



1 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

2  
3 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator  
4 Ginger Morton, Licensing Examiner  
5 Olivia Long, Administrative Clerk  
6

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

8  
9 Catherine Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing

10  
11 Ken Truitt, Assistant Attorney General

12  
13 Dr. Steve E. Aufrecht, Public Administration Department, UAA

14  
15 John Hess, representing Alaska Chapter, American Institute of Architects  
16 (AIA-AK)  
17 4920 Omel-A Circle, Anchorage, AK  
18

19 Scott Sandlin, representing AIA-AK  
20 3900 Arctic Blvd. Suite 301, Anchorage, AK 99503  
21

22 Karen Blue, representing self  
23 1555 Seward St, Juneau, AK 99801  
24

25 Amy Daugherty, representing Alaska Professional Design Council (APDC)  
26 327 W 11th St. #2, Juneau, AK 99801  
27

28 Jeff Wilson, representing APDC  
29 1405 W 33<sup>rd</sup> St., Anchorage, AK 99503  
30

31 James Bibb, representing AIA-AK (President)  
32 522 W 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Juneau, AK 99801  
33

34 Joseph Notkin, representing AIA-AK (Past-President)  
35 305 Slater Drive, Fairbanks, AK 99701  
36

37 John Hargesheimer, representing ASPE-Fairbanks (President)  
38 2400 College Road, Fairbanks, AK 99709  
39

40 The Vice-Chair proposed that for future meetings, Cyra-Korsgaard should be  
41 counted when determining a quorum. Kalen agreed.  
42

43 The Vice-Chair introduced the new clerk, Olivia Long, to the group.  
44

45 **Agenda Item 1 - Review/Revise Agenda**

46  
47 Note: the Vice-Chair took up this agenda item, after Agenda Item 4, Minutes.

1  
2 McLane moved that hydrographic surveying be moved to Friday and placed under  
3 Tab 18.

4  
5 Kalen asked to add continuing education and architect by comity, and place under  
6 Tab 13, Director, Legislation.

7  
8 Peirsol indicated she would not be attending the meeting Friday afternoon, and  
9 asked that downloadable seals and the building officials' manual be moved to an  
10 earlier time, if possible.

11  
12 McLane asked to bring up surveying equivalency tables under Old Business.

13  
14 Mearig and Kalen asked to be excused at noon to attend another meeting.

15  
16 The Vice-Chair indicated he would request to conclude the morning session at  
17 11:45 a.m.

18  
19 Miller suggested that Board member travel reports be placed under "New Business"  
20 to allow for discussion to evolve from the Board member's report.

21  
22 Miller asked to add his combined report under Board member reports at Tab 18:  
23 NCEES President's Assembly/MBA Assembly.

24  
25 **Agenda Item 2 - Ethics Report**

26  
27 The Vice-Chair noted there were no reports by Board members.

28  
29 Mearig noted that the ethics forms could be brought to the meeting but did not need  
30 to part of each packet.

31  
32 The Vice-Chair asked staff to do so for the future packets.

33  
34 **Agenda Item 3 - Review/Approve Minutes**

35  
36 Kalen noted one correction to the August 2000 minutes that on Page 5, Line 28,  
37 should read: Kalen responded that NCEES consultants were working to contain  
38 costs, but it will be difficult because a quantum increase in the number of  
39 engineering examination questions are expected to be required.

40  
41 Kalen, Peirsol, and Miller noted various corrections to the minutes:

- 42  
43 • Page 20, Line 47, should read: professional was not licensed, that the engineer  
44 stamped only his own work.  
45

- 1 • Page 5, Line 28, should read: Kalen responded that NCEES consultants were  
2 working to contain costs, but it will be difficult because a quantum of  
3 engineering examination questions are expected.  
4
- 5 • Page 21, Line 35, should read: Peirsol asked when a fine is paid, if it goes into  
6 the general fund.  
7
- 8 • Page 22, Line 32, should read: Miller would be attending at no cost to the State  
9 of Alaska.

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

13  
14 **RESOLVED to approve the November 16-17, 2000 AELS Board**  
15 **meeting minutes as corrected.**

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

19  
20 **RESOLVED to approve the December 28, 2000 teleconference**  
21 **meeting minutes.**

22  
23 **The Vice-Chair noted that there were no objections and the motions**  
24 **passed.**

25  
26 The Board held a brief discussion about teleconferences and felt that if the scope  
27 were limited, the meetings were functional and it could work for some meetings.  
28

29 **Agenda Item 4 - Correspondence**

30  
31 The Vice-Chair brought up the first item, an e-mail from Mr. Braund on home  
32 inspectors.  
33

34 Kalen indicated the legislation doesn't directly affect our professions, but we have to  
35 be careful because a number of engineers do home inspections.  
36

37 Let the record reflect that Marcia Davis, Daphne Brown, and Linda Cyra-Korsgaard  
38 joined the meeting at 9:40 am.  
39

40 Short discussion followed.  
41

42 Kalen noted that the current bill, HB 27, would allow other people to do home  
43 inspections if they have gone through the process to become home inspectors.  
44

45 The Vice-Chair indicated that the legislation in its present form has an exemption  
46 for engineers and architects.  
47

1 Mearig observed that design professionals who want to provide home inspection  
2 services can do so outside their profession by complying with the terms set up for  
3 home inspectors.

4  
5 Kalen and Miller agreed, and Kalen said he would bring a copy of the bill after  
6 lunch.

7  
8 Break: 9:45 a.m.

9  
10 Reconvene: 10:00 a.m.

11  
12 The Chair resumed the meeting and thanked the Vice-Chair for conducting the  
13 meeting in her absence.

14  
15 The Chair brought up the next item, a letter from Randy Smith, disputing the  
16 requirement for him to retake the AKLS exam.

17  
18 The Chair indicated that the issue of retesting could be discussed at this time and  
19 the application could be taken up during Tab 9, Application Reviews.

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

23  
24 **RESOLVED to take up the matter by reviewing Randy Smith's**  
25 **application during executive session.**

26  
27 Kalen stated he favors not requiring a retake of the exam for all candidates.

28  
29 The Executive Administrator referred to Tab 7, proposed regulation changes for  
30 reinstatements, reference 12 AAC 36.165, would have the effect of not requiring  
31 retesting.

32  
33 Miller referred to the language, "may be reinstated" as giving the Board the  
34 flexibility to examine on a case-by-case basis. He expressed concern that an  
35 applicant could discontinue practice for 30 years and then want to practice and he  
36 would want proof of competency before reissuing their license.

37  
38 The Chair reiterated that the proposed language, "may" would allow the Board to  
39 reexamine candidates before reinstatement. She contrasted "shall" as requiring  
40 and "may" as giving flexibility to the Board.

41  
42 The Chair explained that exams are dynamic and some have changed dramatically  
43 in the last 10 years. The professional engineer exam format is changing, and there  
44 may be a reason to require someone to take a newer exam, even if they were  
45 legitimately licensed before the exams changed.

1 Peirsol stated that during previous discussions, the Board decided “examined” could  
2 be something other than taking an exam and suggested that the Board could define  
3 some other means of making an evaluation on the person, or require experience or  
4 continuing education.

5  
6 Mearig stated that staff could determine verification of an applicant’s license.

7  
8 The Chair moved to the next item, a fax from Genevieve Holubik, AIA, regarding  
9 Architect by Comity alternatives to National Council of Architectural Registration  
10 Board (NCARB) and indicated that the issue would be taken up under Tab 13,  
11 Catherine Reardon, during a discussion on legislation.

12  
13 The Chair moved to the next item, a fax from David Hummel, with an invitation to  
14 attend the National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE) meeting.

15  
16 The Chair moved to the next item, an invitation from the Association of  
17 Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta to attend their  
18 conference, April 25-27, 2001, and Mobility Forum on April 28, 2001 and asked if  
19 there was any interest by Board members in attending.

20  
21 Miller said it was his sense that it would be worthwhile to have somebody attend,  
22 particularly since there are design professionals in Canada that would like to be  
23 licensed in Alaska, and in terms of our mobility issues.

24  
25 The Chair indicated we could take it up with Catherine Reardon, Director, Division  
26 of Occupational Licensing.

27  
28 The Chair noted that Gardner and Iverson are signed up for the NCEES Western  
29 Zone annual meeting on May 3-5, 2001, in Maui, Hawaii.

30  
31 Kalen mentioned that he would be attending the National Society of Professional  
32 Surveyors (NSPS) on March 17-19, 2001, at the American Congress on Surveying  
33 and Mapping (ACSM) national meeting. Kalen serves as Chair of the ACSM,  
34 Alaska section, and he will also represent the AELS Board at that meeting.

35  
36 **Agenda Item 5 – Staff Reports**

37  
38 The Executive Administrator reviewed high points of the administrator’s report.  
39 She discussed the targeted mailings sent to all registrants, courtesy letters sent to  
40 corporations whose corporate authorization lapsed (not yet renewed from 12/31/99),  
41 letters to those advertising landscape architectural services, and letters to  
42 corporations who may not be aware of the requirement for landscape architect  
43 licensure. She indicated staff tracked the courtesy letter to five-year lapsed  
44 licensees, and indicated that 39 have renewed.

