 website and the proposed change in regulation, as well as the current language.

39
40 The Executive Administrator stated that there is a specific format for regulations that includes
41 lead in language. She noted that the Board could make suggestions, and also could post
42 something to the website under, "What's New" or "Regulation Changes".

43
44 Davis stated that there are some places in the proposed regulations that require work under a U.S.
45 registrant, for example, land surveyors.

46
Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1 The Executive Administrator agreed there is a reference to land surveyor and landscape architect
2 and also one for mentoring under engineer. The Executive Administrator stated the Board was
3 only considering engineering work experience under a registered engineer, so the proposed
4 changes were not made to any other section or profession.

5
6 Short discussion followed.

7
8 Mearig stated he felt the request should be limited to work experience for engineers only.

9
10 Iverson agreed.

11
12 **Item 20 – New Subgroups**

13
14 The Chair moved to the next item on the agenda and took up Subgroups.

15
16 Short discussion followed.

17
18 The Chair stated the Subgroups for November meeting would be:

- 19
20 1. Incidental Practice
21 2. Legislation and Regulations
22 3. Building Officials Manual
23

24 The Executive Administrator reported that she and John Clark have been looking at the New
25 Mexico Building Officials Manual. Executive Administrator would like to continue to work
26 with Clark on this project as time permits.

27
28 The Chair agreed.

29
30 **Item 21 – New Business**

31
32 The Chair asked Brown to discuss Western Council of Architectural Registration Boards
33 (WCARB) meeting.

34
35 Brown explained WCARB meeting will be in Anchorage in February, 2003 at her
36 recommendation that the AELS meeting be held in Anchorage on February 28, 2003, as a one
37 day meeting, to coincide with the Iditarod and Fur Rendezvous to begin on March 1. A second
38 option would be to hold the AELS Board Meeting on February 27-28. Brown further explained
39 she looked at various hotels and chose to recommend the Captain Cook Hotel for the WCARB
40 meeting. She noted she would forward her recommendation to Carmen Westberg, Executive
41 Director, WCARB.

42
43 Kalen objected to moving the location of the meeting to Anchorage.

44
45 Brown advised that moving the location would allow Board members the opportunity to attend
46 the WCARB meeting.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 Brief discussion followed and there were no further objections.
3
4 The Chair moved on to the Annual Report and asked the Executive Administrator for her
5 comments.
6
7 The Executive Administrator explained taking the revised report puts the Goals and Objective in
8 a narrative form rather than the “table” form the Board reviews at each meeting.
9
10 The Chair stated that if there are any corrections or questions on the Annual Report, members
11 could email the Executive Administrator, and she would move the report forward.
12
13 The Chair brought up the next item added to New Business on making the Arctic Engineering
14 course and the AKLS exam into some kind of electronic or take home exam.
15
16 Mearig explained this idea came from the Annual NCEES meeting, and that his tenure ends in
17 June 2002, so if another Board member would like to take the lead role on this issue this could
18 go forward. Otherwise, it should be tabled for now.
19
20 Kalen stated he could not support the AKLS exam being done as a take home examination.
21
22 Brown suggested it might be considered for the Arctic Engineering Course.
23
24 The Chair stated he would discuss this conceptually with University of Alaska, Anchorage and
25 Fairbanks faculty currently offering the Arctic Engineering Course and would report back.
26
27 Ms. Vicki Sterling, Alaska Professional Design Council (APDC) stated she came to the meeting
28 just to meet the Board and invited the Board to call her if there is anything they need to
29 communicate to members.
30
31 The Chair brought up the next item under New Subgroups, Consistency in work verification
32 forms.
33
34 Mearig discussed the use of Work Experience forms and the requirement in regulation for
35 documenting work experience and if sub-professional work experience needed to be verified and
36 sealed by the engineer.
37
38 Gardner stated while she agreed the work verification may not be required for subprofessional
39 work, she felt more comfortable having someone other than applicant submitting information for
40 professional or subprofessional work.
41
42 Iverson stated that two years responsible charge experience would need to be verified by a
43 registered engineer but that while the other work may not require a seal, it needs to be
44 documented by someone in the firm.
45

1 The Chair clarified that it would be useful for someone in the firm to provide the details of the
2 work so the Board could determine if this was subprofessional, professional or responsible
3 charge work experience.

