

1 **These draft minutes were prepared by the staff of the**
2 **Division of Occupational Licensing.**
3 **They have not been reviewed or approved by the Board.**
4

5 **State of Alaska**
6 **Department of Community and Economic Development**
7 **Division of Occupational Licensing**
8 **Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors**
9 **May 24-25, 2000**

10
11 By authority of AS 08.01.070 (2) and in compliance with the provision of AS 44.62,
12 Article 6, the Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors,
13 (AELS) held a meeting May 24 and 25, 2000 at the Board of Regents' Conference
14 Room 109, Butrovich Building. Fairbanks, AK 99775
15

16 **Agenda Item #1-Call to Order and Roll Call**
17

18 Daphne Brown, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.
19

20 Members present and constituting a quorum of the Board were:

21
22 Daphne Brown, Chair, Architect
23 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member
24 Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer
25 Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor
26 Scott McLane, Land Surveyor
27 Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer
28 Kathleen Gardner, Secretary, Mechanical Engineer
29 Robert Miller, Vice-President, Civil Engineer
30 Patricia Peirsol, Architect
31

32 Absent: Marcia Davis, Public Member
33

34 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

35
36 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator
37

38 Public members attending portions of the meeting:

39
40 Richard Heieren, Fairbanks, representing self;
41

42 Dr. David Woodall, Ph.D., P.E., representing University of Fairbanks, (UAF) faculty;
43

44 Bill Mendenhall, Fairbanks, representing self;
45

1 Bob Perkins, representing the Fairbanks Chapter, Alaska Society of Professional
2 Engineers, (ASPE).

3
4 **Agenda Item 2. Review/Revise Agenda.**

5
6 Mr. Heiren would like to address the Board in regards to education experience as it is
7 applied to land surveyor applicants. Mr. Heieren would participate during the public
8 comment period.

9
10 Kalen noted that under Board member reports, item #17, he would be reporting on the
11 National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying Western Zone (WCEES)
12 meeting. McLane will issue the main report and Kalen will have several bullets on the
13 Registration Board's forum, March 20, 2000 Little Rock, AR. Report.

14
15 Peirsol joined the meeting at 9:15 a.m.

16
17 Miller noted that under new business, item #16, there are several proposals for web-based
18 or distance education regarding arctic engineering and that he would present the courses
19 conceptually and for discussion. These courses would be up for approval in May 2001.

20
21 Iverson asked about elections and Kalen noted elections were done in May or August.
22 Short discussion. Brown, Miller and Kalen all have terms that expire in July 2000.
23 Elections would be added to agenda, after board member comments.

24
25 Gardner noted she was reappointed and she was confirmed by the Legislature.

26
27 Siemoneit noted he had a brief explanation on advertising in the yellow pages for
28 unlawful practice and would be taken up under time #13, Investigator/Discussion items.

29
30 **Agenda Item #3, Ethics Report**

31
32 The Chair noted there were no reports by Board members.

33
34 **Agenda Item #4, Review/Approve minutes**

35
36 Cyra-Korsgaard and Miller suggested that on page 30, line 10, strike a sentence that
37 appeared to be out of sequence.

38
39 Mearig suggested that a new heading be added instead, titled questions for Catherine
40 Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing.

41
42 Kalen noted that on Page 8. Line37, the ACSM convention that he was not attending on
43 behalf of the organization, but was "paying" his travel but otherwise, Kalen represented
44 Alaska and thought he represented the AELS Board. He recommended changing it to
45 "paying for travel" and delete reference to the organization.

1
2 Miller suggested that it might read, “attending on behalf of the profession” instead of “the
3 professional organization”.

4
5 Peirsol noted a specific item page 43, line 25, seemed to be out of place and didn’t make
6 sense and asked to have the sentence removed.

7
8 **On a motion duly made by Peirsol and seconded by Miller, and carried**
9 **unanimously, it was resolved to strike the sentence.**

10
11 **On a motion duly made by Gardner, and seconded by Kalen, it was resolved to**
12 **approve the February 17-18, 2000 AELS Board minutes as amended.**

13
14 **Agenda Item #5, Correspondence.**

15
16 The Chair noted that the first item was from:

17
18 Robin Garibay, The Advent Group, Inc. for clarification on the practice of engineering as
19 it relates to a project site, spill prevention and control and countermeasure plan
20 preparation.

21
22 Iverson noted they could not do spill prevention work, it would be engineering and would
23 require a registered engineer.

24
25 Siemoneit asked if the industrial exemption would apply.

26
27 Iverson indicated it would apply only if they were working as an employee, for example,
28 an ARCO employee could do an ARCO plan.

29
30 Miller noted that it isn’t always clear but if it is industrial work and the exemption would
31 only apply if the person were an employee, actually worked for the company but not as a
32 contractor.

33
34 Iverson noted that if he did work for ARCO he would have to stamp his drawings, the
35 exemption would not apply.

36
37 Mearig asked if requests from individuals to interpret statutes and regulations were within
38 the Board’s charge, particularly when an issue might not be clear.

39
40 Chair indicated that the Board gets a general understanding through the discussion and
41 that someone needs to answer questions from the public and the Board or staff is
42 providing a service. Discussion followed.

43
44 Cyra-Korsgaard asked about liability if the staff interprets regulations.

1 Staff was asked to respond to the letter.

2
3
4
5 Email from J. Sayre.

6
7 The board discussed the email and thought that item #3 appeared to be a “shop drawing”
8 and that a company could do design work but that it would have to be under the
9 responsible control and stamped by a registered Alaskan engineer.

10
11 The Board discussed generally but hesitated to respond to the general nature of the
12 questions.

13
14 The Chair suggested that staff advise Jeannie Sayre to contact John Clark, the investigator
15 for a more thorough discussion about each item and confirm with Mr. Clark
16 confidentiality.

17
18 Email from Peter Knozel, with specific questions about scope and practice of engineering
19 in Alaska.

20
21 Miller noted that at the last meeting the Board discussed remediation and if the work
22 were just drilling for investigation (taking a sample) it would not be engineering but if
23 any design work or remediation was done, it would fall under engineering. Drilling is not
24 excavation and would not require an engineer.

25
26 Chair notes the email could be discussed with John Clark who also would be familiar
27 with contractor’s regulations.

28
29 Chair asked staff to respond and indicate that designing remediation is engineering but
30 that drilling is not excavation and that any question about contractor’s license should be
31 referred to contractor’s section.

32
33 Mearig and Iverson would review staff’s letter.

34
35 Executive Administrator noted that email discussions are for edification of staff and
36 sometimes the questions are simple, but staff doesn’t have technical expertise to
37 differentiate if questions are routine or need board discussion.

38
39 Chair noted the letter with question about arctic course could be moved to New Business,
40 item #17.

41
42 John Walker, Professional Engineer, DELTAK,

43
44 McLane noted he has a conflict as he has a subcontract with VECO for this project.
45 Gardner offered her impression was that it that the industrial exemption would not apply.

1
2 Miller was not sure stack design is universal and felt that weather conditions and local
3 conditions could influence that kind of design, if so, it would not be the same.

4
5 Chair noted local codes would apply.

6
7 Chair asked staff to respond and all should be stamped unless they would fall under the
8 industrial exemption.

9
10 Brief discussion about other correspondence that were not action items.

11
12 Western Zone report would be given under member reports.

13
14 National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES):
15 The Board discussed briefly the white paper on signing and sealing.

16
17 Kalen noted that there were discussions about this at Western Zone and there are
18 concerns about the electronic sealing alterations. The Board noted that the issues aren't
19 much different than now in that anyone could digitally alter designs and purport they were
20 original.

21
22 Peirsol noted some of the same issue came up at the time of "rubber seals" and they are
23 manufactured and there doesn't seem to be a problem with unauthorized use.

24
25 Chair noted that at some point the Board may want to discuss this.

26
27 NCEES Correspondence

28 Chair referred the Board to the testing survey included in the packet. Short discussion
29 about passing administrative costs on to candidates, rather than having the administrative
30 costs as part of the licensure.

31
32 Architects pay about \$1000 for examination fees and Miller had concerns about passing
33 on higher costs to students. Chair noted that it is important to take the exam and it is not
34 overall an issue of cost and that it would not discourage licensure.

35
36 Short discussion about costs and examination security issues.

37
38 Chair noted the issue isn't raising costs, it is who pays for the costs.

39
40 Peirsol noted that one group is paying for administrative costs and several other groups
41 are not, so there may be a reason to take a look at equity issues so all groups are dealt
42 with in the same manner.

43
44 Chair noted that is particularly important during times of diminishing state resources.
45

1 Gardner noted she and Miller would look at the survey and could refer back to staff.

2
3
4 NCEES: Mearig is a delegate for the NCEES annual meeting in Chicago in August and
5 Executive Administrator would also attend.

6
7 NCARB Correspondence

8 The Chair referred the Board to items in the packet including the building official's
9 interaction.

10
11 Chair asked to add "interior designers" under new business, item #17, reference Joe
12 Giattinni's 3/15/00 letter because the interior designers are talking nationally about
13 licensure.

14
15 Chair said that they should not be licensed because they do not have the training for
16 fire and integrating systems, that you are either an architect or an interior designer. These
17 issues are divisive in other states and it is an area that warrants discussion

18
19 Cyra-Korsgaard noted an interior designer called her and asked questions about how the
20 landscape architects had proceeded with licensure. She suggested that the interior
21 designers meet with other professional organizations to discuss why they think they need
22 licensure. Interior designers are a small group but there is interest the discussion is
23 important. Cyra-Korsgaard noted that they should try to work with the professional
24 organization.