1 The Executive Administrator reported on Administrator tasks.

2

<b>ASSIGNED TASK 8/00 Board Meeting</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>
1. Compile Exam admin costs and obtain quotes from NCEES	2/01 awaiting quote from NCEES. Spoke with staff Susan Whitfield 1/01 for follow-up.
2. Investigate board training possibilities	Emailed UAA for possible training. Emailed MBA list for possible training. Response received and arranged for Steven Aufrecht to attend an AELS board meeting for observation & recommendations. Emailed CLEAR conference for training possibilities. Arranged for follow-up by Dr. Aufrecht.
3. Provide status on agency technology advancements	Catherine Reardon gave a report in November and will update in Feb.
4. Work with the Director to update Oracle to list codes on search database (use less white space)	AELS web site page has list of codes and link to Division homepage.
1. Add “downloadable seal” to Feb. Agenda	Placed on Feb. 01 Agenda
2. Contact CLARB jurisdictions to see how many require the council record (only) and how it works for them.	See CLARB, TAB 5
3. Notify APDC the board will examine the feasibility of Board autonomy.	12/18/00 Email to Vicky Sterling.
4. Ask Catherine if fines collected are accounted for separately for AELS.	Asked K. Taylor/J. Strickler. Yes, fines accounted for separately.
5. Update Alaska information on CLARB web page	(Done 11/20 gm).
6. Letter to MOA with Brown, to respond to design professionals sealing their work (see new business Nov. 00 meeting).	Done 11/30/00.
7. Do targeted mailouts to each profession.	Completed , Dec 00
8. Gardner asked that the web-based course be mentioned in the AELS News Summary.	Done.
9. Research inactive status licenses in other states.	See, TAB 5 Lapsed, Retired, Inactive,
10. Research how other states handle lapsed licenses (3 states).	See, TAB 5 Lapsed, Retired, Inactive,
11. Research with other states any problems encountered with generic professional engineer licenses	See TAB 7, Professional engineering license

12. Research other states that have continuing education requirements.	See Tab 5, CEU requirements
13. Draft letter to MOA on stamping own work, construction observation	(Done 11/30/00, with Chair)
14. What do other jurisdictions call other landscape professionals, what terms are limited ? (Cyr-Korsgaard)	See Tab 5, CLARB/Landscape Architects and titles
15. Add to the “renewal form” a provision that informs parties what happens if they fail to renew (lapsed license provisions)	Current language on the renewal form: Expired Registration If you choose not to renew your registration before it expires, you may reinstate the registration at a later date only after satisfying the requirements of AS 08.48.231 and 12 AAC 36.165. Registrations, which have lapsed more than five years are considered expired, cannot be reinstated and a new application is required.
16. Put landscape architecture stamping on the agenda.	Cyra-Korsgaard asked to move to May 01 meeting
17. Continue work on exam costs and proctor costs	TAB 5, Exam costs
18. Put applicant fitness questions in the Feb packet	Tab 5 Fitness Questions
19. Obtain from CLARB LAAB accreditation report	Requested from C. Chaffee several times. Forthcoming.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

The administrator referred the Board to proposed exam costs submitted by Susan Whitfield, National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES), for administering the NCEES exams. Fees would be collected directly from the candidates. The total fees for Book/Score fees plus administrative fees would range from \$175 for Fundamentals of Engineering to \$235 for the Principles and Practices of Land Surveying.

Short discussion followed.

Miller wondered if it would cost NCEES more to offer the exam here because they would bring staff here to administer the exams.

Mearig added that in Arizona, the NCEES hires proctors but doesn't send staff.

Kalen asked if staff salaries were considered in the AELS current costs.

The Executive Administrator stated that the NCEES is currently offering exams in Arizona and has added Louisiana for first time administration, basically as a pilot. In those jurisdictions, NCEES uses the same facilities and proctors, and sometimes have pared down the sites where exams are offered.

1 Miller is concerned that if the Board didn't have a long-term contract, the costs  
2 could increase over time and the effect of increased exam costs might discourage  
3 people from registering. He stated that currently, the AELS program subsidizes  
4 some exam costs.

5  
6 Peirsol commented that if we are subsidizing one group, we should consider  
7 subsidizing all groups.

8  
9 Mearig indicated that based on the salaries that engineer and architect staff  
10 currently are paid, candidates could absorb the fees as part of professional costs.  
11 He did not feel the need to subsidize exam fees in order to protect the public.

12  
13 The Chair suggested that we should continue to look at this issue and to figure in  
14 staff salary costs and bring it back up at the next meeting.

15  
16 The Executive Administrator noted that the web page has been revised to have a  
17 new look, one that we hope will make it easier for applicants to find information.  
18 Prior news summaries and minutes are posted for the public to access, and more  
19 history will be added. There is currently a search function and information about  
20 how to search is now listed.

21  
22 The Executive Administrator indicated that the fitness questions on applications  
23 are in the packet and are consistent among professions.

24  
25 The Chair asked Peirsol to review the fitness questions and tomorrow morning take  
26 it up under Tab 15, Old Business.

27  
28 The Executive Administrator mentioned that CLEAR offers board training as an  
29 additional possibility.

30  
31 The Chair asked that landscape architectural stamping and the definition of  
32 landscape architect needs to be addressed. There are areas of overlap between  
33 professions and the Board needs to address when a landscape architect must do the  
34 stamping. She asked this be taken up under Tab 16, New Business.

35  
36 **Agenda Item 6 - Review Goals and Objectives**

37  
38 **Goal #1 - Increase Board's work efficiency.**

39 Objective 1) - Orientation program: There are no new members.

40  
41 Miller suggested that it might be helpful for new members to have a sample of each  
42 type of application with the confidential information blacked out as a means of  
43 familiarizing them with the review process.

44  
45 Perisol suggested a new member might come a day in advance of the meeting and  
46 get briefed by a mentor.

1 Peirsol brought up Objective 7, providing a letter of intent on legislative changes.

2  
3 The Chair indicated that the purpose of the regulations is reflected in the minutes  
4 and provides a record of this Board's intent.

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

8  
9 **RESOLVED to develop procedures for letter of intent.**

10  
11 Goal #2 – Increase the Board's cost effectiveness.

12  
13 Objective #1: Gardner was charged with looking at board autonomy and is not  
14 present. Change the target date to August 01.

15  
16 Goal #3 – Ensure that all individuals practicing within the state are either  
17 registered or fall within appropriate exemptions to registration.

18  
19 There were no changes.

20  
21 Goal #4 – Ensure all testing materials used to establish competency in the  
22 professions are appropriate for use within Alaska.

23  
24 Davis suggested adding an objective for "AKLS competency," as we don't want to  
25 lose sight of that objective.

26  
27 Miller suggested adding "Review Arctic engineering course," with a May 02  
28 objective date.

29  
30 Goal #5 – Board will stay current on all competency, testing, and regulatory issues  
31 of other jurisdictions to ensure that Alaska standards stay within the national  
32 norms and its licensing systems are fair and applied uniformly.

33  
34 **On a motion duly made by Mearig, seconded by Davis, and carried**  
35 **unanimously, it was**

36  
37 **RESOLVED to strike "testing" from Goal #5.**

38  
39 Goal will now read: Board will stay current on all competency and regulatory  
40 issues of other jurisdictions to ensure that Alaska standards stay within the  
41 national norms and its licensing systems are fair and applied uniformly.

42  
43 There were no objections.

44  
45 The Chair suggested adding, Review "retired status" and "inactive status" as an  
46 objective. It is on the agenda for today, but if it isn't solved; it would be included in  
47 goals and objectives.

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

Kalen commented on Objective 2), that for the first time, the Board sent a land surveyor to the NCEES meeting and voiced his support to continue having land surveyors attend the NCEES meetings.

Kalen suggested for Objective 3), to split out drainage and soils analysis with a target date of August 01, and GIS/hydrographic and photogrammetry would be reported on under Tab 18, Board member reports.

Peirsol stated it should read “investigate drainage and soils analysis.”

The Chair asked about the CLARB council record and wondered if there were any comments, and asked Cyra-Korsgaard to report on it at the May 01 meeting.

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

Cyra-Korsgaard noted that Objective #3 has been met, in part. Applicants can query the database by profession and the code for landscape architect is ‘S.’

Chair noted that objective #4, downloadable seals, is on today’s agenda and it is likely the seal will be available on the website to download.

The revised Goals and Objectives (including revisions throughout the meeting) are as follows:

**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. Provide Sample applicant files to new members.	Miller	Ongoing
2) Update and maintain goals and objectives.	Davis, & Ex. Adm.	Ongoing
3) Update and maintain clear record of board operating policies and procedures previously adopted by the Board. Date and track progress of all proposed changes to these policies and procedures.		
4) Automate AELS application and licensing process by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distributing and receiving applications electronically</li> <li>• Structuring database so that it minimizes manual data entry</li> <li>• Structuring database so that it can answer queries easily.</li> </ul>	Staff oversee and track	Ongoing

5) Pursue training for Board and staff.	Board and Staff	
6) Pursue strategic planning.	Brown, & Ex. Adm.	
Provide letter of Board's intent and understanding relating to any proposed legislative changes; develop procedures for doing the same.	Board	Ongoing
7) Obtain legal opinion on use of ListServer as group email communication.	Executive Administrator & legal	5/2001
8) Establish subcommittee work at each meeting.	Chair	Ongoing

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

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) All Board members or administrators who attend a regional or national professional function on behalf of board shall submit a written report to rest of board to share knowledge gained.	Attending Board member and/or Staff	Every board meeting; ongoing
2) Examine feasibility of Board autonomy.	Gardner	5/2001 and 8/2001
3) Obtain and analyze board budget. annually and request audit of income or expenses as appropriate.	Mearig, & Ex. Administrator	Ongoing
4) Additional investigator time.	Chair/Director	5/2001
5) Develop regulations for “minor importance” overlap between architect and engineer professions.	Davis, Miller	5/2001

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

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

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

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Review Arctic Course.	Miller	5/2002

2) AKLS Exam updated.	Kalen	Ongoing
3) Audit National Standards for exams and certification.	Board and Ex. Administrator	Ongoing

