

1 STATE OF ALASKA
2 DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
3 DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING
4 BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
5 ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
6

7 MINUTES OF MEETING

8
9 FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000

Draft

10
11
12 *These draft minutes were prepared by the staff of the*
13 *Division of Occupational Licensing.*
14 *They have not been reviewed or approved by the Board.*
15

16
17 By authority of AS 08.01.070 (2) and in compliance with the provision of AS 44.62,
18 Article 6, the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors,
19 (AELS) held a meeting February 17 and 18, 2000 at 333 Willoughby St, 10th floor
20 training room, Alaska.
21

22
23 *February 17, 2000*

24
25
26 **Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order and Roll Call**

27
28 Daphne Brown, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

29
30 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

31
32 Daphne Brown, Chair, Architect
33 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member
34 Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer
35 Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor
36 Scott McLane, Land Surveyor
37 Kathleen Gardner, Secretary, Mechanical Engineer
38 Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer
39 Robert Miller, Vice-President, Civil Engineer
40 Patricia Peirsol, Architect

41
42 Absent: Ernie Siemoneit, Mining Engineer
43 Marcia Davis, Public Member

44
45 Representing the Divisional of Occupational Licensing:

46
47 Helen Sayer, Licensing Examiner
48 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator.

49
50 The Chair noted that Ernie Siemoneit and Marcia Davis were expected to join the
51 meeting at approximately 10:00 a.m.
52

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Public members attending portions of the meeting:

2
3 Jeff Wilson, representing Alaska Professional Design Council (APDC)
4 and self

5
6 Joseph Notkin, representing AIA, Fairbanks, and self

7
8 Mark Seversen, representing self

9
10 Jon Stolle, representing AIA, Alaska, and self

11
12 Dale Nelson, observe

13
14 Puanani Maunu, observe

15
16 Lesil McGuire, aide, Representative Pete Kott

17
18
19 **Agenda Item 2 – Review/Revise Agenda**

20
21 The following changes were made to the agenda:

22
23 Additions and changes:

24
25 • Under New Business:

26
27 Barbara Gabier, Program Coordinator, would like to speak to the board
28 about Alaska Disability Act (ADA) issues, following public comment.

29
30 The Chair wanted to bring several items up:

- 31
32 • Under “Board Reports,” to add “Board Member Remarks,” a way for board
33 members to comment.
34
35 • Prior to “Application Review,” the board could briefly discuss for staff
36 what items the board will accept as missing from applicant files.
37
38 • Under “Goals and Objectives,” to add a discussion item about the board
39 taking action and individual members testifying against that action
40 under.

41
42 Kalen noted that he wanted to add an agenda item under “New Business” to discuss
43 the definition of land surveyor to add drainage and soils analysis.

44
45 Mearig commented that he would like to report on the NCEES “blue book” council
46 record.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Miller noted that he would like to comment under “Application Review” about
2 someone who would like to apply for examination in Alaska, but took the
3 examination in California.

4
5 **Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Report**
6

7 There were no ethics violations or disclosures to report.
8

9 The Chair asked if board members are required to disclosure financial statements
10 and the Executive Administrator answered board members are not required to do
11 so.
12

13
14 **Agenda Item 4 – Review/Approve Minutes**
15

16 The following corrections to the minutes for the November 1999 meeting were
17 noted:
18

- 19 • The Executive Administrator noted that she corrected the November minutes
20 to reflect that McLane would be attending the Western Zone meeting in May
21 2000 and not the WCARB meeting.
22
- 23 • Peirsol noted on page 17, there is a motion with no “second.”
24

25 Kalen and Peirsol commented on the high level and accuracy of the minutes.
26

27 Kalen noted there were some items to be corrected:
28

- 29 • Agenda Item 3, Ethics Report – Kalen is the “Chair of the Alaska Section
30 of the American Congress of Surveying and Mapping,” not the president.
31
- 32 • Page 3, line 29, Kalen stated that the “twice annual offering of the land
33 surveyor examination was once in statute.”
34
- 35 • Page 8, line 42, should read: “Administration,” not the “Legislature.”
36
- 37 • Page 10, lines 29-30, should read: “forum in Fairbanks,” and to replace,
38 “from one board to another” with “taken.”
39
- 40 • Page 12, line 23, insert: “21 people and three teleconferences in
41 Petersburg, Soldotna, and Juneau, among others.”
42
- 43 • Page 12, line 27, Steve Shuttleworth should reference title, “building
44 official.”
45
- 46 • Page 12, line 28, reflect “Mr. Shuttleworth was spokesman for the group of
47 14 plan reviewers that met for three hours prior to the AELS meeting.”

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Chair noted on page 13, line 35, verify, “Mr. Frenier.”
2

3 Kalen continued with corrections, on P 17, line 42, should read seconded by “Kalen.”
4

- 5 • Page 24, line 3, strike the sentence.
6
- 7 • Page 31, line 17, insert, “Fairbanks.”
8
- 9 • Page 31, line 19, except the reference was to taking funds and using them
10 for another board.
11
- 12 • Page 34, line 26, add: “Public comment on fee increase was very
13 negative.”
14

15 Kalen made a comment for the record that the minutes were very well done.
16

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

19
20 **RESOLVED to approve the November 1999 minutes with the**
21 **corrections as noted above.**
22

23 **There were no objections and the minutes were approved as noted and**
24 **staff will verify items.**
25

26
27 **Agenda Item 5 – Correspondence**
28

29 The Chair noted the possible action correspondence in the packet.
30

31
32 **Letter from McClintock Land Associates, Inc. – Regarding Prohibiting Embossing**
33 **Seals**
34

35 Kalen added Mr. McClintock is technically correct. The Chair directed Kalen to
36 work with staff to develop a response to advise FEMA National Flood Insurance
37 Program that Alaska does not use an embossing seal.
38

39
40 **E-Mail from Art High, BIA – Regarding “Direct Supervision”**
41

42 McLane noted he responded by email about his own practice: the PLS stays in
43 contact with the field and office; that the field survey crews work out of town for
44 short duration (1 to 3 days).
45

46 Miller noted that in the mentoring option that the board has a requirement for a
47 face-to-face contact quarterly and written notice, but not physical presence
48 requirement.
49

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Iverson noted that the supervision for surveyors in his practice is the same; they
2 train them and then they are acting independently and to have the physical
3 presence every day defeats that process. The “responsible charge” may not be
4 involved day in and day out and really is their responsibility.
5

6 Mearig asked for clarification for the cite and the chair responded that the cite
7 would be the definition of “responsible charge.”
8

9 The Chair noted that the board indicated they reviewed the regulations and are
10 satisfied with the definition of “responsible charge” and “responsible control” and
11 believe they are adequate at this time.
12

13 Note that Board Members Siemoneit and Davis joined the meeting at 9:40 a.m.
14
15

16 Jeff Wilson, APDC President
17

18 The Chair announced that Jeff Wilson, APDC President, was present and would not
19 be available during the public comment period and would like to briefly address the
20 group.
21

22 Mr. Wilson noted that he knows many of the board members, but wanted to take
23 time to introduce himself and welcome any questions. Mr. Wilson noted he is an
24 architect and a past president of the American Institute of Architects (AIA), Alaska
25 Chapter. Some questions before the board regarding licensure are serious and
26 divisive and the AIA will work to address them as an organization and try not to
27 present fragmented answer.
28

29 APDC newsletter lays out his agenda for the year and they want to assist the board,
30 and integrate continuing education. The organization is separate and should be at
31 arms length, but must cooperate as well.
32

33 The Chair thanked Mr. Wilson for his comments.
34
35

36 Remediation Question from Marcia Pappas, Licensing Examiner
37

38 The Chair announced the e-mail question of 1/7/00 regarding remediation, which
39 also brings up the question of e-mails and the board should discuss this further.
40

41 The Licensing Examiner outlined a question she received asking if Miller noted that
42 sample taking for remediation is not engineering of and by itself. Now, if you are
43 designing a remediation plan based on that information that is when engineering
44 comes into play.
45

46 The Chair noted that the description in the e-mail was that the party was also
47 making recommendations about cleanup.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Miller responded that actually designing an aeration system or removal, would be
2 engineering.

3
4 Peirsol noted that there wasn't enough detail in the email to know exactly what was
5 being done.

6
7 Mearig asked if this would fall under the section of the regulations that describes
8 what a lab could do, under 12 AAC 36.190.

9
10 Chair noted that the analysis and recommendations could fall under engineering.

11
12 Mearig noted that there is a danger with the board interpreting a situation because
13 all the facts are not present. The responsibility for the interpretation rests with the
14 practitioner and the danger is that the board could be creating a loophole for the
15 party.

16
17 The Chair noted that it is important to have that discussion with the Assistant
18 Attorney General, Ken Truitt, at some point.

19
20 The Chair noted that John Clark could have responded, if not, staff should respond.

21
22 Mearig notes that something does not have to be constructed to be engineering. The
23 board decided it would discuss with Mr. Clark the interpretation of engineering.

24
25 Davis noted the board did not have the original email and the party would need to
26 discuss further.

27
28
29 Letter from Valerie Schroer of 12/3/99 and Staff Response of 12/15/99:

30
31 The Chair noted that the response seemed appropriate.

32
33 Kalen noted that if his firm bid and time lapses the client is not likely going to pick
34 up the additional costs.

35
36 Davis noted that once fees are paid that the Division of Occupational Licensing
37 shouldn't raise the fees.

38
39 Executive Administrator explained the agency collects the fees due the day the
40 license is issued or the day the fees are due prior to the examination. If the fees
41 went down, the agency would refund the difference. Also, frequently an applicant
42 has applied or reapplied and then examination fees increase. If the agency doesn't
43 pass those costs through they become part of the costs.

44
45 Davis noted that the agency collects the fees up front and won't consider an
46 application without collecting the fees and that amounts to a bit of a double
47 standard.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Short discussion.
2

3 The board decided that sufficient notice should be given on the forms that the
4 agency reserves the right to increase fees at the time of registration or examination.
5

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

9 **RESOLVED to add a notation to the application form that the**
10 **applicant may be responsible for additional fees and would be**
11 **assessed at the time of examination or registration.**
12
13

14 Faxed Letter of 1/31/00 from Kathleen Hannafious, Lon Lyford, Samuel Prater and
15 Mike Davis
16

17 Chair noted that the board has taken a zero tolerance approach to the examination
18 deadline; that the application form is due in the Juneau office at the close of
19 business on the deadline date.
20

21 Miller noted that the University of Fairbanks has a policy that the student must
22 take the fundamental of engineering examination prior to graduation, but is not
23 required to pass the exam. This is a national exam (NCEES); it could be taken later
24 and is administered in all states.
25

26 Kalen noted that it has been problematic for the board to deal with the late
27 applications.
28

29 Peirsol noted she did not agree with the deadline when the board voted on it.
30

31 Mearig noted that the FE examination can be taken in any state, and it doesn't
32 need to be in Alaska.
33

34 Short discussion about other letters. The Chair noted that the board has not
35 changed its position.
36
37

38 Letter from Tom Thurbee, VECO:
39

40 The Chair notes that Mr. Thurbee has a question about which documents need to be
41 stamped.
42

43 Siemoneit notes the industrial exemption. If you are doing work for your firm, but
44 that does not apply to consultants.
45

46 Iverson notes that is the common thread, if you are selling engineering services to
47 an industrial plant, you do not have the exemption. If you work for the company,
48 then it applies. If you are an officer or an employee, it applies. But, if you are
49 selling the services to a company, it does not apply.
50

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Davis notes that the term, “industrial” doesn’t show up and it truly is an “in-house”
2 exemption, so she doesn’t like that term, but that exemption, under AS 08.48.341(a)
3 (10), does not cover buildings and structures whose primary purpose is public
4 occupancy. There is nothing that requires certification, however the standard
5 norms of property transaction would be that most transactions require some sort of
6 inspection or assumption of risk so if the code required something the new owner
7 would be bound by it. There is no grandfather clause but the act of doing it
8 contemporaneously does not require a licensed professional.
9

10 Brief discussion.

11
12 The Chair indicated that the board noted all designs need to be stamped unless they
13 fall under the narrow exemption but if the architect or engineer were selling any
14 services it does not fall under that exemption, or any other exemption.
15

16
17 ProForma Design Letter – Monique A. Prozeralik of 2/16/00:
18

19 The Chair noted that the local AIA is focusing on this issue and will be coming forth
20 with their proposal or suggestions and the board does not have a response at this
21 time.
22

23
24 Discussion Regarding Staff Response to Inquiries
25

26 Miller discussed response to inquiries and his thought that staff should respond to
27 all inquiries.
28

29 Brief discussion.
30

31 The board decided that staff should develop a generic response or form that
32 acknowledges receipt of the correspondence and acknowledges the correspondence is
33 part of the packet for the board. The originator of the correspondence will need to
34 wait until after the board meeting for an official board response, if required.
35

36
37 National Society of Professional Surveyors (NSPS):
38

39 The Chair noted there is a conference in Little Rock, AR March 20, 2000. The board
40 is not sending a representative but Kalen would be attending on behalf of the
41 professional organization.
42

43 The Chair noted that attending at the board meeting Kalen would be representing
44 the “board positions.”
45

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 CLARB

2
3 The Chair noted that there is a CLARB meeting and no one would be attending on
4 behalf of the board.