4
5 A lengthy discussion followed.

6
7 Gardner stated the regulations do not really direct how the work verification form is treated.

8
9 The Chair recapped the discussion the Board held. The Board agreed that the work verification
10 forms would remain the same, and that when the Board is reviewing files it needs to be
11 consistent in applying the tables. He further clarified that for a professional engineer applicant
12 the only work experience that must be verified by a professional engineer is the 24-month's of
13 responsible charge work experience and the additional time would be listed on the application.

14
15 The Executive Administrator reminded the Board that nothing precludes the Board from asking
16 for more information if there is any question about the work history.

17
18 The Chair moved on to the next item on the agenda, the Industrial Exemption.

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

21
22 **RESOLVED that the Board go into executive session to discuss AS 08.48.331 (10),**
23 **Industrial exemption.**

24
25 The Board went into executive session at 4:01 p.m.

26
27 The Chair announced the Board was out of executive session at 4:23 p.m. and back on the
28 record.

29
30 Brown stated that the Board went into Executive Session to discuss one exemption, which was
31 the Industrial Exemption, in particular, because of some particular circumstances, but the Board
32 has come out of Executive Session and decided to review all the statutory exemptions under
33 08.48.331.

34
35 **On a motion duly made by Brown and seconded by Kalen, and unanimously passed, it was**

36
37 **RESOLVED that the Board put on the work agenda over a number of meetings, a**
38 **subcommittee to re-evaluate all exemptions, and in their re-evaluation of the**
39 **exemptions clarify in the Building Official's Manual illustrate how the exemptions**
40 **apply and don't apply.**

41
42 Discussion followed.

43
44 Brown suggested that the review need not be done in its entirety but could be done one at a time,
45 and as the Board interprets the exemptions, the information can be inserted into the Building
46 Officials Manual.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 The Chair suggested this be a New Goal. Goal 8, Study Exemptions.

3
4 The Chair asked if there was any objection, and there was not and the motion passed
5 unanimously.

6
7 **Item 22 – Board Member Reports**

8
9 The Chair asked for comments from Mearig, Iverson, and Kalen on the NCEES Annual Meeting
10 that took place in Little Rock, Arkansas in August.

11
12 Mearig and Iverson felt the written report covered the meeting.

13
14 Kalen reviewed his written report.

15
16 The Chair then asked Brown for her report on the NCARB Annual Meeting.

17
18 Brown reported the meeting was not very controversial, but NCARB did vote and pass that
19 continuing education credits are needed for renewal.

20
21 Break: 4:43 p.m.

22
23 Reconvened: 4:50 p.m.

24
25 **Item 23 – Board Member Comments**

26
27 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda and asked members to make any comments.

28
29 Kalen reported that Mike Kinney, Teamsters Union does want to come and talk to the Board and
30 asked that he be listed on the November agenda. Kinney advised him that Teamster members
31 want to discuss the land surveyor's education requirements and wanted to go on record as
32 opposed to having construction surveying within the definition of land surveying.

33
34 Siemoneit only wanted to thank Staff for their efforts in supporting the Board.

35
36 Brown wanted to commend Miller for a good meeting.

37
38 Gardner had no comments.

39
40 McLane commented he enjoying seeing everyone after a long summer.

41
42 Peirsol stated she enjoyed seeing everyone and her hope that the Board can get through the
43 Architect by Comity regulation issue. She stated she was pleased with how well the Board dealt
44 with the landscape architect stamping issues.

45
46 Iverson had no comments.