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

**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; ongoing
2) Obtain adequate funding to send “discipline specific” board members/ licensing examiner to National, and Zone meetings to ensure Alaska stays informed on national issues and can influence policy issues affecting their professions.		Ongoing
3) Investigate drainage, soils analysis, hydrographic surveying under the definition of land surveying.	Kalen and McLane	8/2001
4) Investigate GIS and photogrammetry.	Kalen and McLane	8/2001
5) Research CLARB council record.	Ex. Administrator, Mearig; Cyra-Korsgaard	5/2001
6) Review retired/inactive status regulations.	Ex. Administrator	5/2001

7  
8  
9  
10

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

Objectives	Lead Responsibility	Target Date
1) Investigate feasibility of notifying applicants who fail licensing examination of their areas of weakness.	Kalen	02/2001
2) Establish goals and timetables for board communications to applicants by shortening: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time to process applications</li> <li>• Time to notify applicant after board decision</li> <li>• Time to respond to applicant challenge of test</li> <li>• Time to notify applicants of examination results</li> <li>• Time to respond to letter to Board</li> <li>• Time &amp; means to track action items and respond to inquiries</li> </ul>	Peirsol	05/2001

1) Structuring databases so that applicants can access application via internet and answer queries easily (for application checklist).	Cyra-Korsgaard and staff	
2) Update AELS Web Page, including postings of commonly asked questions (FAQs).	Licensing examiner	Ongoing
3) Website downloadable professional seal.	Mearig, Executive Administrator	Done-remove obj. once website
4) Update Goals and Objectives.	Davis	Ongoing
5) Provide Experience Worksheet to Applicants to assist supervisors in documenting applicant's work experience.	Mearig	5/2001

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

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

1) Issue Public Service Notice with contact information for complaints.	Executive Administrator	Ongoing/website
2) Letter to BBB/Ombudsman re: contact for complaints.	Executive Administrator	5/2001
3) Educate Public about Benefit of using Licensed Professionals (in Public Service Notices).	Mearig & Executive Administrator	Ongoing/website

Break: 11:05 a.m.

Reconvene: 11:15 a.m.

**Agenda Item 7– Old Business**

The Chair brought up the first item, professional engineering license vs. discipline specific license.

Miller commented that the email from Kenneth Andraschko had a misstatement. The UAA does not have a bachelor's degree in Environmental Quality Engineering.

Mearig stated he made a presentation to the APDC board, making it clear that the Board is discussing this, not voting on it. There were more positive than negative comments, but the organization has not yet taken a position on issuing a "professional engineering" license that is not discipline specific. He added that he also spoke to the Alaska Society of Professional Engineers (ASPE) and the American Society of Civil Engineers-Alaska Section (ASCE), and both plan on taking this up at their mid-year meetings.

Short discussion that it would need to be a statute change due to definitions for engineers.

1 Miller added that at the NCEES Presidents' Assembly, the leadership discussed  
2 splintering of exams. NCEES has dropped some exams because not enough people  
3 were taking the exam to keep the exam's statistical validity.  
4

5 Mearig noted that his preference would be to revise it so the statute would indicate  
6 "take NCEES exam" and if exams were later dropped it wouldn't require a statute  
7 change. He felt that the Board shouldn't push for any specific discipline exam. The  
8 exams to be offered could be left up to the marketplace and the demand for the sub-  
9 discipline.  
10

11 Miller indicated his interest in seeing what the public is interested in having  
12 offered.  
13

14 Chair added that if the Board decides not to go with a professional engineer license  
15 (not discipline specific) the Board may want to consider adding other disciplines; for  
16 example, environmental engineer.  
17

18 McLane asked if a change would affect the make up of the Board.  
19

20 The Chair noted that currently, there is a provision in statute for an engineer from  
21 another discipline, and that could cover the additional disciplines.  
22

23 Siemoneit indicated that this topic was discussed at the August 99 NCEES meeting  
24 in Buffalo, NY. Some people made a very strong case for segregating and licensing  
25 environmental engineers. There are a dozen institutions that are training in areas  
26 such as genetic engineering, but they don't offer a degree. The spectrum of work  
27 being done is increasing in diversity and it is almost a philosophical question  
28 whether to broaden licenses.  
29

30 Miller stated that the civil exam now allows candidates to select a discipline for the  
31 afternoon, such as environmental engineering or structural engineering. He  
32 thought this is NCEES' attempt to recognize the sub-specialties.  
33

34 Short discussion.  
35

36 The Chair indicated we would keep taking comment at the May meeting and could  
37 bring it up at August 01 meeting.  
38

39 The Chair indicated that the investigator position and continuing education would  
40 be brought up under Tab 13, Catherine Reardon, Director.  
41

42 Kalen indicated that Hydrographic Surveying would be brought up under Tab 18,  
43 Board member comments.  
44

45 The Chair brought up Regulations Projects and asked the Executive Administrator  
46 to discuss.  
47

1 The Executive Administrator discussed the Landscape Architect Registration Exam  
2 (LARE) and that there is a requirement to accept applications up to 90 days before  
3 the exam. The proposed regulation change would require LARE applications to be  
4 received 10 days before the February and August meetings for the June and  
5 December LAREs, respectively. What happens is the deadline is currently mid-  
6 March and all applications received between the February board meeting and mid  
7 March would require convening the board for application approval. To copy files  
8 and distribute them for a mail ballot or teleconference is time-consuming, and  
9 Board members must take time outside the regular meeting to review files.

10  
11 Cyra-Korsgaard supports the regulation change because of increased costs for  
12 mailing and the risk of loss of privacy for applicants.

13  
14 The Executive Administrator outlined the regulation change for reinstatement  
15 under 12 AAC 36.165(b). This regulation was reviewed at the last meeting and  
16 approved by the Board, but held over for additional regulation changes. This  
17 change would make it so applicants applying for reinstatement are not required to  
18 re-test. Subsection (d) makes it clear that engineers have to meet the requirement  
19 under 12 AAC 36.100, which refers to the NCEES exam. So long as they have met  
20 that requirement (tested), they do not need to retest. There is no reference to date  
21 so if the exam changed, retesting is not required. The proposed changes under  
22 subsection (b) broaden this reinstatement requirement to the other professions  
23 (architects, land surveyors, and landscape architects). The effect of the regulation  
24 change would be that no one would need to retest.

25  
26 Davis thought that the subsections might need to be renumbered and suggested  
27 that this be brought up under Tab 11, Ken Truitt, Assistant Attorney General.

28  
29 Peirsol asked about retired status licenses.

30  
31 The Chair asked for comments on 12 AAC 36.320, disciplinary sanctions, and 12  
32 AAC 36. 990(34) retired status definitions.

33  
34 Cyra-Korsgaard asked if architect and landscape architect should be included in the  
35 definition.

36  
37 The Executive Administrator noted that the proposed regulation change should list  
38 all AELS professions.

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

42  
43 **RESOLVED to approve the regulations project with the**  
44 **correction to 12AAC 36.990(34).**

45  
46 There was an objection by Davis. She wondered if there should be numbering  
47 changes on 12 AAC 36.165. Brief discussion.

1  
2 The Executive Administrator stated that numbering can be accomplished during  
3 the Department of Law review. The objection was removed.

4  
5 There were no further objections and the motion passed.

6  
7 Break for lunch at 11:40 am.

8  
9 Reconvened at 1:25 p.m.

10  
11 **Agenda Item 8 - Public Comment**

12  
13 The Chair welcomed members of the Alaska Professional Design Council (APDC).

14  
15 James Bibb, speaking on behalf of AIA-Alaska, expressed the AIA's support for  
16 another route for Architect by Comity instead of requiring an NCARB Council  
17 record.

18  
19 Joe Notkin, speaking on behalf of the AIA-Fairbanks, reiterated support for  
20 Architect by Comity alternatives.

21  
22 John Hargesheimer, President, representing ASPE-Fairbanks, indicted that he had  
23 met with the House Finance Committee regarding the sunset legislation. He has  
24 worked with the APDC, Amy Daugherty, their lobbyist, and others on refining  
25 AELS sunset audit recommendations.

26  
27 Kalen indicated that he testified on SB 9 in support of continuing education for  
28 Land Surveyors, but that not all professions are in agreement on the need for a  
29 mandatory continuing education program.

30  
31 Karen Blue, engineer, stated she is a City and Borough of Juneau engineer. She  
32 spoke in favor of changing the engineer licensing to a professional engineer license  
33 rather than a discipline specific license because it is difficult to get work experience  
34 under some disciplines, which makes it difficult for some to get licensed in Alaska.

35  
36 Jeff Wilson, representing Alaska Professional Design Council (APDC), President,  
37 indicated that the APDC is in favor of the sunset bill extension until 2005. The  
38 general consensus of APDC on continuing education is that the professions are  
39 moving in that direction. If legislative action on continuing education, Architect by  
40 Comity statutes, and Board composition is proposed it should be separate from the  
41 sunset bill for the AELS board extension. The APDC recommends that the  
42 Legislature consider adopting some level of mandatory continuing education.

43  
44 The Chair indicated there were no additional people signed up to comment and that  
45 the public comment period has ended.

1 Mearig noted for the record that all comment received has been favorable toward  
2 general licensure for Professional Engineers.

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

6  
7 **RESOLVED to add to the regulations project a revision to**  
8 **12 AAC 36.065, Table A, deleting “or related engineering**  
9 **sciences” from the PLS Table A for experience.**

10  
11 Miller stated that this regulation is about engineering science and there are  
12 differing interpretations of what that encompasses. He felt that engineering  
13 sciences courses are intended to be any course any engineer would have taken.

14  
15 McLane indicated that is covered at the bottom of the table.

16  
17 Mearig indicated that Table B will be phased out at the end of the year and it was  
18 not necessary to revise it due to the length of time required for a regulation change.

