

**State of Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors
Minutes of the Public Outreach Committee Meeting November 2, 2018
Held 1:00 pm in the Ed and Mary Alice Pine Board Room, Suite 130,
1755 East Plumb Lane, Reno, Nevada 89502**

Committee Chairman Greg DeSart, PE, called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm, in the Ed and Mary Alice Pine Board Room, Suite 130, 1755 East Plumb Lane, Reno, Nevada 89502. Committee members present were; Karen Purcell, PE; Patty Mamola, PE, Executive Director. Joining via teleconference were Kent Anderson, PE, and Tracy Larkin-Thomason, PE. Also present were Murray Blaney, Compliance Officer, and Louisa Kern, Administrative Assistant. Susan Fischer, Lobbyist, joined via teleconference.

1. Public Comment Period

There was no public comment.

2. Discuss ReConnect, the continuing education event held in Las Vegas, Nevada, October 11, 2018. (Discussion Only)

Mr DeSart asked for comments and observations on the event from committee members.

Ms Larkin-Thomason commented that the venue was accessible and parking was convenient. She added that attendees seemed skewed toward an older Caucasian male demographic, where the event attracted a number of engineers who were retired or close to retiring, and that that group may have been enticed by the good value pricing. Ms Larkin-Thomason said that there were a number of attendees who were based outside of Nevada.

Ms Mamola said that of the 155 who attended on the day, only 18 were female, accounting for just over 11%. Ms Purcell commented that the percentage seemed to be below the industry average demographic.

Ms Larkin-Thomason said that she heard particular feedback on the personal branding session. Although it wasn't technical, it really seemed to capture the room's attention. She continued to say that the retention rate for the whole event stayed strong, with not too many people leaving before the end of the program.

Mr Anderson said he was concerned about getting younger engineers to participate in the event. He suggested splitting the event into two half days, or to offer a Saturday program to avoid work conflicts. He said with most firms being very busy it would be hard to get the younger employees away from the office midweek. Ms Purcell added if Friday could be an option for the event.

Ms Mamola agreed that with business being strong getting younger engineers to attend midweek could be a challenge. She added that she thought younger professionals with families may not want to give up the weekend personal time. Ms Mamola also said that hosting the event on a Friday could present a challenge in that a number of public agencies work four ten hour days and have Friday's off.

Mr DeSart said he thought engineers who were active had a greater number of opportunities to attend regular industry conferences, and that those who are now not in that routine could have seen the ReConnect event as opportunity to gather a number of PDHs cost effectively in one day.

Ms Larkin-Thomason agreed and said that it may need to be understood that this type of outreach does serve the demographic observed.

Mr DeSart said the event was a trial to see if it is something the board would want to continue supporting in the current format or an alternative. He continued to say that at the least the committee should extend the trial with a similar event in Northern Nevada next year.

Ms Mamola asked Mr Blaney to give a brief overview of the event numbers.

Mr Blaney reported that the net number of paid registrations was 168, with 8 refunds processed from the original paid number of 176. He said the actual number of attendees on the day was 155. Mr Blaney continued to say the gross registration revenue was \$16,632 and expenses amounted to \$26,590 – keeping just within the \$10,000 event allotted budget.

Mr DeSart said for the proposed event in Northern Nevada, he would be inclined to go with the same speaker line-up, or perhaps with one less speaker, and shorten the timeframe to 9am – 4pm.

Mr Anderson said the committee should at least commit to one more event in the North, and that the \$10,000 allocation is not necessarily a subsidy, it is more about giving back to the engineering community.

Mr DeSart agreed that the \$99 fee should be held, and after the event in the North the committee can review and decide on any continuation or whether a whole new idea should be put forward.

Ms Larkin-Thomason said for a first event the attendance was very good. She added that for the proposed North event, that the committee should consider a different mix of speakers – and suggested a keynote with a more direct tie-in to the professions.

Ms Mamola stated that staff had already started a tentative speaker topic list based on feedback from attendees and asked Mr Blaney to share staff thoughts with the committee.

Mr Blaney said the following topics had been included for consideration for a future event:

- Networking in a business setting
- The do's and don'ts of business presentations
- Contracting and insurance: how to write and how to interpret contracts and insurance clauses etc.
- Written communications: business email, internal and external, best practices.

Ms Purcell said she would like to see the same keynote speaker, or someone of equal quality, to headline the program. Having someone speak about an interesting expedition or very unique project would make the event memorable.

Ms Mamola said she would like to consider using different speakers as the draw for the event was beyond just Las Vegas locals. She said a number of attendees flew down from Reno, and others came from Los Angeles and Phoenix. She added to entice people to attend again or to travel a little further; having a fresh program would be an important incentive.

Ms Larkin-Thomson said having someone involved in unique mining projects speak could be very interesting and provide a draw for the large number of mining professionals in Northern and Eastern Nevada.

Mr DeSart said that Las Vegas event presented a lot on non-traditional topics as opposed to the typical technical PDH programs. He said this is a good message for the board to send in encouraging engineers to be better-rounded with the inclusion of themes of communication, personal branding etc. He added that the committee should continue in the direction of the non-traditional topics for future events.

Ms Mamola asked what the general consensus was from the committee about the mid-October timing and whether Thursday was the best day of the week to target.

There was general agreement that October was a good month to schedule the Northern Nevada event. Ms Purcell said Thursday is probably the best day. Monday through Wednesday tend to be the meeting heavy days of the week, and Friday, as mentioned earlier, is a scheduled day-off for a number of the public agencies.

Mr DeSart asked that Mr Blaney draft a couple of proposed program schedules and dates for the committee to review and approve. Mr Blaney replied that he would have draft options ready for committee review by Feb 1, 2019. (ACTION Item).

3. Discuss future meet & greet with Nevada legislators and other possible legislative outreach (Discussion Only)

Mr DeSart asked for an update on the scheduled event with Nevada legislators.

Ms Fischer said the event, in conjunction with Contractors and Architects boards would be held in room 3100 on February 15, 2019 from 8am – 12pm, and that breakfast would be served. She continued to say that there would be displays and collateral on-hand in the room that staff and legislators can view or take with them. Ms Fischer said that it is important to note that Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton had been known as being a leader on regulatory issues, but that torch is now being passed to Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui. She added that it will key to connect with Assemblywoman Jauregui during the event to explain the issues related to the board as she will be an advisor to the caucus on all things related to regulatory boards.

Ms Fischer said that someone representing the board will need to be in the room for the duration of the event, while others can break away to have one-on-one meetings with legislators, particularly those on the commerce committee. Ms Fischer added as reminder, to make sure to have the collateral piece available for the legislators and their staff to take-away. She said it would also be helpful to keep board members unified in the messaging.

Ms Mamola said it may also be pertinent to try to set up a separate meeting or cocktail hour with Assemblywoman Jauregui as a follow-up to answer any specific questions she may have.

Ms Fischer said she could try to set something up at either an earlier or later date. She added that she would be meeting with Assemblywoman Jauregui prior to the session starting – likely before the end of the year. Ms Fischer said having a draft of the board talking point collateral prior to her meeting with Assemblywoman would be helpful to introduce any issues. Ms Mamola said she would have something to Ms Fischer by Dec 1. (ACTION Item). Ms Mamola continued to say that the piece would be succinct and capture the board's position on issues in layman's terms. She added that before being finalized for the meet & greet a draft would be presented for approval by the appropriate committee(s). (ACTION Item).

Mr DeSart asked how many board members would typically attend the meet & greet. Ms Mamola replied that in the past it had been the board chair, vice chair, and legislative committee chair; but we would encourage any board member who is available and would like to attend to join.

Ms Larkin-Thomason stated that the infrastructure day at with the legislators was being held on February 28, 2019. Mr DeSart asked if that event should have a board presence because of the major role of design professionals. Ms Larkin-Thomason said the event tended to focus more on funding but having consistent messaging coming through at any meeting opportunities would be a good thing.

Ms Mamola agreed that any opportunity to raise the board's position on issues with legislators is a positive step. Mr DeSart added that if members attending the infrastructure event had access to the collateral piece it would help keep everyone on message. (ACTION Item).

4. Discuss Nevada university outreach (Discussion Only)

Mr DeSart asked Ms Mamola to review what form this outreach had taken in the past and where it currently stands. Ms Mamola said typically it has been the universities that have reached out to the board but now we have started to be proactive in making the initial outreach.

Ms Purcell said she had talked to UNR's Dr Chatterjee who was going to take the request to the dean's meeting. She added that in the past the university has only been receptive with civil students and not so much with the other disciplines.

Ms Mamola said there seemed to be some push back from the faculty within certain departments about talking to the students about licensure. She said it was explained to Dr Chatterjee that the talk was not about promoting licensure, it was about what it means to be a professional engineer and the associated opportunities and options that provides.

Mr DeSart asked how can we overcome the staff push back. Ms Mamola replied that it would likely require talking directly with the faculty members. Mr DeSart suggested trying to seek an opportunity at UNR to speak to staff. Ms Mamola said she and Ms Purcell would explore options. (ACTION Item)

Ms Mamola asked if Mr DeSart and Mr Anderson could explore meeting options at UNLV. Mr Anderson said he had spoken to engineering classes in the past and would be willing to do so again. Mr DeSart said he would reach out to Dean Venkat to see if something can be arranged with faculty. (ACTION Item)

5. Open discussion topics (Discussion Only)

Ms Larkin-Thomason asked if any outreach was planned with the board as a whole to the professional community. She continued to say that a meet the board had been held a number of years back in conjunction with a professional association meeting, and with the number of new board members now serving it may be the right time to do something similar again.

Ms Mamola said that at the last PAL committee meeting it was suggested that a combined professional association meeting be organized to discuss electronic submissions and digital signatures, with a board panel as guest speakers in a Q & A format. She added that an event like that in the south and in the north could serve a dual purpose as a board meet & greet. Mr DeSart and Ms Larkin-Thomason agreed. Mr DeSart said he would introduce the idea during open discussion at the next PAL committee meeting. (ACTION Item)

6. Public Comment Period (Discussion Only)

There was no public comment.

7. Adjourn

Mr DeSart adjourned the meeting at 1:53 pm.

Respectfully,

Patty Mamola
Executive Director