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

1
2 Miller thanked the Board for their indulgence. He stated he felt comfortable, when discussing the
3 Architect by Comity regulation changes, to rely on Brown and Peirsol's expertise as resources,
4 but that the matter still remains a responsibility for each Board member.
5

6 **Item 24 – Read Applications into Record**

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

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

14 **COMITY APPLICANTS**

15

#	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	DISCIPLINE	BOARD ACTION
1.	Phillips	Jerry J.	Architect	Conditionally approved pending arctic engineering.
2.	Knedler	Marvin E.	Architect	Approved.
3.	Powell	Robert A.	Architect	Conditionally approved pending receipt of NCARB certificate (Blue Book Council record).
4.	Stuff	William	Architect	Approved (IDP has been satisfied).
5.	Kapasi	Dilipkumar K.	PE/Chemical	Approved.
6.	Nelson	Thomas W.	PE/Chemical	Approved.
7.	Antrobus	Donald C.	PE/Civil	Approved.
8.	Ball	Steven C.	PE/Civil	Approved.
9.	Burroughs	Daniel K.	PE/Civil	Conditionally approved pending arctic engineering.
10.	Comer	Blaine	PE/Civil	Conditionally approved pending arctic engineering & receipt of transcript.
11.	David	Jack L.	PE/Civil	Conditionally approved pending arctic engineering.
12.	Diaz	John M.	PE/Civil	Approved.
13.	Everton	Kerry T.	PE/Civil	Approved.
14.	Hicks	Thomas R.	PE/Civil	Conditionally approved pending arctic engineering.
15.	Krishnamurthi	Ram	PE/Civil	Approved.
16.	Luth	Gregory P.	PE/Civil	Conditionally approved pending arctic engineering.
17.	Manarin	Fabio	PE/Civil	Conditionally approved pending verification of 2 U.S. registered engineering references.

18.	Niemi	Andrew D.	PE/Civil	Conditionally approved pending arctic engineering.
19.	Olmer	Miroslav	PE/Civil	Conditionally approved pending verification of foreign degree evaluation and arctic engineering.
20.	Rodegerdts	Lee A.	PE/Civil	Approved.
21.	Schambeck	Stephan	PE/Civil	Approved.
22.	Soden	Derek J.	PE/Civil	Approved.
23.	Gottshall	Douglas L.	PE/Electrical	Approved.
24.	Lenihan	Jody	PE/Electrical	Conditionally approved pending arctic engineering.
25.	Morris	Donn A.	PE/Electrical	Conditionally approved pending arctic engineering.
26.	Poole	Charles M.	PE/Electrical	Conditionally approved pending arctic engineering.
27.	Rohkohl	Jay D.	PE/Electrical	Approved.
28.	Wong	Sei Yuen	PE/Electrical	Conditionally approved pending verification of 2 U.S. registered engineering references.
29.	Higgs	Bruce J.	PE/Mechanical	Approved.
30.	Weigand	Micheal J.	PE/Mining	Conditionally approved pending arctic engineering.

1
2
3
4
5

EXAM APPLICANTS

#	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	DISCIPLINE	BOARD ACTION:
1.	Zaccaro	Marco A.	ARE	Approved for A.R.E.
2.	Espinoza	Margarita C.	FE (foreign degree, MS Environmental Quality)	Approved for F.E.
3.	Abubaid	David H.	FE	Approved after staff review
4.	Anderson	Erin	FE	Approved after staff review
5.	Ayers	Mark L.	FE	Approved after staff review
6.	Boone	Eryn A.	FE	Approved after staff review
7.	Borman	Paula J.	FE	Approved after staff review
8.	Botulinski	Christopher S.	FE	Approved after staff review
9.	Byard	Helena R.	FE	Approved after staff review
10.	Chamberlain	Lisa M.	FE	Approved after staff review
11.	Dodge IV	George P.	FE	Approved after staff review
12.	Evetts	David M.	FE	Approved after staff review
13.	Folk	Angela M.	FE	Approved after staff review
14.	Gates	Bill	FE	Approved after staff review