19  
20 The Chair noted there was no objection and this change was added to the  
21 regulations project.

22  
23 The Chair stated she has been asked to meet with the finance co-chair’s  
24 (Representative William) legislative aide, Mike Tibbles, to discuss the Board’s  
25 position on SB 9 and answer any questions as it relates to the Architect by Comity  
26 process. When the letter of support for SB 9 was sent to the Legislature, it was  
27 silent on the Architect by Comity issue. The Executive Administrator had discussed  
28 the legislative audit recommendation with the Assistant AG, Ken Truitt, and was  
29 advised that it was not necessary to clarify the statute in regards to Architect by  
30 Comity because the Board addressed the specific NCARB council record required  
31 when it revised its regulations. What is at issue is what other methods are  
32 available for Architects to enter the system, and if the statute is changed now, it  
33 could make it difficult to make other methods of entry available at some later date.

34  
35 The Chair asked if the letter should be revised in order to comment on the  
36 legislative audit recommendations.

37  
38 McLane thought the letter should be revised.

39  
40 Kalen thought the discussion about Architect by Comity should be dealt with  
41 outside the sunset bill.

42  
43 The Chair indicated the Executive Administrator would draft changes to the  
44 original letter.

45  
46 Davis suggested the letter should emphasize either a mandatory or voluntary  
47 Continuing Education (CEU) program.

1  
2 **Agenda Item 9- Application Reviews**

3  
4 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, Application Reviews.

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

8  
9 **RESOLVED to go into executive session for the purposes of**  
10 **reviewing applications.**

11  
12 **Authorities for executive session are noted as AS 44.62.310(c)(3) and**  
13 **AS 08.48.071(d).**

14  
15 The Board came out of executive session at 5:10 p.m. and promptly recessed until  
16 Friday, February 16.

17  
18  
19 **Friday, February 16, 2001**

20  
21 The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m. Members present and  
22 constituting a quorum of the Board were:

23  
24 Daphne Brown, Chair, Architect  
25 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member  
26 Dr. Robert Miller, Vice-Chair, Civil Engineer  
27 Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor  
28 Scott McLane, Land Surveyor  
29 Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer  
30 Patricia Peirsol, Architect  
31 Ernie Siemoneit, Mining Engineer

32  
33 Not present at roll call, but joining the meeting were:

34  
35 Marcia Davis, Public Member

36  
37 Excused from the meeting were:

38  
39 Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer  
40 Kathleen Gardner, Secretary, Mechanical Engineer

41  
42 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

43  
44 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator  
45 Ginger Morton, Licensing Examiner

1  
2 Joining a portion of the meeting, in person, were:

3  
4 Catherine Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing

5  
6 Ken Truitt, Assistant Attorney General

7  
8 Dr. Steve E. Aufrecht, Public Administration Department, UAA

9  
10 Scott Sandlin, representing AIA-AK  
11 3900 Arctic Blvd. Suite 301, Anchorage, AK 99503

12  
13 James Bibb, representing AIA-AK (President)  
14 522 W 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Juneau, AK 99801

15  
16 Joseph Notkin, representing AIA-AK (Past-President)  
17 305 Slater Drive, Fairbanks, AK 99701

18  
19 Jon Stolle, Representing AIA-AK, Past President  
20 808 E Street, Suite 200, Anchorage, AK 99501

21  
22 Joining a portion of the meeting by teleconference, was

23  
24 John R. Clark, Investigator

25  
26 Kalen brought up the matter of Randy Smith, who had asked the Board to  
27 reconsider his need to re-take the AKLS exam since he had already taken the exam.  
28 The Board reviewed his file again and decided that it was sufficient that he had met  
29 the AKLS exam requirement. Kalen noted that the public member agreed.

30  
31 No further discussion.

32  
33 Davis joined the meeting at 8:15 a.m.

34  
35 The Chair brought up the “fitness questions” that are on the initial application  
36 forms, and also on the renewal form.

37  
38 Peirsol reminded the Board members that at the November meeting, it was decided  
39 to review the fitness questions asked of applicants and licensees on all our forms for  
40 consistency and to see if any could be eliminated. She indicated the questions were  
41 consistent on initial applications for all professions, but were different on the  
42 renewal form, and suggested that the renewal form questions be changed to make  
43 them the same as all the other forms.

44  
45 Discussion followed.

1 Peirsol felt that the questions should be based on professional conduct and that  
2 other matters are not the business of the AELS board.

3  
4 Siemoneit mentioned that there already is an intervention on behalf of child  
5 support owed so the process judges more than just professional conduct.

6  
7 Davis suggested that question #1 in the application form, "Have you had any felony  
8 convictions relating to the profession for which you are applying?" is too narrow, but  
9 the renewal question, "Have you been convicted of any criminal offense other than a  
10 minor traffic violation?" may be too broad.

11  
12 The Chair wondered if a felony happened 20 years ago if it was relevant; that  
13 people do get rehabilitated and the issue shouldn't carry on forever.

14  
15 Short discussion followed.

16  
17 Mearig suggested changing the renewal form to reflect the questions in the  
18 application and delete question #2, "Have you had any professional society  
19 revocations?" in all of the applications. Then the questions are uniform in all forms.

20  
21 Kalen added that he was not aware of any society revocations.

22  
23 Miller agreed and added that not all professionals are members of societies.

24  
25 Peirsol asked for clarification on question #4, "Have you been found guilty of  
26 misconduct, dishonesty, fraud, incompetence, and/or gross negligence in the practice  
27 of Architecture, Engineering, or Land Surveying?"

28  
29 The Chair indicated it might be when design professionals enter into a contractual  
30 agreement.

31  
32 Davis stated she liked the wording in question #3 on the renewal form, "Has your  
33 professional license been denied, revoked, suspended, surrendered, stipulated, on  
34 probation, or been subject to any other restriction or disciplinary action in any  
35 jurisdiction?"

36  
37 **On a motion duly made by Mearig and seconded by Kalen, it was**

38  
39 **RESOLVED to use question #1 from the application form,**  
40 **question #5 from the renewal form, and question # 5 from the**  
41 **application form as the "fitness questions" to be used on all**  
42 **applications.**

43  
44 On an amendment made by Davis and seconded by Miller, to replace in the main  
45 motion "felony" with "criminal."

1 Miller indicated that what would be reported are criminal convictions related to the  
2 profession and he is inclined to think that many things could be plea-bargained and  
3 would be misdemeanors.

4  
5 **Mearig objected to the amendment because of the nature of some criminal**  
6 **actions that are not relevant to the AELS board.**

7  
8 The Chair asked for a show of hands.

9 **Show of hands on the amendment:**

10

<b>Brown</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Davis</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Kalen</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>McLane</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Mearig</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Miller</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Peirsol</b>		<b>No</b>
<b>Siemoneit</b>	<b>Yes</b>	

11  
12 **And so, the amendment passed.**

13  
14 The Chair asked if there was any discussion on the main motion and restated the  
15 motion.

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

18  
19 **RESOLVED to use question #1 from the application form,**  
20 **question #5 from the renewal form, and question #5 from the**  
21 **application form as the “fitness questions” to be used on all**  
22 **applications.**

23  
24 **There were no objections and the main motion passed.**

25  
26 **Agenda Item 11 – Attorney Comments**

27  
28 Joining a portion of the meeting at 8:40 a.m. was Ken Truitt, Assistant Attorney  
29 General, Alaska Department of Law.

30  
31 The Chair asked Truitt about the technical edits and indicated that the education  
32 standards language was edited from his suggested language. He suggested the  
33 Board might consider referencing the NCARB Education Standard and not specify a  
34 year.

35  
36 Truitt added that the actual standard hasn't changed and any changes to the  
37 standard are well published and advertised among the member boards. Truitt  
38 continued that the project was initially drafted in 98, at a time when the Board was  
39 attempting to be as specific as possible because of issues that had arisen in the past.

1  
2 The Chair added that besides the degree, an evaluation of foreign degree, there is a  
3 provision for the Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) as a means for certification  
4 through experience. That BEA has been expanded to say that the experience does  
5 not need to be acquired in the jurisdiction for which the architect is applying for  
6 registration. In other words, if an architect is applying for BEA certification, the  
7 experience could be from Colorado work experience. However, it can be a costly and  
8 complicated process to work through.

9  
10 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Peirsol, and**  
11 **unanimously adopted, it was**

12  
13 **RESOLVED to add to the regulations project, under 12 AAC**  
14 **36.061, proposing to cross reference the year and the**  
15 **paragraphs, Roman numeral II-2,3, etc.**

16  
17 The Chair asked if there was any discussion and there was none. She noted that  
18 this language is approved to be added to our regulations project.

19  
20 The Chair brought up the next item, the regulations projects that were recently  
21 edited by the Department of Law, Regulations project I and II covering the NCEES  
22 Council Record stamped 'model law engineer,' retired status reactivated fees, and  
23 referred members to Tab 11.

24  
25 Truitt commented that the regulation attorneys are not permitted to make  
26 substantive changes.

27  
28 The Chair brought up the last item for discussion, the 2000 legislative audit  
29 recommendation for a statute change for architect by comity. She indicated that  
30 some parties made comments during the public comment period and they also  
31 wanted to participate further when this comes up under Tab 13, Director's  
32 comments.

33  
34 Truitt indicated it is a question of policy to initiate a statute change. The  
35 Legislature could decide to do many other changes if a bill were before them. He  
36 explained that AS 08.48.942, the comity statute, makes a reference to two ways of  
37 licensure by comity: accept another state's registration or by way of submitting the  
38 NCARB certificate known as the Blue Book. This statute was adopted in 1972. You  
39 can't require an NCARB certificate if you accept an applicant by reciprocity.