5
6
7 NCARB Exam Site

8
9 The Chair noted that the NCARB could add Fairbanks as a site, but it would cost
10 \$36,000 per year. Short discussion.

11
12
13 NCEES Bylaw Changes

14
15 The Chair noted that there are proposed bylaw changes for NCEES.

16
17 **A motion was duly made by Mearig, and seconded by Kalen to**
18 **support the changes to the bylaws for NCEES and for McLane to**
19 **carry them to the WCEES meeting in May 2000.**

20
21 Short discussion followed and the Chair held over a vote on the motion until the
22 next day, to allow board members to review the bylaws.

23
24 The Chair noted that after attending WCEES, McLane would be required to report
25 back to the board.

26
27
28 Other Miscellaneous Correspondence

29
30 The Chair noted a response from California noting the information from their
31 rosters that are posted on the website.

32
33 The Chair noted that NCARB has a program, the intern development program
34 (IDP) and that Canada has a similar program (CAIP). Short discussion.

35
36 The Chair noted the board would ask Mr. Truitt about the Canadian intern
37 program for clarification.

38
39 The Chair asked if there is any discussion on any information items in packet.

40
41 Kalen left the meeting at 10:40 a.m. to attend another meeting.

42
43 Break at 10:45 a.m.

44
45 Reconvene at 11:00 a.m.

46
47 Kalen rejoined the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

Agenda Item 6 – Goals and Objectives

The Chair asked Davis and Gardner to lead the discussion on goals and objectives, Tab 6, and to report on the Committee on Goals and Objective’s work.

Davis asked the board to consider the Goals and Objectives as an ongoing project. The group used the California Board of Architects’ Strategic Plan and the AELS Goals and Objectives and tried to capture it in a structural way.

Davis explained that they added a core mission statement and broad goals that underpin the mission statement:

1. increase the Board’s work efficiency;
2. increase the Board’s cost effectiveness;
3. ensure that all individuals practicing within the state are either registered or fall within the appropriate exemption to registration;
4. ensure all testing materials used to establish competency in the professions are appropriate for use within Alaska;
5. board will stay current on all competency, testing and regulatory issues of other jurisdictions to ensure that Alaska attracts qualified applicants, its licensing systems are fair and applied uniformly; and
6. improve communications with applicants and licensed professionals.

The Chair asked Davis to continue by leading us through the goals and objectives and a brief discussion of each.

Davis identified and read each objective and the board discussed or clarified the goal or objective.

Goal 1: Increase Board’s work efficiency.

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.	Miller	2/2001
2) Update and maintain goals and objectives	Davis and Executive Administrator	Each meeting
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.		

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

4) Assess which duties currently performed by the board could be performed more efficiently		
5) 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. 		

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

Davis noted that additional objectives could be added as necessary.

Kalen mentioned some boards review applications between meetings.

Executive Administrator mentioned that documents are not required until 10 days prior to the meeting and logistically it may be difficult for members to review files between meetings.

Miller noted that there is a real benefit for discussion and sharing of files at the meetings and some of this could be lost if files were reviewed by only a few.

Cyra-Korsgaard stated she thought that #5 also referred to downloading and being able to type the application as many people don't have a typewriter.

Davis noted #6 repeated a statement from the prior Goals and Objectives.

Peirsol noted that each board member is doing things differently and training can help with consistency and that could be added as a bullet.

Chair noted that the strategic plan might be accomplished by an additional day of training.

Kalen noted he doesn't agree with strategic planning and would make a motion later in the meeting about this.

Goal 2: Increase Board's cost effectiveness.

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Assess which duties currently performed by the Board could be performed in a more cost-effective manner.		
2) All Board members or administrators who attend a regional or national professional		

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

function on behalf of board shall submit a written report to rest of board to share knowledge gained.		
3) Examine feasibility of Board autonomy.		
4) Obtain and analyze board budget annually and request audit of income or expenses as appropriate.		

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

Davis noted that she saw #2 as a cost efficiency because of the travel element and # 4 helped to demonstrate the board's progress as being cost effective.

Davis read Goal 3 – Ensure that all individuals practicing within state are either registered or fall within appropriate exemption to registration.

Goal 3: Ensure that all individual practicing within state are either registered or fall within appropriate exemption to registration.

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Determine what action, if any, is necessary concerning fact that University of Alaska engineering faculty are not registered		
2) Advertise AS 08.48.295 provision for civil penalty for unregistered and unauthorized practice.		
3) Clarify regulations as they apply to government employees handling construction permitting.		

13
14
15
16
17

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

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Request NCEES to revise "Blue Book" form to meet Alaska's needs		
2) Increase and refine pool of questions for Alaska Land Surveying Examination.	Kalen	
3) Develop new definition of minimum experience necessary to take professional examination for Land Surveying.	Kalen	
4) Revise Land Surveying Examination application to _____?	Kalen	

18

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Davis noted that the board struggles to keep current and have the right fit for
2 Alaska.

3
4 Mearig noted that the blue book council record doesn't have anything to do with
5 testing.

6
7 Davis noted it could be revised to "standards used to establish competency."
8 Chair noted the board could come back to that.

9
10 Davis noted that objectives 2-4 referred to land surveying.

11
12
13 **Goal 5: Board will stay current on all competency, testing, and regulatory**
14 **issues of other jurisdictions to ensure that Alaska attracts**
15 **qualified applicants, its own professionals can compete**
16 **effectively, and its licensing systems are fair and applied**
17 **uniformly.**

18

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Monitor and review latest federal regulations, state board decisions, and national organization policies relating to NAFTA.		
2) Obtain adequate funding to send 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.		

19

20

21 Davis noted that one of the reasons the board decided to license landscape
22 architect's was that the landscape architect's were not able to compete with
23 "outside" professionals because they didn't have licensure.

24

25 Chair mentioned that NCARB is looking at other countries, China, etc.

26

27 Chair noted that this goal was changed to "discipline specific" at the last meeting.

28

29 Cyra-Korsgaard also noted that it is for us to also have equal footing in other
30 jurisdictions.

31

32 Discussion about how goals and objectives were refined.

33

34

35 **Goal 6: Improve communications with applicants and licensed**
36 **professionals.**

37

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Determine feasibility of notifying applicants who fail licensing examination of their areas of weakness.		
2) Establish goals and timetables for board communications to applicants by shortening: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to process applications • Time to notify applicant after board decision • Time to respond to applicant challenge of test • Time to notify applicants of examination results Time to respond to letter to Board		
3) Structuring databases so that applicants can assess via internet and answer queries easily		
4) Ensure all applications and forms readily available on AELS Web page.		
5) Establish question and answer section to AELS Web Page, with possible postings of commonly asked questions.		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Miller responded by thanking Davis and Gardner's effort as great.

Peirsol agreed and added once a goal is completed to have the goal listed with the tracking completed date for one subsequent meeting.

Chair asks if the board wants to adopt now and fill in later. Short discussion.

Miller offers to take Goal 1 as lead responsibility and set 2/2001 as the target date.

On a motion duly made by Kalen, and seconded by Gardner, it was

RESOLVED to adopt this format as the Goals and Objectives, as a starting point.

Chair notes this matter could be brought back at the end of this meeting and add as New Business on 2/18/00. Before adjournment, the board can add names for lead responsibilities.

Peirsol asked if we could add this to the web page.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 **Agenda Item 7 – Discussion on Goals and Objectives, contains Budget and**
2 **Audit Report and CLEAR**
3

4 Chair notes that there is a report that she would like to discuss Friday,
5 February 18, 2000.
6

7 Chair asked to have Barbara Gabier, Program Coordinator, discuss ADA changes.
8
9

10 **Process for Making Examination Accommodations for ADA**
11

12 Barbara Gabier stated she wanted to discuss the ADA process and mainly wanted
13 to see if the board wants to have more input or more knowledge about the ADA
14 requests. Most, if not all, of the accommodations are still in a review process. That
15 process has been evolving. Typically, staff provides the request, and she gathers as
16 much information as possible regarding the disability and specific accommodation.
17 She then works with the Personnel Officer, who acts as the department's ADA core
18 person, or with Don Brandon, who is the state's ADA person. Next, the division
19 works with the testing agency to notify them of the necessary accommodation. The
20 process has not included the board up to this date. Everything to do with
21 accommodations is confidential. Once the person passes the examination, the
22 evidence of an accommodation is removed from the file. One thing that staff
23 needs to be sure is followed is to notify proctors that information regarding the
24 accommodation is confidential and not to be discussed outside the testing site. As
25 a practice within the division, boards have not been included in the process, other
26 than information being contained within the applicant's file.
27

28 She went on to ask the board their desire for involvement. So far, all requests have
29 been granted, but the testing companies are involved.
30

31 Short discussion about the logistics of setting up a separate testing room or proctor
32 and examination security and confidentiality.
33

34 Siemoneit mentioned there was a presentation on examination security, but by law,
35 the state is required to make a reasonable effort for accommodation.
36

37 Cyra-Korsgaard stated that having the general information about the number of
38 requests annually is helpful.
39

40 The board stated they were comfortable with the process being followed at this time
41 and did not request additional input over the ADA accommodations being made.
42

43 Barbara Gabier notes that if there is an unusual request, she will advise the board.
44

45 Break for lunch at 12:10 p.m.
46

47 Reconvene at 1:30 p.m.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 **Agenda Item 8 – Public Comment**
2

3 The Chair explained the board would be taking public comment and called on Mark
4 Severson to comment.
5

6 Mark Severson, representing himself, commented on his desire to have the state
7 add environmental engineering to the list of engineering disciplines it licenses. He
8 noted he was an environmental engineer in Utah and came to Alaska and desired
9 comity licensure. Mr. Severson noted that he took the arctic engineering course and
10 while he was told he could take the civil engineering examination he was not
11 allowed a comity license as a civil engineer. He noted that he was not able to testify
12 in Anchorage at the last meeting when the issue came up and the board did not
13 teleconference that portion of the meeting so he wanted to comment on the tabling
14 of the issue.
15

16 There were several other people who share his concerns but were not able to testify
17 today. Alaska is a resource rich state and a state in which many people are
18 interested in protecting its resources. Mr. Severson felt that to enhance perception
19 that the state takes it seriously, would be by licensing environmental engineering
20 as a discipline. Mr. Severson wanted to comment on statements made in the last
21 minutes. One person commented that the line between environmental and civil is
22 blurred and Mr. Severson disagrees. NCEES issued an examination in 1993 and it
23 may be because they did recognize the difference between the disciplines.
24 Environmental engineering doesn't cover traffic systems or geotechnical issues but
25 civil engineering doesn't cover pollution control systems, biological or industrial
26 hygiene aspects of engineering. Mr. Severson felt that there could be overlap
27 between any of the six disciplines. His main point is that engineering isn't about
28 the discipline you are in but rather is about providing good engineering within your
29 limits of expertise. A civil engineer may be able to sign off on a traffic system but
30 he may not have expertise about that system. Mr. Severson thinks there is public
31 support for adding other disciplines but perhaps teleconference could assist with the
32 responses.
33

34 Mr. Severson asked for a response to the tabling.
35

36 Chair responded that there are some requests for adding extra disciplines but there
37 hasn't been overwhelming support. Some states do not issue discipline specific
38 licenses but general professional engineer licenses and the board may consider that
39 at some time.
40

41 Miller discussed the definition of civil engineering to include traffic engineering,
42 structures, water supply and treatment, sewerage, refuse disposal and asked if
43 these are the sort of topics that environmental engineers would do.
44

45 Mr. Severson responded not traffic systems but the others, yes.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Miller noted that if a civil engineer signs off on a system they are not familiar with
2 they could be disciplined and the Division of Occupational Licensing does have an
3 investigator. Miller noted that environmental engineering could be considered a
4 subdiscipline of civil engineering, just as structures could be, or highway
5 engineering could be and this does present a dilemma for the board.
6