25
26 Chair noted most of the rest of the items are for information only. She noted that the
27 annual meeting for the architects is coming up in June and Peirsol is the representative.

28
29 Chair asked to move the NCARB resolutions to new business, item #17.

30
31 Chair noted that the NCARB has been undergoing a practice analysis to change the
32 examination.

33
34 Kalen noted that the letter from Dave Norton on HB 414 was dealt with during the
35 legislative session.

36
37 APDC newsletter was noted and Cyra-Korsgaard asked that as a Board correspondence
38 should be answered more timely.

39
40 Executive Administrator indicated that she agreed it was important and more effort would
41 be taken to make timely responses, particularly now that the licensing examiner has been
42 hired. It was noted that minutes are posted to the website and staff would indicate when
43 minutes are posted.

44
45 Recessed at 10:30 a.m.

1 Reconvened: 10:45 a.m.

2
3 **Agenda Item # 6. Review Goals and Objectives**

4
5 Goal # 1, Catherine Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing would talk about the
6 budget tomorrow and perhaps there would be some funding for this.

7
8 Iverson noted that Goal #3 is completed, building officials legislation is complete.

9
10 Chair noted that the goals need to be typed into a format for better discussion.

11
12 Chair noted that Goal #4 is completed although Kalen noted that this is an ongoing, long-
13 term goal.

14
15 Miller noted that some things might be available at NCEES or NCARB meetings and it
16 might be helpful to whomever we send to review goals and communicate any action taken
17 back to the Board.

18
19 Staff can send goal & objectives packet to board member, if needed, prior to attending a
20 meeting.

21
22 The Chair asked about Goal 6 and staff responded that comments were sent to APDC,
23 Vicky Sterling. Staff is to contact Davis for the final goals and objectives on disk for the
24 AELS packet in August.

25
26 Chair would like to cover budget requests that the Board may have for inclusion in the
27 annual report.

28
29 Mearig notes that there will be a sunset audit and the Board will just respond to the audit.
30 Kalen notes that the last audit report would be the starting point for the new audit report.

31
32 Chair notes the Board would take up the audit in the November meeting.

33
34 Tape 2, Side A

35
36 **Agenda Item #7. Dave Woodall, UAF Faculty Registration**

37
38 Dr. Robert Carlson was also present for this presentation.

39
40 Dr. Woodall introduced himself and described his background. He noted he is a
41 professional engineer and has degrees in physics and engineering from Columbia
42 University and Cornell University. He has taught mechanical engineering in Rochester,
43 was department chair in New Mexico, teaching chemical and nuclear energy, and served
44 on the faculty of the University of Idaho where he was the associate dean and has
45 considerable industrial engineering background in the private sector. Has been a

1 registered Professional Engineer in New Mexico and Idaho but doesn't meet the
2 requirements in Alaska for registration for two reasons: Alaska does not register the
3 discipline nuclear engineering and he has not yet taken the arctic engineering course.

4
5 He described his work evaluating engineer programs through NCEES, and examination
6 preparation for Nuclear engineering discipline, and his work at the ABET accreditation
7 board. He is currently actively involved with the NCEES.

8
9 Dr. Woodall explained that the University has been striving for qualified engineers to
10 become registered. He discussed his work at the national level and the trend for computer
11 science and computer engineering to become one discipline.

12
13 Dr. Woodall has the largest engineering department and Dr. Carlson is the department
14 head of civil engineering and environmental engineering. The engineering departments in
15 his college consist of mechanical, civil, and environmental engineering. Another college
16 houses the School of Mining and petroleum engineering.

17
18 Dr. Woodall described the programs and degrees they currently have and went on to
19 identify faculty that are licensed, are registered in Alaska, or have taken their
20 Fundamentals of Engineering examination. He noted that these are the minimum
21 numbers of licensed faculty and it is possible that some faculty may be licensed or
22 registered in another jurisdiction or in Alaska.

23
24 **UAF Faculty:**

Engineering Department:	Number	Licensed	Alaska	FEs
Civil and Environmental engineering	10	7	5	2
Electrical engineering	10	1	1	6
Mechanical engineering	8	3	2	0
Mining engineering	4	3	3	0
Geological engineering	2	0	0	1
Petroleum engineering	2	2	2	0
TOTAL	36	16	13	9

25
26 In his capacity as Dean, he explained the commitment of engineering faculty to
27 registration and licensure. It is an important element of his program to create engineers
28 that are going to understand the importance and necessity of licensure and are educated to
29 become registered if they so choose.

30
31 Dr. Woodall provided a table and explained that 56 total engineering and computer
32 science (5) students received undergraduate degrees, 18 receiving masters' degrees and 4
33 receiving their doctorate in 1999, for a total of 78 total degrees.

34
35 Current UAF Enrollment in engineering programs:

Discipline	Undergraduate	Total
Civil engineering	100	75
Electrical engineering	70	50
Mechanical engineering	70	60

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

Dr. Woodall noted that nationwide enrollment statistics show there has been a six to seven year decline, 30 % below the peak six years ago. However, that is turning around and at lower levels they are seeing about a ten- percent increase, which seems to be following national trends. The engineer programs are important to the state and need to be nourished. The University has an active research collaboration program right now with UAA in an experimental program, EPSCORE, to stimulate competitive research, which is a National Science Foundation program. The program purpose has been to fund more faculty engaged in engineering research and to encourage more engineering students and professionals.

Dr. Woodall indicated in his program the UAF plans to hire six additional faculty, two in each department plus four for the EPSCORE program in the next two years. Short discussion.

Dr. Carlson, head of civil and environmental engineering introduced himself.

Dr. Woodall described the ABET accreditation review last fall. ABET sends a team on campus to evaluate each department and the whole program, report recommendations and take action the following year at their annual meeting of the commission. The prior year the faculty and administrators conducted a self-assessment of their program and put together the materials the team would want to review.

ABET just changed their criteria, Criteria 2000, which switches to an outcomes based rather than prescriptive. Short discussion about ongoing course evaluation.

Dr. Miller stated that UAA was evaluated last year under the old criteria.

Peirsol talked about computer-based examinations and examination expenses and asked for comments.

Dr. Woodall noted that NCEES has asked every discipline to change format for computer based exams. A discussion ensued about costs and accessibility for examination testing.

Dr Woodall reiterated his goal that University faculty should be registered although legally there is no requirement since there is an exemption, but that faculty should set example for students and with respect to fairness they should be registered. There are various ways that administration could foster or encourage registration. One way would be by hiring or by providing financial incentives. Short discussion followed.

1 Chair asked Dr. Miller to bring additional information on Anchorage faculty at the
2 August 2000 meeting.

3
4 Recessed for lunch at 11:45 a.m.

5 Reconvened at 1:36 p.m.
6

7 Tape 2, Side B

8 **Agenda Item # 8, Public Comment**

9
10 Bill Mendenhall (representing self)

11 1907 Yankovich Rd.

12 Fairbanks, AK 99709
13

14 Bob Perkins (representing Alaska Society of Professional Engineers)

15 1605 Moose Trail

16 Fairbanks, AK 99709
17

18 Richard Heieren (representing self)

19 348 Driveway St.

20 Fairbanks, AK 99701
21

22 Mr. Mendenhall commented that almost all requirements for land surveyors and
23 engineers have a written examination with the exception of the arctic engineering
24 requirement. He requested that the Board have an alternative to taking the arctic course by
25 taking an examination instead. He envisioned the examination would be about two to
26 three hours' duration administered directly by the Board, not contracted out by some
27 agency. He admitted he didn't have a familiarity with the architects' courses but did
28 have a familiarity with the arctic engineering course (C.E. 603). Short discussion.
29

30 Bob Perkins, Fairbanks Chapter of the Alaska Society of Professional Engineers (ASPE),
31 the local chapter of the National Society of the Professional Engineer (NSPE). The NSPE
32 was formed as an umbrella organization to unite engineers under the principles of the
33 ethical and licensed practices of professional engineering. He represents the local chapter
34 and explained that he thought the ASPE objectives are exactly the same, to encourage
35 ethical practice of engineering and licensure. The ASPE has about 100 members and
36 they have supplied proctors for the engineering exams. Mr. Perkins is a former Board
37 member and served on board for five years in the 1980s and has familiarity with the
38 examination process and the Boards' perspective. This past year the ASPE conducted a
39 professional engineer review course for civil and mechanical engineers, UAF faculty
40 donated their time and profits went to scholarships. The ASPE has a Legislative affairs
41 committee and Kalen also lets them know if there are any issues that they can assist. The
42 ASPE might differ over some fine points but agrees with the Board in most respects. Mr.
43 Perkins welcomes any requests from the Board as they are happy to assist.
44

45 The Chair noted that there were no questions.

1
2 Kalen noted that the previous two guests have been enormously helpful on examinations
3 and offered to assist as backup for examinations.

4
5 Richard Heieren, a licensed land surveyor had a comment about the regulation and
6 wanted to advise the Board there might be a typographical error in the regulations for
7 education and work experience for Fundamentals of Engineering. He referred the Board
8 to the December 1999 regulations, pages 25 and 26. In his view both tables have a
9 problem. Under 12 AAC 36.065 (a) (2) (A) and (B) the board will allow an education
10 credit of two years for graduate of an ABET accredited or board approved curriculum in
11 civil engineering or related engineering sciences. However, under 12 AAC 36.064 (a) (2)
12 (A) and (B), Eligibility for Fundamentals of Land Surveying examination no credit is
13 allowed for “related engineering sciences”, it reads, “Course work in ABET accredited or
14 board approved curriculum in civil engineering” and either a typographical or an
15 oversight occurred because the Fundamentals of Land Surveying examination
16 requirement does not allow any credit for “related engineering science”.

17
18 Mr. Heieren explained that this surfaced because he has an employee who has a math
19 degree who applied and got zero credit for his four year degree in mathematics. He
20 continued that surveying is deeply entwined with mathematics and thought he should
21 have received credit for two years for his degree. Mr. Heieren thought that this was an
22 oversight and hopes the board would address it. He noted his employee dropped an appeal
23 because he didn’t want to go through a judicial action. It turns out that the applicant is
24 eligible for the Fundamentals of Land Surveying and the PLS at the same time because of
25 how the credit is applied. His employee would like to reapply if the oversight or
26 omission were corrected.

27
28 Kalen noted that he would like to discuss the Alaska Land Surveyors (AKLS) Workshop.

29
30 The Chair asked that the AKLS budget should also be discussed under new business
31 tomorrow.

32
33 Brief discussion about the regulation issue just raised, no action was taken.

34
35 **Agenda Item # 9. Application Review**

36
37 **On a motion duly made by Iverson and seconded by McLane, and unanimously**
38 **carried, the Board went into executive session at 1:55 p.m. for the purpose of**
39 **reviewing applications.**

40
41 **The Board remained in executive session for the remainder of the day.**

42
43
44 **May 25, 2000 AELS BOARD MEETING**

1 ROLL CALL:

2
3 The Chair called the meeting to order at 8: 20 a.m.

4
5 The roll call taken by staff:

6
7 Daphne Brown, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

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

10
11 Daphne Brown, Chair, Architect

12 Linda Cyra-Korsgaard, Landscape Architect, Temporary Board Member

13 Donald J. Iverson, Electrical Engineer

14 Patrick Kalen, Land Surveyor

15 Scott McLane, Land Surveyor

16 Lance Mearig, Civil Engineer

17 Kathleen Gardner, Secretary, Mechanical Engineer

18 Robert Miller, Vice-President, Civil Engineer

19 Patricia Peirsol, Architect

20
21 Absent: Marcia Davis, Public Member

22
23 Representing the Division of Occupational Licensing:

24
25 Nancy Hemenway, Executive Administrator

26
27 Joining the meeting by teleconference were John Clark, Occupational Licensing
28 investigator and Ken Truitt, assistant attorney general, Alaska Department of Law.

29
30 Joining the meeting in person for a portion of the meeting was Catherine Reardon,
31 Director, Occupational Licensing.

32
33 Public members attending portions of the meeting:

34
35 Karen Tilton, Fairbanks, representing self.

36 PO Box 71478

37 Fairbanks, AK 99707

38
39 Kalen advised the Board that Karen Tilton, Right of Way supervisor for Northern Region
40 DOT/PF, and she was committee chair and the suggested changes for the new regulations
41 that essentially came out of her workshop.

42
43 Tilton stated she understood there was some discussion about “related engineering
44 sciences” in the Land Surveyor tables and referred the Board to Pages 26, 27 of their
45 regulation book, December 1999, to Table A under 12 AAC 36.065 (a) (2) (A). She

1 noted that Table B is the present requirements, Table A is the new proposed
2 requirements. The controversy really affects both tables. She described some problems
3 that the profession was having in that they require 8 years education at the upper limit but
4 some applicants were poorly prepared to enter the profession. There was at one time no
5 requirement at for education. Consequently, there had been a high failure rate for the
6 professional land surveying exam, and their goal was to set minimum standards so that
7 the land surveyors could pass the Fundamentals of Land Surveying (formerly the LSIT)
8 (FLS) and the Professional land surveying examination. The committee did not want to
9 exclude candidates but, rather, wanted to have candidates able to perform at minimum
10 levels. The committee looked hard at the professional examination and they looked at the
11 entrance requirements. Excluding a four-year degree in related sciences doesn't address
12 the problem. Problem was recognizing and valuing education on the front end of the LSIT
13 application. Allowing the education credit for civil engineering and related science
14 degrees definitely raised that quality but points out that she speaks for herself and not the
15 professional society when she makes this statement.

16
17 Chair asked for clarification to add to Table A and Table B the language "related
18 engineering sciences to both tables. Short discussion of "related sciences".

19
20 Tillton felt that a four year math degree was in the same college and there was some
21 related value and that provide a strong background because the first couple years of
22 engineering degree course work is math, in some form. She noted that there is no
23 substitute for the land surveying experience but there is value to the degree.

24
25 Kalen noted that course work for board approved curriculum in land surveying-no degree
26 is allowed in Table A, but in Table B there is civil engineering education recognized in
27 Table B.

28
29 Tillton agreed and noted that Table B would apply until December 31, 2001.

30
31 Chair asked if there should be another line added to Table A for "related engineering
32 sciences" and give credit of one year or two years rather than tack it on to the land
33 surveying no degree, which gives you 3 years credit.

34
35 Kalen stated that we eliminated the partial work allowance because all we were seeing
36 was some course work and they wanted it to be land surveying course work.

37
38 Iverson referred to the requirements for land surveying professional examination PLS, in
39 other words if you have a degree in math or science, you get 2 years credit, which makes
40 sense because most civil engineering is math and science for the first two years.

41
42 Miller stated if the intent is to raise the level and still allow for the possibility of people in
43 the system now who have passed the LSIT, they are the caboose. So if we have it for PLS
44 but have closed the door and will require some kind of college education for land

1 surveying. If he wants Land Surveyors academically trained, then we fuzzy it up by
2 giving credit for math or other related course work.

3
4 McLane agreed and stated he prefers not changing the land surveyor regulations and
5 spoke in favor of leaving the tables as they are currently constructed.

6
7 Kalen stated there was controversy in the professional organization at the time of the
8 changes and the vote passed at about the 85 % level.

9
10 Gardner stated adding “and related sciences” simply gives them more flexibility.

11
12 Chair said we could take up under regulations.

13
14 Iverson wonders why was the old table developed in the first place, the table on Page 26.

15
16 Kalen suggested that Table B has been revised to make it more uniform, that it was done
17 for consistency.

18
19 Tillson stated that the direction and trend has been to move to a requirement for a 4-yr.
20 degree in land surveying in Alaska. But the goal was to raise the minimum standard and
21 there is a great value to the ABET 4-year degree in other engineering sciences.

22
23 Kalen agreed that the direction the land surveyors are headed is towards a requirement for
24 a 4-yr. degree.

25
26 Chair thanked Tillson for her comments.

27
28 **Agenda Item # 12, Budget summary report**

29
30 Mearig noted that personal services for the division has been almost 800,000 and he
31 thinks that the figure has doubled, which seems like a radical increase. He felt, at this
32 rate, the Board expenditures would be 1.5 million this fiscal year. Discussion.

33
34 Mearig referred to the expenditure report prepared after the last meeting but he still
35 couldn't understand the increased costs and he felt the division would spend any surplus.
36 He felt the fees are cyclical, with fees increasing or decreasing, which is not
37 unreasonable. He thinks the funds are available to the Board if they can get expenditure
38 authority. He briefly discussed his assessment of the AELS fees and expenditures.

39
40 Chair noted the Board has stated its priorities for additional funds for travel, handbooks,
41 goals and objectives, training for priorities.

42
43 Kalen suggested that he would like to quickly develop a budget for the AKLS budget.

44
45 Tape 3, side A

1 Kalen noted that AELS has contracted with Warner Brothers in amount of \$8000 for a
2 workshop. His proposed budget would cover a printer, lunch, and travel for volunteer
3 members, and pick up the incidental expenses that has been absorbed by the societies, and
4 noted the workshop is scheduled for June 18, 2000.

5
6 Mearig added that perhaps AELS should run examination committee similar to NCEES,
7 formalize the committee process but volunteer professionals would donate their time and
8 the state would pay expenses to attend. Short discussion about the logistics of the state to
9 pick up expenses.

10
11 Miller asked if there would be any problem with state paying travel if people are not
12 members of the board.

13
14 McLane said we could set the groundwork similar to the framework for the examination
15 similar to what is happening for the arctic engineering course.

16
17 Kalen suggested it could be similar to proctors. Short discussion.

18
19 Mearig noted that another approach might be to fund the contractor for the fall meeting
20 from funds this fiscal year.

21
22 Chair suggested that encumbering funds is an item that could be discussed with the
23 director.

24
25 **Agenda Item #13, Investigator's Report**

26
27 John Clark, Occupational Licensing investigator joined the meeting by teleconference at 9
28 a.m.

29
30 The Chair referred members to Tab 13 &14, and asked for any reports or comments.

31
32 Mr. Clark noted that there some cases that will be closed in a couple week but that the
33 files, about five or six cases, still required letters.

34
35 Mr. Clark noted the only older cases have been referred to the Attorney General's office.

36
37 Clark said the investigators are turning around cases more quickly.

38
39 Gardner stated she thought that was a great sign.

40
41 Staff advised that the investigator's report is added as an attachment to the
42 administrator's report and that document is then posted to the website.

43

1 Cyra-Korsgaard asked about the professional engineer advertising. Chair noted that
2 someone addressed the Board and his business card indicated that he is a professional
3 engineer in a couple of other states, but did not show Alaska registration.

4
5 Clark indicated that it would be difficult, from an investigation perspective, to enforce a
6 case if the party is registered and so indicates, but is not alleging registration in Alaska. If
7 someone has come to Alaska and handed out business cards but are not qualified, he has
8 sent out letters advising them they are not qualified to hand out the cards, that it is in
9 violation of Alaska law.

10
11 Siemoneit noted that he had information on advertising in yellow pages, that the gist is
12 that informing the public that titling yourself as an architect or engineer requires
13 registration. Siemoneit continued by advising that he had contacted the Berry Company,
14 who publishes all the major area directories and the cost would vary but would be about
15 \$150 per year for one ¾ in advertisement. The board could decide if it would want to
16 advertise in each section: architect, engineer, or land surveyor or just have a generic
17 advertisement.

18
19 Siemoneit noted as background information there is a notice, a public service notice listed
20 under contractor's license there was an index which caution parties to check for a valid
21 license. He indicated a contact as Mr. Al Negel, who does enforcement for unlicensed
22 contractors. Discussion about the possibility of the Board requiring the same of design
23 professionals.

24
25 Clark was off line at 9:15 a.m.

26
27 Chair referred the Board to Tab 6, annual report and budget recommendations.

28
29 Recessed at 9:20 a.m.

30 Reconvened at 9:30 am

31
32 The Chair indicated there were some areas that the Board wanted to fund: additional
33 travel to National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) and NCEES
34 meetings; staff salaries need to be increased: how to hire own staff or reclassify or raise
35 salaries to help prevent staff turnover; Alaska Land Surveyor Workshop, (AKLS)

36
37 The Board discussed employee salaries and issues surrounding the state classification.
38 Gardner suggested ranking the items to prioritize funding.

39
40 The Board discussed Board training or a consultant to assist the board in focusing on the
41 goals and objectives. The Board discussed the necessity of Board training and that the
42 Executive Administrator could investigate some possibilities, for example the Nevada
43 board and California Board have used consultants to assist them.

44
45 Tape 3, Side B

1
2 Mearig suggested that the Board needed some guidance to decide if some policies should
3 be placed in regulation, to have more consistency in meetings as Board members change.

4
5 Mearig mentioned there was a bill that passed the Legislature to move the board off
6 budget and that may affect the Board's funding issues. Brief discussion about the budget
7 cycle.

8
9 Kalen noted this could lead the Board to a greater measure of control over its budget, that
10 it is a step towards autonomy.

11
12 McLane asked if the Board could get reimbursement for the temporary Board member's
13 expenses and the Board decided to pose this issue to the Catherine Reardon, Director,
14 Occupational Licensing.

15
16 Kalen discussed a preliminary budget, to be discussed with the director, for the upcoming
17 AKLS workshop of about \$4,000 two day workshop, item #5 of the list, one from
18 Fairbanks, Juneau, and Homer and would not cover Warner Brothers (now TEST, Inc.)
19 but does cover board member travel.

20
21 The Chair suggested that someone had recommended the AKLS group become a standing
22 committee of the Board.

23
24 Mr. Truitt joined the AELS Board at 10:00 a.m. by teleconference.

25
26 The Chair noted that the Board wanted to discuss the regulation changes and the Board
27 also had some additional questions.

28
29 Mr. Truitt noted he had discussed the draft regulations changes for Part 2 regulations, 12
30 AAC 36.062 and 12 AAC 36.063, the engineer table of experience for Fundamentals of
31 Engineering and Professional Engineer with Kurt West, Occupational Licensing,
32 Regulations specialist and the Executive Administrator. Mr. Truitt referred to the
33 proposed changes in the packet, and indicated that taking out "in addition to the standards
34 set out in Table A" would effectively change what the Board wanted to do.

35
36 Mearig clarified that the table on page 20 (referring to the December 1999 regulations
37 booklet), striking the language makes the table either or and applies to both the table for
38 Fundamentals and Professional Engineering. The tables conform to the land surveyor
39 tables on page 25-28. However, the land surveyor table really is an either or situation,
40 whereas the engineering table is a phase out table.

41
42 Mr. Truitt reiterated that Table 2 would be deleted after 2003. He suggested conceptual
43 language, as a lead in language to Table B: "In addition to the standards set out in Table
44 A, the Board will also approve education that meets the requirements in Table B. For
45 applications received on or after January 1, 2004 the Board will only approve education

1 and experience set out in table A. For applications made on or before December 31,
2 2003, in addition to the standards set on in Table B, the Board would also approve
3 education and experience standards required under Table A.”

4
5 Mr. Truitt noted he would make some draft changes to both 12 AAC 36.062 and to 12
6 AAC 36.063 and would fax the draft language to the Board via Kalen’s fax later that day.

7
8 Siemoneit asked Mr. Truitt if using the word, “applicant” versus “application” create any
9 problems for applications made in December and any carryover that might have.

10
11 Mr. Truitt responded that the proxy for applicant would be the actual application. The
12 Board moves on the application. If you receive an application on or before 12/31/2003
13 and Board took up the application in Februray, the Board would apply Table B to the
14 application.

15
16 Siemoneit asked if we want to leave it as applicant to close the window. Short discussion.

17
18 Peirsol was concerned about the potential for applicants to misunderstand the deadline by
19 trying to narrow this language. She suggested that the Board leave the language with the
20 current deadline.

21
22 Iverson stated the applications would be quantifiable and after a short discussion the
23 Board agreed.

24
25 Chair noted she had a regulation change to discuss and referred to 12 AAC 36.061 and
26 noted that the regulation refers to a specific NCARB education standard pamphlet that is
27 now obsolete. Further action at the annual meeting may make additional changes to the
28 educational standard? If left as is, the state is out of step one to two years.

29
30 Mr. Truitt will take the matter up with regulations attorney.

31
32 Chair noted a licensee had a license that lapsed license in 1985 and he recently reapplied.
33 The Board didn’t think he would be required to take Professional Engineer examination
34 and referred to 12 AAC 36.165 (b) and (d).

35
36 Miller continued that the applicant might have to pass the current examination, and also
37 arctic engineering. If they had met those requirements once, was there any intent that
38 they would have to do something extraordinary to reinstate the license or would they just
39 pay the fees.

40
41 Mr. Truitt, and a former licensing examiner, Carol Whelan, looked at the regulations and
42 they felt that subsection subsections (c) and (d) were added in 1996. Based on that it was
43 our presumption that when the board adopted (d), specific to engineers, they meant to
44 strike subsection (b).

1 Mr. Truitt referred the Board to 08.01.100 and indicated the Board has the authority to set
2 up the standards for reexamination and reinstatement.

3
4 Any person covered now should be held to (d). The specific controls over the more
5 general.

6
7 Mr. Truitt noted that the Board could require that the licensee establish that they
8 continually have been active in their practice, and also have a requirement that they show
9 proof of continuing education.

10
11 SPCC Correspondence:

12
13 Gardner noted that they had correspondence: Could a professional engineer licensed in
14 another state but not licensed in Alaska practice engineering? Could a professional
15 engineer not licensed in Alaska prepare a spill prevention control and countermeasure
16 plan and certify the plan? Would that be in violation of our laws? What constitutes the
17 practice of engineering in our state?

18
19 Chair explained that Mearig had voiced concern whether the Board should be interpreting
20 these or simply to refer them to a statute. Chair stated they want to be a service agency
21 but need some help with this.

22
23 Mr. Truitt noted that the Board could be setting up an estoppel, a defense.

24
25 Tape 4, Side A:

26
27 Chair explains that it is through these discussions that the Board gets a much better
28 understanding of what is governed by our regulations and what isn't governed.
29 But the Board doesn't want the public to get frustrated by not getting a response and she
30 asked if the Board could refer some of these questions to Mr. Clark, their investigator.

31
32 Mearig suggested that when parties contact the agency and ask the Board for an opinion,
33 they might not have presented all the facts of the case. So, it could be difficult for the
34 Board to give an interpretation for parties given that some facts may have been omitted.
35 Parties always can consult an attorney for statute interpretations.

36
37
38 Peirsol asked for clarification in terms of what the Board is supposed to be involved in
39 terms of interpretation. The Board has intent when they change regulations and it seemed
40 appropriate for the Board to express its view.

41
42 Mr. Truitt noted that he thinks in terms of what is defensible and may not necessarily be
43 thinking in terms of the Board's authority.

1 Peirsol says there are sometimes seven or eight different opinions on any given issue
2 because the Board may not know what the intent was at the time the regulations were
3 revised.

4
5 Mr. Truitt noted that 12AAC 36.165, lapsed licenses, is a good example. A future Board
6 might not be able to discern what this Board intended.

7
8 Peirsol noted that at their last meeting the Board considered writing a page of intent
9 language to keep in our files so a future Board could go back and see their intent.

10
11 The Board decided to discuss land surveyor regulations under agenda item # 17, New
12 Business.

13
14 Mr. Truitt has no other comments.

15
16 10:45 am break

17 11:05 am reconvened.

18
19 Miller referred to a fax from the University of Washington that speaks to the direction
20 that many universities are going. The Board has previously approved a video version of
21 CE 603, arctic engineering course and it is out of date. Earlier this year Miller discussed
22 with President Hamilton that the CE 603 may be a good course to develop a web based
23 instruction to allow people to take the course from anywhere. President Hamilton offered
24 to sponsor development funding to do this in conjunction with the University of Alaska,
25 Fairbanks (UAF). Dr. Carlson, and John Zarling and University of Alaska, Anchorage,
26 faculty Orson Smith, are working together to develop a course that is web based rather
27 than a video course. There would be a credit version of CE 603 and would launch the
28 University of Alaska into a distance delivery mode.

29
30 The fax from the University of Washington is a course Miller has been involved in. It is a
31 similar course, moving more in the direction of taping lectures and through use of email,
32 a chat room, and video for distance delivery mode. The course would be a short course
33 version but would not be for graduate credit the way the web-based version would be.
34 Since development is fairly expense, in the range of \$20-25,000 or more. Miller asked
35 for ideas from the board and seeks direction in terms of what should be built in to the
36 course. Miller doesn't yet know the exact format but would envision it to be similar to
37 the course currently offered. And is this something the Board would be interested in
38 pursuing?

39
40 The Chair asked about the Northern Design course in terms of being added to the web
41 based.

42
43 Miller discussed the Northern Design course and thinks from an economic view the
44 potential students for the engineering version is much, much larger. The Northern Design
45 Course is offered to 10-12 students once a year and hasn't grown. But the arctic course

1 with a campus population of close to 150-200 per year, and the short course taken by
2 about 100-120 per year. It makes more sense for the engineering version rather than other
3 versions to be developed.

4
5 Gardner wondered how the examination process would work.

6
7 Miller thought it would be a proctored examination, perhaps through the Sylvan Learning
8 Center. Certainly examination security is a concern.

9
10 Cyra-Korsgaard asked if it would be offered outside Alaska and Miller responded that it
11 would be offered anywhere the sites were available. The Board discussed costs.

12
13 Miller noted that there is value in face-to-face course. Tests are only a partial measure of
14 what is learned and he has some concerns about just offering an examination.

15
16 Chair echoed that concern. She noted that interaction is important but nationally we are
17 going towards a distance based learning system.

18
19 The Board discussed other potential examination problems.

20
21 Cyra-Korsgaard really liked the idea and thinks the Board should move forward on it.
22 Ability for landscape architects to take the course on line would have been great. Juneau
23 cancelled their arctic course and five applicants had to come to Anchorage to take the
24 course. She also noted that it was costly to have hotel bills for a week in order to take an
25 examination, plus \$800 for the course, and time away from their work.

26
27 Miller indicated that about five to ten percent of applicants take the course in Seattle at
28 the University of Washington.

29
30 Chair asked if they needed a resolution in support of the course.

31
32 Miller felt he could take comments back to the University of Alaska and University of
33 Washington.

34
35 **On a motion duly made by Kalen and seconded by Siemoneit, and carried, it was**

36
37 **RESOLVED TO endorse the concept of a University of Alaska or University of**
38 **Washington web based version of the CE 603 arctic course, distance delivery.**

39
40 **Miller abstained from voting due to his involvement in the both institutions.**

41
42 Cyra-Korsgaard mentioned her interest in pursuing having the Northern Design course
43 expanded.

1 Miller noted that the University of Alaska faculty does not teach the Northern Design
2 Course. Mr. Maynard and a collection of people in Anchorage teach it. As a result it
3 does lack the institutional focus. It is considerably less quantitative and focuses on
4 buildings; and some concepts like heat transfer and temperature measurements are not in
5 the course. Short discussion followed about the Northern Design Course.

6
7 Chair noted that there were not any NCARB resolutions of any significance that affect
8 our Board. There were several miscellaneous (?) resolutions which she highlighted.
9 Resolution 8, refers to housekeeping revisions for certification. The Board has supported
10 the NCARB education standard and has allowed for people to get certified if they were
11 registered prior to 1984 because that is when they offered the qualifying examination and
12 the professional examination without a degree. That education requirement sunsets this
13 year unless some action is taken. There is some discussion about what to do with those
14 architects that were licensed after 1984 but don't qualify for the NCARB certificate
15 because they don't have the degree.

16
17 Resolution 10, regarding the use of the title "architect", and Resolution 9: Alaska hasn't
18 taken much issue with using the term "intern architect" to "architectural intern" because
19 they think the term is degrading.

20
21 Resolution 11 is in support of some people taking the examination prior to completion of
22 the Intern Development Program (IDP) and the Chair opposes this resolution. Peirsol
23 asked the intent of the resolution. Discussion followed concerning the distance between
24 the examination and the actual course work. The resolution states that member boards of
25 NCARB encourage acceptance of the following principle: the examination of certain
26 subject matters that are based primarily on knowledge obtained in an accredited degree
27 program may be offered to graduates of those programs who are enrolled in IDP prior to
28 the completion of the IDP program.

29
30 **On a motion duly made by Peirsol and seconded by Gardner it was**
31 **RESOLVED to support NCARB Resolution 11.**

32
33 Miller objected and a discussion followed.

34
35 Catherine Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing joined the meeting as an observer.

36
37 Peirsol noted that the examination does have lateral forces and structures, and does have
38 mechanical engineering, the other ones, site planning, materials and methods are part of
39 the work.

40
41 Gardner would approve if we could let NCARB know which ones we would support.

42
43 Peirsol suggested that the Board could change the motion to ask for further consideration
44 of this resolution. Taking test for courses outside of architecture (mechanical, electrical,
45 and structural engineering). Some portions will fit into an early schedule.

1
2 Mearig supported as written.
3
4

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

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

6
7 **The Chair noted the motion to support NCARB resolution #11 carried 6-3.**
8

9 Kalen distributed handouts for NCEES and ASCSM registration
10

11 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by McLane, it was**
12 **RESOLVED to formalize the Alaska Land Surveyors (AKLS) committee under the**
13 **AELS board.**
14

15 Kalen explained that rather than have volunteers unofficially coming from the
16 professional organizations the committee would set up a process similar to NCEES
17 process for examination preparation. The effect of the committee would be so volunteers
18 could qualify for reimbursement of expenses.
19

20 McLane thought it might enhance the security of the examination as well. Having the
21 people working on the examination know that they are formally recognized and that
22 security is important.
23

24 Kalen stated that parties would have to sign an authorization agreeing to protect
25 examination security.
26

27 There was no objection and it was approved.
28

29 Break for lunch at 11:45a.m.

30 Reconvene from lunch: 1:25 p.m.
31

32 Catherine Reardon, Director, Occupational Licensing
33

1 She stated she had a couple topics to cover including the Board's budget for coming fiscal
2 year; HB 418 which has to do with the budget and expenditures and other legislation.

3
4 Tape 4 side B:

5
6 The supplemental appropriations bill passed and the Legislature gave the her authority to
7 spend funds at the same level as last year (1999) for Occupational Licensing. The
8 Occupational Licensing did get the increments for the upcoming fiscal year and the ones
9 that impact this Board are: increase for out of state travel, 25 trips division wide and she
10 counted one for each Board member; an additional \$200,000 for attorney & paralegal;
11 and an increment increase for an additional \$106,000 for Board activities. This would
12 give funding for computer equipment to automate; funding for travel to architectural
13 board meeting; for ongoing membership in Council of Landscape Architects (CLARB);
14 travel for the Executive Administrator to attend the Member Board Administrators'
15 (MBA) and to attend the NCARB annual meeting. The funding will be extremely
16 valuable to the board. There could be up to \$40,000 for planning or Board training
17 depending upon how many meetings and how much consultant time the Board would
18 envision. She is looking for direction from the Board, their priorities for expenditures.
19 She also expects this as an ongoing ability to spend, that the division's expenditures being
20 moved to program receipting may well reduce the pressure to take across the board cuts.
21 They will still need appropriations but because, in part, due to the recognition of their
22 financial self-sufficiency, the Legislature made these changes.

23
24 She noted the work the lobbyist, Sharon Macklin, did for the Alaska Professional Design
25 Council (APDC) to assist the bill's passage and for the change in funding.

26
27 Chair stated that this is good news. She indicated the Board would set priorities.

28
29 Reardon noted that the funding increase is in addition to \$50,000 for trips for the division.

30
31 Some things have increased under indirect expenses, FY 2000 vs. FY 1999. The division
32 was assigned another couple hundred thousand of indirect cost allocations from other
33 agencies; which we discussed somewhat during the fee changes last fall. The increases in
34 indirect cost increases show up in contractual services mainly because, for example,
35 additional computer staff is hired and our allocation is assessed to the agency.

36
37 Mearig expressed concern that the agency would spend the fee increase funding in
38 indirect costs.

39
40 Reardon assured the Board that this was a legitimate concern but the agency would not be
41 spending the additional \$106,000. When new indirect costs are assessed, they come as
42 budget increments. There is no new cost allocation increment and the agency is not
43 getting any new costs. The budget to go with the new costs was given in 2000, and also
44 in 1999, and in 1998 and the right to spend the money. It isn't that the Commissioner's

1 office tells the division in August that they have additional costs, instead, they make the
2 proposal and argue the costs before the Legislature during the budget process.

3
4 Mearig expressed concern that increases in indirect costs were being passed on as fee
5 increases that the ever-burgeoning indirect costs affect licensees. Regardless of what the
6 Legislature appropriates we still can only spend what we bring in so we are somewhat
7 limited.

8
9 Reardon stated this would not be limiting. The positive is that, let's say the fees that we
10 set for AELS at the \$195 level don't generate enough AELS money to cover the trips and
11 other planned expenditures, she would have enough from other programs to allow the
12 expenditure. The adjustment would come when fees are set again and AELS would "pay
13 back" the funds they spent beyond the \$195 level; that money would be transferred back
14 to the other programs through a credit if they brought in more than they spent.

15
16 Discussion continued about funding. It was noted, the Board is limited by what the
17 licensees are willing to pay in license fees.

18
19 Chair noted that the onus is on us to keep licensees informed but also to give a product:
20 building officials notebooks, plans; automation; to show that these funds are well spent.

21
22 Mearig reiterated that his concern is that the Board does not having any control over
23 indirect costs. The Board has had feedback that the professions are willing to pay higher
24 fees but that the service they want is increased enforcement in an efficient manner. The
25 Board simply has no control over steep increases in indirect costs but there isn't anything
26 tangible in services that the Board can point to other than we can continue to operate and
27 that is frustrating.

28
29 Reardon noted that is true, that you can not see something tangible. The Occupational
30 Licensing is experiencing a change in how costs are allocated so that the professions and
31 the division would pay 100% of their costs.

32
33 For example, she anticipates rent increases. Currently, general fund money flows to the
34 Department of Administration and they cover costs of office space rental. However, if
35 she gets billed for one dollar per square foot for rent then she'll have to pass on those
36 costs to all the licensees.

37
38 Mearig asked about the distribution of indirect costs. He wondered how much more
39 space does AELS staff occupy than a board that has 20 licensees in terms of direct costs
40 rather than indirect costs.

41
42 Reardon noted that there are philosophical differences in how costs should be allocated,
43 for example, by licensee rather than by program. She noted that some members of the
44 Board might prefer the allocation be based on direct personal services because, for

1 example, a small profession with only 100 licensees isn't using a fulltime employee but
2 perhaps might only be using 1/5 of an employee.

3
4 Short discussion about cost allocation process that the changes occur in the
5 administration's budget and the legislature acts on it.

6
7 Reardon thinks the allocation has leveled out because the department had to prepare a
8 cost allocation plan. Under the current allocation plan they decided how to calculate the
9 cost and she thinks that the Occupational Licensing is paying close to 100% of their costs
10 unless the department as a whole gets assessed a new cost.

11
12 Kalen discussed travel cuts and how that would be affected.

13
14 Reardon noted that while it would be less likely to have the Board's travel cut with the
15 program receipts funding, it wholly depends on who is making the policy decisions.
16 There simply isn't any way to predict policy decisions.

17
18 Discussion about new type of funding and how it benefits the Board and the Occupational
19 Licensing division continued.

20
21 Chair indicated that the Board wants to go over travel, AKLS workshop, pay increases for
22 the licensing examiner and executive administrator.

23 Reardon noted that the Board has already joined CLARB and would be administering the
24 examination in June. It is possible that they may send someone to the CLARB annual
25 meeting, even if we can't send the Landscape Architect.

26
27 Kalen asked about the AKLS workshop. In the past the professional land surveyor's
28 organization has paid for travel and expenses for the workshops. Some Board members
29 have expressed concern about any professional society being involved, and their desire to
30 have an arms length distance between the examination activities and the professional
31 societies. While in this instance the Alaska Society of Professional Land Surveyors
32 (ASPLS) have funded travel and provided a pizza lunch, and paid other expenses and
33 haven't objected to doing so, the Board has expressed a concern and he would like to
34 address this issue.

35
36 Reardon said it could be viewed as reimbursing volunteers, the volunteers could be
37 viewed as consultants to Warner Brothers and consequently their contract could be
38 increased. The Occupational Licensing has a contract with Warner Brothers to conduct
39 the workshop. Or the Board might be able to view the workshop attendees in much the
40 same way as the Occupational Licensing currently views and pays proctors.

41
42 Chair noted that the Board is considering making the workshop participants as part of the
43 Board function rather than a professional society function.

1 Reardon suggested that if that were the case, the contract language might read something
2 like, “the Board would be selecting a certain number of participants and providing them
3 to Warner Brothers use for the workshop.” Reardon suggested that she would need to
4 know who the participants were in advance, they couldn’t just show up.

5
6 Short discussion about how NCEES conducts their examination process and proctor
7 process.

8
9 Reardon asked how many participants the Board anticipated would be attending the
10 workshop.

11
12 The Chair indicated she didn’t think the Board could address this workshop for this
13 summer but that it could be done for future workshops next year they could.

14
15 Reardon noted that as they try to keep within the \$100,000 extra expenditure authority,
16 they would know how much to show for that workshop expenditure.

17
18 Kalen indicated he estimated that there would be one from Fairbanks, one from Juneau,
19 and two from the Mat-Su Valley that might have to stay over for an extra day’s workshop
20 for about \$4,000.

21
22 Reardon discussed automation. She suggested that the Board could decide to spend
23 money on a person to work on the web page, on a programmer to program certain
24 functions, or on a clerk to do data entry to show applicants what they have submitted, to
25 allow them to look on line at activity. She also indicated the Board might want to think
26 about increased staff workload as each activity added could take more staff time.
27 Another option might be to work on enhancements, for example, scanning in documents
28 was possible to add. Also, for the next renewal cycle the Board may want to have web-
29 based online renewals. She noted that business licenses would have a new program up on
30 July 1, 2000. She noted that the this program, cold fusion, project is about 80%.
31 Business licensing renewals would be mailed with a pin number and applicants would go
32 on line to renew. They could change fields, such as updating their address, and could
33 make payment with a credit card. Additionally the applicant can print their license on
34 laser printer of their choice or they can wait for the Occupational Licensing to mail their
35 license.

36
37 The Chair asked about the status of online applications and noted that having online
38 applications wouldn’t speed up the licensing process but would assist applicants because
39 they would not need a typewriter to type up their application.

40
41 Reardon advised the Board that one division typist now has a copy of the program to
42 develop convert the documents to ones that could be downloaded and filled out in a word
43 document, so is likely that the word form applications could be completed fairly soon.

1 Peirsol asked if the Board could go to an outside consultant to accomplish the form
2 changes.

3
4 Reardon responded that they might be able to do so but that in terms of the forms, it
5 might not be necessary, and the money is budgeted in contractual services. Additionally,
6 it may work out that if the Board wants the division to provide a web person, one might
7 be available were the Board to pay the funding.

8
9 Reardon indicated if the Board wanted the online form and the option for renewal's
10 online as a starting point that she could proceed. July 1st would be the starting point, and
11 she thinks that much of this could be provided in-house pending vacancies. She
12 suggested that by August she could give a status report, for example, that business
13 licensing program is running and the Board members could take a look at the website at
14 that time.

15
16 The Chair asked the Executive Administrator to give a status report on computer
17 technology at the August Board meeting.

18
19 The Chair asked if there were some means to reimburse AKLS workshop participants.

20
21 Kalen suggested he provide the director with a budget for estimated costs to cover a
22 printer and associated meeting costs for a one day workshop.

23
24 Current planning is to have a one-day workshop this summer but then not having one for
25 two years.

26
27 McLane suggested that a secondary plan would be, as a result of new legislation
28 introduced, new potential questions for the examination that we need to take action on, in
29 a winter workshop, to increase the pool of questions.

30
31 Reardon suggested that she would need the costs and names of people planning to attend
32 for a winter workshop.

33
34 Kalen noted that ASPLS thought they could do the workshop to do new questions.

35
36 Reardon suggested that the Board look at the budget for a winter workshop at the August
37 Board meeting.

38
39 Chair noted that as part of that review it would be helpful to know the people interested in
40 participating on the committee.

41
42 Reardon asked Kalen to supply her with names and addresses of prospective participants
43 so the Occupational Licensing could contact them.

44
45 McLane stated that could be accomplished at the upcoming summer workshop.

1
2 Chair also suggested that the Executive Administrator get some information for strategic
3 planning, perhaps to investigate various proposals to discuss at the August meeting. She
4 noted that she was envisioning a special meeting, added on to a regular Board meeting to
5 discuss challenges and issues regarding AELS work and brainstorm ideas.

6
7 Gardner suggested she volunteer to work with staff to put together information on other
8 boards and facilitators or strategic planners.

9
10 The Board discussed staff turnover and the problems the Board has experienced with
11 turnover and how it affects the clients.

12
13 The Board discussed having more participation at the upcoming NCARB annual meeting
14 and anyone who would be able to attend. None of the other Board members expressed
15 interest, but Executive Administrator would contact board member Davis to see if she
16 would like to attend the meeting.

17
18 The Board discussed the August annual meeting in Chicago for NCEES. Mearig and the
19 Executive Administrator would be attending on behalf of the Board.

20
21 Mearig suggested a comment that the Board might want to consider funding a fulltime
22 clerk or having the licensing examiner attend an outside meeting instead of the Executive
23 Administrator to relieve some of the stress the staff experiences.

24
25 Tape 5, Side B

26
27 Chair mentioned the landscape architect Board member doesn't get reimbursed for state
28 board meetings for per diem.

29
30 Reardon would consider the Board's requests and would check into this and also
31 mentioned the possibility that the geologist's organization might speak to the Board as a
32 possible agenda item for expanding the professions the Board would register.

33
34 The Chair thanked the director for attending and expressed interest in having her attend
35 the August Board meeting in Anchorage. Reardon left the meeting at approximately 3:00
36 p.m..

37
38 The Chair recapped the areas still needed to be covered at this meeting: Regulations,
39 Board member reports, read applications into the record and that Siemoneit needed to
40 leave meeting at 4 p.m.

41
42 Break at 305 p.m.

43 Reconvene:320 p.m..

44
45 Regulations:

1
2 **On a motion duly made by Kalen and seconded by Gardner, and approved**
3 **unanimously it was RESOLVED to public notice the regulations clarifying the**
4 **tables under 12AAC 36.062 (a)(2)(A) and 12 AAC 36.062 (a)(2)(B) and 12 AAC**
5 **36.061 (a) (2) regarding the NCARB publication reference as recommended by the**
6 **assistant attorney general.**

7
8 Chair suggested that the architect education standard refer to the specific publication or
9 whichever is the latest version, to be clear there would not be a choice and directed staff
10 to work with Mr. Truitt to accomplish this.

11
12 There was no objection and the motion passed.

13
14 The Chair suggested that the Board also start a regulation project to present to the Board
15 in August to cover the lapsed licenses.

16
17 Miller noted that the Board decided that it did not want anyone to have to take a
18 reexamination, not architect, engineer, land surveyor or landscape architect professions.

19
20 **On a motion duly made by Gardner, and seconded by Kalen, and carried**
21 **unanimously, it was RESOLVED to start a regulations project addressing lapsed**
22 **licenses, as the Board discussed earlier.**

23
24 Cyra-Korsgaard asked how the regulation project affects Board costs. Short discussion.

25
26 The Board decided to move forward with public noticing the regulation project , the
27 technical changes regarding the engineering tables, and to reflect the most current
28 NCARB publication. The Executive Administrator noted that under 12 AAC 36.135,
29 responsible charge party would be required to fill out a form to acknowledge they agree
30 they are the responsible charge party for the corporation. Also, Board member Davis
31 previously made suggested changes to the way the Board conditionally approves
32 documents and the Board had instructed the staff to have them typed for this Board
33 meeting and they are in the packet.

34
35 **On a motion made by Mearig, and seconded by Kalen, and carried unanimously, it**
36 **was RESOLVED to include public notice revisions to 12 AAC 36.135 and 12 AAC**
37 **36.010 along with those voted on earlier this meeting.**

38
39 **There was no objection.**

40
41 Chair noted that the lapsed license request is just for the Executive Administrator to work
42 up, not for the attorney or others to work on.

43
44 Elections:

1 **On a motion made by Gardner, and seconded by Miller, moved to nominate Brown,**
2 **to continue as Chair.**

3
4 Kalen moved to nominate Miller as Chair. Short discussion followed.

5
6 **On an amendment to the main motion, made by Peirsol, and seconded by Miller to**
7 **nominate all three officers, Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary continue in their**
8 **positions.**

9
10 Short discussion.

11 Iverson agreed with the motion, however he felt that the future slates should not be
12 moved as a whole because it doesn't leave time for members to move into an officer
13 position. Short discussion.

14
15 McLane suggested the Board go to a silent vote.

16
17 Peirsol suggested that the Board have as an agenda item in February 2001 under elections
18 so Board members have an opportunity to express their interest prior to the election at the
19 May 2001 meeting.

20
21 **There were no objections and the motion passed.**

22
23 McLane presented his report on the Western Zone, WCEES meeting at Grand Junction,
24 CO. The primary theme was mobility and many jurisdictions are making significant
25 moves towards allowing professionals to practice across state borders. It appears that
26 Alaska might be on the tail end of those discussions. Another major topic of discussion
27 was NCEES financial difficulties through bankruptcy of a national testing firm, which led
28 to the council coming up with contract for ratification by all states to enter into to secure
29 funding and integrity of tests. McLane noted he provided a copy of the draft contract for
30 Board members to review. The next WCEES meeting would be held in Maui, Hawaii.
31 The council condensed their format and reduced the proposed meeting by half a day to
32 reduce costs. A few white papers also were mentioned as topics in his report.

33
34 Brief discussion.

35
36 Kalen added that the testing contract would be acted on at August annual NCEES
37 meeting and that the potential loss was in the nature of about \$350,000 and provided
38 details about this. Kalen suggested that it is very beneficial to have two or more board
39 members in attendance at the regional and annual meetings. Kalen thought that
40 interaction with group was better and felt it also made sense for the Board member to
41 attend the regional and the national meeting, since there is an extension of issues. The
42 regional meeting provides the preparation for the annual meeting.

43
44 Kalen discussed the Registration Board Forum held at Little Rock, AR and the agenda is
45 attached to his report. The forum discussed drainage and photogrammetry. Kalen felt the

1 East Coast was a bit ahead of the Midwest and western states in terms of those issues.
2 There was a presentation on NAFTA. Model law for surveyors. Washington has had their
3 statute for 20 years and Pennsylvania has had the same statute for 30 years.

4
5 The Chair gave her report on the regional meeting at Santa Fe that she attended for
6 WCARB in late March. She noted that the key issue dealt with interior designers and
7 whether or not they should be licensed as professional designers because of the health and
8 safety issues for public. She felt the biggest concern is the benchmark for education and
9 that some programs are called interior decorators and some are interior architecture but
10 not all. She noted that the issue would continue at a national level and that Alaska could
11 anticipate those interior designers may approach the Board for inclusion as a profession.
12 She noted that there is an ongoing issue of reciprocity, that some states don't require a
13 degree and can't get entry to other states. She noted there currently is a review of the
14 requirement for certification and there may be some other means to certify architects.

15
16 Miller asked if more states are going toward a degree. The Chair responded they were but
17 that some states are adopting the intern development program (IDP) which is becoming
18 more formal. Another issue is one of "piling on." Some jurisdictions take enforcement
19 action and other states would take action and the discussion was to move towards
20 differentiating unless the original action was an egregious act.

21
22 NCARB also has been involved in the international scene and some countries have
23 requested reciprocity and there has been some concern in terms of minimum competency.
24 Also, there has been concern expressed about whether NCARB should be traveling in
25 conjunction with these issues. NCARB's position has been that it thinks more globally
26 but the concern has been that the trips are junkets. The Chair thinks that there certainly is
27 some validity to explore reciprocity with other countries due to practice expansion.
28 She went on to explain one big issue has been the practice analysis effort on the
29 architect's examination. The results would help guide what changes should be made to
30 the examination and determine how to make it more responsive to the practice of
31 architecture.

32
33 She noted that the regional director, Kin DuBois, CO was elected, and that she was also
34 elected to serve on the WCARB executive committee. The significant thing about this is
35 that the organization will prepay executive committee members' travel to the meetings.

36
37 **Agenda Item #18, Board Member Comments**

38
39 Mearig supported considering an examination as an alternate to arctic engineering course
40 and also would like the Board to consider if the AKLS examination should have some
41 questions pertaining to arctic engineering or consider if land surveyors be required to take
42 the arctic engineering course.

1 The Chair asked that the arctic engineering item be added to the agenda for the August
2 2000 board meeting.

3
4 Kalen commented that he was quite amenable to the suggestion. As surveyors are
5 becoming more involved with some aspects of engineering it is not unreasonable to
6 consider requiring them to complete the arctic engineering course.

7
8 McLane agreed with the two previous suggestions that the arctic engineering course be
9 considered as a requirement for land surveyors.

10
11 Cyra-Korsgaard suggested that landscape architects also should meet some requirement
12 for cold regions. She commented that perhaps they should take a section pertaining to the
13 northern design course because of the differences in practicing in our state. CLARB
14 indicated that there used to be state specific examination sections in the LARE, but that
15 the testing has gone to one standard national test. However, landscape architects
16 practicing in Alaska should know it is different than practicing in Florida, for example.
17 The local society isn't a large enough organization to put together the test, similar to what
18 the land surveyors are doing in the AKLS workshop. However, some areas of the
19 northern design and some areas of the arctic engineering course would be relevant but
20 neither works well as a requirement for landscape architects.

21
22 Miller commented that one of reasons for the emphasis for a short course in Washington
23 state was because requiring applicants to travel to Alaska in order to meet the local
24 requirement for an arctic engineering course was a restraint of trade and was onerous for
25 applicants. Applicants living in other states couldn't devote a whole semester to take the
26 course. He further suggested that a web-based instruction might meet that need because
27 applicants could take the course no matter where they lived.

28
29 McLane suggested that testing for all professions need to be more open to address the
30 mobility issue and a lack of restrictive trade that professions have. Land surveyors that
31 have to wait a whole year to take the AKLS examination may find it onerous.

32
33 Kalen commented that the AKLS examination has been offered once a year, in April, but
34 it could be proctored in other states.

35
36 Chair asked that another item be added to the August 2000 agenda regarding whether the
37 state should register non-specific professional engineering licensing. For example, an
38 environmental engineer could take the environmental engineering examination and get
39 licensed as a generic engineer.

40
41 The Chair asked staff to research other states that have non-discipline specific registration
42 what testing requirements they have in terms of discipline.

43
44 Short discussion.

1 Mearig added that would be an area of interest to him.

2

3 Cyra-Korsgaard thought it would be a good lead in for those interested in obtaining
4 licensure, for example, environmental or geology disciplines in engineering.

5

6 Short discussion.

7

8 Miller suggested that there are probably advantages to either discipline specific or non-
9 discipline specific engineering.

10

11 Kalen commented that the AKLS examination workshop would be reviewing questions
12 that have not yet been through the committee process. The process also weeds out
13 questions that aren't working. He cautioned that the Board and Occupational Licensing
14 shouldn't get too dependent on one entity, such as Warner Brothers, to provide
15 examination development and testing results. He expressed concern about the
16 contractor's slow turnaround in testing results.

17

18 **Agenda Item # 20, Read Applications into Record**

19

20 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Miller, and carried unanimously, it**
21 **was Resolved to approve the following list of applications for comity and**
22 **examination as read, with the stipulation that the information in the applicant's file**
23 **will take precedence over the information in the minutes:**

24

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

27

#	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	APPLYING FOR	DISCIPLINE	BOARD ACTION
1.	Bellis	William D.	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
2.	Blees	John G	PE/Exam	Civil	Approved
3.	Brinker	Gordon	FLS		Approved
4.	Brinker	Gordon	PLS/AKLS/Exam		Approved for exam
5.	Bush	David A.	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
6.	Carpenter	Johathan M.	FE		Approved by staff
7.	Chemelowski	Laquita	FE		Approved by staff
8.	Coad	John D.	PE/Comity	Mechanical	Approved
9.	Cole	Christopher S.	Arc./Comity		Approved
10.	Coleman	Ruth	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
11.	Crewdson	Jaes A.	FE		Approved by staff
12.	Crouder	Larry A.	PE/Exam	Civil	Approved for reinstatement
13.	Davis	Michael	PE/Exam	Civil	Approved
14.	Dayton	David	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
15.	Dean	Michael	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved

16.	Filler	Dennis M.	PE/Exam	Civil	Approved
17.	Flint	Brett F.	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
18.	Forrssen	D. Kennett	PE/Comity	Civil	Conditional Approval pending verification of PE and license verification
19.	Hannafious	Brian	FE		Approved by staff
20.	Hearon	Gregory E.	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
21.	Homan	Stephen W.	PE/Exam	Civil	Approved
22.	Hooker	Wayne 'Bud'	LS Arc./Exam		Approved for exam
23.	Huggins	M. Elise	LS Arc./Exam		Approved for exam pending arctic prior to licensing
24.	Hunter	William A.	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
25.	Johns	Jimmy B	PE/Comity	Electrical	Approved
26.	Johnson	Lorri	PE/Exam	Civil	Approved
27.	Kampsen	Maria E.	PE/Exam	Civil	Approved
28.	Kinsella	Shannon M.	PE/Comity	Civil	Conditional Approval pending transcript and fees
29.	Korshin	Matthew H	PE/Exam	Civil	Approved
30.	Kotynek	George	PE/Comity	Mechanical	Conditional approval pending arctic
31.	Kurtz	George R.	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
32.	Lent	Burdett B.	LS by Comity		Conditional Approval pending 1 reference
33.	Lewis	Michael H.	PE/Exam	Electrical	Approved for exam, must satisfy arctic engineering prior to licensing
34.	Livingston	Michael C.	PE/Comity	Chemical	Approved
35.	Lundin	David W.	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
36.	Lyford	Norman A.	FE		Approved by staff
37.	Machan	George	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
38.	Mahler	Kevin T.	PE/Exam	Civil	Approved
39.	Manzies	Scot A.	PLS/AKLS/Exam		Approved for exam
40.	Maurer	Jeffrey C.	PE/Comity	Electrical	Approved
41.	Monaco	Domenick J.	LS by Comity		Approved
42.	Morton	Kenneth V.	LS by Comity		Conditional Approval pending reference
43.	Naik,	Maheshchandra	PE/Comity	Mechanical	Approved
44.	Nichols	Charles M.	PE/Comity	Civil	Conditional Approval pending verification of exam, current registration & education
45.	Olson	Robert D.	PE/Comity	Electrical	Approved

46.	Pappas	John M.	PE/Comity	Mechanical	Conditional Approval pending arctic engineering
47.	Pendleton	Kenneth E.	LS Arc./Comity		Conditional Approval pending reference
48.	Porritt	Thomas	FE		Approved by staff
49.	Prater	Samuel	FE		Approved by staff
50.	Quinn	Gary A.	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
51.	Roeller	Dirk A.	PLS/AKLS/Comity		Approved for exam
52.	Roggenkamp	David A.	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
53.	Rowe III	John R.	LS Arc./Comity		Conditional Approval pending arctic engineering
54.	Sanchez	Pedrito	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
55.	Sarber	Jon	PE/Exam	Petroleum	Approved
56.	Savatgy	David	FE		Approved by staff
57.	Schanche,	Lori E.	LS Arc./Comity		Approved
58.	Schexnailder	Don C.	PE/Comity	Electrical	Approved
59.	Schneider	Ronald A.	PE/Comity	Mechanical	Conditional Approval pending arctic engineering
60.	Stine III	Charles R.	FE		Approved by staff
61.	Thompson	Sheldon C.	FE		Approved
62.	Vaughan	Clifford E.	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
63.	Vernon	Walter	PE/Comity	Electrical	Conditional Approval pending arctic engineering
64.	Vozka	Gina	Arc. /Comity		Approved
65.	Watson	Ray	PE/Comity	Civil	Approved
66.	Weisner	Paul C.	PE/Exam	Civil	Approved
67.	Wilke	Nathan	FE		Approved by staff
68.	Williams	Paul M.	FE		Approved by staff
69.	Wong	Judy	PE/Comity	Chemical	Approved
70.	Wood	Ronald G.	PE/Comity	Mechanical	Approved

1
2
3
4
5
6

On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Miller, and carried unanimously, it was Resolved to find incomplete the following list of applications for comity and examination as read, with the stipulation that the information in the applicant's file will take precedence over the information in the minutes:

1.	Keyuravong	Pisonth	PE/Exam	Chemical	INCOMPLETE, experience not relevant to Chemical engineering
2.	Murray	Leonard	PE/Comity	Civil	INCOMPLETE, needs 24 months responsible charge experience under a U.S. registered engineer
3.	Hutchison	Andrew	FE		INCOMPLETE, needs one year additional experience

1
 2 **On a motion duly made by Kalen, seconded by Miller, and carried unanimously, it**
 3 **was Resolved to deny the following list of applications for comity and examination**
 4 **as read, with the stipulation that the information in the applicant’s file will take**
 5 **precedence over the information in the minutes:**
 6
 7

1.	Rataj	Jeanne	PE/Comity	Civil	Denied, but approved for professional engineering examination
----	-------	--------	-----------	-------	---

8
 9 **Agenda Item #21, Calendar of Events/Confirm Meeting Dates**

10
 11 Mearig noted that the landscape architects will be required to be licensed at a time
 12 certain.

13
 14 Executive Administrator noted that the requirement was in the enabling legislation and
 15 while it doesn’t appear in our regulations it is found under special acts. Landscape
 16 architects are required to be registered 60 days after the L.A.R.E. is graded. The LARE is
 17 being administered in June and allowing 12 weeks for grading would set the date to
 18 sometime in November. Short discussion

19
 20 The Chair asked staff to put the information in the news summary and post it to the
 21 website. She also asked Cyra-Korsgaard to take this to the professional organization, the
 22 Alaska Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA).

23
 24 The Chair noted the annual meeting for NCARB is June 14 – 17th, 2000. Peirsol is the
 25 Board delegate, and Brown, and Executive Administrator would also be attending the
 26 meeting. She continued that the Executive Administrator would ask Davis if she would
 27 be interested in attending the meeting.

28
 29 Kalen noted the AKLS workshop will be held on June 18th, 2000 and he has a draft letter
 30 so the notice goes to participants.

31
 32 The Chair noted that the annual meeting for NCEES is August 2-5, 2000 and Mearig
 33 would be representing the Board and the Executive Administrator would be also attend.
 34 The Chair asked if any other Board members were interested in attending and stressed the
 35 value to participate on committees.

36
 37 Kalen indicated he would like to attend the NCEES meeting. He added he would attend
 38 or would try to attend and encouraged McLane to attend also.

39
 40 Chair noted that the Occupational Licensing director indicated there is funding for travel
 41 and encouraged members to participate.
 42

1 Gardner asked if staff could advise the dates of future meetings so Board members could
2 consider their schedules further in advance. Brief discussion.

3
4 Chair asked Executive Administrator to furnish future meeting dates to Board members.

5
6 Chair noted the CLARB meeting would be coming up in late September and asked if
7 there was any interest by Board members in attending. Davis previously expressed
8 interest in attending the CLARB meeting.

9
10 Tape 6 side A (580)

11
12 Chair directed the members to get with the Executive Administrator and that if three
13 members attended that would be great. Executive Administrator would contact Davis
14 about her interest in attending.

15
16 Peirsol indicated she would be interested in attending CLARB meetings, the landscape
17 architect's meeting, rather than engineering meetings.

18
19 Cyra-Korsgaard asked the Board to reconsider how frequently the landscape architect's
20 examination is the offered. At the last meeting the Board decided to hold the
21 examination once a year but there had been quite a bit of discussion about this. All
22 sections of the LARE are offered in June and two sections are offered in December.
23 Since February, she has had many discussions with landscape architects and since they
24 have a busy summer season and due to the length of the test, there is interest that the
25 LARE be offered also in December.

26
27 **On a motion duly made by Cyra-Korsgaard and seconded by Kalen, and carried**
28 **unanimously, moved to offer the LARE in December and in June for the first few**
29 **years.**

30
31 Short discussion followed.

32
33 **Mearig made an amendment , seconded by Gardner, to have the test offered twice a**
34 **year for December 2000 and 2001.**

35
36 **The Chair noted there was no objection to the amendment and it passed.**
37 **The Chair noted there was no objection to the main motion and it passed.**

38
39 Cyra-Korsgaard noted she would not be available for the LARE but could get proctors if
40 necessary.

41
42 **Agenda Item # 22, Review Task List**

Siemoneit	Continue work on unlicensed advertising in the yellow pages
Executive Administrator	Respond to correspondence
	Obtain LAAB course work “equivalency” information
	Update the landscape architect form
	Start a regulation project addressing lapsed licenses, as the Board discussed earlier.
	Public notice the regulations project: NCARB education publication reference; Correction to engineering tables from last regulations project; public notice revisions to 12 AAC 36.135 Corporate responsible charge and 12 AAC 36.010, board reviewed documents
	Research other states that have non-discipline specific registration what testing requirements they have in terms of discipline
	Furnish future meeting dates to Board members and to contact Davis about interest in attending NCARB or NCEES
	For board training investigate some other boards’ strategic planning or training information, for example, consultants used and costs
	for Part 2 regulations, 12 AAC 36.062 and 12 AAC 36.063, the engineer table of experience for Fundamentals of Engineering and Professional Engineer
	Provide status report on agency technology advancements
	Attend NCARB and NCEES meetings

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

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 by:

Nancy Hemenway

APPROVED:

Chair

Date