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

15.	Hess	Jacob F.	FE	Approved after staff review
16.	Hosier	Myron C.	FE	Approved after staff review
17.	Knorr	Kathryn B.	FE	Approved after staff review
18.	Lawler	Monty M.	FE	Approved after staff review
19.	Lemay	Patrick M.	FE	Approved after staff review
20.	Leroux	Robert	FE	Approved after staff review
21.	Markey	Serena M.	FE	Approved after staff review
22.	Metcalf	Susan K	FE	Approved after staff review
23.	Moberg	Darin K.	FE	Approved after staff review
24.	Pepe	John A	FE	Approved after staff review
25.	Rasmussen	Mathea E.	FE	Approved after staff review
26.	Sakalaskas	Jason M.	FE	Approved after staff review
27.	Schreifels	Chelan	FE	Approved after staff review
28.	Schulte	Luke	F.E.	Approved after staff review
29.	Smith	Frank T.	FE	Approved after staff review
30.	Toth	Frank J.	FE	Approved after staff review
31.	Watts	Jeffrey O.	FE	Approved after staff review
32.	Weinant	Mike W.	FE	Approved after staff review
33.	Winter	Katryn R.	FE	Approved after staff review
34.	Write	Delencia E.	FE	Approved after staff review
35.	Zahn	Delmer D.	FE	Approved after staff review
36.	Roemer	Stefan	FE (foreign degree)	Approved.
37.	Allison	Richard F.	FLS	Approved, but over half of work experience is construction engineering.
38.	Boyd	Blade D.	FLS	Approved.
39.	Callaghan	Steven	FLS	Approved after staff review
40.	Gibson	Susan M.	FLS	Approved.
41.	Kimbrell	Dimitri	FLS	Approved.
42.	Shavlik	Craig B.	FLS	Incomplete. Needs additional 5 months' work experience.
43.	Smith	Jedd G.	FLS	Approved.
44.	Wentworth	Richard L.	FLS	Approved.
45.	Gardner	David H.	Landscape Arch.	Approved.
46.	Allison	Richard F.	PLS/AKLS	Incomplete. Needs documentation of experience.
47.	Kimbrell	David A.	PLS/AKLS	Approve for FLS/PLS/AKLS exam.
48.	Drozdic	Ronald J.	PE/Chemical	Approved.
49.	Bethard	Todd G.	PE/Civil	Approved.
50.	Campbell	Rebecca L.	PE/Civil	Approved.
51.	Frey	Lisa L.	PE/Civil	Approved.
52.	Garney	Gregory L.	PE/Civil	Approved for exam, needs arctic

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

				engineering prior to licensure.
53.	Gaulke	Michael S.	PE/Civil	Approved.
54.	Gonzalez	Calex N.	PE/Civil	Approved.
55.	Greely	Dirk J.	PE/Civil	Approved.
56.	Hansen	Timothy E.	PE/Civil	Conditionally approved pending 8 months' additional work experience under U.S. registered engineer.
57.	Kennedy	David L.	PE/Civil	Conditionally approved pending arctic engineering.
58.	Lynch	Chris M.	PE/Civil	Approved.
59.	Pedwell	Keith G.	PE/Civil	Approved. No re-test of Professional Engineer exam required.
60.	Pfister	Anthony W.	PE/Civil	Approved.
61.	Ribble	Randon A.	PE/Civil	Approved.
62.	Savatgy	David	PE/Civil	Approved.
63.	Schauer	Caleb J.	PE/Civil	Approved.
64.	Snyder	Curt	PE/Civil	Approved.
65.	Sprague	Anthony E.	PE/Civil	Approved.
66.	Doubleday	Rolland L.	PE/Electrical	Approved.
67.	Miller	Randall W.	PE/Electrical	Approved.
68.	Pepe	John A.	PE/Electrical	Approved.
69.	Roemer	Stefan	PE/Electrical	Approved.
70.	Schaefer	Phillip B.	PE/Electrical	Approved.
71.	Alkire	Paul J.	PE/Mechanical	Conditionally approved pending arctic engineering.
72.	Barry	Robin P.	PE/Mechanical	Conditionally approved pending verification of Fundamentals of Engineering exam.
73.	Fawcett	Daniel W.	PE/Mechanical	Approved to sit for examination, Also needs arctic engineering prior to licensure.
74.	King Jr.	Willaim G.	PE/Mechanical	Approved.
75.	Stephl	Chris L.	PE/Mechanical	Approved.
76.	Ganguli	Rajive	PE/Mining	Approved.
77.	Hanson	Brian R.	PE/Mining	Conditionally approved pending transcript.
78.	Williamson	Mary J.	PE/Petroleum	Conditionally approved