7 Iverson noted that the problem also could be the specific examination Mr. Severson
8 took. He noted that Mr. Severson did not take the civil examination.
9

10 Miller noted that the examination would not be an equivalent examination. An
11 option is to sit for the civil examination, even though it is not an environmental
12 engineer's field.
13

14 Short discussion on examination contents. The environmental examination is likely
15 about 70 percent similar to the civil exam.
16

17 Chair mentions that logistically that for costs and fairness it wouldn't be realistic to
18 offer teleconferencing for one person.
19

20 Peirsol mentions the board's concerns and understands some parties are left
21 without ability for licensure. She suggests if there were enough interest, there
22 wouldn't be a moratorium for a year.
23
24

25 Jon Stolle, Representing the AIA as President for 2000
26

27 Mr. Stolle noted that the organization has previously been before the board with
28 recommendations from some of its members that wish to be licensed by comity.
29 However, they don't meet all the requirements of the state. The AIA has formed a
30 new licensing committee that is meeting now to develop some recommendations.
31 The committee would take its recommendations to the full membership and work to
32 develop a consensus. Mr. Stolle indicated their hope to bring a proposal to the
33 board at its May meeting. Mr. Stolle noted that AIA is also a member of the APDC
34 and noted its support for adding a landscape architect member to the board.
35
36

37 Joe Notkin, Representing Himself and the AIA, Northern Section
38

39 Mr. Notkin appreciates the work the Committee on Plan Review has done and
40 obtained the proposed language change from Kalen yesterday. Mr. Notkin thought
41 the language looked very good but suggested the board may wish to limit it to
42 drawings and specifications. He appreciates that the plan reviewers have been
43 involved in the process and thinks that the changes may also assist by encouraging
44 building officials to enforce the stamp requirement.
45

46 Mr. Notkin received a letter from Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of
47 Occupational Licensing, suggesting "off-budget" spending for the board and he

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 supports this. He noted there are some legislators that have a philosophical
2 objection to this, but Mr. Notkin sees this as a way for the board to gain more
3 control.

4
5 Chair noted several people were present to observe.
6

7
8 Lesil McGuire, Aide, Representative Pete Kott
9

10 Lesil is a staff attorney for Representative Kott and is coming before the board on
11 behalf of a constituent, Brian Hannafious. Mr. Hannafious missed the deadline for
12 application for the Fundamentals of Engineering, in part, because the UAF handed
13 out outdated forms. The deadline in 1999 was January 25. Mr. Hannafious'
14 application was received on January 18, three days late for this year's deadline.
15

16 Ms. McGuire referred the board to its regulation under 12 AAC 36.050(e) governing
17 application deadlines, page 18. Her plea is for reasonableness and she thinks that
18 there is room for board discretion and requests the board grant approval for
19 Mr. Hannafious to take the April examination. Mr. Hannafious could take the
20 examination, graduate without a waiver, and begin his career.
21

22 The Chair notes that the board has grappled with this issue for some time and has
23 taken the position that the responsibility rests with the students and the university
24 to meet the deadline. There were numerous requests to consider late applications
25 each board examination deadline.
26

27 Mearig indicates that the requirement to take the Fundamentals of Engineering
28 examination stems from UAF, not the board.
29

30 Discussion ensued.
31

32 Miller notes that there is a schedule printed as part of the application but it is the
33 applicant's responsibility to read the application for the pertinent dates. There is a
34 lag time of several months before examination results are received. Additionally,
35 students can take the examination in any state, not just Alaska.
36

37 Iverson indicated that his firm employs students and whether or not they have
38 taken the examination is not relevant. In order to sit for the professional engineer
39 examination an applicant must have four year's work experience. Sitting for the
40 examination in October instead of April is not going to have an adverse impact for
41 employment.
42

43 The Chair notes that the forms are all on the website now.
44

45 Short discussion continues about other problems that have arisen with students not
46 meeting the deadline and use of outdated forms.
47

48 The Chair asked if there were other people to testify and there were none.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 File Review Practice/Process
2

3 The Chair asked to have a discussion about which files the board would like to see.
4

5 The Executive Administrator referred to samples of incomplete and approved
6 pending files and one was considered incomplete and one was considered approved
7 pending verification of another states' license.
8

9 Discussion about staff approval for items where there is no discretion.
10

11 Iverson noted if an application is incomplete, missing just a name or reference, the
12 file could go to the board for consideration because staff can verify the information.
13 But if the file were missing a letter of reference, the board would need to review it
14 because the board would use its judgement to determine the outcome.
15

16 Davis referred to page 16, 12 AAC 36.010, subsection (d) lists conditional approval
17 requirements. Conditional approval can only be given if transcripts or verification
18 of licensure is missing.
19

20 Short discussion of Arctic Engineering course fitting under transcript and staff
21 procedures.
22

23 Davis noted that this is an opportunity to revisit the regulations to see if any
24 changes would be beneficial when reviewing files. For example, if what is actually
25 missing is verification of specific discipline on a work experience form and the board
26 gave staff direction as to what was acceptable, the board wouldn't need to see the
27 application again.
28

29 Miller suggested the board may wish to consider a possible language change to give
30 the board additional flexibility.
31

32 Davis suggested an objective, with her as lead, to develop changes to 12 AAC
33 36.010.
34

35 Peirsol would also like to see the board develop a checklist to assist board members
36 as they review files.
37

38 Miller noted that task could fall under new board member orientation.
39

40 **On a motion duly made by Davis, and seconded by Gardner, and**
41 **carried unanimously, it was**
42

43 **RESOLVED to move that the board revise 12 AAC 36.010 and to**
44 **revise Goal 1.**
45

46 Short discussion about regulations project.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 File Review
2

3 **On a motion duly made by Miller, and seconded by Iverson, and**
4 **carried unanimously, it was**

5
6 **RESOLVED to enter executive session for the purpose of**
7 **reviewing applications for comity and examination by**
8 **authority of AS 44.62.310 (c)(3) and AS 08.48.071 (d) at 2:00 p.m.**
9

10 The Chair announced the board would come out of executive session at 4:50 p.m.
11 and recessed immediately.

12
13 Recess at 4:50 p.m.
14
15
16
17
18

19 **February 18, 2000**

20
21
22 **Call to Order and Roll Call**

23
24 Daphne Brown, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m. and asked the
25 Licensing Examiner to take the roll:

26
27 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

28
29 Daphne Brown, Chair, Architect
30 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member
31 Marcia Davis, Public Member
32 Kathleen Gardner, Secretary, Mechanical Engineer
33 Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer
34 Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor
35 Scott McLane, Land Surveyor
36 Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer
37 Robert Miller, Vice-President, Civil Engineer
38 Patricia Peirsol, Architect
39 Ernie Siemoneit, Mining Engineer
40

41 Representing the Divisional of Occupational Licensing:

42
43 Helen Sayer, Licensing Examiner
44 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 **Agenda Item 11 – Budget Report**
2

3 The Chair asked for comments.
4

5 Mearig wonders if the expenditures are high and referred the board members to the
6 Total Indirect costs.
7

8 Short discussion about possible reasons for the higher costs and reviewed the
9 number of licenses renewed to date.
10

11 The Chair indicated the matter could be brought up to Catherine Reardon, Director,
12 Occupational Licensing.
13

14
15 **Agenda Item 12 – Investigator’s Report**
16

17 Mr. John Clark, Occupational Licensing Investigator, referred the board to Tab 12
18 and asked if there were any questions.
19

20 The Chair asked for an update on clearing up old investigations. Mr. Clark
21 indicated that several cases have been closed out and some additional ones would be
22 closed out in the next 90 days. Mr. Clark also indicated that several new cases
23 would be opened, that he would be conducting some additional interviews this week
24 and hoped to initiate some new cases soon.
25

26 The Chair asked if summaries are reported on the website? Mr. Clark noted that
27 his report is a public document and posting it would be a board decision.
28

29 Davis indicated reporting could work to in several ways, one, to show the level of
30 enforcement, secondly, the professionals also see the nature of the cases and it may
31 work to reduce illegal activity.
32

33 Discussion continued about public posting of cases on website and disposition of
34 cases.
35

36 Davis further noted that the state has in its constitution a right to privacy and
37 posting preliminary cases could impede investigations and result in defamation or
38 slander cases.
39

40 Mr. Clark noted that the cases that are final actions, i.e., memorandums of
41 agreements, are all final actions that are public.
42

43 The Chair asked if parties are circumventing the publicity by avoiding the
44 agreement. Those people are penalized.
45

46 Mr. Clark detailed a specific case and the reluctance of the party to agree, forcing
47 the Occupational Licensing investigator to take certain action, an accusation, which
48 is a public action.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Peirsol asked why a case was closed for noncompliance.
2

3 Mr. Clark noted that if the attorney general's office determines it would not move
4 forward with enforcement the case is closed.
5

6 The board held a discussion about enforcement possibilities: Mr. Clark representing
7 the state instead of an attorney general; more funding for attorney general
8 enforcement and concern about lack of enforcement in some cases.
9

10 Davis noted that in some cases the public also has another recourse, to take the
11 matter up as a civil matter.
12

13 The Chair noted that the APDC has asked for more enforcement but is concerned
14 about creating frustration by embarrassing inadvertent violations by persons who
15 are not consciously violating the law.
16

17 Mearig noted that releasing that the investigator had consulted with a board
18 member prior to closing a case could provide some reassurance to APDC or the
19 public that the case was discussed prior to closure.
20

21 Mr. Clark added that in every instance when he consults with a board member it is
22 noted in his report.
23

24 Mearig indicated he received a request from Mr. Colin Maynard, APDC, that the
25 board could write an article describing the enforcement procedures for inclusion in
26 the APDC newsletter. Mearig volunteers to work with Mr. Clark and the Executive
27 Administrator to accomplish this task.
28

29 Mr. Clark noted that he closed 14 cases, ten of which were discussed with board
30 members.
31

32 Chair brought up a specific case regarding remediation and Mr. Clark indicated he
33 had deferred to the engineer's opinion.
34

35 Miller noted that Mr. Clark felt that engineering required construction and that
36 might be too narrow of a view of engineering. The board discussed testing and
37 laboratory reports and when it would constitute engineering.
38

39 Siemoneit noted that determining where to take samples, i.e., going to a gas station
40 site, the overall plan of where to sample, how many samples to take constitutes
41 engineering. Brief discussion.
42

43
44 Plan Review
45

46 The Chair indicated that the board could discuss the plan review issue and then
47 bring up the matter at 2:15 p.m. and referred the board to Tab 17.
48

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Iverson indicated that there would be broad support for a statute change and the
2 Committee on Plan Review decided to create an exception to AS 08.48.331(a) to
3 read:

4
5 (13) an employee, officer, or agent of a regulatory agency while
6 conducting a review of drawings and specifications, stamped by a professional
7 architect or engineer where required for code compliance.
8

9 Iverson noted that “where required” would be because there is an exemption from
10 requiring an architect or engineer stamp for residential. The board discussed the
11 proposed statute change.
12

13 Davis noted that there was also concern about creating a loophole by having a
14 building official review drawings that should be stamped; and simply the review of
15 those drawings created an inadvertent compliance. Another words, a party could
16 say that building official approved their plan and since they didn’t reject the plan it
17 meant that the party did not need an architect or engineer. The agency review, not
18 the underlying document that would be reviewed, would fall under this exemption.
19

20 Discussion continued about a homeowner exemption and architectural review.
21

22 Davis referred to the definition of architecture and engineering that limits the
23 exception and a discussion continued.
24

25 Davis noted the committee had a concern that the exemption might inadvertently
26 allow a regulatory agency to accept unstamped drawings. The committee felt that
27 the building officials have an obligation and responsibility to ensure that they are
28 not accepting unstamped drawings when the law requires an architect or engineer’s
29 seal. It would create an additional filter, and ensure that the law didn’t create an
30 unintentional immunity.
31

32 Iverson noted that another concern that the exemption could also do the reverse,
33 which would be to require an architect or engineer’s seal when one wasn’t required,
34 as previously discussed under the residential exemption.
35

36 Mearig indicated he felt this might be a backdoor approach to enforcement and the
37 board discussed this view.
38

39 Miller didn’t believe anyone was disadvantaged by the action.
40

41 Iverson stated code officials have a limited scope of review under this exemption:
42 building officials can review documents that constitute code compliance review but
43 cannot review other documents unless the building official is an engineer.
44

45 McLane noted that one problem was that drafting services were drawing
46 commercial buildings and the fire marshal was reviewing and approving them and
47 this exemption limits that activity.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 The Chair wanted the board to provide a record, a clear understanding and intent of
2 the board's action with this statutory change.
3
4 Mr. Clark detailed an instance where a building official, during a code review, made
5 comments on drawings done by an unlicensed engineer and indicated this law
6 would help ensure that activity didn't happen.
7
8 The Chair asked about International Code of Building Official's (ICBO)
9 certification.
10
11 Iverson indicated that ICBO certification doesn't fall under the purview of this
12 board.
13
14 Discussion followed about ICBO certification.
15
16 The Chair wondered about how this is going to affect reviews required of other
17 agencies, for example, the state Department of Environmental Conservation.
18
19 Mr. Clark indicated it shouldn't because the agencies are not doing code compliance
20 reviews.
21
22 Miller asked Mr. Clark his general sense of the enforcement activity. Mr. Clark
23 believes there has been progress within the agency.
24
25 Peirsol asked if the board could develop a letter of intent for the bill.
26
27 Mr. Clark brought up the overlap between architecture and engineering and
28 referred to the definitions that include language, "of minor importance."
29
30 Mr. Clark mentioned that he has encountered problems with parties constructing
31 buildings and only using a structural engineer, not an architect or a mechanical
32 engineer when required by law to do so. Additionally, at times he has board
33 members that he simultaneously contacts about the same investigation.
34
35 Iverson mentions that in practice if there is an office or occupied building they
36 employ an architect because exiting is required.
37
38 A discussion ensued about the specific requirements of employing respective design
39 professionals.
40
41 McLane noted that since minor importance is not addressed in regulation that it is
42 up to the design professionals to work out the overlap and not get beyond minor
43 importance.
44
45 Miller suggested that it might be possible to define minor importance.
46
47 Mearig notes that it isn't just an issue for Alaska but is an issue in other
48 jurisdictions, at times a very heated issue.
49

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Mr. Clark noted that since there is no corresponding regulation, an architect is told
2 he can't practice any engineering and conversely, an engineer is told he can't
3 practice any architecture. Further, if overlapping work is discovered the parties are
4 given warning letters that they cannot practice outside their field. Mr. Clark asked
5 the board for guidance in this matter.
6

7 The board discussed various solutions: sending a letter to parties, publicizing the
8 statute, add to the website, involve professional organizations, articulating "minor
9 importance," researching other states' practice.
10

11 The Chair noted that Mr. Clark needed clarification and suggested that if there is
12 an engineer who transgresses he should confer with an architect on the board and
13 vice versa. Brief discussion.
14

15 Break at 10:05 a.m.
16

17 Reconvened at 10:15 a.m.
18
19

20 **Agenda Item 16 – New Business**
21

22 The Chair moved to the NCEES "blue book" council record.
23

24 Mearig directed the board to his handout and the suggested regulation change.
25 Mearig noted he was tasked to review the NCEES "blue book" council record as it
26 relates to comity licensure and identified that the task included considering
27 mobility.
28

29 Mearig included two handouts, from the December 1999 NCEES report. Mr.
30 Cottingham, the NCEES president-elect's message was directed to improving
31 mobility for engineers through streamlining reciprocity. National standard
32 examinations have been offered since 1984 but reciprocity requirements vary among
33 jurisdictions. Mr. Cottingham suggests that the reciprocity standard should be that
34 any Model Law Engineer should be considered a nationally registered engineer.
35

36 Mearig suggests that it would not be likely that NCEES would change the
37 information in the council record so another approach would be for Alaska to modify
38 its minimum requirements by accepting the equivalent record. NCEES already
39 verifies the minimum requirements have been met for those council records that are
40 stamped "model law engineer." Mearig notes that should meet our requirements
41 under 12 AAC 36.105(a) and (b). The applicant has to have met the ABET
42 accredited degree, similar experience requirements and have passed the
43 Fundamentals of Engineering examination and the Professional Engineering
44 examination. The only remaining requirement would be the applicant must provide
45 proof of completing the arctic engineering requirements of 12 AAC 36.110. Mearig
46 suggests that the file would still come before the board for review but it would be a
47 starting point for the board to address the mobility issue.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Mearig noted that our regulations do not require the work verification form be
2 stamped, although our forms have the stamp. NCEES doesn't require a stamp.
3

4 Peirsol wanted clarification about the NCEES requirements. If they were similar
5 she would like the requirements highlighted so the board can view the differences.
6

7 Mearig stated he thinks the requirements are the same.
8

9 Miller noted that if a reference form was signed or stamped from a generic
10 professional engineer, Alaska does accept the verification but if the engineer has a
11 discipline specific registration we do not accept the responsible charge time. Miller
12 notes he would be in favor of streamlining the process.
13

14 **On a motion duly made by Iverson, and seconded by Miller, and**
15 **carried unanimously, it was**
16

17 **RESOLVED to move that the board embark on the regulation**
18 **project proposed by Mearig to accept the NCEES "blue book"**
19 **council record stamped "model law engineer" as equivalent to**
20 **the engineer registration by comity requirements except**
21 **applicants would still need to complete the arctic engineering**
22 **course.**
23

24 Davis asked for clarification between 12 AAC 36.105 (e) and (f).
25

26 Mearig responded that the NCEES "blue book" council record is a repository of
27 information while the "model law engineer" meets NCEES minimum qualifications
28 for engineer. However, it is the state's responsibility to check for any disciplinary
29 action. NCEES does not have a minimum responsible charge requirement, however,
30 it would meet the letter of reference requirement.
31

32 NCEES does have a requirement for 48 months work experience and it has been
33 Mearig's experience that all the "model law engineers" meet our requirement for 24
34 months responsible charge.
35

36 Davis asked if the motion would eliminate the 24-month time responsible charge
37 requirement.
38

39 Mearig stated the amendment would eliminate the 24-month responsible charge
40 requirement.
41

42 Mearig would like to have the motion satisfy the objective.
43

44 The Chair noted it would satisfy the objective.
45

46 The Chair indicated there were no objections and so the motion passed and staff
47 would begin the regulation project.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 The Chair brought up the NCEES motion on bylaws. There is a standing motion on
2 the floor from yesterday.

3
4 **On a motion duly made by Mearig, and seconded by Kalen, , and**
5 **carried unanimously, it was**

6
7 **RESOLVED to support the changes to the bylaws for NCEES**
8 **and for McLane to take them to the WCEES meeting in May**
9 **2000.**

10
11 There were no objections and the motion passed.

12
13
14 Soils and Drainage Aspects Under Scope of Practice of Land Surveying

15
16 The Chair brought up the under new business, the issue of soils and drainage.

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

20
21 **RESOLVED to investigate concept of adding the following**
22 **areas of practice to the practice of land surveying: the**
23 **drainage, soils analysis, photogrammetry and Geographical**
24 **Information Systems (GIS).**

25
26 Kalen explained that drainage and soils analysis would be encountered in
27 subdivision process, whether or not septic systems can be built on the property.
28 Photogrammetry is potentially controversial, and would be described as a type of
29 surveying where an aerial photograph using survey control points to construct
30 maps. Many states consider photogrammetry to be surveying but some consider it
31 not to have boundaries within jurisdictions but rather would be a worldwide
32 practice. Geographical information systems are based on cadastral surveying,
33 combination of visual maps tied to data bases, spatially related. Some scientists
34 and planners do GIS and oppose being registered and it is important to note that
35 this motion refers only the part of GIS which controls how your map would be made,
36 the control layer.

37
38 Cyra-Korsgaard asked what would the product be that would be stamped.

39
40 Kalen notes that the product would be in a digital format and might not be readily
41 seen.

42
43 Siemoneit notes that photogrammetry and GIS would be used in everyday business
44 and the licensed surveyor ensures the information is accurate.

45
46 Kalen added that surveying has been moving toward a 4-year degree program and
47 NCEES has a very strong component of photogrammetry and GIS, geomatics.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Davis noted that the authority when satellites are used, the airspace raises
2 jurisdictional issues.

3
4 Iverson points out that soils would encompass more than just drainage and the civil
5 engineer would be involved and drainage and percolation is a very small piece of
6 what a geotech does.

7
8 Kalen noted that in Georgia, the law allows surveyors to do “minor engineering” but
9 it is very restrictive.

10
11 Discussion continued about the definition of land surveying.
12 Chair announces that Catherine Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing has
13 joined the meeting.

14
15
16 **Agenda Item 14 – Meet with Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of**
17 **Occupational Licensing**

18
19 Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing, joined the meeting
20 and began her discussion about the budget.

21
22 The Chair noted that the board had a question about the indirect costs
23 proportionately higher than other years and that revenues seem to be down and
24 what affect that would have on fees.

25
26 Catherine Reardon notes that while the revenue appears to be down it has more to
27 do with internal posting. The fees are higher than two years ago and it would
28 require a huge number of licensees to not renew before there would be an impact.
29 Although the funds would be collected they might not show up on AKSAS for some
30 time and wouldn't be reflected in the report before you. Additionally, examination
31 fees would also be collected. Reardon could also provide some additional
32 information in another month to give the board a better idea of what has been
33 reflected in the additional revenue reported to date. In terms of the expenditures,
34 and the concern that indirect expenses are higher than other years, Reardon would
35 need to figure out what indirect costs are included in the report and could provide
36 that information later in the day.

37
38 Mearig indicated that the 98 report and 99 report helped to explain some of the
39 questions he previously had. However, the 3-year comparison shows that the 1.4
40 million is spread to all licensees. In prior years, the indirect cost was about
41 \$800,000. The percentage changes slightly 13 to 14 % and the figure is much larger
42 this year than prior years.

43
44
45 **APDC letter**

46
47 Reardon indicated two different issues, budget increments and to move the
48 division's budget into designated program receipts. The Governor included in his

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 proposal the requests in the annual report: technology, strategic planning, travel.
2 Reardon counted one trip per year for each board member. Rather than using the
3 Governor's bill as a starting point, the Legislature introduced its own bill. The
4 Legislature's budget bill uses this year's expenditure authorization as a starting
5 point and does not include any of the increments that were in the Governor's
6 budget.

7
8 Counting our expenditures as designated program receipts, off budget, means the
9 expenditures wouldn't be counted as unrestricted general fund expenditures total
10 expenditures of the state. Offnet budgeting would require a statute change and
11 Representative Rokeberg indicated he would introduce a bill to do so and about half
12 of the budget subcommittee currently supports this concept, but the Legislature
13 may not decide on this issue until the end of the legislative session. That decision
14 won't be made in hearings, but in the leadership decisions.

15
16 Reardon explained some of the political maneuvering that occurs and problems with
17 supplemental funding issues. Reardon predicted that chances might be about 70%
18 that the Legislature would approve designated program receipts (offnet budgeting)
19 and maybe about 50% chance of approving budget increments.

20
21
22 Travel Reimbursement

23
24 Reardon discussed board member travel and organizations paying for board
25 member travel to conferences. She noted from a state policy perspective, the state
26 prefers to issue the travel authorization and to collect reimbursement from the third
27 party. Reardon continued that if an organization can't do that, the next best
28 situation would be for them to give the board member the ticket and pay the hotel
29 direct rather than to reimburse a board member direct. The direct cash payment
30 from outside interests for government work is undesirable.

31
32 The Chair asked if anything precluded a board member from paying for his or her
33 own trip to a conference.

34
35 Reardon responded that was fine. If the travel reimbursement would be for an
36 individual not representing the board then it falls outside the division's purview.

37
38 Discussion continued about state's liability for travel that seemed not to apply in
39 board travel situations.

40
41
42 L.A.R.E. Examination

43
44 The Chair asked how often the state would offer the L.A.R.E. Examination, the
45 national test for landscape architects. Once the state offers examination then that
46 triggers the date landscape architects would need to be licensed.

