

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
Minutes of the Professional Association Liaison Committee Meeting
held in the Ed and Mary Alice Pine Board Room, 1755 E Plumb Lane, Suite 130,
Reno, Nevada 89502, on November 8, 2018

Chairman, Gregory P DeSart, PE; declaring a quorum present, called the meeting to order at 8:00am, in the Ed and Mary Alice Pine Board Room, Suite 130, 1755 E Plumb Lane, Reno, Nevada 89502. Board members present were Robert LaRiviere, PLS; Brent Wright, PE/SE; Angelo Spata, PE, and Tracy Larkin-Thomason. Also present were Patty Mamola, PE, NVBPELS Executive Director; John Welsh, ACEC; Don Pawlowski, APWA; Greg Phillips, NALS; Randall Rice, ASCE; Murray Blaney, NVBPELS Compliance Officer; and Louisa Kern, NVBPELS Administrative Assistant.

1. Call Meeting to Order

2. Public Comment Period

There was no public comment.

3. Introductions

Those present introduced themselves. The following persons representing professional organizations were in attendance:

John Welsh – American Council of Engineering Companies - ACEC
Don Pawlowski – American Public Works Association - APWA
Greg Phillips – Nevada Association of Land Surveyors - NALS
Randall Rice – American Society of Civil Engineers - ASCE

4. Approval of September 12, 2018, Professional Association Liaison Committee meeting minutes.

PAL 18-3 A motion was made by Ms Mamola, seconded by Mr DeSart to approve the meeting minutes. The motion passed.

5. Discussion of changes to Nevada Administrative Code 625 to update laws and rules (Discussion Only)

Mr DeSart explained that 3 of the 4 proposed amendments (described below) were adopted at a public hearing on September 13, 2018.

- a. Temporary regulations adopted September 13, 2018:
 - i. NAC 625.260 revises provisions concerning structures and buildings that are required to be designed by professional engineers licensed as structural engineers, also clarifies highest point reference.

- ii. NAC 625. 610 revises provisions related to stamps, seals, and signatures of professional engineers and professional land surveyors.
- iii. NAC 625.630 revises provisions related to advertising for or offering to perform land surveying or engineering—removing the physical requirement of a full-time PE/PLS at each business location where work is being completed.

Ms Mamola said that the adopted regulations were in temporary effect and that she is in the process of notifying the LCB of the adoption so they can continue the process to permanent status.

Ms Fisher said that there is a provision that any temporary regulations adopted by regulatory boards after August 1, and before the legislative session, expire by November 1 of the following year if they have not yet gained permanent status. She added that if they did expire the adoption process would need to begin again. Ms Mamola said she was hopeful that the changes would become permanent before the November 1, 2019 date.

- b. Consideration of future changes to update regulations including consideration to repealing existing regulations and replace with new updated regulations.

There was no discussion on this section.

6. Discussion of possible future joint professional association meeting to have a panel discussion related to digital signatures (Discussion Only)

Mr DeSart said that the Public Outreach Committee of the board had proposed the concept of having panel discussion with one or more professional associations regarding digital signatures. He continued to say that invitation would go out to PE's, PLS's, and maybe public entity officials, to talk about what digital signatures and electronic submissions mean to them and how we are going to best facilitate implementation. Mr DeSart said the committee would like to do one in the North and one in the South. He added that it was also thought it would be a good opportunity to pair with a board "meet & greet" to facilitate licensees getting to know the board members and to have a better connection with the community. Mr DeSart said that the Public Outreach Committee was hoping to partner with one or more professional association(s) to host it or help organize the event. He said the board of course would provide resources and support to organize it. Mr DeSart asked those present if any of their organizations would be willing to help?

Mr Phillips asked for clarification on the duration of the event – was the committee thinking one hour or four hours? Mr DeSart said that the timeframe had not been defined, but was thinking a meeting in the 60 to 90 minute range.

Mr Rice said he thought ASCE would be more than happy to be involved.

Mr Pawlowski said APWA has two conferences a year, one in the North and one in the South. This may

be an opportunity as a part of the conference to include a time for the board members to meet with some of our members, especially our licensed members. He said he would work with the two conference committee chairs and see if there is an appetite to host the panel. Ms Larkin-Thomason suggested that APWA might be a good fit for a panel discussion on digital signatures and electronic submissions. She added, even though not all members are licensed, a lot of them are using or receiving them.

Mr Pawlowski asked when the next board meetings in southern Nevada were going to be. Ms Mamola replied January and May 2019. Mr Pawlowski said the APWA conferences were to be in April and October 2019.

Ms Mamola said there may need to be separate events to get participation from professionals and building officials that don't necessarily participate in APWA events, and it would be nice to get NSPE and ACEC on board.

Ms Mamola added that what we really need is not just a panel discussion, but also the gathering of input. She said the board is at an impasse of what help it can give to licensees and building officials to facilitate electronic submittals and use of digital signatures. It is a balancing act between helping the licensees protect their signature and seal, and also enabling the building departments to do what they need to do. She continued to say, we need to understand what is happening right now and comprehend the current issues, and get feedback on what we need to do to make the regulations relevant and applicable.

Mr DeSart said he felt there are ways to accomplish that in one setting. One is the presentation of the board position, the other one is a board panel discussion, where building officials say this is what we do, and engineers can say this is what I want, and then there is opportunity for the audience to get clarifications on what everyone's positions are. I think it is a little bit different, but still effective.

Mr Pawlowski said that APWA has the setting and it wouldn't take much more to add the board to the agenda. We are already doing a conference. We already have everyone gathered together. We have the Southern conference that has over 300 attend and we had about 270 attend at the Northern conference.

Mr DeSart said that is a good captive audience and he felt if building officials were invited to come, and if they thought it was important, he was sure they would attend. Even Sam Palmer would involve himself in that conversation.

Mr Pawlowski asked if Ms Mamola would be the point-of-contact. Ms Mamola replied that she would be.

Mr DeSart said in addition that board members or Ms Mamola may want to consider attending a NALS meeting to keep their membership informed.

Ms Mamola said initially we were considering a January date and there was a suggestion that we tag something on to the January board meeting, maybe at least the meet & greet.

Mr DeSart asked if Ms Mamola was suggesting that maybe we then separate the meet & greet and the panel discussion. Ms Mamola said yes, and added that we can talk about digital signatures. She continued to say that the digital signature issue is becoming more urgent. Ms Mamola said Clark County is in constant contact and that she had been in discussions with the City of Henderson just last week, and that the City of North Las Vegas is waiting on what the City of Henderson decides. The building departments are looking to the board to help determine a process that works and is in line with the regulations for all parties.

Mr DeSart asked for clarification from Ms Mamola. She thought the APWA events were the best venue for both panel discussion and the meet & greet. Ms Mamola said she thought it would be best to do separate events. I completely agree that APWA is a great venue to catch a wider cross section of licensees, officials, agencies, but I think a separate meet & greet with some panel discussions would be beneficial, because I think we will get a different group.

Mr Phillips said he could probably pull in NALS members. He said they get a pretty good cross section each luncheon that they hold, and also during their board meeting they could bring up the discussion pieces. He continued to say they can at least bring forward some of the concerns or approvals of this process as far as our group goes and maybe present them in a more formal setting. That way you are having one or two points of contact rather than a group of people trying to relate and digest that information.

Ms Mamola said she would be concerned that something could be lost in the translation as it was interesting hearing directly from the City of Henderson, their perspective and thinking. The licensees really need to hear the planning authority side because they will be working directly with it. I think licensees will have one position and the authority will have their position, but we need to hear both sides. Ms Mamola said maybe having a joint lunch meeting with NSPE and ASCE can achieve that.

Mr Rice said they will be having a joint APWA and ASCE in December so that might be a good time to bring these issues up. Mr Pawlowski said it can be brought up, but that is not the focus they want for that meeting. He continued saying that the nice thing about the two conferences is that all logistical stuff is already done and it would be less work for the board.

Mr Philips said that the NALS meeting is in March here in Reno if you wanted an event sooner instead of waiting for the fall conference, NALS could facilitate that.

Mr DeSart said he thought the board should definitely move forward with the panel discussion with APWA in terms of something. In addition to that maybe we can set something up with some building officials because it is really them driving the discussion.

Ms Mamola said perhaps a workshop with the building officials could be scheduled and licensees

invited to attend. Mr DeSart added that whatever comes out of that workshop can also be presented at APWA in April. Ms Mamola agreed.

Mr Pawlowski asked what agencies would be involved. Ms Mamola said Clark County Building Department, City of Henderson Public Works Department, and possibly the City of North Las Vegas. We haven't yet engaged with Clark County Public Works, but we need to.

Mr DeSart said it appears that we need to have a direct engagement between the board and the Southern Nevada agencies that are concerned about this. He added that it could be done in January and tag it on to our normal board meeting or have it the night before. Then the outcome can be recorded, brought up and further discussed at the meeting. Mr DeSart said we could also start to gather feedback from the northern Nevada agencies.

Mr DeSart said regarding action items, for clarity, APWA is going to look into getting the panel discussion into the April and October conferences, and it is going to involve agencies and engineers. (ACTION Item – APWA) He continued to say, Ms Mamola would also begin organization of a workshop in January, and depending on how that goes, make a determination on holding one in northern Nevada. (ACTION Item)

Ms Larkin-Thomason suggested that maybe in partnership with universities the board could do a panel on digital signatures and electronic signatures so an understanding can be given to engineering students before they enter the profession. She added that by connecting with a department Dean maybe an extra credit in class can be given as an incentive to attend. (ACTION Item)

7. Discussion of October 11, 2018, Reconnect, continuing education event in Las Vegas and future similar event in Reno (Discussion Only)

Mr DeSart recapped the ReConnect event hosted by the board in Las Vegas on October 11. He asked if there was any feedback from the group about the event. Mr LaRiviere said he received feedback from a number of attendees who thought the event was good value for 8 PDH and that they were impressed with the quality of the presenters. Mr DeSart said the philosophy that was taken for the event program was less technical speakers, not the kind of content you would get at a typical APWA or a NALS meeting. He continued to say it was more about branding yourself, interacting with people, people skills, leadership and those kinds of things to make the program a little more unique. Mr DeSart said that the committee had committed to hosting a ReConnect event in northern Nevada in October 2019.

8. Nevada State Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors activities (Discussion Only)

Ms Mamola summarized activities of the board. She reviewed the proposed relocation of the Reno board office to another space within the existing building. Ms Mamola said that the board was working in developing a BDR sponsor for the proposed changes to NRS 625 and NRS 329. She also said she wanted to make the group aware of a BDR proposed by Clark County to increase the QBS dollar amount to \$100k from the current \$35k level. Ms Mamola continued to say that this is an item that will be discussed by the board. She said this issue had arisen in the past and that she had testified against it (as a licensee, not as a representative of the board) on the grounds of issues related to public safety.

9. Professional association / industry activities (Discussion Only)

Mr DeSart asked those in attendance to highlight their association's activities.

Mr Welsh reported that ACEC is maintaining liaison with public agencies on as needed basis. He said they have standing committees that are able to maintain a good pulse on what is going on. He added that they have made good progress with RTC Southern Nevada with regard to the issuing of RFPs. Mr Welsh said that as a group ACEC exists to address engineering and business issues, and that those issues are better resolved as a group than individually. He said attendance at monthly lunch meetings were in decline in southern Nevada and they were considering moving to a quarterly calendar, and that the northern Nevada meetings had been lost. He continued to say the groups looking to combine meetings on shared topics is a good step to recovering attendance. Mr Welsh said that ACEC are surveying membership to see what business challenges they are facing and that they will then look to develop a committee(s) to help practitioners with developing solutions. He added that ACEC was looking for someone to help assist on legislative issues as they come during the legislative session, with regard to providing review and discussion, advice, and possible testimony.

Mr Rice said that ASCE had just installed their new officers. He said that ASCE's awards banquet was coming up in March 2019 (**ACTION Item** – add to master calendar).

Mr Rice added that a number of their members were involved in review of title 4, title 6 and title 18, which will impact development and affect building permits. He added that it is probably going to be a 2 year process and ASCE recommended that members should be on that board to represent the engineering community and their interests in the processes of getting new development approved. Mr Rice said this is underway and their next meeting is going to be in January, where basically they will be listening to the changes the city has proposed to the code and see how the engineering community will accept that information.

Mr Pawlowski said that APWA will have a new leadership team for the state chapter starting in January. He said that they conduct monthly meetings both in northern and southern Nevada and that often those are technical and accrue PDH's for the benefit of their licensees. Mr Pawlowski said that APWA has over 600 members throughout the state, with a large contingent being engineers and land surveyors. He continued to say that twice a year APWA has a competition to highlight public works projects, and a number of those projects get nominated for national awards. He added that APWA has morphed its intern scheme to a scholarship program. The scholarships are \$1500 and with four awarded, two in the northern and two southern Nevada.

Mr Phillips reported that NALS had good membership and activity had been increasing over the last year. He said the annual conference is going to be in Reno March 23 – 27, 2019 (ACTION Item – add to master calendar) and that NALS may reach out for some sort of board panel as a part of that curriculum. He added that their fall workshops had just finished and they were well attended. Mr Phillips said the NALS scholarship fund awarded three \$2,500 scholarships to students at our Great Basin program. He continued to say that 5 Great Basin students will be funded to attend the NSPS spring meeting outside of Washington DC and that they will be participating in the student competition.

10. Open discussion topics (Discussion Only)

No additional items were put forward.

11. Next meeting date and location

Mr DeSart said that the next PAL meeting would be at 10am on Thursday January 17 in Las Vegas.

12. Public comment period (Discussion Only)

There was no public comment

13. Adjournment

Mr DeSart adjourned meeting at 8:55 AM, November 8, 2018.