40  
41 Discussion followed.

42  
43 Truitt suggested that if the Board wanted to amend the regulations, one method  
44 would be to change 12 AAC 36.061 completely. The Board could also adopt  
45 language similar to the engineering regulations in 12 AAC 36.062 that set up the  
46 minimum education and experience qualifications for licensure.

1 The Chair suggested that an alternative path for Architects by Comity is the  
2 Broadly Experienced Architect (BEA) process. NCARB does provide a means of  
3 entrance without the degree and there is work being done at the national level on  
4 this issue. One thing that has happened is that the program now accepts  
5 experience gained in other jurisdictions as applicable experience.

6  
7 Mearig asked if the only way to get the BEA standing would be to be registered in  
8 another jurisdiction.

9  
10 The Chair indicated yes, and went on to explain that NCARB also recognizes  
11 Canadian architects because they take the same exam.

12  
13 The Chair brought up the question of renumbering of the proposed regulation  
14 change and referenced 12AAC 36.165 (b) – (d).

15  
16 Truitt said it could be renumbered but he suggested leaving (d) as it is, and possibly  
17 flipping (b) and (c) if the Board wanted to do so.

18  
19 McLane brought up hydrographic surveying and referred to AS 08.48.341(11), the  
20 definition of the practice of land surveying. McLane thought that they would be  
21 required to be registered land surveyors if they used certain tools for the location of  
22 land or submerged lands within the jurisdiction of Alaska (AS 08.48.351). Presently,  
23 photogrammetry is being used for determining boundaries for as-builts, and if used  
24 to determine boundaries, should be under the jurisdiction of land. There is no issue  
25 with the person taking photographs, but with the analysis that follows: if someone  
26 not registered as a professional land surveyor is doing it. McLane suggested a  
27 regulation change to update our changing technology.

28  
29 Kalen indicated some states have changed their statutes to reflect photogrammetry.

30  
31 Truitt indicated that the macro view of land surveying is using the science for  
32 measuring and locating boundaries. He felt that everything else supports location  
33 and monumentation of property boundaries. He agreed that people could take  
34 photos without being registered if they are not using them to determine boundaries.

35  
36 Truitt suggested if the Board wants to consider a regulations project to do a memo  
37 to him that would create a history and firm record supporting the project. He  
38 suggested trying a regulations project first to see if the Board could accomplish the  
39 change rather than initiating a statute change that might have broader  
40 implications, since the Legislature would determine the scope of the changes.

41  
42 The Chair asked Kalen and McLane to proceed with proposed language changes for  
43 a land surveying regulations project for the next meeting.

44  
45 Kalen asked to have a target date of August 2001 Board meeting for this project.

46  
47 The Chair asked Truitt to sit in on the discussion about Architect by Comity.

1  
2 Break: 10:08 a.m.

3  
4 Reconvene: 10:20 a.m.

5  
6 **Agenda Item 13 - Director's Comments**

7  
8 The Chair noted there were several public members who had comments about the  
9 sunset audit recommendations as it relates to Architect by Comity and Continuing  
10 Education.

11  
12 Jeff Wilson, APDC, stated that there has been a long-standing debate within the  
13 organization. They have been unable to resolve differences and present a united  
14 front.

15  
16 Joe Notkin, representing AIA-AK, indicated that AIA-AK is interested in creating a  
17 working relationship with the Board. The NCARB broadly experienced architect  
18 route is not acceptable as an alternative and he would like to bring back some  
19 language, in time for inclusion in the Board packets, for consideration at the May  
20 2001 meeting.

21  
22 James Bibb, representing AIA-AK, past president, indicated that they would like a  
23 consensus from members and they are expecting feedback from their section  
24 meetings. He felt that there are architects that are being turned away that, by  
25 their assessment, are good architects. They would like to see some way for these  
26 architects to have access to licensing in Alaska.

27  
28 Catherine Reardon, Director, Division of Occupational Licensing, joined the  
29 meeting at 10:20 a.m.

30  
31 The Chair brought up SB 9, the sunset audit legislation before the Legislature and  
32 indicated that she had submitted a letter of support on behalf of the Board  
33 supporting extending the temporary landscape architect member. The letter also  
34 supported amending the statutes so the Board may, by regulation, require  
35 continuing education (CEU) for license renewal. The Board was silent on the  
36 legislative audit recommendations for permanent board composition changes and  
37 architect by comity statute (AS 08.48.191).

38  
39 Reardon discussed hearings she had attended on SB 9, and indicated that several  
40 legislators were interested in mandatory continuing education, primarily House  
41 Labor & Commerce Committee members. She said the bill passed the Senate  
42 without changes requiring mandatory education or Architect by Comity statutory  
43 changes and anticipates the bill will pass the Legislature.

44  
45 Short discussion.

1 The Chair asked if there was any possibility of sending a board member to attend  
2 the Canadian Association of Professional Engineer and Geologists meeting next  
3 month. The Board receives a fair number of licensure requests from Canada and it  
4 would be helpful to have this interaction. The request would be outside the  
5 authorized trips.

6  
7 Reardon responded that for this year, it would be possible, but next year, there  
8 would be constraints. Right now, she has not been able to use the expenditure  
9 authority for AELS so there are additional funds available that would not be  
10 available next year.

11  
12 The Chair brought up the investigator position and stated the Board is interested in  
13 a full-time investigator and is quite happy with our investigator, but would like him  
14 fulltime.

15  
16 Reardon explained that there is an investigator position and she would need  
17 expenditure authority. Right now, the Board has about \$106,000 expenditure  
18 authority for computer projects, equipment, and strategic planning. It costs  
19 approximately \$65,000 for an investigator position. There are several options  
20 available to the Board. One option would be to fill the empty position by moving  
21 the current investigator's other duties and have him work full-time. Another option  
22 would be to hire another half-time investigator, keeping in mind that half-time  
23 positions are hard to keep filled. The Board could also request another investigator  
24 position in the annual report, keeping in mind that there would be no result until a  
25 year from July 1. The Board currently has requested an additional licensing  
26 examiner and the earliest that would happen, pending legislative approval, is  
27 July 1, 2001.

28  
29 The Chair indicated that construction is increasing and that investigative activity is  
30 pretty low, particularly in rural areas. She asked if there was interest by the Board  
31 in pursuing an increase. Davis responded that she was interested in pursuing this.

32  
33 Truitt cautioned that when considering adding new investigators, the Board also  
34 needed to consider the backlog at the Department of Law because they go hand-in-  
35 hand, since investigators generate cases for the attorneys.

36  
37 Reardon added that there have been problems filling current vacancies at the  
38 Department of Law and that she couldn't support asking for additional attorney  
39 positions at this time.

40  
41 The Chair indicated that the Board is interested in bringing people into compliance  
42 rather than suing.

43  
44 Reardon asked that the Board consider where the funds would come from since the  
45 Board couldn't commit funds without reconsidering their priorities (strategic  
46 planning, computer enhancements).

1 The Chair asked for an update on the licensing examiner reclassification and  
2 Reardon responded that she thought that there was forward movement, but that it  
3 would be July before she would know something further.

4  
5 The Chair noted that last fall, the Board had asked what equipment was needed  
6 and staff had indicated it would be helpful to have a copier in their near vicinity.  
7 She asked if there was any update on the copier.

8  
9 Reardon indicated she would get more information to the Board later today on  
10 copier costs.

11  
12 The Chair asked for an update on computer technology and expressed interest in  
13 additional programming time for on-line renewals and other enhancements.

14  
15 Reardon responded that it is still her intention to have on-line renewal for the  
16 upcoming licensing cycle and she believes she can do so.

17  
18 The Chair asked for an update on the budget and asked Mearig to lead the  
19 discussion.

20  
21 Mearig said there was a big hit in indirect costs from what was last reported in  
22 November. He assumed that those costs are reported in chunks and not monthly  
23 billings. Mearig indicated that there has been an increase in applications and  
24 consequently there would be more revenue for AELS. He expressed concerns about  
25 fee reductions and asked for an update on the director's thoughts on AELS fees.

26  
27 Reardon responded that when the fee projections are prepared, she has the  
28 flexibility to adjust anticipated expenses over the next two years. An increase in  
29 projected expenditures would affect whether fees go down. The Board enters this  
30 cycle with a \$60,000 deficit, and it looks like it will have over collected. We haven't  
31 spent expenditure authority yet. There are \$862,000 expenditures to date and  
32 revenue is \$1,186,000. The revenue figures may come in on target and  
33 expenditures could be lower than anticipated. It appears that the deficit would be  
34 made up, but that other expenditures are still anticipated.

35  
36 Mearig requested that there be changes in the reporting on the Budget Summary  
37 report. He felt that the Board doesn't really need to see the details of the AKSAS  
38 reports, but it would be helpful to have the prior budget summary information on  
39 the report so the Board could see how they are progressing for the current year in  
40 terms of revenue and expenditures.

41  
42 Reardon responded that she could make that request.

43  
44 Kalen asked if there was funding to plan the next AKLS workshop.

45  
46 Reardon indicated she was awaiting a budget from Kalen on potential costs for the  
47 AKLS budget for travel expenses.

1  
2 Kalen indicated he estimated the costs would be about \$8,000, including  
3 participation from Southeast Alaska and he could provide a budget.

4  
5 Mearig indicated he supported funding the AKLS workshop.

6  
7 The Chair reiterated that the Board supports holding the AKLS workshop in June  
8 2001.

9  
10 **Agenda Item 12 - Budget Summary Report**

11  
12 The Chair noted that this item had previously been discussed.

13  
14 **Agenda Item 14 - Investigator's Report, Discussion Items**

15  
16 The Occupational Licensing Investigator, John R. Clark, joined the meeting at  
17 11:20 a.m. by teleconference.

18  
19 Clark gave a summary of the investigator's report that is included in the Board's  
20 packet. He felt that there was progress and that the number of cases was at a  
21 manageable level, although there were still several old cases pending.

22  
23 The Chair asked if there were any questions for Clark and indicated that the Board  
24 would be considering redirecting funds for additional investigator time, particularly  
25 to allow for rural, on-site construction inspections. She noted that Reardon would  
26 be discussing possibilities with the Chief Investigator.

27  
28 Reardon asked if the investigator was working fulltime on AELS if there would be  
29 additional rural onsite inspections.

30  
31 Clark responded that it would be difficult to predict accurately. He estimated that  
32 a week's worth of travel generated about 8 -10 cases. Streamlined procedures and  
33 his experience in working cases have resulted in faster resolution of cases.

34  
35 The Chair noted the investigator's assistance in revising the building officials'  
36 manual that would also help the public comply with the current laws.

37  
38 Cyra-Korsgaard asked the investigator about the provisions that allow  
39 opportunities for people to design systems without being licensed.

40  
41 Clark responded that she was referring to the specialty contractor's license and it  
42 would take legislation to change that exemption.

43  
44 Cyra-Korsgaard asked if that could be put on the May 01 agenda and asked if Clark  
45 would be attending the meeting.

46  
47 Clark stated he thought he would be able to attend the May AELS Board meeting.

1  
2 The Chair brought up the Building Officials' Handbook and asked if there were any  
3 questions. She mentioned that landscape architecture stamping would be discussed  
4 at the May 01 meeting under new business. She noted that in terms of the building  
5 officials' point of view, decisions need to be made about what drawings require a  
6 landscape architect stamp. Once the Board has developed the guidelines, that  
7 information would go into the manual as well.

8  
9 Clark expressed interest in participating during that discussion.

10  
11 The Chair thanked Clark and expressed appreciation for the work done on the  
12 Building Officials' Handbook.

13  
14 **Agenda Item 16 – New Business**

15  
16 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, Downloadable Seals.

17  
18 Mearig felt that the design in the regulations book was almost impossible to  
19 replicate unless scanned in. He suggested that the Board simplify its seal.

20  
21 McLane asked if the requirement could read that it is a digital representation of the  
22 seal.

23  
24 Miller wanted to be sure that changes made would not require everyone who  
25 already has stamps to get new ones.

26  
27 Short discussion about the ease of downloading stamp versus access by ordering a  
28 rubber stamp.

29  
30 Cyra-Korsgaard indicated both are readily available and also that the number  
31 would be on the stamp which discourages people from fraudulent use.

32  
33 Brief discussion followed.

34  
35 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Peirsol, and**  
36 **unanimously adopted, it was**

37  
38 **RESOLVED to add to the regulations project, under 12 AAC**  
39 **36.180, to require a design as set forth in the representation of**  
40 **the seal, or a similar digital representation.**

41  
42 The Chair indicated that there were no objections and the motion passed.

43  
44 The Chair brought up the next item, HB 8, a bill establishing the Legislative  
45 Pioneer Road Development Task Force; and providing for an effective date.

1 Kalen stated Representative Rokeberg introduced a bill that establishes a task  
2 force, consisting of 11 members. The AELS Board is to designate a civil engineer to  
3 serve on the task force. Kalen wondered why the designee would be limited to a  
4 civil engineer and not include a land surveyor.

5  
6 Short discussion followed.

7  
8 Mearig stated the Board should inform the sponsor that the work the task force is  
9 charged with is not a Board function. The AELS Board is concerned with the  
10 regulation of licensure of architects, engineers, land surveyors, and landscape  
11 architects.

12  
13 **On a motion duly made by Mearig, seconded by Kalen, and**  
14 **unanimously adopted, it was**

15  
16 **RESOLVED to send a letter to Representative Rokeberg**  
17 **suggesting that the AELS Board is not the appropriate body to**  
18 **name a person to the task force since the task force has**  
19 **nothing to do with the regulation of licensure.**

20  
21 The Chair asked if there was any discussion, or objection. There was none and the  
22 motion passed.

23  
24 The Chair indicated the Executive Administrator would draft a letter for her  
25 review.

26  
27 Kalen added that there is currently a home inspectors bill that was reintroduced  
28 this year and he would obtain a copy for review.

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

31  
32 Reconvene: 1:20 p.m.

33  
34 The Chair indicated that Patricia Peirsol was excused this afternoon.

35  
36 The Chair announced that the discipline specific license versus professional  
37 engineering license would continue to be open for public comment. There currently  
38 is not a proposed regulation before the Board and the purpose is to get more  
39 information about the merits of each licensing system.

40  
41 The Chair announced other items for future meetings: The regulations projects and  
42 the Building Officials' Manual would be taken up again at the May 01 meeting,  
43 Board autonomy, and the definition of landscape architect and landscape architect  
44 stamping would be taken up at the August 01 meeting

1 Cyra-Korsgaard suggested that she could have a landscape architect come before  
2 the board for the purposes of discussing the practical aspects of the practice of  
3 landscape architecture.

4  
5 The Chair brought up the next item for discussion, the Building Officials' Manual,  
6 and asked for comments.

7  
8 She noted that "of minor importance" had not been defined and if that should be  
9 done in concert with looking at the definition of landscape architecture.

10  
11 Lengthy discussion followed about overlap between landscape architecture and  
12 other design professional work and items that require stamping.

13  
14 The Chair suggested that Iverson, Peirsol, and Cyra-Korsgaard review landscape  
15 architectural stamping with regard to the Building Official's Manual language  
16 revisions and that this be on the May agenda.

17  
18 The Chair suggested that a subcommittee be formed to define incidental practice,  
19 and asked the Executive Administrator to look at the model law and other similar  
20 statutes or regulations that be helpful.

21  
22 **Agenda Item 17- Board Training**

23  
24 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda, Board Training, and asked Dr.  
25 Aufrecht to proceed.

26  
27 Dr. Steven Aufrecht gave an overview of his ideas on training. He understood the  
28 Board members had a variety of ideas about Board training. If they were interested  
29 in a strategic plan they could develop their mission statement, come up with goals  
30 and objectives, set deadlines, and determine measures of success. The real benefit  
31 of that process is not the outcome, but in doing so it identifies how the Board spends  
32 its time and how it prioritizes items. The Board has routine responsibilities to  
33 accomplish and it could assess how much time it takes to do these regulatory tasks.  
34 Once they get a sense of how much time is spent per meeting it could prioritize  
35 proactive tasks for the remaining time available and set up measurements to show  
36 what they have accomplished over the course of a year. Questions might be how to  
37 quantify the outcomes of the outreach. The other type of Board training deals more  
38 with process. Dr. Aufrecht stated that as he looks at issues that occur in training  
39 groups, there are areas of disagreement that come up, and substantive areas of  
40 disagreement on how something should be accomplished. He stated that there are  
41 some personality types that can cause disagreement. In those instances, there can  
42 be technical or goal oriented people versus interpersonal or group oriented people.

43  
44 Miller indicated he thought this group was able to voice their views. The  
45 opportunity to express personal observations is helpful, and the Board needs to be  
46 sensitive and responsive to those observations. He thought that the subcommittee  
47 process might be a way to be sure that any reservations are voiced. He also noted

1 that some activities should remain with the group as a whole, such as decisions and  
2 the application review process.

3  
4 The Chair noted that she thought some items were well suited to subcommittees.  
5 An example would be working on specific regulations for the group to consider, and  
6 other time consuming efforts that might be accomplished with a smaller group.

7  
8 Siemoneit felt that the Board would always have a reactive element due to the  
9 dynamic fields and professions the Board represents. He thought that as the Board  
10 was able to do more outreach and provide more information to the public,  
11 applicants, and registrants, it could lessen the investigator load, and could make  
12 file review easier.

13  
14 Dr. Aufrecht noted that reactive tends to drive out the proactive effort and felt it  
15 would be useful to have subcommittees.

16  
17 The Chair noted that any subcommittee meetings would be public noticed.

18  
19 Brief discussion followed.

20  
21 McLane thought that there could be benefits to using subcommittees during the 2-  
22 day Board meetings.

23  
24 Brief discussion followed.

25  
26 Mearig thought the Board could do things more efficiently and be more effective.  
27 He thought the Board should work to identify items for efficiency during meetings  
28 and develop a strategy to address them. He thought the Board spent time  
29 discussing issues with no resolution to the issues.

30  
31 Dr. Aufrecht thought the Board might want to look at how it arrives at a timely  
32 decision.

33  
34 Brief discussion followed.

35  
36 Dr. Aufrecht thought it might be useful to have discussions on a list-serve, where  
37 the board could send messages among themselves with some public access to the  
38 discussions.

39  
40 The Board broke into groups to work on individual goals and recommendations on  
41 how to accomplish them. The sub-groups were Public Education, Outreach, and  
42 Board Effectiveness and Efficiency.

43  
44 Many ideas emerged from the subgroups and Davis incorporated suggestions from  
45 the subgroups into the overall Goals and Objectives:

1 Public Education subgroup suggestions were incorporated into Goal #4, Objective  
2 #3, Audit National standards for exams and certification, and into Goal # 7,  
3 Objective #1, Issue public service notice with contact information for complaints,  
4 Objective #2, Send letter to BBB/Ombudsman re: contact for complaints

5  
6 Outreach subgroup suggestions were incorporated into Goal #6, Objective#7,  
7 Provide experience worksheet to applicants to assist supervisors in documenting  
8 applicant's work, and Goal #7, Objective #3), Educate public through public service  
9 notices about the benefits of using licensed professionals.

10  
11 Board efficiency subgroup suggestions were incorporated into Goal #1, Objective #8,  
12 Obtain legal opinion on use of a ListServer for group email communication, and  
13 Objective #9, establish subcommittee work at each meeting.

14  
15 The Board also felt it would be helpful to have the Goals and Objectives listed on  
16 flip chart paper and posted during Board meetings to keep focused on its overall  
17 goals and would act as a dynamic working set of Goals and Objectives.

18  
19 3:40 p.m.: Dr. Aufrecht finished his presentation.

20  
21 The Chair asked about future training. Brief discussion. The Chair indicated the  
22 consensus was to meet in May without a facilitator. It might be possible to have  
23 Dr. Aufrecht back a future meeting.

24  
25 The Chair asked if Miller and Davis would work on a definition of "minor  
26 importance" and report back at the May 01 Board meeting.

27  
28 Davis noted that this fits into Goal 3, new objective #3, to develop regulations that  
29 cover the overlap/minor importance between the practice of architecture and  
30 engineering.

31  
32 Cyra-Korsgaard suggested identifying lead Board members on specific agenda  
33 items.

34  
35 The Chair suggested that the agenda could be revised. The Goals and Objectives  
36 could be listed on sheets for use during the meeting and could be taken up the  
37 second day, with some time to break into groups on the second day.

38  
39 The Chair noted that the Executive Administrator would work with her to revise  
40 the agenda format.

41  
42 **Agenda Item 18 – Board Member Reports**

43  
44 The Chair moved to the next item on the agenda, Board Member Reports.

45  
46 Dr. Miller gave his report on the Presidents' Assembly that he and the Executive  
47 Administrator attended February 2-3, 2001 in Phoenix, Arizona.

1  
2 Dr. Miller indicated that there were a number of issues that were discussed at the  
3 Presidents' Assembly. President Cottingham made comments on his goals for the  
4 NCEES and his priorities were Exams, Mobility, Promoting Licensure, Strategic  
5 Planning, and Evaluation of Qualifications for Licensure. The NCEES is examining  
6 the relevance to stakeholders, FE pass rates, and the Canadian model for  
7 structured intern programs. Trends are for increased licensure mobility for  
8 individuals and firms.

9  
10 Dr. Miller reported that President Cottingham brought up the interesting point  
11 that we have a three-legged stool with education, examination, and experience as  
12 the legs, and all are equally important components. He noted that one  
13 recommendation that came out of committee work was to count one year for a  
14 master's degree and two years for a doctorate. Dr. Miller indicated that Alaska's  
15 regulations give one year for either, but not the additional second year credit for a  
16 doctorate degree. He mentioned that there was some discussion about splintering  
17 exams and that Group I exams support the viability of all Group II exams.

18  
19 Dr. Miller mentioned that Elaine Fink, Minnesota Board, gave a brief overview of  
20 the Treasurer's report for the NCEES, and while exam revenues are not in yet, she  
21 indicated that the Council is in good shape. Exam fees are over half of the income  
22 and she will report at the annual meeting.

23  
24 Dr. Miller highlighted the outcome of the workshop on strategic planning. Areas  
25 with a great deal of interest included Exams, Sharing FE scoring data for outcomes  
26 assessment, Mobility, International Mobility, and Land Surveying exams by  
27 discipline.

28  
29 The Chair indicated that Reardon had provided several quotes for the purchase  
30 price or lease of a copier for the AELS staff. She described costs for a Ricoh Aficio  
31 700, with capabilities of 70 copies per minute. The purchase price was  
32 approximately \$14,500, and a full service plan of \$578.54 for up to 70,000  
33 impressions per month. She went on to describe a Xerox DC255 digital copier for  
34 lease at \$855.00 per month for up to 50,000 copies per month.

35  
36 Discussion followed about the two options that the Director had passed on for their  
37 review.

38  
39 The Chair indicated that the Board could defer to the Director in terms of what type  
40 of copier to purchase, and that the Board did not need to make that determination.

41  
42 **On a motion duly made by Kalen and seconded by Miller, it was**

43  
44 **RESOLVED to ask the Director to purchase a copier for AELS**  
45 **staff.**

1 **There was an objection by Siemoneit because he felt purchasing the copier**  
2 **was too expensive.**

3  
4 **The Chair asked for a show of hands on the motion:**

<b>Brown</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Davis</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Kalen</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>McLane</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Mearig</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Miller</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<b>Siemoneit</b>		<b>No</b>

6  
7 The Chair stated that the motion passed 6-1, and the Executive Administrator  
8 could pass the information on to the Director.

9  
10 The Chair reviewed the Board's requests for expenditures for up to \$8,000 for the  
11 AKLS workshop, for a staff copier, the staff computer equipment was purchased,  
12 computer enhancements and on-line renewals are moving forward, and she  
13 wondered if there were other expenditures.

14  
15 The Chair recapped items for the next meeting: discuss landscape architect  
16 definition to help building officials, Building Officials' Manual revisions,  
17 comity/alternative paths to licensure for Architects, define minor importance (Miller  
18 and Davis), and land surveying regulations re photogrammetry (Kalen and  
19 McLane).

20  
21 **Agenda Item 19 – Board Member Comments**

22  
23 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda and asked members to make any  
24 comments.

25  
26 Mearig reported that he serves on the NCEES ACCA Committee. That committee  
27 met following the Presidents' Assembly/ MBA meeting to draft the new strategic  
28 plan that will be presented at the Western Zone meeting. Mearig noted he could  
29 email a copy to anyone interested.

30  
31 Mearig commented that people inquire periodically about the appropriate title to  
32 use for someone who has passed the Fundamentals of Engineering exam. There has  
33 been some resistance in the working world to move away from the Engineer in  
34 Training (EIT) title. Model law defines engineer intern and surveyor intern.

35  
36 Mearig suggested that the Board consider adding definitions to our regulations so  
37 trainees can use the title on business cards or other materials.

38  
39 Short discussion followed.

1 Davis added that there is some pending legislation in other jurisdiction regarding  
2 the title "EIT." She expressed interest in having Truitt do a WESTLAW search on  
3 what terms are being used in the statutory body so the Board would have more  
4 information.

5  
6 Davis commended the Licensing Examiner for her work on the applicant files and  
7 notations made that were very helpful when reviewing files.

8  
9 **Agenda Item 20 – Read Applications into Record**

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

13  
14 **RESOLVED to approve the following list of applications for**  
15 **comity and examination as read, with the stipulation that the**  
16 **information in the applicant’s file will take precedence over**  
17 **the information in the minutes:**

18  
19 **COMITY APPLICANTS**

20

#	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	DISCIPLINE	BOARD ACTION
1.	Beaumont	Craig	Architect	Approved
2.	Carlson	Bruce	Architect	Approved
3.	Conley	John	Architect	Conditional approval pending Arctic course
4.	Drake	Barton	Architect	Approved
5.	Fullerton	Gail	Architect	Approved
6.	Kollmeyer	Larry	Architect	Approved
7.	Park	Samuel	Architect	Approved
8.	Schnair	Gene	Architect	Conditional approval pending Arctic course
9.	Sonnenberg	Karl	Architect	Approved
10	Torre	Leonard	Architect	Conditional approval pending arctic, verification of current license and 1 additional reference
11	Power	Mark	Land Surveyor/ AKLS Exam	Approved for AKLS exam and registration if passes AKLS
12	Springberg	Craig	Land Surveyor/ AKLS Exam	Incomplete. Needs 7 months work experience or 1 additional reference letter
13	Teitzel	Allen	Land Surveyor/ AKLS Exam	Approved for AKLS exam and registration if passes AKLS
14	Biesmeyer	Mark	PE/Chemical	Approved
15	Hudgens	Patric	PE/Chemical	Approved

16	Ahsan	Muhammad	PE/Civil	Conditional approval. Needs to practice engineering through July 2001, or document 24 months responsible charge time (r.c.)
17	Briggs	Dean	PE/Civil	Conditional approval. Needs verification of satisfying a licensing action.
18	Coffland	Edward	PE/Civil	Approved
19	Erpelding	Christopher	PE/Civil	Incomplete. Needs 24 months r.c. and Arctic course
20	Faunce	John	PE/Civil	Approved
21	Jamy	Ahmad	PE/Civil	Conditional approval. Needs verification of current licensure
22	Jenkins	Robert	PE/Civil	Approved
23	Kemp	David	PE/Civil	Conditional approval. Needs 13 months work experience
24	Lauderbach	Robert	PE/Civil	Approved
25	Lee	Peter	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending Arctic course
26	McReynolds	Daniel	PE/Civil	Conditional approval. Needs verification of current license
27	Miller	Bradley	PE/Civil	Conditional approval. Needs verification of PE exam
28	Niksad	Khashayar	PE/Civil	Approved
29	Page	Martin	PE/Civil	Approved
30	Sarkisian	Mark	PE/Civil	Conditional approval. Needs verification of PE exam, current license and arctic course
31	Simpson	Darren	PE/Civil	Approved
32	Smith	Bonnie	PE/Civil	Denied. Approved for exam, needs arctic before registration
33	Tan	Choon	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending Arctic course.
34	Willis	Kenneth	PE/Civil	Incomplete. Needs verification of current license, 24 months r.c., or 2 reference letters from registered engineers
35	Dunn	Craig	PE/Electrical	Conditional approval pending Arctic course
36	Hale	Eric	PE/Electrical	Conditional approval. Needs verification of current license
37	Livengood	Gregory	PE/Electrical	Conditional approval. Needs verification of PE exam
38	McMicheal	Mark	PE/Electrical	Approved
39	Bozlowksi	Michael	PE/Mechanical	Approved
40	Langebartel	Edwin	PE/Mechanical	Conditional approval. Needs college transcripts
41	Seiders	Edmund	PE/Mechanical	Approved
42	Tarkon	Eric	PE/Mechanical	Approved

**EXAM APPLICANTS**

#	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	DISCIPLINE	BOARD ACTION
1.	Donaldson	Patrick	ARE	Approved
2.	Holmgren	Elisabeth	ARE	Approved
3.	Jagels	Todd	ARE	Approved
4.	Valenote	Victor	ARE	Approved
5.	Benerito	Angel	FE	Approved after staff review
6.	Arvey	Dave	FE	Approved after staff review
7.	Baxter	Jay	FE	Approved after staff review
8.	Blair	Joseph	FE	Approved after staff review
9.	Boles	Dina	FE	Approved after staff review
10.	Botero	Federico	FE	Approved after staff review
11.	Bradford	Traci	FE	Approved after staff review
12.	Chandler	Kristopher	FE	Approved after staff review
13.	Daly	Pat	FE	Approved after staff review
14.	Frey	Stephen	FE	Approved after staff review
15.	Frisch	Steven	FE	Approved after staff review
16.	Hackett	Matthew	FE	Approved after staff review
17.	Halstead	Rachel	FE	Approved after staff review
18.	Heiden	Jennifer	FE	Approved after staff review
19.	Henrickson	Scott	FE	Approved after staff review
20.	Hewko	Peter	FE	Approved after staff review
21.	Holloway	Emberley	FE	Approved after staff review
22.	Horton	David	FE	Approved after staff review
23.	Hutchinson	Andrew	FE (foreign degree)	Approved
24.	Johnson	Bryan	FE	Approved after staff review
25.	Johnson	Tyler	FE	Approved after staff review
26.	Kaletka	Steven	FE	Approved after staff review
27.	Kidder	Sybil	FE	Approved after staff review
28.	King	Kevin	FE	Approved after staff review
29.	Laderach	Shawna	FE	Approved after staff review
30.	Lamoreaux	Jason	FE	Approved after staff review
31.	Li	Gar	FE	Approved after staff review
32.	Maxwell	Tal	FE	Approved after staff review
33.	Meurer	Stephen	FE	Approved after staff review
34.	Norford	Arsby	FE	Approved after staff review
35.	Panilo	Mark	FE	Approved after staff review
36.	Peltier	Brandon	FE	Approved after staff review
37.	Prater	Naomi	FE	Approved after staff review
38.	Reilly	Evan	FE	Approved after staff review
39.	Reitmeier	Cameron	FE	Approved after staff review
40.	Shelt	Bruce	FE	Approved after staff review
41.	Smith	Todd	FE	Approved after staff review
42.	Spees	Alison	FE	Approved after staff review
43.	Straub	Tyler	FE	Approved after staff review

44.	Tidwell	Amy	FE	Approved after staff review
45.	Werner	Mary	FE	Approved after staff review
46.	White	Trevor	FE	Approved after staff review
47.	Wilke	Nathan	FE	Approved after staff review
48.	Boneta	Anthony	FLS	Approved
49.	Brechan	Donna	FLS	Approved after staff review
50.	Crews	Peter	FLS	Approved
51.	DeWilde	Victor	FLS	Incomplete. Needs 10 mos work exp.
52.	Harai	Susan	FLS	Approved
53.	Karoly	John	FLS	Denied. Needs 45 mos work exp.
54.	Kimbrell	David	FLS	Approved
55.	Kimbrell	Dmitri	FLS	Denied. Needs 30 mos work exp.
56.	Pugh	Wiley	FLS	Denied
57.	Quigley	Ryan	FLS	Approved after staff review
58.	Weiler	Chad	FLS	Approved after staff review
59.	Boneta	Anthony	PLS/AKLS	Approved
60.	Hale	David	PLS/AKLS	Approved
61.	Horton	George	PLS/AKLS	Approved
62.	Patterson	Robert	PLS/AKLS	Approved
63.	Allstatt	Christina	PE/Civil	Approved
64.	Anderson	Michael	PE/Civil	Approved
65.	Bailey	Keolani	PE/Civil	Approved
66.	Baysinger	Clarence	PE/Civil	Approved
67.	Costales	James	PE/Civil	Approved
68.	Cox	Patrick	PE/Civil	Incomplete. Needs 5 mos r.c.
69.	Doggett	Bradley	PE/Civil	Approved
70.	Field	Michael	PE/Civil	Approved
71.	Grant	James	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending FE and Arctic engineering
72.	Iris	Wendy	PE/Civil	Approved
73.	Isgrigg	Frances	PE/Civil	Approved
74.	Koruna	Robert	PE/Civil	Approved
75.	LeMay	Jennifer	PE/Civil	Approved
76.	Lestochi	Christopher	PE/Civil	Approved
77.	Mears	Donna	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending 7 months work experience.
78.	Montoya	Michael	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending verification of FE exam
79.	Moore	Ericka	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending verification of FE exam
80.	Pflugh	Elaine	PE/Civil	Approved
81.	Pogany	Mandy	PE/Civil	Approved
82.	Potts	Jeffrey	PE/Civil	Approved
83.	Reddaway	Lisa	PE/Civil	Approved
84.	Rieser	Michael	PE/Civil	Approved
85.	Sheahan	Craig	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending 5 months work experience.
86.	Snyder	Curt	PE/Civil	Incomplete. Needs 10 mos r.c.

87.	Strand	Laura	PE/Civil	Approved
88.	Williams	David	PE/Civil	Conditional approval pending BSCE transcript
89.	Wolpert	Christopher	PE/Civil	Approved
90.	Wood	Christopher	PE/Civil	Approved
91.	Buss	David	PE/Electrical	Approved
92.	Dodge	George	PE/Electrical	Conditional approval pending BSEE transcript
93.	Lease	Lon	PE/Electrical	Approved
94.	Reed	David	PE/Electrical	Approved
95.	Weese	Roger	PE/Electrical	Conditional approval pending BSEE transcript
96.	Willmon	Michael	PE/Electrical	Approved
97.	Broyles	Ronald	PE/Mechanical	Approved
98.	Calaway	James	PE/Mechanical	Approved
99.	Carroll	Clifford	PE/Mechanical	Approved
100.	Chen	Shanwei	PE/Mechanical	Approved
101.	Cott	Donald	PE/Mechanical	Approved
102.	Coyle-Schlotfeldt	Angela	PE/Mechanical	Approved
103.	Crafts	Chester	PE/Mechanical	Approved. FE waived
104.	Hill	James	PE/Mechanical	Approved
105.	Lust	Scott	PE/Mechanical	Approved
106.	Sever	Jeffrey	PE/Mechanical	Approved
107.	Varoz	Brad	PE/Mechanical	Conditional approval pending 15 mos work exp. & FE

1  
2  
3

**APPLICATIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION**

1.	Glashan	Stafford	PE/Civil	App was denied 2/00 – Applicant needed an additional 10 months work experience. He was told he would not have to reapply. He has supplied additional work experience and now contests having to reapply. See file.	Approved for PE Exam
2.	Smith	Randy	PLS/ Comity	11/00 bd mtg indicated he had to retake AKLS and he contests this. See file.	Conditional approval pending verification of current license

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

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

**RESOLVED to go back into Executive session for the purposes of reviewing two files read into the record.**

1 The Chair indicated there were no objections. The Board went into executive  
 2 session at 4:40 p.m. and reconvened at 4:45 a.m.  
 3 The Chair asked the Licensing Examiner to re-read two applications that had  
 4 previously been read into the record to correctly reflect the Board's action and she  
 5 did so. The above table was corrected to reflect the Board's action taken on the two  
 6 files.

7  
 8 **Agenda Item 21 – Review Calendar of Events**

9  
 10 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda. The Chair brought up the next  
 11 item of discussion, the tentative schedule for the quarterly AELS 2001 board  
 12 meetings:

13  
 14 May 17-18, 2001 - Fairbanks  
 15 August 23-24, 2001 - Anchorage  
 16 November 15-16, 2001 - Anchorage

17  
 18 **Agenda Item 22 – Review Task List**

19  
 20 The Chair brought up the next item on the agenda.

21  
 22 The Executive Administrator indicated she would forward the task list, outlining  
 23 each person's tasks as assigned at this meeting, as part of the minutes.

24

Executive Administrator	1) Continue to work on exam costs and staff time spent on exam administration
	2) Look at the model laws and check with other states in terms of defining minor importance or incidental practice overlap between professions
	3) List Goals and Objectives on flip charts
	4) Draft a letter to Rep. Rokeberg on HB 8, indicating that the Board is not the appropriate body to serve on the task force (for Chair review)
	5) Respond to correspondence
	6) Revise format of the agenda (with Chair)
Brown	Revise format of the agenda (with Executive Administrator) to allow for subgroups, work flow
Cyra-Korsgaard	1) Landscape Architect definition and stamping.
	2) Iverson, Peirsol, and Cyra-Korsgaard - review landscape architectural stamping with regard to the Building Official's Manual language revisions
Davis	Miller & Davis to look at incidental practice and define minor importance (May 01)
Iverson	Iverson, Peirsol, and Cyra-Korsgaard - review landscape architectural stamping with regard to the Building Official's Manual language revisions

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

Kalen	Kalen & McLane - develop land surveyor definition changes
Miller	Miller & Davis to look at incidental practice and define minor importance (May 01)
Mearig	Complete downloadable seal
McLane	Kalen & McLane- develop land surveyor definition changes
Peirsol	Iverson, Peirsol, and Cyra-Korsgaard - review landscape architectural stamping with regard to the Building Official's Manual language revisions

**Agenda Item 23 - Housekeeping**

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

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

**RESOLVED to adjourn the meeting at 4:50 p.m.**

There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

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

Approved:

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

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