47
48 Cyra-Korsgaard stated that the board wants to let applicants know what to expect.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Discussion ensued about sites since sites offered and the frequency of offering the
2 examination would mean less cost to the Division of Occupational Licensing and the
3 division could offer the examination annually.
4

5 Reardon noted that she would defer to the board since this would be administering
6 a new program but to keep in mind the overall costs. Reardon suggested if the
7 board decides to offer the examination in December, to consider holding it in Juneau
8 and Anchorage.
9

10 Miller asked about lobbying costs and also board members testifying before the
11 Legislature.
12

13 Reardon noted that primarily, the board must decide how it wants to handle this.
14
15

16 **Agenda Item 15 – Ken Truitt, Assistant Attorney General**
17

18 The Chair recapped the issues to discuss with Mr. Truitt to include statutory
19 change for plan reviewers; 12 AAC 36.060 can be interpreted to include Canadian
20 Intern Development program (IDP); AS 08.48.081, examination in the state,
21 statutory definition for overlap in practice of architecture and engineering, but no
22 corresponding regulation; and technical errors in regulations adopted in November
23 1999.
24

25 Mr. Truitt suggested that he review the statutory change for plan review and to
26 report back at 2:15 p.m.
27

28 The Chair asked about the requirement for a candidate to take the examination in
29 Alaska. Since it is a national examination would Alaska recognize the results.
30

31 Mr. Truitt states that the statute is very specific. Short discussion. The board
32 could add a statute change to remove “in this state” since there are now national
33 norms.
34
35

36 **NCARB Intern Development program (IDP)**
37

38 Mr. Truitt suggested that staff could consult with NCARB and if the Canadian IDP
39 were also referred to as the green cover just as the NCARB IDP is referred to in our
40 regulation, it would be acceptable. It could also be added to a regulation project to
41 identify the specific title of the Canadian IDP and Mr. Truitt would work with the
42 Executive Administrator prior to the May meeting.
43
44

45 **Overlap in Practice of Architecture and Engineering**
46

47 Mr. Truitt indicated the issue would be to enforce the statute when a party goes
48 beyond “minor importance” practice.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Davis notes that some people have interpreted this to mean that the overlapping
2 practice may be allowed but if you read it strictly, the board may promulgate
3 regulations but absent regulations no overlap can occur.
4

5 The Chair noted that the Executive Administrator would investigate how other
6 states are handling the overlapping practice before embarking on a regulation
7 change.
8

9 Mr. Truitt noted that the board could consider how it wants to spend its resources.
10 Does the board want to concern itself with matters of minor importance?
11

12 Short discussion followed.
13
14

15 Regulations Correction
16

17 Last fall, the regulations were changed for 12 AAC 36.061, 062 and 063. The
18 language now reads applicant instead of application. Short discussion. Mr. Truitt
19 would look at that language and report back later in the day.
20
21

22 Licensed Architects and Engineers Advertising in Yellow Pages
23

24 Mr. Truitt was asked if an architect or engineer is licensed in another state, could
25 they offer services in the yellow pages in Alaska as registered professionals?
26 Mr. Truitt indicated they could not advertise in Alaska.
27

28 The Chair noted that at the last meeting Mr. Truitt mentioned that if they were
29 stating facts it would likely be all right.
30

31 Mr. Truitt responded that Alaska has specific prohibited acts and advertising is one
32 of those prohibited acts.
33

34 The Chair noted that architects are considering that it is all right to advertise in the
35 yellow pages that they are licensed in another state. Discussion follows.
36

37 Miller notes that there is a specific exemption from the practice of engineering and
38 architect for professors.
39

40 The board discussed and noted that the yellow pages provide an expectation for an
41 offer of services and the general public has an expectation that the party can
42 provide services.
43

44 Miller noted that the general public would not be able to tell that the person wasn't
45 licensed in Alaska.
46

47 Peirsol noted that the "AIA" is a term the public thinks refers to registration not the
48 affiliation with a professional organization.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 The Chair asked Mr. Truitt to work with Executive Administrator to develop a
2 paragraph for insertion in the news summary and to send the article to Davis for
3 review.
4

5 Mr. Truitt added that persons cannot practice architecture and engineering in
6 Alaska without being registered and when there is a specific prohibition for
7 advertising, persons may not hold themselves out to be one of the design
8 professionals.
9

10 Peirsol noted that architects and engineers doing residential work are exempt from
11 the statute but have not found a means to advertise. Peirsol asked if there could be
12 a specific designation for architectural design.
13

14 Mr. Truitt stated that the lay public wouldn't know the difference so it would be a
15 violation of the statute.
16

17 The Chair asked for clarification for those parties advertising on business cards as
18 architectural intern.
19

20 Mr. Truitt stated that did not appear to be in violation of the statute.
21

22 Break for lunch at 12:15 p.m.
23

24 Reconvene at 1:30 p.m.
25
26

27 Scope of Practice of Land Surveyors – Continued
28

29 **The Chair brought the board back to New Business, and there is currently**
30 **a motion on the table to investigate the concept of adding drainage, soils**
31 **analysis, photogrammetry and GIS. Restating the motion:**
32

33 **RESOLVED to investigate the concept of adding the following areas**
34 **of practice to the practice of land surveying: the drainage, soils**
35 **analysis, photogrammetry and Geographical information systems**
36 **(GIS)**
37

38 Discussion about the scope of the investigation followed.
39

40 Siemoneit noted he has some concerns about soils and drainage part because of the
41 engineering implications and suggested it be removed.
42

43 Iverson responded that for now the motion is fact finding and investigative in
44 nature and could be left in although he, too, shares Siemoneit's concern.
45

46 Mearig supports the motion but adds his concern about the soils analysis.
47

48 Peirsol supports the motion but adds her concern about the drainage and soils
49 analysis.
50

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

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

3
4 **RESOLVED to investigate the concept of adding the following**
5 **areas of practice to the practice of land surveying: the**
6 **drainage, soils analysis, photogrammetry and Geographical**
7 **information systems (GIS).**

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

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

13
14 **RESOLVED to limit the above investigation for the practice of**
15 **land surveying relating to drainage and soils analysis as**
16 **related to the subdivision design rather than overall drainage.**

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

19
20
21 **Agenda Item 11 – Goals and Objectives**

22
23 The Chair brought the board back to Agenda Item 11, Goals and Objectives and
24 noted that the board approved the format of the Goals and Objectives and the Chair
25 would open up the discussion. She noted that the board adopted a starting point
26 and suggested that a motion for an amendment to each item be taken.

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

29
30 **RESOLVED to adopt the format as a starting point for the**
31 **board Goals and Objectives.**

32
33 The Chair noted there was no objection and the motion carried.

34
35 The Chair suggested that amendments be made for each item.

36
37 Peirsol suggested a change adding “operating” to objective #1.

38
39 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Peirsol , and carried**
40 **unanimously, it was**

41
42 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to change**
43 **objective #1 by adding “operating” and by removing,**
44 **‘amendments’, and adding “changes to these policies and**
45 **procedures.”**

46
47 The Chair noted there was no objection and the amendment was adopted.

48
49 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Mearig and carried**
50 **unanimously, it was**

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to delete objective #4.

The Chair noted there was no objection and the amendment was adopted.

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

RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to add an objective, "Pursue training for Board and staff."

The Chair noted there was no objection and the amendment was adopted.

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

RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to add an objective "Pursue strategic planning."

The Chair noted there was no objection and the amendment was adopted. The table for Goal # 1 as revised:

Goal #1: Increase Board's work efficiency.

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.	Miller	2/2001
2) Update and maintain goals and objectives.	Davis and Executive Administrator	Each meeting
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 Cyra-Korsgaard to check on contracting out costs	
5) Pursue training for Board and staff.	Board and Staff	
6) Pursue strategic planning.	Brown and Executive Administrator	

The Chair moved the board to Goal #2.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

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

3
4 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to delete**
5 **objective #1“Assess which duties currently performed by the**
6 **Board could be performed in a more cost-effective manner.”**

7
8 The Chair noted there were no objections and the objective was deleted.

9
10 Davis suggested that the objective to analyze the board budget would include
11 providing the historical data, too.

12
13 Mearig states that he would ask for Executive Administrator assistance.

14
15 Cyra-Korsgaard discussed the possibility of contracting out to have forms revised to
16 allow applicants to fill out the forms.

17
18 Chair asked for a lead on this item and that it would appropriately fall under Goal
19 #1 as part of automating forms and Cyra-Korsgaard volunteered.

20
21 The revised Goal #2 is listed as follows:

22
23
24 **Goal #2: Increase Board’s cost effectiveness.**

25

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 or Executive Administrator	Every board meeting
2) Examine feasibility of Board autonomy.	Gardner	
3) Obtain and analyze board budget annually and request audit of income or expenses as appropriate.	Mearig and Executive Administrator	

26
27
28 The Chair moved to Goal #3.

29
30 Miller volunteered to be the lead on objective #1.

31
32 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by McLane, it was**

33
34 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to “Consider**
35 **application of “minor importance standard” contained in our**
36 **statutes.”**

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Objection by Mearig.

2
3 The Chair asks for a show of hands and the tally was

Supports	Opposes
Davis	Iverson
Kalen	Mearig
Peirsol	Miller
McLane	Gardner
Brown	Siemoneit

5
6 The Chair notes that the motion failed, 5 – 5.

7
8 The revised list for Goal 3 is as follows:

9
10 **Goal #3: Ensure that all individual practicing within state are either**
11 **registered or fall within appropriate exemptions to registration.**
12

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Determine what action, if any, is necessary concerning fact that University of Alaska engineering faculty are not registered	Miller	
2) Advertise AS 08.48.295 provision for civil penalty for unregistered and unauthorized practice.	Siemoneit and Executive Administrator	
3) Clarify regulations as they apply to government employees handling construction permitting.	Iverson	

13
14
15 Ken Truitt, Assistant Attorney General, joined the meeting at 2:15 p.m.

16
17 The Chair moved to Goal #4.

18
19 Mearig suggested changing this goal to surveying. Brief discussion and goal was not
20 changed.

21
22 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Iverson , and carried**
23 **unanimously, it was**

24
25 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to “Propose**
26 **revision to engineer comity standards to adopt NCEES to**
27 **revise ‘Blue Book’ stamped ‘model law engineer.’ ”.**
28

29 The Chair noted there was no objection and the amendment was adopted.
30

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

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

3
4 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to add the**
5 **“investigation of drainage, drainage, soils analysis, GIS,**
6 **photogrammetry under the definition of land surveying.”**

7
8 Davis noted that this objective might better be listed under Goal #5.

9
10 The Chair indicated the board could take this up now. There was no objection so the
11 amendment would be listed as an objective under Goal #5.

12
13 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Peirsol , and carried**
14 **unanimously, it was**

15
16 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to “Provide a**
17 **letter of the Board’s letter of intent and understanding relating**
18 **to proposed legislative changes.”**

19
20 The Chair noted there was no objection and the amendment was adopted.

21
22 Davis suggested the board consider adding an amendment to AS 08.48 to delete “in
23 this state” to make consist with national examinations that are taken in other
24 jurisdictions.

25
26 Mearig suggested this didn’t need to be part of the goal.

27
28 Short discussion continued.

29
30 Davis suggested “transmit to department requested statutory changes arising out of
31 last meeting.”

32
33 The Chair suggested the board think about that objective and come back to it at the
34 next meeting.

35
36 **On a motion duly made by Davis, it was**

37
38 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to “Develop a**
39 **regulation to correct the NCARB reference in regulation.”**

40
41 The Chair noted this amendment died for lack of a second.

42
43 The revised goals for Goal #4 are as follows:

44
45
46 **Goal #4: Ensure all testing materials used to establish competency in the**
47 **professions are appropriate for use within Alaska.**

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Propose revision to engineer comity standards to adopt NCEES to revise "Blue Book" stamped "model law engineer"	Mearig	Done 2/18/00
2) Increase and refine pool of questions for Alaska Land Surveying Examination.	Kalen	done 2/18/00
3) Develop new definition of minimum experience necessary to take professional examination for Land Surveying.	Kalen	done 2/28/00
4) Revise Land Surveying Examination application to _____?	Kalen	
5) Provide letter of Board's letter of intent and understanding relating to proposed legislative changes	Board	
6) Update references to correct NCARB publications for architect regulations	Davis	

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

The Chair moved to Goal #5.

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

RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to revise Goal #5 by striking "attracts qualified applicants, its own professionals can compete effectively, and to keep in and its licensing systems are fair and applied uniformly."

Discussion followed.

The Chair noted there was no objection and the amendment was adopted.

Siemoneit mentioned that at the NCEES meeting some states were sorry they had adopted NAFTA.

The Chair brought the discussion to objective #2 and the board generally discussed travel, "discipline specific travel," and how to improve coverage at conferences.

On a motion duly made by Mearig, seconded by Miller, it was

RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to strike "discipline specific" from objective #2.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 There was objection to the motion.

2

3 The Chair asked for a show of hands and the tally was:

4

Supports	Opposes
Gardner	Brown
Iverson	Davis
Mearig	Kalen
Miller	McLane
Siemoneit	Peirsol

5

6

7 The Chair noted that the vote was 5 – 5 and the motion failed.

8

9 The revised Goal #5 as amended:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Goal #5: Board will stay current on all competency, testing, and regulatory issues of other jurisdictions to 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.		Each board meeting.
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.		
3) Investigation of drainage, drainage, soils analysis, GIS, photogrammetry under the definition of land surveying.	Kalen	

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The Chair moved the board to Goal #6.

Discussion of objective #1 followed:

Siemoneit noted that proctors are to advise applicants not to discuss the examination.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

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

3
4 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to change**
5 **“Determine” to “Investigate.”**

6
7 Davis suggested that a way to track objective #2 would be to set standards and work
8 with staff to see if they are realistic and to track effectiveness.

9
10 Davis suggested additional tasks discussed but left as action items were:

- 11 • Respond to all inquiries with a form letter that advises them.
12 • Add Goals and Objectives to the web page.
13 • Description of closed cases to AELS web page.
14 • Article for news summary on enforcement.
15
16
17
18
19

20 The Chair suggested that Davis update the goals and objectives.

21 Davis suggested adding “updating the NCARB.”

22
23 The revised Goal # 6 listed as below:

24
25
26
27 **Goal #6: Improve communications with applicants and licensed**
28 **professionals.**
29

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Investigate feasibility of notifying applicants who fail licensing examination of their areas of weakness.	Kalen	
2) Establish goals and timetables for board communications to applicants by shortening: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to process applications • Time to notify applicant after board decision • Time to respond to applicant challenge of test • Time to notify applicants of examination results • Time to respond to letter to Board 	Peirsol	

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

3) Structuring databases so that applicants can assess via internet and answer queries easily	Cyra-Korsgaard and staff	
4) Ensure all applications and forms readily available on AELS Web page.	done	1/1/00
5) Establish question and answer section to AELS Web Page, with possible postings of commonly asked questions.	Licensing examiner	
6) Update Goals and Objectives	Davis	

On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Gardner, and carried unanimously, it was

RESOLVED TO AMEND the original motion to, “Update references to correct NCARB publications for architect regulations.”

There was no objection and the objective would be added to Goal #4.

The Chair brought the main motion before the board for adoption as amended:

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

RESOLVED to adopt the revised board Goals and Objectives as a working document.

Mearig and Miller objected to the amendment for “discipline specific” travel.

The Chair asked for a show of hands and the tally was:

Supports	Opposes
Brown	Mearig
Davis	Miller
Gardner	
Iverson	
Kalen	
McLane	
Peirsol	
Siemoneit	

The Chair noted that the main motion as amended passed.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 The Chair noted that the Goals and Objectives would be a document that is an
2 evolving document.

3
4 Mr. Truitt noted that a statute change would be more powerful.

5
6 Kalen noted his sense that the building officials supported a statute change rather
7 than a regulation change.

8
9 Iverson noted that the building officials supported this language change and did not
10 give support to any other language.

11 Siemoneit suggested “for code compliance” changed to “for regulatory compliance.”

12
13 Mearig suggested tightening rather than broadening, “for building code
14 compliance.”

15
16 Discussion continued about the scope of the reviews.

17
18 Iverson noted the intent is the ability to review not to change and the officials do
19 not change the plans.

20
21
22 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, and seconded by Iverson, it was**

23
24 **RESOLVED to move to adopt the statute change proposed by**
25 **the Committee on Plan Review as a statute change required by**
26 **AS 08.48.**

27
28 Brief discussion followed.

29
30 **On a motion duly made by Siemoneit , seconded by Gardner, it was**

31
32 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the main motion to change “for code**
33 **compliance” to “for regulation compliance.”**

34
35 Siemoneit stated that if a party has applied for a permit and ADEC or DNR,
36 Division of Mining reviews, there are federal regulations that they are required to
37 enforce or exceed and their people would use a checklist to ensure compliance.
38 Siemoneit noted that if the board sent a letter to ADEC and stated that if they were
39 reviewing professional product maps the result would be similar to the plan review
40 concerns.

41
42 Davis suggested for clarification that the struggle would be over the term and goes
43 on to discuss various terms used. Davis noted that Legislatures pass statutes,
44 administrations promulgate regulations, municipalities adopt ordinances, and
45 private body creates its own body of knowledge that is so valuable that it is
46 incorporated by reference as a “code.”

47
48 Mr. Clark indicated the authority originally stemmed from the fire marshal.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Iverson noted that what the board is examining is the architectural review of
2 drawings and specifications by regulatory agencies practicing architecture, and in
3 engineering, it refers to projects and drawings and specifications.

4
5 Brief discussion.

6
7 Kalen objected.

8

Supports	Opposes
Gardner	Brown
Miller	Davis
Siemoneit	Kalen
	Iverson
	McLane
	Mearig
	Peirsol

9

10

11 And so, the motion failed.

12

13 **On a motion duly made by Mearig, seconded by Davis, it was**

14

15 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the main motion to add “for**
16 **building code, fire code, zoning ordinance compliance.”**

17

18 Discussion followed:

19

20 Mearig stated the board has sent letters to the ADEC in the past and the party got
21 licensed. The task has a pretty narrow scope and that the board may not want to
22 bring other parties into this task. Mearig is concerned about losing support of the
23 building officials

24

25 Peirsol asked for clarification, that the board should not be concerned about
26 statutes, regulations or ordinances.

27

28 Davis noted the only codes she has ever heard of were uniform laws and the code is
29 adopted by reference either through regulation, city ordinance or state law.

30

31 Mr. Truitt notes that the board could define code by regulation, for example, for the
32 purposes of AS 08.48.331 (a) (13), code means “building code.”

33

34 **Mearig withdrew his motion.**

35

36 **On a motion duly made by Davis, seconded by Iverson , and carried**
37 **unanimously, it was**

38

39 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the main motion to change “stamped”**
40 **to “sealed and signed.”**

41

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Iverson stated that this was merely clarification and given in the spirit of the
2 language.

3
4 **There was no objection and so the amendment passed.**

5
6 The Chair brought the board back to the main motion.

7
8 **The Chair asked if there were any objections to the motion and there were**
9 **none, so the main motion passed.**

10
11 The Chair noted that this will then move forward and staff can take the next step to
12 forward the letter of intent to the committee.

13
14 Mearig noted that there was an offer by Rep. Davis to carry this forward, however,
15 the personal bill deadline has passed.

16
17 Kalen noted that since the bill deadline has already passed the board would need to
18 find a vehicle under the statute to tack it on.

19
20 The Chair noted that the intent is clear and that Mr. Clark has enough intent to
21 move forward on his investigations.

22
23
24 Status Report on HB 130

25
26 Mr. Truitt noted that the bill passed the House and is currently before the Senate
27 but has not yet been scheduled for a hearing.

28
29
30 Status Report on Adopted Regulations

31
32 Mr. Truitt noted that the regulations under Part 2 that were adopted are now
33 final. Mr. Truitt went on to explain what the Regulations Attorney was trying
34 to accomplish under 12 AAC 36.062, regarding eligibility of Fundamentals of
35 Engineering examination. He noted there are two tables and in between the tables
36 there were instructions when the table would go into effect. The regulation uses
37 two different terms, the board accepting and the board approving; i.e., "the board
38 will accept; the board will not approve applicants."

39
40 Davis stated that instead we could read this, for board approval made on or after
41 1/1/2000 of an applicant. Davis explained that the date applies to when the board
42 approves the file, not to the date the applicant makes an application.

43
44 Mr. Truitt stated that in most statutes and regulations it is the action date not the
45 application date that is important.

46
47 Davis stated that the board could leave the language as it stands just
48 understanding that it is the board approval date that triggers whether the board
49 uses one table or both.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Mr. Truitt reiterated that the attorney tried to follow the board's intent when doing
2 the editing. He went on to explain that the language that came with the
3 regulations created a situation where it was conceivable that a person could get
4 their application in on 12/31/03 and the board wouldn't take action after that, at the
5 February meeting, and you'd have the situation where the board would have the
6 application but wouldn't approve for licensure.

7
8 Discussion continued.
9

10 Davis noted that since both clauses are worded identically so they couldn't be
11 interpreted differently. Davis explained that the operative date would be the date
12 of board approval unless the board would change the application, and then it would
13 be the date the applicant applies that triggers which tables the board would apply.
14

15 Mr. Truitt asked for clarification of the board's intent.
16

17 Davis responded that she thought it would be when the applicant applies because
18 the board's intent was to assist people in terms of grandfathering.
19

20 Miller noted that some applicants have a file in for some time.
21

22 Iverson stated that it makes sense the way it is currently written because the
23 person who makes the application wouldn't be taking the examination until April.
24

25 Davis responded that the examination date wouldn't be the board approval date.
26 Davis added that the board could approve a candidate for examination before the
27 examination date. The board approval date would be the date of the meeting.
28 February would be too late, October would be the true deadline and it wouldn't
29 work.
30

31 Brief discussion.
32

33 The Chair announced that the matter would be taken up at the next meeting.
34
35

36 **Agenda Item 16 – New Business**
37

38 The Chair moved the board to New Business, Under Tab 16, HB 207, relating to
39 home inspectors.
40

41 Executive Administrator noted that Catherine Reardon, Director, asked to have the
42 bill inserted in the packet because architects and engineers do home inspections
43 and she thought the board may be interested in the bill.
44

45 Iverson noted that regulations exempt residential.
46

47 Davis noted that there could be overlap between what engineers currently do and
48 what might be required under this bill and the board does have an interest.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Discussion followed.
2

3 Davis noted that under the bill, only licensed home inspectors will be able to
4 perform an evaluation of the home or four plex unless they are a civil engineer or
5 are licensed under the bill.
6

7 **On a motion duly made by Davis, and seconded by Miller, it was**
8

9 **RESOLVED that the board communicate with sponsors of the**
10 **bill areas of concern which included the statutory reference**
11 **line 21, the narrowness of the civil engineer restriction and the**
12 **lack of reference to licensed architects and #3, engineering**
13 **training.**
14

15 Discussion on the motion.
16

17 Mearig asked if electrical engineers should do home inspections.
18

19 Iverson stated that more important than electrical would be mechanical inspections.
20

21 Davis noted that the board could give the committee a suggestion that they follow
22 the format of AELS statutes of prohibited practices and essentially stating if the
23 services being performed by a person or the practice is authorized by another
24 license held by that person, they are not guilty of violating that section.
25

26 Davis recapped that what they could say under their prohibited acts would be
27 Notwithstanding anything contained in here if anyone is otherwise authorized to
28 perform services that fall within the description of practices by any engineering or
29 architecture license under AS 08.48 it is not a violation of this chapter.
30

31 Davis went on to explain that that approach wouldn't broaden it to someone who
32 otherwise wouldn't be qualified but if they are qualified by their engineering or
33 architectural training.
34

35 Further discussion.
36

37 Mearig and Siemoneit objected.
38

39 The Chair called for a show of hands noted below:
40

Supports	Opposes
Brown	Mearig
Davis	Siemoneit
Gardner	
Iverson	
Kalen	
McLane	
Miller	
Peirsol	

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 The motion passed.
2
3

4 New Business – HB 305, Landscape Architect’s Bill
5

6 The Chair noted that this was an item that the board previously voted on and it was
7 included in the annual report as an item.
8

9 Break: 3:40 p.m.
10

11 Reconvene: 4:00 p.m.
12
13

14 Board Member Activities and Representation
15

16 Chair wanted to discuss the appropriateness of members acting as individuals or
17 representing professional societies before the general public or the Legislature on
18 matters that have come before the board.
19

20 Iverson noted that he serves on other boards and that members still maintain their
21 own individual right to object regardless of the position their board took on a
22 matter.
23

24 Miller noted that all members of professional societies bring a perspective to the
25 group and enhance that group.
26

27 The Chair noted that members of this board should agree about board member
28 conduct.
29

30 Davis stated that there is a group dynamic that may change over time and that this
31 issue is really about group identity versus the individual’s right to speak their own
32 mind.
33

34 The Chair noted that a facilitator could help the board with a determination.
35

36 Peirsol stated that there is a fine line between relating as a board member versus as
37 board members. She noted that in this instance it appears as though the bill has
38 been sabotaged by actions by board members. A board member could have
39 expressed their concerns to the Chair as comments rather than to send a letter to a
40 legislative committee.
41

42 Davis noted that if the board voted favorably on a matter that the Chair would be
43 put in an advocacy position and could forward the board’s views.
44

45 Mearig stated that he testified against the bill as an individual and had asked staff
46 for guidance. Staff advised that nothing would prohibit a person from testifying as
47 an individual but to be certain to make clear to the committee those facts.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 The Chair cautioned the board about using emails as a general means of
2 communication. Those types of communication are limited and generally single
3 sided. The Chair suggested that board members are better served through dialogue
4 and that matters could be discussed at the board meeting.

5
6 Discussion continued.

7
8 The Chair recapped her sense that the board would like to exercise their right to
9 express individual views by testifying so long as they clearly state their testimony
10 as individual and not one shared by the board.

11
12 The Chair noted that when the board takes action on legislation that it could be
13 decided if the board wanted to include a favorable view and a dissenting view on the
14 bill. The Chair continued that the pro and con view of the bill could move forward
15 with the bill so the committee could have a clear understanding of the board's view.

16
17
18 HB 305 – Discussion Continued

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

22
23 **RESOLVED to board to strike all language in HB 305 regarding**
24 **board composition and to substitute “The temporary non-**
25 **voting landscape architect position is extended to June 30,**
26 **2002.” Further, to suggest that the proposed building code**
27 **revision to statute submitted by the Committee on Plan**
28 **Review, revised and adopted by the board on 2/18/00, be**
29 **inserted.**

30
31 Discussion on the motion.

32
33 Siemoneit noted that his recollection was that there would be small numbers,
34 perhaps 60 registrants, of landscape architects but the board wanted someone to
35 take custody of the LARE application approvals and to work with CLARB. He
36 continued that despite the small numbers the landscape architects would have a
37 specialized relationship with a national organization and a separate test. He
38 expressed support for regrouping and saw this motion affording the board time to
39 assess the resources necessary.

40
41 **On a motion duly made by Mearig, and seconded by Gardner, and**
42 **carried unanimously, it was**

43
44 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the main motion by reimbursing the**
45 **temporary member for travel costs to the board meetings and**
46 **to attend CLARB annual meeting.**

47
48 Discussion followed:

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Mearig noted that the current temporary member has contributed to the process but
2 he has discomfort with the monetary ties to the professional organization.

3
4 Peirsol brought up that the enabling legislation had a zero fiscal impact in terms of
5 the temporary board member and thought that had been the issue.

6
7 Executive Administrator noted there isn't funding in the existing budget for CLARB
8 travel. However, it is an increment. She noted that through attending the CLARB
9 meeting an issue was raised that Alaska may not have a vote if their member was
10 not a permanent board member.

11
12 Discussion continued about possible support for the bill.

13
14 The Chair noted there was no objection to the amendment, and so the amendment
15 passed.

16
17 Mearig reminded members that the motion is not deleting any language but is
18 using language from the enabling legislation as a starting point as language
19 changes to the HB 305 relating to landscape architects.

20
21 The Chair agreed and clarified the motion would allow the state to pay per diem
22 and travel expenses for the temporary non voting member through June 30, 2002.
23 Additionally, the statute change for the code revision, as approved by the board,
24 would be added to the bill.

25
26 Kalen notes his general support for the motion.

27
28 Siemoneit suggested a letter of intent be sent with the bill changes.

29
30 **On a motion duly made by Peirsol and seconded by Gardner, and**
31 **carried unanimously, it was**

32
33 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the main motion to extend the date to**
34 **June 30, 2003.**

35
36 Peirsol indicated this date would correspond with the date of the board's sunset.

37
38 Kalen lent his support to the amendment

39
40 The Chair noted there was no objection and the amendment passed.

41
42 The Chair stated she doesn't agree with this action. She noted that the board
43 appeared to be forced to compromise its own position on the bill because of the
44 concern that the Legislature might not pass the original bill.

45
46 Davis noted that the board's action offers the Legislature another option and may
47 keep the bill active this Legislature.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 **The Chair asked if there was objection to the main motion and hearing**
2 **none, the motion passed.**

3
4 Iverson asked if the intent letter would reflect the board's unanimity.

5
6 Siemoneit volunteered to draft a letter of intent.

7
8 The Chair recapped the items still left to cover: LARE examination, read
9 applications into the record, regulations changes, travel and miscellaneous reports.

10
11
12 Tab 17 – New Business

13
14 The Chair moved to take up the L.A.R.E. examination.

15
16 Discussion about when to offer the examination ensued.

17
18 Barbara Gabier, Program Coordinator commented that when the board states that
19 it would approve applications it means the entire board and the agency has worked
20 with the Attorney General's office for clarification. She noted that although two
21 members sign off on the file when the files are read into the record it means that
22 the entire board approves and would be taking action.

23
24 The Chair noted that she wanted to have two individuals sign off and then have a
25 teleconference to read the applications into the record.

26
27 Miller noted that frequently two board members review the files, the option to
28 discuss the facts or anomaly among other board members exists and he wouldn't
29 want to lose this option.

30
31 Barbara Gabier, Program Coordinator suggested that rather than have a face-to-
32 face meeting staff could copy the applications.

33
34 Mearig and Kalen suggested that they would like to review the files.

35
36 The Chair noted that staff would copy the files and there would be a teleconference.

37
38 Mearig suggested that the possibility of changing the future deadline for landscape
39 architect applicants so that the board could review the files without having a mail
40 ballots or teleconferences to approve files.

41
42 The Chair suggests that the board offer the examination in June and December for
43 the first two years, then to only offer it once a year.

44
45 The Executive Administrator indicated it is a paper/pencil examination offered in
46 June and spans a three-day examination.

47
48 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard suggests offering the examination in Anchorage and Juneau
49 since the proctors are available.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

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

3
4 **RESOLVED to offer the examination once a year.**

5
6 **The Chair noted there was no objection and the motion passed.**

7
8 **On a motion duly made by Gardner , and seconded by Miller, it was**

9
10 **RESOLVED to offer the examination in Anchorage and Juneau.**

11
12 **McLane objected.**

13
14 Discussion about costs and sites offered.

15
16 Peirsol asked that the board not just leave Fairbanks out of the examination site.

17
18 **On a motion duly made by Peirsol, and seconded by Siemoneit , it**
19 **was**

20
21 **RESOLVED TO AMEND the main motion to offer the**
22 **examination in Fairbanks also.**

23
24 **Iverson objected.**

25
26 The Chair called for a show of hands noted below:

27

Supports	Opposes
Brown	Iverson
Davis	McLane
Gardner	
Kalen	
McLane	
Mearig	
Miller	
Peirsol	
Siemoneit	

28
29
30 Gardner noted that since this is the test that triggers the licensure that it would be
31 best to capture as many applicants as possible.

32
33 **The Chair noted that the main motion was before the board and**
34 **there was no objection and so the main motion passed.**

35
36 The Chair noted that board member reports are in the packet, and pointed out the
37 NCARB member board report that she'd like to discuss next meeting.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Arctic Engineering Course for Landscape Architects.
2

3 The Chair noted the next item on the agenda was the Short Course for Arctic
4 Engineering.
5

6 Miller noted that landscape architects need to be able to take a course and he and
7 detailed the course syllabus and noted that it is a limited class and would be a one
8 time course.
9

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

13 **RESOLVED to adopt the landscape architect short course for**
14 **Arctic Engineering course, open to anyone.**
15

16 The Chair noted that there was no objection and the short course was approved.
17
18

19 Committee on APDC White Paper
20

21 Cyra-Korsgaard noted that she and Gardner put together a response to the APDC
22 white paper and passed out a handout for discussion.
23

24 Gardner noted Gardner, Cyra-Korsgaard, Kalen and Colin Maynard met by
25 teleconference in December and discussed the paper and incorporated into that the
26 comments from Reardon's letter to APDC.
27

28 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, and seconded by Mearig , and**
29 **carried unanimously, it was**
30

31 **RESOLVED to adopt the Committee to Review APDC White**
32 **Paper's response.**
33

34 Kalen suggested a change to replace "legislature" with "administration."
35

36 Siemoneit suggested credit be given to Catherine Reardon, Director for her proposal
37 to use program receipts.
38

39 Miller suggested in the first paragraph to end the sentence with "effectiveness," and
40 after "following our" make it plural, "thoughts."
41

42 Chair suggested deleting the sentence under Finances, "This appears to be the best
43 avenue with no support for autonomy in the administration." The board has not
44 adopted or decided that autonomy is the best avenue.
45

46 Mearig asked to be excused and left the meeting at 5:15 p.m.
47

48 Peirsol suggested changing under area 1, deleting "is and" and under staffing,
49 replace "The board" with "AELS board."
50

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1 Cyra-Korsgaard noted that under enforcement section, under item 2, what they
2 were talking about was civil action.

3
4 Barbara Gabier, Program Coordinator, noted that the board has special statutes
5 and she recommended the board discuss this with the board's investigator.

6
7 The Chair asked if there was objection and there was none so the letter was
8 approved.

9
10 The Executive Administrator would put this on letterhead.

11
12
13 24-Month Responsible Charge Concern

14
15 The Chair stated that Peirsol has a question about the 24-month responsible charge
16 requirement being met. If the board accepts the NCEES "blue book" stamped model
17 law engineer.

18
19 Miller noted that as a practical matter if the comity applicant has 48 months
20 experience they would likely have 24 month's responsible charge and he did not
21 recall reviewing any files that didn't meet that qualification.

22
23 Davis noted that in doing so the board is making an assumption that inherent in
24 the experience we require that the applicant meets that requirement. Davis added
25 that the board can determine that something is equivalent to something else.

26
27
28 **Agenda Item #19: Read Applications into the Record**

29
30 **On a motion duly made by Kalen , seconded by McLane and carried**
31 **unanimously, it was**

32
33 **RESOLVED to approve the list of applications for comity and**
34 **examination as read:**

35
36

	Last Name	First Name	City	ST	Discipline	Exam	Loc	Board Action
1)	Klein	Joseph	Anchorage	AK		FE	A	Approved
2)	Kornegay	Joseph	Anchorage	AK		FE	A	Approved
3)	Lewis	Michael	Valdez	AK		FE	A	Approved
4)	Neogi	Bhaskar	Fairbanks	AK		FE	F	Approved
5)	Reynolds	Daniel	Anchorage	AK		FE	A	Approved
6)	Schnabel	William	Fairbanks	AK		FE	F	Approved

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

	Last Name	First Name	City	ST	Discipline	Exam	Loc	Board Action
7)	Smith	Rochelle	Corvallis	OR		FE		Approved
8)	Elliott	Stephen	Cheyenne	WY	Architect by Comity			Conditionally Approved pending licensure verification, arctic engineering & references
9)	Hamilton	John	Edina	MN	Architect by Comity			Conditionally Approved pending arctic engineering
10)	Miologos	John	Oak Brook	IL	Architect by Comity			Approved
11)	Welsh	Amanda	Ketchikan	AK	Architect			Approved for exam
12)	Landua	John	Kenai	AK	Chemical	PE	A	Approved
13)	Xu	David	Anchorage	AK	Chemical	PE	A	Approved
14)	Bohachek	Randolph	Boise	ID	Civil	PE		Approved
15)	Elliott	Stephen	Cheyenne	WY	Civil by Comity	PE		Conditionally Approved pending arctic engineering
16)	Finnegan	Thomas	Seattle	WA	Civil by Comity	PE		Approved
17)	Hahenkratt	Harold	Centralia	WA	Civil by Comity	PE		Approved
18)	Jongjitirat	Pong	Edmonds	WA	Civil by Comity	PE		Approved
19)	LaPrairie	Richard	Reno	AK	Civil by Comity	PE		Conditionally Approved pending arctic engineering
20)	Lem	Joyce	Seattle	WA	Civil by Comity	PE		Approved
21)	Lorenz	Robert	Anchorage	AK	Civil by Comity	PE		Approved
22)	McCrosen	Debbie	Carson City	NV	Civil by Comity	PE		Conditionally Approved pending application form with 5 references

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

Last Name	First Name	City	ST	Discipline	Exam	Loc	Board Action
23) McFarlane	Shaun	Everett	WA	Civil by Comity	PE		Approved
24) Monthei	Emery	Fairbanks	AK	Civil by Comity	PE		Conditionally Approved pending 3 references (1 engineer)
25) Ostbo	Bruce	Federal Way	WA	Civil by Comity	PE		Approved
26) Smith	Corinne	Anchorage	AK	Civil by Comity	PE		Conditionally Approved pending Professional Engineer verification, arctic engineering
27) Trisko	Gregory	Bellevue	WA	Civil by Comity	PE		Approved
28) Whipple	Todd	Spokane	WA	Civil by Comity	PE		Approved
29) Brown	Gerry	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Approved
30) Carn	Steven	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Approved
31) Gehring	Loren	Auke Bay	AK	Civil	PE	J	Conditionally Approved pending fees and arctic engineering
32) Hendee	Mikal	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Approved
33) Leet	Charles	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Approved for examination, needs arctic for licensure
34) Logan	Mary	Fairbanks	AK	Civil	PE	F	Approved
35) McConnell	Gregory	Eagle River	AK	Civil	PE	A	Approved
36) Messing	Marie	Juneau	AK	Civil	PE	J	Approved
37) Morris	Michael	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Conditionally Approved pending arctic
38) Nakanishi	Allan	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Conditionally Approved,

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

Last Name	First Name	City	ST	Discipline	Exam	Loc	Board Action
							pending arctic engineering
39) Olness	Colin	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Approved
40) Redington	Julia	Fairbanks	AK	Civil	PE	F	Approved
41) Rhee	Scott	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Conditionally Approved pending arctic engineering
42) Rice	William	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Approved
43) Ronning	Pamela	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Approved
44) Senden	Robert	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Approved
45) Shubert	Kirk	Juneau	AK	Civil	PE	J	Approved
46) Slaton Barker	Tony	Eagle River	AK	Civil	PE	A	Approved
47) Taylor	Linda	Fairbanks	AK	Civil	PE	F	Approved
48) Thomson	Scott	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Approved
49) Tlapa	Greg	Juneau	AK	Civil	PE	J	Approved
50) Wassmann	Wendell	Nome	AK	Civil	PE	F	Approved
51) Weiss III	Frank	Eagle River	AK	Civil	PE	A	Conditionally Approved pending completion of current application (used 87 form)
52) Winkler	Charles	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Approved
53) Woods	Travis	Anchorage	AK	Civil	PE	A	Approved
54) Gabriel	Joseph	Soldotna	AK	Electrical	PE	A	Conditionally Approved pending fees
55) Garrett	John	Nashville	TN	Electrical	PE		Approved
56) Reed	Alexander	Bellevue	WA	Electrical	PE		Conditionally Approved pending fees
57) Theriault	Herman	Kent	WA	Electrical	PE		Conditionally Approved

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

Last Name	First Name	City	ST	Discipline	Exam	Loc	Board Action
							pending arctic engineering and reference number
58) Johnson	Randell	Anchorage	AK	Electrical	PE	A	Conditionally Approved pending fees
59) Lillo	Channing	Anchorage	AK	Electrical	PE	A	Approved
60) Parks	Stuart	Anchorage	AK	Electrical	PE	A	Approved
61) Rinehart	William	Anchorage	AK	Electrical	PE	A	Conditionally Approved pending arctic engineering
62) Schneider	William	Anchorage	AK	Electrical	PE	A	Approved
63) Shaw	Robert	Anchorage	AK	Electrical	PE	A	Approved
64) Wood	Scott	Eagle River	AK	Electrical	PE	A	Approved
65) Harville	J. Cliff	Nashville	TN	Mechanical	PE		Approved
66) Hiatt	Anthony	Park City	UT	Mechanical	PE		Conditionally Approved pending arctic engineering
67) Romberg	Barry	Valdez	AK	Mechanical	PE		Conditionally Approved pending arctic engineering; verification of Professional Engineer exam
68) Collins	Matthew	Anchorage	AK	Mechanical	PE	A	Conditionally Approved pending arctic engineering
69) Fraser	William	Anchorage	AK	Mechanical	PE	A	Approved
70) Lang	Rick	Fairbanks	AK	Mechanical	PE	F	Conditionally Approved pending fees
71) Miller	Chris	Fairbanks	AK	Mechanical	PE	F	Approved
72) Reed	Jeromy	Anchorage	AK	Mechanical	PE	A	Approved
73) Sanford	Bryan	Anchorage	AK	Mechanical	PE	A	Approved

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

Last Name	First Name	City	ST	Discipline	Exam	Loc	Board Action
74) Zizza	Louis	Elmendorf AFB	AK	Mechanical	PE	A	Approved
75) Elliot	Thomas	Anchorage	AK	LS	FLS	A	Approved
76) Rinckey	Bradford	Eagle River	AK	99577	FLS	A	Approved
77) Whaley	Robert	North Pole	AK	LS	FLS	F	Approved
78) Davis	Randal	Juneau	AK	LS	PLS/ AKLS	J	Approved
79) Elliott	Thomas	Anchorage	AK	LS	PLS/ AKLS	A	Approved
80) Popham	Douglas	Eagle River	AK	LS	PLS	A	Approved
81) Webb	Jon	Middletown	CA	LS	AKLS	A	Approved
82) Ostrander	Paul	Soldotna	AK	LS	PLS/ AKLS	A	Approved
83) Wells	Clayton	Anchorage	AK	LS	PLS/ AKLS	A	Approved
84) Williams	Shelley	Anchorage	AK	LS	PLS/ AKLS	A	Approved

1
2

1) ADAMS, Tovan L.	FE	Staff approved
2) BABER, Casey P.	FE	Staff approved
3) BECK, Albert M.	FE	Staff approved
4) BURKET III, Virgil E.	FE	Staff approved
5) BURT, Chris L.	FE	Staff approved
6) BUSEY, Robert C.	FE	Staff approved
7) CARLE, Jennifer M.	FE	Staff approved
8) CLAYTON, Shawn W.	FE	Staff approved
9) CONRAD, Timothe C.	FE	Staff approved
10) ERICKSON, Glory R	FE	Staff approved
11) FENNER, Roy R.	FE	Staff approved
12) GIBBONS, Scott A.	FE	Staff approved
13) HALLINAN, John R.	FE	Staff approved
14) HALVERSON, Kevin	FE	Staff approved
15) KAJDAN, John S.	FE	Staff approved
16) KAMIENSKI, Edward J.	FE	Staff approved
17) KAWASKI, Sonja N.	FE	Staff approved
18) KASGNOC, Aaron D.	FE	Staff approved
19) LAUBER, Samuel C.	FE	Staff approved
20) LINEBARGER, Kevin L.	FE	Staff approved
21) MCLANE, Cody R	FE	Staff approved
22) OPPER, Frederick D.	FE	Staff approved

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

23) PIPKIN, Forrest A.	FE	Staff approved
24) REILLY, Duane	FE	Staff approved
25) ROE, Andrew T.	FE	Staff approved
26) STALSBERG, Erik	FE	Staff approved
27) TERRY, William T.	FE	Staff approved
28) THOMPSON, Franklin S.	FE	Staff approved
29) VOJTA, Scott A.	FE	Staff approved
30) WATKINS, Carmen R.	FE	Staff approved
31) WEEKLY, Brad A.	FE	Staff approved
32) WILLIAMS, Martha S.	FE	Staff approved
33) WILLIAMS, Matthew S.	FE	Staff approved
34) WONGNAPAPISAN, Busba	FE	Staff approved
35) WORDEN, Michael	FE	Staff approved
36) ZIESERL, Michael	FLS	Staff approved
37) CRESS, Kirby	FE	Staff conditionally approved
38) CREWS, Peter	FE	Staff conditionally approved
39) DASOVICH, Andrea	FE	Staff conditionally approved
40) DINSTEL, Daniel	FE	Staff conditionally approved
41) MAXWELL, Tal	FE	Staff conditionally approved
42) SLOAN, Daniel R.	FE	Staff conditionally approved
43) SULLIVAN, Anthony	FE	Staff conditionally approved
44) SWENSON, Sally	FE	Staff conditionally approved

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

There was no objection and the motion passed.

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

RESOLVED to find incomplete the following files, with the stipulation that the information in the applicant's file will take precedence over the information in the minutes.

1) Keyuravog	Pisonth	Fairbanks	AK	Chemical Exam	PE	F	Incomplete, experience not under chemical engineer, can reapply for civil comity
--------------	---------	-----------	----	---------------	----	---	--

12
13
14
15
16
17

There was no objection and the motion passed.

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

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

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

1) Glashan	Stafford	Wasilla	AK	Civil	PE	A	Denied; needs 10 mo. work experience
2) Stark	Jeremy	Fairbanks	AK	LS	FLS	F	Denied; needs 42 months work experience
3) Rogan	Vincent	Copper Center	AK	LS	FLS	A	Denied; needs transcript

8
9

There was no objection and the motion passed.

10
11

Agenda Item 20 – Review Calendar of Events

12
13
14

The Chair noted that the Executive Administrator would attend the WCARB regional meeting as well as the Chair; however, Brown would be traveling at her own expense.

15
16
17

Kalen noted that he would be attending the WCEES regional meeting in Grand Junction May 18-20, 2000.

18
19
20

The Chair indicated that Kalen provided a letter stating the professional organization would pay for half of the expenses to attend WCEES Zone meeting and has asked if the division would pick up the other half of the expenses.

21
22
23

Kalen responded that he spoke to Reardon, the Division Director, who offered to pick up half the expenses. He continued by explaining that he wrote a letter stating the state should pay for travel and it was his understanding that the state wouldn't fund the travel due to budget constraints. When he later spoke to the director, Reardon offered to pay for half of the trip.

24
25
26

The Chair asked for clarification on whether the professional organization for the land surveyors would be funding the trip.

27
28
29

Kalen responded that the professional organization for the land surveyors would be funding the trip whether or not the state assists but they appreciate any help.

30
31
32

The Chair indicated she felt uncomfortable with member organizations funding trips because it doesn't make a clear division between the board and professional activities. She noted this would be a policy the board could discuss at their next meeting.

33
34
35

36
37
38
39
40
41

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

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

If the professional land surveyors are going to send a member, the board should discuss whether they should designate an engineer.

Miller noted that the members take the agenda to the meeting and doesn't believe that the board is compromised by a professional organization funding the trip.

Gardner asked if the board member could vote if the professional organization has funded the trip.

The Chair responded that generally the state has one vote and the board would designate that person.

The Chair wondered if the professional organization would be paying for the individual, in this case Kalen, or if they were paying for a board member.

Kalen noted that the professional organization would be reimbursing his, or part of his expenses.

Miller stated that since the society would be paying for a land surveyor designate that the professional engineering society could be approached to fund half an engineer's expenses. Miller continued stating since the engineers haven't made that commitment he suggests the two surveyors attend the WCEES Zone meeting in May.

Davis noted that the board couldn't select the professional organization's representative.

Peirsol noted that earlier the board discussed concerns about the landscape architect organization funding the board member's travel and that concern prompted the board's action to include travel funding in HB 305 for the temporary landscape architect.

Davis brought up the point that when the state has travel constraints the choice would be for the board to benefit from the professional organization subsidizing travel or to not have travel and suffer through ignorance.

Peirsol agreed that the education benefits outweigh the concern about conflict.

Siemoneit felt the board would need to decide if the funding from outside sources outweighs the board member benefits from attending the meeting.

The Chair noted it is very valuable but if the board had advance notice that Kalen would be attending through his professional organization, the board could have assigned an engineer and that decision may have better assisted the board.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

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

3
4 **RESOLVED to do what it can to support the subsidized travel**
5 **for Kalen to attend the Western Zone meeting in Grand**
6 **Junction, CO May 18 -20.**

7
8 There was no objection and the motion passed.

9
10 The Chair noted that upcoming trips include the NCARB meeting to be held on
11 June 14 -17, 2000 in Chicago and that she has been asked by the Chair to attend
12 but that Peirsol may wish to attend. She further noted the NCEES annual meeting
13 would be held in Chicago August 2-5, 2000.

14
15 Brief discussion and Gardner, Iverson, Miller indicated they would not be available
16 for the August meeting. Siemoneit indicated he may be available and Mearig was
17 not available for comment.

18
19 The Chair indicated the board would take the matter up at the May meeting.

20
21 Davis noted she has fleshed out a regulation change and would submit it to the
22 Executive Administrator.

23
24
25 **Agenda Item 21 - Task List**

26
27

Name	Task
Daphne Brown, Chair	
Linda Cyra-Korsgaard	
Marcia Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write draft regulations that gives the board more flexibility for conditional approval; continue work on G& O
Kathy Gardner	
Don Iverson	
Pat Kalen	Research land surveying definition to include photogrammetry, GIS & soils; develop letter to FEMA on embossing

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

Name	Task
Scott McLane	Attend WCEES meeting & take resolution
Lance Mearig	Work with John Clark and staff on Investigator's enforcement procedures
Bob Miller	Work on Goal 1, Objective 1
Patty Peirsol	
Ernie Siemoneit	Work with staff on intent letter on HB 305
Executive Administrator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respond to correspondence, develop regulations project • Update forms to include fee change language • Work on unlicensed advertising article for news summary with Mr. Truitt and Davis • Work with Siemoneit on letter for HB 305 changes • Research "minor importance" with other states, overlap between engineering and architecture • Work with Mearig and Clark on enforcement procedures
Licensing Examiner	
Division	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Agenda Item #22 Housekeeping

The Chair asked members to submit travel authorizations and wall certificates were signed.

**BOARD OF REGISTRATION FOR ARCHITECTS,
ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 17-18, 2000**

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

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

RESOLVED to adjourn at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator

Approved:

Daphne Brown, Chair, Architect
Board of Registration for Architects,
Engineers
and Land Surveyors

Date: _____