Last printed 09/18/01 2:06 PM

A:\1_revised draft August 01 minutes bd lm rm to dl.doc

				pending transcript.
--	--	--	--	---------------------

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

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

RESOLVED to deny 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:

	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	APPLICATION	BOARD ACTION
1.	Bekkedahl	Lawrence K.	FLS	Denied for October 2001 exam. Can resubmit work experience for April 2002 exam.
2.	Keiner	Robert M.	FLS	Denied, needs additional 13 months’ work experience.
3.	Melvin	Kermit C.	FLS	Denied, needs additional 20 months’ work experience.
4.	Miller	Charlene M.	FLS	Denied. Needs 11 months’ additional experience
5.	Papoi	James M.	FLS	Denied. Needs additional 21.5 months’ work experience.
6.	Pierce	Grant	FLS	Denied. Denied for October 2001 exam. Can resubmit work experience for April 2002 exam.
7.	Berryhill	Bruce R.	PLS/AKLS	Denied, Needs additional 30 months’ work experience.
8.	Spangler	Michael E.	PLS/AKLS	Denied.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Item 25 – Review Calendar of Events

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

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

McLane left the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Brown, and passed unanimously that the May meeting be changed to May 16-17, 2002 in Fairbanks, Alaska.

1 The Chair stated Board member delegates to CLARB would be Mearig, Cyra-Korsgaard, and the
 2 Executive Administrator would also attend the annual meeting in Salt Lake City, on
 3 September 13-15, 2001.

4
 5 The Executive Administrator reported she was assigned to serve on NCARB Chauncey
 6 Management Task Force (CCMS) to review the exam system. The Task Force would meet
 7 twice, in October, in Princeton, New Jersey and in February in Florida. Also, she the NCARB
 8 sends all Executive Administrators to Washington, D.C. in November for a workshop.

9
 10 **Item 26 – Review Task List**

11
 12 The Executive Administrator will compile task list from the minutes and send around to all
 13 Board Members.

14

Executive Administrator	Respond to Correspondence
	Research two states' statutes to obtain language for partial terms
	Add agenda items to November meeting: LARE dates offered: Lead: Cyra-Korsgaard Continuing Education Program Canadian Engineering Reciprocity FY 02 Allocation Plan Begin subcommittee work for all statutory exemptions (add results to Building Officials manual)
	Send Examination Diagnostics Reports to members
	Update Goals & objectives
	Post disciplinary actions on website
	Public notice regulations projects: Architect by Comity alternate path Engineer Non-discipline specific
	Post landscape architect stamping to website as interim policy
	Move annual report forward
	Request roll forward tracking from prior history on the budget report
	Distribute Board member report for Mearig
	Prepare draft regulations for landscape architect stamping
Davis	Touch Bases with APDC on Industrial Exemption

Kalen	Lead on June 2002 AKLS workshop
	Lead on Fairbanks Examination Oct 2001 exams
Miller	Check on BS degree for Control Engineers
Peirsol	Provide History of 08.48
Siemoneit	Check again with Anchorage telephone directory to pursue unlicensed advertising
Catherine Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing	Provide roll forward tracking on budget summary
	Check with Governor's office on partial terms
TRUITT	Research work experience gained under a registered architect counting towards applicant r.c.

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

Item 27 – Housekeeping

Kalen stated he would oversee the NCEES exam on October 26 and 27, 2001 in Fairbanks, but will be out of town for the April exams. Gardner would be assisting during the October exams and Gardner would likely be overseeing the Fairbanks April 2002 exams.

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

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

RESOLVED to adjourn the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator

Approved:

Robert Miller, Chair
Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers and Land Surveyors

1
2
3

Date: