

Q5 Any comments related to answer to Question 4

Answered: 1,466 Skipped: 623

Question 4 was:

Do you think the current continuing education requirement (30 professional development hours in a biennial renewal period) related to technical competency is meeting the intent of the regulation with regard to public protection?

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors
Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

RESPONSES

For SE licensees having technical requirements is important. Keeping the total requirement at 30 and requiring a min number of the hours to focus on ethics and nevada law would be beneficial.

This is a highly debatable topic and one which I feel generates revenue not necessarily knowledge or safety as intended

I understand the intent of the rule, but 30 hours is difficult to attain in a two year period with busy lives and work schedules. I own my own consulting firm and honestly the best continuing education I get is from new projects. Each offers its' own obstacles and challenges which require you to learn, research, and collaborate to overcome these things which I believe lead to your growth and understanding of the field your in. A lot of the continuing education classes are expensive and you really don't get a lot out of them. The best experience I had that led to continuing education credits was taking a couple college course, but I discontinued the classes because of the work load with our business. I appreciate the board putting together the one continuing education seminar every year, I make a point to try and attend. It's affordable and I enjoy the speakers, but it isn't as affective as working through projects in my opinion.

I have no problem including the 3 units on ethics and Nv law in the 30 required. Most professional licensing in other fields require PDH or CEU. Design criteria and rules and regs change regularly so it is critical that engineers stay up to date b

3 hrs biennially probably is not be enough to meet the intent

There are many states that require 30 hours, though I feel 24 or fewer is more appropriate and less burdensome. knowing I need to complete 1 hour a month is easier to remember to space out than 1½ hours per month, as most courses are offered in full hour increments.

I think that a continuing education requirement to maintain a PE is good for the profession.

I feel it is excessive. Perhaps 15 to 20 hours would be better with 2 of those being ethics.

Other states have a 24 CE requirement, where I could see private sector surveyors finding it difficult to locate quality CE course offering. Most rely upon annual conventions, where much of the content is somewhat repetitive and of a general knowledge approach.

I think you should institute requirements for mandatory classes for ethics and Nevada law AND keep the 30 hours per 2 years. You should also have stronger enforcement.

our practice is incredibly diverse and is constantly evolving. It is the responsibility of our profession to stay up with those changes, learn new techniques and sometimes refresh old skills not used in awhile. The 2 year 30 hour criteria fulfills those needs.

There are a lot of incompetent engineers out there, you need to keep them educated.

I think the 30 hrs is achievable given the wide/diverse range of qualifying items that count towards it.

While I believe it meets the intent of the regulation, it is getting harder to get employers to support their engineers in achieving this requirement.

The state of the practice is constantly evolving. I believe the 30 hour requirement is important for a professional to remain relevant in a changing world.

Fewer course requirements and greater selectivity would accomplish would meet the intent.

Public safety comes through proper practices, not continuing education.

The current CE requirements are generally in alignment with the other jurisdictions within which I practice

It can be more about checking off a requirement rather than keeping up to date on the latest technology.

The continuing ed requirement forces engineers to stay more current. Some kind of training in

current codes and material standards is better than none.	
Continue education needs to continue as it keeps professionals in contact with each other allowing for exchange of ideas and builds a form of community	
This is pretty common for many of the states in the US.	
I think that most continuing education is just "checking the box" type stuff. Online training that doesn't teach much, vendor lunch presentations, etc. Not a lot of real learning.	
Any required classes should be readily available	
Limiting only to laws and ethics does not enhance public protection. Licensees' CE requirements in their area of practice enhances the public protection	
I believe the 30 hours of education require Nevada Engineers to spend necessary time outside of project related work to think about their profession.	
I take no offense to the idea of maintaining the 30 PDH requirement as it helps maintain the professionalism standard and minimum expectations high. Other groups also have similar requirements that prompt PE's to also maintain similar requirements to receive similar professional respect, status and earnings. In general, I believe that a PE who is in responsible charge of any area better stay on top on the laws, rules, regulations, code requirements, etc. etc. They are in charge and need to spend whatever time is necessary to keep current and protect the public with whatever design they are approving. If their stamp is on it then it better be right, regardless of how many PDH's they conducted that year. They may have to spend a 100 hours a year staying current and studying the most recent designs, rules and regulations. There are also PE's that don't need as many PDH's (much less than 30) to stay current and be responsible for the correct and safe design they are stamping. The issue for me is there are way too many examples and situations and it would be very difficult to defend or oppose significant changes to existing policy. The proposed change from 30 to 3 and focus on ethics and regulations seems like a significant change but in general I would support fewer required PDH's that would ultimately shift the responsibility and accountability to the PE. That's where the responsibility should be and not so wrapped up on the exact number of PDH's. From a personal perspective, unfortunately, I have fulfilled my PDH requirements spending time in seminars and meetings that do not necessarily benefit me or my profession but meet a quota that I must manage to maintain the PE. Just my opinion.	
PEs evolve their knowledge during their work. The requirement for 30 units in technical field only opens a door to low level commercial classes that are often below the level of catalogues.	
I believe requiring some regular engagement in technical organizations or attending technical conferences improves our knowledge and understanding of the current state of practice and new developments. I do believe the 30-hr requirement is a bit arbitrary and could be changed. I think the Ethics requirement and/or 1-2 hrs of reviewing Nevada regulations would be worthwhile.	
There's a lot of CE hours that are able to be acquired that provide no beneficial educational experience. It's just a check in the box and a waste of time. Having legitimate education exercises with stated goals and expectations would provide a better service to the general public.	
I feel like 30 credits is sufficient and allows professionals to improve their technical competencies through a variety of opportunities.	
Seems like many professionals go to a convention or seminar for their CE hours, then immediately forget everything afterwards	
Reduce hours required	
Finding new material related to surveying is difficult if not impossible. Since graduating from the U of M all that's been available is a rehash of the university coursework. The 30 hr. requirement is redundant.	
Based on the poor quality of surveys and maps submitted to the Agencies, it appears that ethics, NRS, proper procedures and quality control should all be mandatory.	
I do think that the current continuing education requirement of 30 professional development	

hours in a renewal period is meeting the intent, but I think a more focused education requirement regarding professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulations will be more beneficial.

Engineers, like other professionals, should keep up to date with their profession. That said, professional development should emphasize advances in technologies and best practices—as opposed to the mostly elementary review courses available from PDH services.

30 pdh's are relatively easy to obtain in two years.

The requirement is consistent with requirements in many other states.

It is very important to stay up with technology in ones field and 15 hours of C.E. in one year should not be a problem for anyone!

Most technical competency comes from working experience.

Responsible engineers will do what is necessary to maintain appropriate technical competence in their area of practice.

I would just add, that 1 - 2 hours per year should be on ethics. That would be within the 15 hours per year.

Very few calls to the Board for discipline are related to the 30 CEU requirement, so the Board feels need to change it. If the 4-yr degree program isn't sufficient then is a decrease in the 30 CEU requirement necessitated? However, once the requirement is changed, the 27-odd CEUs stricken will mean those gaps will supplant the ones arguably replacing them. Why bother to 'dumb down' a craft that is - in many views - already dying? I'm of the opinion it is not a positive step to replace it with less, as this industry is always going to be 'the canary in the coal mine' with respect to new innovations to it. Keep the standards, and augment 10 or 15 yr Licensees with additional Requirements if you must. I'm a 20 yr Licensee.

I feel it's a little out dated.

30hrs every two years is minimal, requirements are reasonable, and I personally believe engineers should always be learning more as the industry is always changing and growing.

It is my opinion that a PE with 25 years of experience in a leadership or project management role active in the area of expertise of registration would be qualified and not need the 30 hours of CEU's. I do agree the hours of professional development for state standards and laws of practice are required.

The current 30 hr requirement does not result in very effective continuing education. I believe it results in minimal increase in technical knowledge. The majority of the pdh's are typically 1-2 hour webinars that provide a general overview but don't do much more than provide an overview of the subject. Overview's can be helpful and make you aware of something that is available but doesn't really increase your expertise. I believe it is up to each engineer to keep their technical skills and knowledge up to date themselves. That takes a more focused effort than trying to comply with a government requirement.

I think it is critical to maintain technical competency for licensed engineers. I think the current program is adequate but I recommend reducing the professional development hours down to (perhaps) 20 and make professional ethics and Nevada regulations required training.

It would be likely helpful to add a requirement that a certain number of PDH need to be focused on ethics, laws and regulations.

While the intent of continuing education may sound good, in reality, I have never taken a class that makes me a better engineer. I maintain competency through my engineering practice as I would not be hired if I didn't do a good job. If you want to focus on Nevada regulations, a model similar to what is used in Texas with their periodic webinars would be great

Maybe some requirements for PDH should focus on code updates.

Training can be on any related topic, without consideration or interest of changes to state law regulating Professional Engineers.	
It should be up to the individual to ensure they are adequately up to date on the pertinent codes and standards. Having a blanket hourly education requirement almost certainly forces a 'go-through-the-motions' attitude that is degrading.	
The 30 PDH requirement has little to no impact on the competency of an engineer. With the never ending code changes and engineering software updates a good engineer must endure continuing education every day in order to keep up.	
About 50% of the continuing education available meets the intent. The other 50% just meets the requirement.	
n/a	
With the advances in the engineering practice, it is very important to have continued education be a part of maintain a licence.	
I have mixed feelings regarding the requirements for ethics training-see comments to questions below	
Adding to one's proficiency requires finding educational opportunities that reflect the registrant's needs. Far too often I see engineers attending just for the credits and not for learning's sake. I think fewer hours focused on core competency would better serve the public. Also, for learning to take place one must measure if learning was achieved.	
30 hrs. per biennial renewal period in line with other states that have same requirement.	
It shows engineer is staying current in their industry. However, some just obtain CEUs to meet individual state requirements.	
While some model law content is now trending toward advanced degree requirements, an engineer with a reasonable amount of education from an ABET accredited program should be a cognizant technical resource. However, the pace of change in industry mandates continuing education to remain relevant in delivery.	
The ethics and laws being required by most states now should be more universal to all states.	
It is tough to meet the required hours and I don't believe all trainings selected are relevant to continuing our education. In my experience there are not many options for us to choose from. Sessions are selected because they will help reach our 30 hour goal, not because of their content.	
I realize many PE's come from other states to Nevada. I think the requirements ensure some form of competency whereas commonality may not.	
Engineers in private practice have continuing education daily. Most CEU programs are money grabbers for the operators.	
I learn everyday on the job.	
30 hours per biennium should be considered the minimum; the course structure and Board approval of the subject matter should be discussed.	
It is beneficial to stay involved in technical committees, attend conferences and other areas to continue to stay current in the field. However, in regards to public protection, the credits do not necessarily help meet that	
just seems like a lot of time spent for pretty minimal gain.	
I am a strong proponent of continuing education. In 32 years of practice, I have observed a tendency for engineers to allow their skills to grow "stale." While continuing education doesn't completely eliminate this phenomenon, it is the logical first step. Periodic re-certification would do even more.	
Requiring continuing education is a MUST. If you want change the required hours, I suggest 10	

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

per year with 1 about Nevada rules/laws annual and 1 about ethics annual.

To go to 3 PDH of which 2, EVERY 2 years are ethics/state requirements is going to be repetitive and non-productive. As a PE-PE/SE in half the states, I would recommend, 1.) a requirement of 2 PDH in ethics every 4 years be required. 2.) consider a reduction to 24 PDH. (I find that I consistently have more PDH and 'lose' hours for many states. If a PE wants to keep current they will do continuing education, if they don't they are just going through the motion and getting fluff 'hours' anyway.)

I think it is fine to add requirements to have hours required for ethics and specific Nevada Rules and Regulations. Other States also do this. I also think 15 hours of continuing education per year is NOT a burden.

none

I believe the Continuing Education requirement, as it is, ensure continuing engagement in the industry through participation seminars, conferences, courses, association committee work, etc. This participation help engineers stay current with the latest developments and issues facing the Engineering community. I struggle to see how reducing this requirement to 3 hours, and only focusing on ethics and regulations, would improve public safety.

I do feel that professional ethics has given way to greed in the last 13 years.

Let's require that 3 of the 30 hours be about ethics and laws.

30 hours is consistent with many other states requirements, so a reduction would not change much for me.

I think the current the PDH requirement helps maintains technical competents in the profession.

The public is best served by engineers trained and well versed in the latest technologies and most recent code developments.

I believe a portion of the required hours should be related to ethics.

Technical competency is not necessarily the prerequisite of public protection

Not really.

I believe 30 hours would be required in order to keep up with new technical development.

Back when first implemented, the PDHs earned for Patents were granted when the patent was ISSUED, possibly YEARS after the application was SUBMITTED. Many technical education options contributed little to technical competency or public protection. Serving as an officer or participating member of a committee of a professional or technical organization contributes little to technical competency or public protection.

This directly addresses the original intent. I recommend that we keep it!

Continuing education is inherent in most PE's careers regardless of enforcement at the state level.

hard to correlate intent of safety with acceptable courses

This is comparable with other states as well as requirements for other related professions and easily achievable.

Many of the seminars that we get credit for have nothing to do with protecting the public.

3 hours seems to be significantly below the threshold to demonstrate a practicing engineer is keeping up to date on current code requirements, technical competence and ethics training.

Technical competency and understanding of the best engineering practices is the best way to ensure public protection. 30 hours could be decreased to 20. Nevada law classes will be unnecessary hurdles for out of state licensees without any benefit to the public.

CE should be limited to laws and ethics.

The cost of attending/utilizing submissible material is ridiculous! This applies to IBC/ICC course material as well which is off base, but not really. It is simply a rip-off in my opinion (and others that I deal with).
Seems high compared to other states I am licensed in, though I recently obtained MS and LA and they are also both 30 every two years.
30 may be a little high for some people and I might anticipate 8-12 hours a year may work. Also, keep in mind attending professional organizations typically meet the requirements and this would encourage participation.
N/A
with the amount of building code changes and material codes changes, continuing education is required at some level to keep up to date
The PDH's that engineers accumulate may not actually contribute towards the area of practice that the engineer practices on a daily basis.
I find it VERY interesting that my home state has no PDH requirements.
To many things qualify. The requirement has been watered down
None.
Keeping current technically especially with code related changes is important as well.
The value to having the 30 PDH requirement is that employers are generally much more willing to provide opportunities for training since it is required.
This time is not needed.
Technical Competency is inherent in professional ethics and the threat of the consequences of incompetence. Every professional has to be honest with themselves to decide if they are capable of handling the work they take on. You cannot force competency through continuing education by the current means, which amounts to just exposing engineers to new tools, products, design methods, etc. The real question is do they understand these new things and are confident to use them. Self-education is required to gain the confidence to use new ideas, products, and methods. The self-motivation, to gain the confidence, cannot be forced. That's up to the engineer and his professional ethics.
I think that 30 hours is overkill. I mostly just refresh knowledge that I already have or that I need to do my job more efficiently. There have not been any inovations in civil engineering that I can think of that would require me to take a class to learn.
Brief, one day long, PDH courses are designed to achieve the goal of completing the PDH requirement for licensure. They do not provide in depth knowledge on subjects to improve or maintain professional competency.
no
It establishes a reasonable threshold for ensuring that licensees maintain the technical and administrative skills necessary to protect public health, safety and welfare.
30 PDH is higher than several other states 24 PDH for biennial renewal.
I have heard of reducing the number of hours and making the training specific to the intent of ethics and public safety.
Many of my hours are spent watching presentations about engineering efforts and advancements. Ethics and law are not included
Personally, I use the continuing education requirement to expand my knowledge base such as solar design or use of drones. I ma not sure how either of those lead to public protection unless it is the safe flying of crones. I am registered in multiple state, about half of which have no continuing education requirement. Those that do have the 30 hour requirement with reciprocity among states regarding the continuing education requirements. If I comply with one state, I comply for all. One of states does have a mandatory 2 hours of ethics requirement, I think every other renewal.

The requirement should not be reduced. With ever new technologies, projects and theories, Professional engineers should, now more than ever, be more involved in participating in the future of the world and the profession.
I think a reduction in hours wouldn't be in the best interest of the public.
The suggested changes focusing on Nevada law and ethics will cover the most important elements of professional development.
I do feel that the current professional development paradigm is (somewhat) effective in promoting technical competency. It could always be improved.
I think it's important that engineers keep their knowledge up to date.
I would be in favor of the Board putting together a 4 hour on-line webinar that would be required prior to re-issuance of the license having to do with engineering ethics and changes to the State of Nevada Rules and Regulations.
30 credits every two years = 15 credits each year = 1.25 hours each month of continuing education
It helps, but the 30 hours alone is not enough to ensure technical competency. The individual or company must also obtain the education/knowledge updates for the exact areas they work on.
I don't have a problem with the requirement, but question whether it provides any public protection benefit. I see it more of a requirement to socialize with other engineers for at least 30 hours every two years. I think it provides a benefit for networking and updates on current state of practice i.e. interesting projects, new technology, etc and gives vendors to opportunity to showcase new products where they have a captive audience. I think if it were to be truly about public protection the eligible PDH list would have to be scaled back to focus more on design/construction issues.
30 hours is too much time to attend and very costly.
Other states I am licensed in also include a requirement that at least 1 hour per year must be in ethics. I think it is good to require both technical and ethics for continuing education.
Continuing education is a scam promoted by lobbyist for the providers of the "continuing education". I am licensed in several states and Nevada is the only one with these education requirements. It is expensive to complete, frustrating to track, and the majority of the time has no bearing on the work I conduct. My recommendation is to remove the requirement all together. I have completed a four year degree, plus and additional 2 years for a masters, completed the FE and PE and worked diligently in my field. This should be the requirements to be a professional engineer in this state.
while this works to ensure PE's are staying current, i think without professional development hours required, PE's are still responsible for their work and making them take PDHs does not alleviate them of their responsibility, so the PDHs to me see unnecessary for the state to keep track of. PE's should be doing this regardless.
No
Any engineering consultant that intends to stay in business will already be doing what is necessary to be current on the latest developments and technology related to their profession as well as be looking at how to expand their knowledge.
Registrants need more direct training on different levels other than rehashing the same training we do every year.
Continuing education is the responsibility of the individual who gets licensed by the State. "Continuing education regs" gives a false impression of public safety. California has no continuing education requirements for licensed professionals and there do not appear to be any public safety concerns.
it is consistent with other states and represents a reasonable investment in time and cost for a professional engineer to stay up to speed with changing regulations and technology.
I support the concept of a smaller number of required hours but with a focus on public protection. I am motivated to continue to study state of the art areas in my specialty even if that surpassed your minimum hourly requirements.

Unfortunately, I think the majority meet the required hours in a method of least resistance by learning about vendors' new products through a class or presentation backed with a lot of technical backup for that product but with loose ties to the relevant codes and standards or to public protection.
The requirement keeps PEs engaged and avoids complacency.
Have the existing requirement keeps engineers at least somewhat engaged in the profession. Lessening this may result in more 'part time' engineers.
N/A
NO COMMENT
The 30 hour requirement is adequate, however, there is no required ethics component.
I believe that a professional development hours requirement is in keeping with the intent of the regulation, but quantity alone cannot ensure it.
No.
I think the proposed change would more closely meet the original intent.
30-hour is a lot of hours.
Is working well
no
My feeling is the CEU's used are not always technical or ethical related.
I am licensed in Utah also and they require 30, so it works.
rECENTLY THE ENTRANCE QUALIFICATIONS WERE INCREASED. THIS IS VERY GOOD. DO NOT DECREASE THE CONTINUING EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS.
None
30 pdh/2 years is the most pdh required by any jurisdiction that I'm licensed in. I think this requirement could be relaxed a bit without being harmful to the public. 10 pdh/year would be less of a burden on design professionals while still protecting the public interest.
could reduce to 10 hours and would still be effective
I think the requirement could be less and still meet the regulation with regard to public protection.
Yes, I believe that maintaining adequate continuing education requirements related to technical competency meets the intent of the regulation with regards to public protection. The Nevada laws for continuing education credits allow for a broad level of engagement by a licensee into technical training, technical interactions such as industry meetings or seminars, and more conventional continuing education type credits.
I do believe that some of the work we take on deserves credit for professional development. Some projects that require high degree of care, that may not be standard or utilize standard materials, often requires research, study, and learning new concepts, should be able to count as continuing education credits.
No
I work nationwide and am licensed in 32 states. Nearly all states now require continuing education and any state opting out will be a negative outlier.
No
Continuing Ed requirement helps keep professional engineers current with advancements in their industry
i would reduce the requirement to 16 or 24 hours but would not eliminate it. 2 or 3 hours of ethics refresher is not a bad idea.
Competency is achieved through practice not conferences.

The current requirement of 30 biennial PDH's is similar to the other state in which I am licensed (Texas, which requires 15 PDH's per year). However, in Texas one of your PDF's must be related to ethics. I feel the ethics requirement is beneficial. While I feel the other PDH's have their place, I think 15 PDH's per year might be overkill.

Engineers have to stay current in their field to be successful and productive. Generic, low-level courses are not ensuring that licensed engineers are good at anything except choosing the professional development courses that allow them to return to their actual work as quickly as possible.

I think the professional development hours are just a hoop that we are forced to jump through. I can normally meet the the hours, but am in a position where my company sends me to conferences as a learning opportunity. Some engineers need some leverage to get their companies to approve these types of learning opportunities. Some engineers work for companies were the entire burden of complying with these hours falls on them. Not really fair, but that is the way it is. A whole industry has grown up around providing "courses" to comply with these state requirements. Most of these so called PDH courses are useless.

Some of the courses are repetitive for each renewal

No

Protecting the public involves keeping current on best practices and new technology.

Most PDH's come from conferences which are expensive and time consuming in private sector. It just adds unnecessary overhead. I get mire Beni fit from actually doing the work.

30 hours may be a bit excessive, but they do need to have a few hours relating to ethics and state law. The primary focus must relate to technical design techniques and code updates. 30 hours is too much and 4 hours is too little.

I think the present 30 hours is excessive and that it should be focused to the 3 hours on the ethics, laws and regulations

The purpose of the 30 CE requirement is to maintain proficiency. Practicing engineers maintain their proficiency by conducting their daily business.

no

Technical competency needs to be up to the individual engineer. He should decide if he is competent to do the task. This is where ethics would play a big part.

The requirement helps keep engineers up to date on the latest codes and practices to be able to make better engineering decisions and designs.

I think 30 hours is to high

Perhaps 30 PDH maybe too many, but 3 is certainly not enough.

Technology is changing rapidly and it is incumbent upon the professional to keep up. Without the 30 hour requirement, many would keep their head in the sand and let technology pass them by. While ethics and demonstrable knowledge of NRS is very important, it should only be a part of the overall continuing education process. Rather than limit continuing education only to 3 hours of ethics and state law, perhaps simply requiring that 3 of the 30 PDH's should be on those topics.

I am also licensed in California and they do not require you to document the PDHs. As a professional engineer I prefer the California method as I have proven that I understand the duties an ethical responsibilities of an engineer.

It appears to me that most engineers meet the required PDH's by attending luncheons or conferences. Although these may be informative, I rarely hear of valuable information being learned from them - let alone anything to do with public protection. Most hours are obtained with a cost and time sacrifice that do not meet the intent of the regulation.

Presently, there are few requirement of the PDH's. You can take almost any course and get meaningless credits. In today's world, we are exposed to more and more risk. Perhaps some hours should be mandated for risk management.

Excessive continuing education hours is a detriment to small businesses, especially single

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

proprietor businesses in the State. In many disciplines there are no in-state opportunities for continuing education, which means expensive trips to out-of-state conferences. A recent trip to the NGPA conference in Oklahoma City for 16 hours of PHA cost me in excess of \$3000 - which is outrageously expensive.

195	Nope	2/11/2020 9:15 AM
196	The 30 hr requirement motivates PE to evolve, improve and refine knowledge, skills, ability as career progresses. This provides greater benefit to public because the state of practice never remains static.	2/11/2020 9:08 AM
197	No.	2/11/2020 9:04 AM
198	I don't believe practicing professionals make adequate time to effectively participate in the 30 hours.	2/11/2020 9:00 AM
199	None	2/11/2020 8:57 AM
200	Technology is changing so fast that continuing education is needed. In the years 2018 and 2019 combined I recorded over 120 hours of continuing ed. I already have 35 hours this year (2020). I am a licensed PE in 29 states soon to be 30 states. As a result, I have been taking ethics cont. ed classes for years and such classes haven't impacted my ethics at all and I thus consider ethics education a waste of time for me and others although it likely looks good for you to require ethics classes if that is what you are trying to do...look good. Reading state engineering laws every two years is overly burdensome for a person to read/study the laws and rules in your state especially for those licensed in 29 states. However, I know it is good to review the state laws once in a while much more so than sitting through an hour of an ethics class. If you haven't learn ethics growing up from your parents, you aren't going to learn ethics as an adult. Remember, what is ethical to one person is not ethical to another. The state laws state clearly what a P.E. is and is not to do in each state. My practice is to review the state laws when I do a job in a particular state because there are some minor variations in state P.E. laws and rules from state to state, and I want to comply. Suggest you keep the 30 hours of continuing education and figure out method of getting engineers to periodically review the state PE laws and rules, but it is overly burdensome for the states to require that a PE study/read the states laws and regs for 29 states every two years for an engineer licensed in 29 states unless your goal is to try and limit the number of engineers licensed working in your state. For example, I got licensed in Arkansas in 2007 (just in case) because my parents retired to Arkansas even though I live in Colorado. I have never worked in Arkansas. Arkansas doesn't require me to read their laws every two years thank goodness. But if someone wanted me to do a job in Arkansas, I would review the laws and rules, which is my practice in part because the laws and rules change occasionally. The 35 hours of continuing education class I took this year was held in Las Vegas. I didn't have to study and read the state laws to rent a car in Nevada. P.E. should know the state engineering laws and rules or at least review them periodically which is what I do as a matter of practice when needed. Your challenge is to alert PEs that they need to review the state laws and rules periodically because changes occur and people forget things. Beyond that, PEs should be taking 30 hours of cont. ed every two years. I am 70 years old. I already have 35 hours of tech. cont. ed. this year 2020. Some states drop the cont. ed. requirement when a person turns 70 or 75, which I think is crazy. If anything an older person needs more cont. ed. because they start to forget things. Why don't you adopt a rule that requires a person to certify he or she has reviewed your states laws and rules within the past years of sealing and signing a print or report. Whoever made this proposal to drop the 30 hours of cont education in favor of reading the state laws and rules and getting some ethics training must be a structural engineer as they use the same "I" beam books published in 1900...nothing has changed in the world of structural engineers (just kidding), but if you are an electrical engineer like me, there is no way to keep up with technology and things a person has to know than to take lots of continuing education in the interest of public safety and welfare.	2/11/2020 8:50 AM
201	Protection of the public is achieved by safe designs, designed per the relevant ruling standards. I have not found that continuing education has particularly contributed to ensuring public safety. Rather, this simply happens by the engineer being willing to always follow the applicable standards of design, motivated by the desire for the common good and the safety of every person, during the design process itself.	2/11/2020 8:49 AM
202	30 hours is excessive!	2/11/2020 8:48 AM
203	I believe the current 30 hr. requirement has worked well. I have found that typically a practicing engineer who keeps up with the changes and new information easily meets this requirement	2/11/2020 8:47 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

and is able to better protect the public.

204	I think some of the PDH's can be very valuable but not all PDHs are created equally.	2/11/2020 8:40 AM
205	no	2/11/2020 8:36 AM
206	This is fair enough	2/11/2020 8:34 AM
207	I think that the 30 hours of continuing education is a good thing for the profession and should be encouraged to expand knowledge outside of local practice, which from my experience is lagging behind other parts of the country.	2/11/2020 8:33 AM
208	I believe that getting 30 hours over two years is acceptable. It allows engineers to learn about new product and information that is out there so we are always staying up to date and what is the best for the client and public.	2/11/2020 8:33 AM
209	I think a lot of people go to presentations that give general overviews and it's not even guaranteed that the person is even paying attention.	2/11/2020 8:32 AM
210	I believe the current requirement is meeting the intent, however I believe that the 30 hours is a bit much. I would like to see somewhere around 15-20 hours.	2/11/2020 8:31 AM
211	None	2/11/2020 8:30 AM
212	Most states require 12 per year (24 Biennial) with some having a 2 hour ethics requirement.	2/11/2020 8:30 AM
213	There is a thin line between doing wrong because one doesn't know and doing wrong intentionally. A balanced approach and mandatory PDHs are instrumental to assure & maintain the quality of the engineering community, thus meeting the intent of the regulations.	2/11/2020 8:29 AM
214	PDH's are easily obtained with no certainty that the professional is truly learning current methods or improving their engineering practice.	2/11/2020 8:26 AM
215	Being licensed in several states, most with different CE requirements has become a nuisance and the many of the training opportunities are perfunctory to meet a requirement.	2/11/2020 8:25 AM
216	The goal is to stay involved and stay informed. Go to conferences and lectures, talk and compare ideas and experiences with other professionals. With the 30 PDH requirement, laws and ethics will be covered without ever taking a law or ethics class.	2/11/2020 8:19 AM
217	n/a	2/11/2020 8:18 AM
218	Active engineers get plenty of continuing education in the course of doing business. The NV requirement is just a bureaucratic hoop to jump through with little value.	2/11/2020 8:14 AM
219	It may be excessive but it does meet the intent	2/11/2020 8:14 AM
220	N/A	2/11/2020 8:13 AM
221	No.	2/11/2020 8:13 AM
222	30 hours is fairly easy to obtain every 2 years.	2/11/2020 8:12 AM
223	When doing the same type of work for a number of years it is easy to get set in our ways. Yet technology is constantly changing. Codes are always changing. The continuing education requirement forces us to stay current and keep learning. It also give us more leverage with our employers to pay for the training. Attending a big conference for a few days or taking another design class can cost thousands of dollars. I know that personally if I were not required to earn PDHs to maintain my license, my employer would never pay for the training, and I would not be able to afford it from my own family budget. The 15 PDH per year requirement is a good idea. We need to keep it.	2/11/2020 8:11 AM
224	Yes it helps. However reading the trade publications (like Engineered Systems), Vendor presentations and pod casts helps more than some of the canned classes which are not very good.	2/11/2020 8:11 AM
225	I'm not sure 30 is the right number. It is perhaps a little high.	2/11/2020 8:09 AM
226	The people needing more education are smart enough to sign up for a seminar, only to show up to sign in and then leave getting credit. Webinars are no better.	2/11/2020 8:07 AM
227	The engineering concepts remain constant while new products are continuously being	2/11/2020 8:05 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

developed. Developers and suppliers are very good at keeping professional informed.

228	Ethics should be required as part of the 30 hours	2/11/2020 8:04 AM
229	I favor professional development and spend time every year refreshing my existing knowledge and/or learning something new about my discipline speciality. However, I do not favor *mandatory* training because it is a burden and will lead less honest professionals to do the minimum necessary to meet the regulation but without the personal investment necessary to gain new knowledge.	2/11/2020 7:57 AM
230	This regulation arrestees that all professionals keep up to date on all maters of their profession. It makes the Engineers review the current trends in the constantly changing envioment of science with respect to what we are working on in each particular case.	2/11/2020 7:57 AM
231	none	2/11/2020 7:57 AM
232	Other professional licenses require far more than the proposed amendment. Are we so arrogant to think we are smarter than other professionals?	2/11/2020 7:49 AM
233	The concept is sound but the reality is that this requirement is just a "busy work" requirement common too many states If one is active in the business, one stays current with the status of the engineering business	2/11/2020 7:46 AM
234	Keeping up with this requirement is very costly and difficult in MINE engineering as there are so few of us. A PE is not required to work for a mining company.	2/11/2020 7:43 AM
235	Ethics and State Law applicability are usually not covered in any of the offered conferences and seminars.	2/11/2020 7:39 AM
236	This is consistent with the requirement for P.E's in WY	2/11/2020 7:30 AM
237	Maybe not the 30 hours, but I do believe there should be some technical PDHs required.	2/11/2020 7:26 AM
238	In my experience, most of the training offered/taken to meet continuing education requirements does little to advance the knowledge of the professional taking it. The whole system is designed and propagated by those who offer the training as a means of making money for themselves.	2/11/2020 7:21 AM
239	Most of the Continuing Education work that is being done is non-substantial and does not advance understanding among the Licensees.	2/11/2020 7:17 AM
240	.	2/11/2020 7:17 AM
241	No	2/11/2020 7:15 AM
242	It is a good idea to incorporate NV laws and ethics into PDH's. In consulting engineering you are always having to stay current with technology and how to apply it, so there is on the job continuing education.	2/11/2020 7:13 AM
243	I am registered in 15 states and most of them follow the same criteria. Some are asking for one credit in ethics and one in laws which seems ideal to me. At least one state allows ethics and laws to be self study which helps me keep my costs for pdh down. Another thought would be to administer laws and ethics online through the board with a quiz to help keep practitioners focused on the most significant points without extra cost to practitioners.	2/11/2020 7:12 AM
244	In order to be a good engineer, one must stay current or the industry will pass one by and you will know longer be a viable employee or firm if you don't keep current.	2/11/2020 7:08 AM
245	Difficult to find courses/webinars/etc. related to the work requiring my P.E. license.	2/11/2020 7:08 AM
246	I think that a portion of the required 30 professional development hours could be dedicated to regulation/public protection.	2/11/2020 7:07 AM
247	I think that a continuing ed requirement helps assure that the licensee is at least making an effort to stay competent. However, I also feel that the hour requirement could be reduced - possibly to 15-20 hours per biennium rather than 30? - to encourage the licensee that continuing ed is important to a professional without burdening the professional with finding and paying for continuing ed simply for the sake of fulfilling the minimum hour requirement.	2/11/2020 7:07 AM
248	Absolutely we should have continuing education requirements. Just like other professions. In my opinion 3 hours is not sufficient. Continuing education also tends to foster collaboration and	2/11/2020 7:06 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

networking as people get together at workshops, classes, and conferences for those credits. I think it "dumbs down" our profession to remove those requirements.

249	The continuing education requirement is too broad. It can be satisfied by taking almost any type of class, most of which contribute little to public safety.	2/11/2020 7:06 AM
250	The current requirements in NV place a significant burden on working folks. I let my registration slip because I could not find the time to satisfy the requirements.	2/11/2020 7:05 AM
251	I feel extorted by those selling services for professional development hours (PDHs) as they are the ones that lobbied to get such a rule enacted. I believe that PDHs should only be required of those not actively working in their field for which they are licensed. It is simply an additional regulatory burden on industry to expect those actively working in their field to take 30 hours of time biennially for PDHs - and to pay a third party for them. Why did we agree to such a sham? Why not simply have PEs document how many hours they actively worked in their field of licensing to fulfill PDH requirements? I totally disagree with any PE having to pay for PDHs. Why should intelligent engineers fall victim to lobbyists seeking clients for their business of training?	2/11/2020 7:05 AM
252	The educational opportunities that are really of interest to me are expensive, and my public employer does not cover those costs. That means I end up finding free or low cost opportunities that really often don't help me in my present field.	2/11/2020 7:03 AM
253	None	2/11/2020 7:03 AM
254	I would LOVE the opportunity to be a PDH course provider! I teach an 8-hr course in Environmental Engineering entitled SPCC Compliance Workshop that addresses 40CFR112.	2/11/2020 7:02 AM
255	Being licensed in 11 states, 30 hours is average across the nation.	2/11/2020 7:00 AM
256	None	2/11/2020 6:58 AM
257	Continuing education makes engineers better equipped to complete their craft and thus improve public safety and people will not necessarily always take the additional step to self educate without a requirement in place. However, I think the required hours could be reduced to 15 instead of 30.	2/11/2020 6:57 AM
258	No	2/11/2020 6:57 AM
259	No	2/11/2020 6:55 AM
260	Most of the things I learn that educate me in my professional development, I receive from self study and not from courses for PDU credit.	2/11/2020 6:53 AM
261	Depends on your area of practice - if it were structures, probably yes, I do railroad engineering - No, there are very few PDH's available that deal in the work I am competent in and what i do.	2/11/2020 6:52 AM
262	no	2/11/2020 6:51 AM
263	I can see no down side to continuing to 30-hour PDH requirement. With the profusion of "free" online training courses and white paper presentations, it can be achieved in 1-hour "nibbles" rather than day-long commitments. Yes it can be inconvenient, especially if put off until the last moment, but I believe it is necessary to ensure that we stay relevant in the rapidly-changing world of construction engineering.	2/11/2020 6:46 AM
264	no	2/11/2020 6:46 AM
265	Regardless of continuing education requirements I still must follow the laws as dictated in the building codes to arrive at a safe structure for the public.	2/11/2020 6:45 AM
266	The limited amount of available courses results in the same course being taken every three or four years. The code updates are probably the most important seminars available.	2/11/2020 6:34 AM
267	The requirement is too broad.	2/11/2020 6:33 AM
268	The requirement is onerous and is mostly unnecessary.	2/11/2020 6:28 AM
269	The continuing education requirement does little to protect the public. Good engineers will continue to stay current while less competent engineers will continue to just collect CEU's.	2/11/2020 6:27 AM
270	No	2/11/2020 6:17 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

271	Cost and access to training can be a problem.	2/11/2020 6:17 AM
272	I am licensed in multiple states and 15 hours annually or 30 hours biannually is standard for most other states. I would not suggest reducing the requirement below this level.	2/11/2020 6:16 AM
273	Requiring 30 non-specific hours means a lot of areas are covered and typically within the PE interest or market.	2/11/2020 6:06 AM
274	N/A	2/11/2020 6:05 AM
275	During my 18-year career staying employed and work experience has been far the most valuable.	2/11/2020 5:55 AM
276	None	2/11/2020 5:52 AM
277	The requirements are too vague to meet to really help to protect the public.	2/11/2020 5:51 AM
278	This requirement is burdensome and time consuming.	2/11/2020 5:51 AM
279	The intent is to increase your knowledge and use that in your everyday practice as a professional engineer. If someone is not doing that then their intentions are not in the interest of the health, safety and welfare of the public.	2/11/2020 5:33 AM
280	I think there should be more than 3, but maybe less than thirty. 20 PDH's i believe would be good.	2/11/2020 5:23 AM
281	It is if it includes ethics and standard laws for boundary Surveys	2/11/2020 5:22 AM
282	If all states would adopt the same rules relating to the 15 hours per year requirement, it would make it easier for individuals registered in multiple states to comply.	2/11/2020 5:22 AM
283	no	2/11/2020 5:22 AM
284	Believe that there should be more required hours	2/11/2020 5:22 AM
285	Current Subject matter too flexible!	2/11/2020 5:19 AM
286	As I am licensed in every state, the 30 PDH requirement is quite typical and also allows me to spread hours over most jurisdictions. Adding Ethics within that 30 is no different than several other states as long as I can share with the other states' requirements. You may certainly consider an hour of NV laws & rules, but (I believe) that your renewal application requires the licensee to state that they've read and understand them. Having to include an hour is excessive in my opinion. However, since I understand the need for NV to insure understanding of NV laws & rules, if you offer a free on-line webinar for the 1 PDH, as some states provide, then I would think that would be acceptable for me.	2/11/2020 5:19 AM
287	The 30 hours is consistent with other states, encouraging Engineers to get quality hours.	2/11/2020 5:18 AM
288	I am licensed in 13 states and counting; most have similar total PHD/CEU requirements and this consistency is nice. I also find the ~30 hour requirement about right, for keeping up with changes in software, products, etc.	2/11/2020 5:16 AM
289	I am in favor of a middle ground. I am licensed in multiple states and several have public safety/building codes/life safety code requirements as well as ethics and rules requirements. I am in favor of the ethics and safety related hours. Too many of the remaining hours can be filled with nonsense that does not help an engineer to practice any better.	2/11/2020 5:05 AM
290	There are not enough CE courses within each engineering discipline that count for credit. Engineers end up taking courses that mean nothing to them and they get very little from.	2/11/2020 4:58 AM
291	The other two states in which I am licensed require similar hours of continuing education.	2/11/2020 4:55 AM
292	My sense of professionalism ensures that I perform my duties to protect public interest. Required training is just an additional time burden that does not influence my actions or ethical compass.	2/11/2020 4:51 AM
293	I suggest keeping the total 30, but including the 3 ethics and law and regs.	2/11/2020 4:42 AM
294	I believe the answer is a combination of yes and no. I think it also depends on each professional's choice of pdhs. Sometimes these webinars and seminars are very interesting and helpful and other times it doesn't seem to be. 30 is a large number but if the intent is to get broad continued educational knowledge then that may still be something to consider. Maybe a	2/11/2020 4:34 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

lesser value is more appropriate with a percentage being focused on particular aspects that the board feels needs special consideration every year.

295	It's too many hours. Online submittal should be utilized though.	2/11/2020 4:33 AM
296	None	2/11/2020 4:25 AM
297	The 30 hour requirement does make an engineer take the time to do training.	2/11/2020 4:15 AM
298	No	2/11/2020 3:58 AM
299	IT IS WASTE OF TIME AND \$	2/11/2020 3:43 AM
300	No	2/11/2020 3:22 AM
301	I don't think that such requirement is necessary.	2/11/2020 1:21 AM
302	Excessive hours compared with other states such as California.	2/11/2020 12:25 AM
303	Professionals are trying to get PDH by attending any presentations which might not be helping in public protection education	2/10/2020 11:50 PM
304	It is too many hours and not enough availability of applicable classes without spending hundreds of dollars an hour.	2/10/2020 11:30 PM
305	No.	2/10/2020 11:06 PM
306	No standard of technical content that count. Engineers are already working each day in their fields and gain knowledge no matter what. Otherwise they won't be able to access work opportunities in a free market.	2/10/2020 10:52 PM
307	No comments	2/10/2020 10:41 PM
308	None	2/10/2020 10:28 PM
309	I don't believe professional licensing or professional development hours do anything but lull the public into a false sense of security.	2/10/2020 10:28 PM
310	Most PDH curriculum that I have followed for hours have been heavily focused on ethics. No need to convolute things by making more regulations on type of PDH's that count. Just leave it simple at 30. I find it rare in my experience that in 30 hours of Training that at least 2 of these hours are not ethics based. If the State of Nevada prepared online courses on these topics that were made available to PE's licensed in Nevada I would definitely utilize these to meet my PDH requirements without a law mandating it.	2/10/2020 10:07 PM
311	I feel the proposal is very appropriate to the field of practicing everyday engineer especially with respect to ethics and laws and rules in Nevadz.	2/10/2020 10:00 PM
312	I think combined with PDH should be the actual work performed during the two year period. For example I have performed work that far exceeds anything I would learn from most seminars I have participated in. Retrofit of historic buildings, landmark structures, and the like has proved more challenging and require far more investigation and experimentation than PDHs. For most PDH are satisfied by on-line curses of little value or attending lectures etc. only for the purpose of meeting PDH requirements. I think the changes you propose are well over due and would again only add that actual practices might be a supplement to the 3 hours proposed.	2/10/2020 10:00 PM
313	The majority of engineers work is within realm of material and design criteria that changes very little with exception of reference standard changes all engineers study anyway. As such continuing education requirements are of little importance or value	2/10/2020 9:59 PM
314	None	2/10/2020 9:55 PM
315	None at this time	2/10/2020 9:49 PM
316	The current 30 hours requirement does satisfy the boards original intent but it is much too much overkill. I agree withthe new 3 hour proposal.	2/10/2020 9:49 PM
317	Continue education should focus on new coming and curent state code requirement on the area of practice.	2/10/2020 9:31 PM
318	Continuing Edccation introducs the Licensee to updated methods, systems, safety, and ethics. It is an absolute requirement for engineering capabilites.	2/10/2020 9:28 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

319	I think the 30 hour requirement is necessary, and would welcome a revision that states 3 of the 30 hours would focus on Nevada rules and regulations. How will the hours be fulfilled? Can we research on our own time if "official" training courses are not available?	2/10/2020 9:23 PM
320	Conferences are easy and affordable	2/10/2020 9:21 PM
321	Most engineers just do the minimum required to meet the 30 hours regardless of subject matter. We take courses that interest us and expand our knowledge as a matter of course. The requirement has no affect on that and only provides one more hurdle to have to jump while providing little value other than creating a new market of companies offering courses.	2/10/2020 9:15 PM
322	Having a continuing education requirement for license renewal is necessary to insure minimum competency.	2/10/2020 9:11 PM
323	too lenient	2/10/2020 9:06 PM
324	15 hours a year is not insignificant, and current board regulations accept a variety of topics/areas including ethics and liability.	2/10/2020 9:03 PM
325	I do believe that the requirements meet the intent of Public Safety, however, I believe that the 30 hour requirement is a little excessive, & hard to achieve, when considering the work load of most practicing engineering.	2/10/2020 8:54 PM
326	Although, I answered "yes", state of California does not have such requirement, and I received my registration in California in 1997. All engineers should catch up with the state-of-the-art, technology and construction. Therefore, those who don't, will not be able to sell their services at all.	2/10/2020 8:52 PM
327	Many engineers are obtaining pdh's by attending meetings/seminars that do not necessarily educate them in areas relevant to their work.	2/10/2020 8:51 PM
328	The current requirements encourage my attendance at conferences and to understand current trends. I am not sure how well they impact public protection.	2/10/2020 8:51 PM
329	No comments	2/10/2020 8:50 PM
330	No	2/10/2020 8:50 PM
331	The requirement is useful to help make some effort to educate professionals, however, competency testing to allow engineers license in the first place is too easy. Many engineers are less than technically competent even in their areas of expertise. The CEU requirement does not reduce this much, but it does not make it worse either.	2/10/2020 8:43 PM
332	What is important is that licensees practice within their areas of competence.	2/10/2020 8:37 PM
333	Preference to reduced number of hours	2/10/2020 8:34 PM
334	I don't use the 30 PDH as my guide as I'm always striving to improve my perspective and position. While it may not be enough for some, I can't imagine mandating a higher requirement as the current requirements seems fair and balanced across the spectrum of registrants.	2/10/2020 8:32 PM
335	Do not change.	2/10/2020 8:25 PM
336	It is important that we stay current with technological advances in our practice but ethics are equally important. However, I do think 30 hours is excessive and a reduced PDH requirement would be preferred with a certain number of hours dedicated to ethics.	2/10/2020 8:21 PM
337	It's more of a burden to fulfill the hours, not benefit from specific criteria.	2/10/2020 8:21 PM
338	Just a money maker for certain organizations.	2/10/2020 8:18 PM
339	As long as there are plenty of CE options available that expand knowledge, no one is going to do a technical refresher Of their area. At best there MAY coincidentally be some maintenance but it is far from intentional.	2/10/2020 8:18 PM
340	i get those hours doing educational seminars that cover a wide range of topics. including code and conduct within the profession. two weeks ago I attended a seminar in which the topic was stamping plans and other professional instruments of service. the discussion also covered the proper oversight and stamping of As Built plans. also what to stamp or write onto plans that are not complete and don't yet carry a stamp.	2/10/2020 8:09 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

341	I like the focus on some PDHs on the state by-laws but if you remove the requirement for technical training it reduces the value of PDHs.	2/10/2020 8:09 PM
342	Reasonable requirement	2/10/2020 8:08 PM
343	This is a minimal amount of education. I believe ADDITIONAL hours to cover the consequences of failure to protect the public should be emphasized.	2/10/2020 8:05 PM
344	Personally, I feel that asking for at least some measure of discipline related CEUs help keep the license holder engaged in the discipline for the benefit of their clients	2/10/2020 8:04 PM
345	Reduce to 20 hours every 2 years	2/10/2020 8:01 PM
346	30 hours requirement is too much	2/10/2020 7:58 PM
347	The 30 PDH requirement has been reasonable and achievable.	2/10/2020 7:58 PM
348	An engineer should continue to learn and update their skill set throughout their career. However, I am against compulsory continuing education primarily because it fosters a secondary market for course developers whose primary motive is profit and too often the content is of little actual value. Often I find myself scrambling to accumulate meaningless PDHs while the new skills and knowledge I accrue in my normal practice of engineering is not counted because it is not accredited.	2/10/2020 7:56 PM
349	I think 30 hrs is meeting intent. But I also think 3 hours of stand alone ethics and laws is too drastic a move. Maybe 15 hrs biennial would suffice.	2/10/2020 7:55 PM
350	Obtaining up to date training on the topics that impact my industry helps ensure our design changes and analysis in the nuclear plants protect the public and plant personnel.	2/10/2020 7:54 PM
351	not at this time	2/10/2020 7:51 PM
352	It isn't clear that the activities that are credited for continuing education are actually serving that purpose since active engineers have no problem meeting the 30 hours with good academic or profession technical training. Non-active engineers do the least necessary to meet the requirement.	2/10/2020 7:47 PM
353	I do not see how the requirements affect public safety.	2/10/2020 7:43 PM
354	N/A	2/10/2020 7:43 PM
355	We need to be updated by the building codes and we automatically do that every time the codes changed we have to know everything about every code and then we have to study and know that particular design if we are going to be in practice the continuing education's don't really prevent us from having to do the codes anyways	2/10/2020 7:42 PM
356	Since i am licensed in a number of states that require continuing education, what Nevada requires does not add to what other states require.	2/10/2020 7:34 PM
357	none	2/10/2020 7:34 PM
358	I like the idea of reducing it to 3 hours from 30	2/10/2020 7:28 PM
359	The PE's need to stay competent in their technical field. Sounds like overkill on laws and regs	2/10/2020 7:26 PM
360	Define intent of the regulation and I could respond more accurately to the question. Talking to other Professionals I am not sure if the CED promotes or causes the desired results as reported. A certain amount of outside education does add certain positive results but not necessarily in the area of expertise of ethics, honesty and professional conduct. I am from the ols school where we sprnt equal time in document research, field research and field geometrics. I think most professionals would agree this is far from the balance of our work today. I think I better stop now before I get in trouble.	2/10/2020 7:23 PM
361	The intent is good, however it seems 30 hours is hard to keep up with for relevant training. I would vote to keep a similar requirement, but reduce hours to 15-20.	2/10/2020 7:21 PM
362	code compliance and laws/regulation is most important element of continuing education for civil engineers	2/10/2020 7:17 PM
363	I am aggregating 30 to 40-CEU's annually though patents, attending mining seminars, PE exam development credits, writing accepted PE exam questions etc. I fail to comprehend how my	2/10/2020 7:06 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

competence in these areas is accounting for public protection...

364	None.	2/10/2020 7:00 PM
365	Con-Ed is a necessary requirement to keep from stagnating.	2/10/2020 7:00 PM
366	30 hours per biennial period is too many	2/10/2020 6:59 PM
367	None	2/10/2020 6:59 PM
368	No.	2/10/2020 6:52 PM
369	The amount of effort an individual puts into obtaining information will determine the amount of knowledge gained. It is easy to just complete online courses to satisfy this requirement. If someone truly wants to obtain quality information, they will get the information elsewhere.	2/10/2020 6:46 PM
370	There is no requirement for mandatory ethics or NRS training. I think the state as a whole is trying to import more engineers to keep up with new development and more tech jobs but I see more and more flagrant violations of NRS and ethics from these new engineers as well as the local firms who seem to be too busy to be ethical. For us to have a better quality engineers in the state, mandatory ethics courses and training on NRS/Blue book should be added	2/10/2020 6:44 PM
371	No further comment	2/10/2020 6:43 PM
372	I think that 30 CEUs every 2 years is an important requirement.	2/10/2020 6:37 PM
373	An engineer gains far more knowledge from day to day work than from continuing education webinars and such.	2/10/2020 6:37 PM
374	My updates that are important to me are code updates. My license is Electric. To get 15 hours per year seems reasonable, but basics needed for quality designs don't change, so I agree with change	2/10/2020 6:35 PM
375	Continuing education is not needed in civil engineering.	2/10/2020 6:31 PM
376	I think any time you study / learn more or brush up on past studies it helps.	2/10/2020 6:26 PM
377	The requirement needs to be strengthened, not weakened, and it needs teeth. Just paying a fee, showing up, attending sessions but paying no attention, then walking out with a pocketful of credit, is a useless joke. Credit should be EARNED, only those who can prove they actually learned something should get credit.	2/10/2020 6:26 PM
378	I have been an advocate of Arizona adopting similar requirements with little luck. Architects are governed by the same board with engineers. they seem to be resistave	2/10/2020 6:14 PM
379	Any Engineer needs to learn; and advance his technical knowledge.	2/10/2020 6:13 PM
380	I'm a very newly licensed PE so I have not completed my educational requirements as yet. Since my current employment does not require my license, I am unsure if I will be able to complete the requirements before next December.	2/10/2020 6:11 PM
381	The number of hours currently required aligns with what other PE Boards are requiring. I do not believe reducing it to 3 hours and only focusing on Ethics and Nevada Law would accomplish the goal of serving and protecting the public.	2/10/2020 6:11 PM
382	The criteria for what to count is open and subject to interpretation, but the flexibility means licensee holders can choose relevant trainings.	2/10/2020 6:08 PM
383	No	2/10/2020 5:59 PM
384	If you are a practicing professional, I believe 30 is high but achievable. N.J. requires 24, so 6 more would not be a heavy lift. Please consider carry over.	2/10/2020 5:56 PM
385	A lot of non-specific requirements mean that the focus of most courses are not public protection, even if applicable to engineering practice in general.	2/10/2020 5:52 PM
386	Continuing education requirements do not not necessarily encompass ethics and statutes.	2/10/2020 5:50 PM
387	I think the existing requirements for continuing Ed are adequate.	2/10/2020 5:49 PM
388	NV and other states programs I am in encourage the setup of a cottage industry of CE providers in an effort just to churn hours and generating fees and not really improve technical	2/10/2020 5:42 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

	competency. I am in a specialized area of engineering and there are not enough hours offered in my area of practice, so I end up taking hours that really do not help my competency.	
389	The current PDH requirement is working, but could be done more efficiently.	2/10/2020 5:41 PM
390	Most would seek out education to keep up with new codes and engineering methods without a regulation	2/10/2020 5:40 PM
391	I believe 15 - 20 CEUs on a biennial basis is more realistic and would achieve the same results.	2/10/2020 5:33 PM
392	While well intentioned, the reality is that the courses that we need to complete end up being "filler" of little educational or professional development value due to the way the continuing education credit companies are milking the system.	2/10/2020 5:31 PM
393	None	2/10/2020 5:31 PM
394	The requirement is burdensome	2/10/2020 5:28 PM
395	No	2/10/2020 5:27 PM
396	I think the program is good for encouraging engineers to attend and participate in technical meetings and conferences and stay apprised of developments in professional practice.	2/10/2020 5:25 PM
397	It is critical that engineers keep up with the new technologies and codes, which happens by attending seminars, etc.	2/10/2020 5:21 PM
398	PDH requirements for maintaining licensure in NV are similar to, and typical of requirements in other states	2/10/2020 5:20 PM
399	I do think it is more than what is needed, 10 hours and 1 hour of ethics each year is satisfactory	2/10/2020 5:19 PM
400	Add 1 hour ethics class required every two years	2/10/2020 5:08 PM
401	I know many professionals just do things to satisfy the requirement and really do not expand their knowledge. I am not sure what would work better, but this does not seem to meet the requirement. It actually seems like people who are going to keep up do it without the requirement.	2/10/2020 5:04 PM
402	Not entirely. Most of the technical competency is through work experience working on projects and meeting standards and requirements.	2/10/2020 4:58 PM
403	As a practicing engineer at a large firm, I learn more from working on projects and from in house training than I do from outside seminars	2/10/2020 4:58 PM
404	None.	2/10/2020 4:55 PM
405	It's hard to tell that there is a strict correlation between CE and public safety.	2/10/2020 4:49 PM
406	no	2/10/2020 4:47 PM
407	I believe 30 PDHs is a good number, but it is difficult for me to get training unless I pay out of pocket. My company does not support me retaining my PE	2/10/2020 4:47 PM
408	Like other states that require CEU's, the only thing that this requirement does for practicing engineers who are by default keeping up with technology is to line the pockets of the CEU-mill offerors.	2/10/2020 4:45 PM
409	I don't think the 30 hr requirement is developing more qualified engineers or preventing unqualified engineers from practicing.	2/10/2020 4:45 PM
410	none	2/10/2020 4:42 PM
411	No.	2/10/2020 4:39 PM
412	I think that the education requirements should not include soft lunches that normally do not add to any education that is relevant to the engineers discipline.	2/10/2020 4:39 PM
413	Professional continuing education is paramount to designing with the applicable methodologies. State specific law review is administrative and doesn't provide protection to the public.	2/10/2020 4:36 PM
414	Codes and standards is the basis of most efforts. They are typically slow to change in any	2/10/2020 4:35 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

	significant way.	
415	I am required to fulfill the same amount of professional development for Nevada as I am for my Ohio license. I answered no because I don't feel strongly that the public welfare is being served by continuing technical education. As part of the Ohio law I am already required to fulfill some of those hours for professional ethics.	2/10/2020 4:35 PM
416	Requirement should be waived because engineers should be keeping up with state of practice through thorough review of analyses, design, specifications and drawings.	2/10/2020 4:34 PM
417	NO	2/10/2020 4:32 PM
418	This allows one to stay up with the new technologies and code changes which affect desins.	2/10/2020 4:28 PM
419	The requirements of a professional engineer to practice in the area of their expertise and uphold all codes and ethical standards is what protects the public.	2/10/2020 4:26 PM
420	If a person is practicing there is no need for training. Training cannot replace practice.	2/10/2020 4:26 PM
421	I concur with the suggested reduction in Professional Development Hours from 30 to 3 hours and requiring that at least 2 of the hours are related to professional ethics and that 1 hour is related to Nevada laws and regulations (NRS 625 and NAC 625).	2/10/2020 4:25 PM
422	An industry for quick and easy 30 hr. packages has developed, not sure these meet the intent. I don't use them but see the advertisements and get calls.	2/10/2020 4:25 PM
423	none	2/10/2020 4:23 PM
424	I agree with the proposed changes regarding the law and ethics. I don't have a problem with the hours required currently but think there should be refocused.	2/10/2020 4:22 PM
425	It's common for states to require 15 annual or 30 biennial professional development credits.	2/10/2020 4:17 PM
426	It has not been to much of a burden to me, I have participated in some good seminars that I otherwise might have missed.	2/10/2020 4:16 PM
427	I have a license in Texas and they required the specific hours in ethics. I believe that is worthwhile together with the total number of hours.	2/10/2020 4:14 PM
428	Lacking specific guidance as to how the requirement protects the public.	2/10/2020 4:13 PM
429	30 hours every 2 years can be a bit challenging, but it is well worth it. I would not like to see the requirement reduced at all.	2/10/2020 4:13 PM
430	Many states have a similar professional development requirement. Would make sesnse to align with the rest of the country. More importantly, 30 hr. of study keeps the registrant up to date on important issues.	2/10/2020 4:12 PM
431	No	2/10/2020 4:12 PM
432	Time is limited outside of work hours to perform meaningful continuing education. It is difficult to get credit for the most important forms of continuing ed such as reading journals, new textbooks, or learning through project work.	2/10/2020 4:10 PM
433	The required amount is too much.	2/10/2020 4:09 PM
434	30 hours is pretty standard.	2/10/2020 4:07 PM
435	We can reduce the number of hours required a little bit	2/10/2020 4:05 PM
436	I believe that requirement for professional development is meeting intent of regulation, however, 30 hours (15 per year) may be more than necessary. I suggest 8 hours (one full day) with a requirement of a minimum of 1 hour of ethics for professionals and 1 hour of ethics related to Nevada Board regulations.	2/10/2020 4:04 PM
437	Training/education specific to a licensee's discipline seems to be the most effective way to meet the regulation's intent to "keep individual licensees current with the latest developments and technology in the profession, and to maintain, improve or expand knowledge relevant to their discipline."	2/10/2020 4:03 PM
438	Continuing Education or something like it is a good idea. However, I've found the current continuing education requirement at 15 hours per year to be, at times, somewhat difficult to	2/10/2020 4:03 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

satisfy. I would support a relaxation to perhaps 12 hrs (24 per cycle). Also, I believe that certain educational content providers are price gouging the engineering industry. Some are free, true, but others are quite expensive. Also, I'm not sure why Nevada requires CEUs when other states don't (I.e., California). It would be better to have more consistency between states. Finally, please allow us some latitude in what is allowed as CEUs/PDHs. Some seminars or presentations don't provide certs but I sat through the presentation, I learned new or updated content and that should count.

439	I think the 30 hours is good it may be a bit much bit for some but for me it forces me to get to a conference and also take some classes. I do believe that part of it should be mandatory towards ethics and state specific law.	2/10/2020 4:01 PM
440	Reducing the amount of continuing education seems counter productive. How about just add the caveat that some measure be specific to NV (if that's really of added value)	2/10/2020 4:00 PM
441	i support it	2/10/2020 3:59 PM
442	Would like to use hours dedicated to ASTM, SAE and other technical societies towards credits	2/10/2020 3:59 PM
443	The online classes offered by websites like PDHdirect.com are good but dont necessary relate to my specific talents on a daily basis.	2/10/2020 3:52 PM
444	I have been in job positions where it was easy to obtain PDH's and I have been in job positions where it was a struggle. I believe that having continuing education, although it can be difficult at times, is at its core a positive for the industry. The total number of hours can be reduced, but elimination would not be the benefit of the public. I also agree with 1 hour related to the law. It seems like the rules are changing very regularly lately and having a requirement to access that information about those changes would be good.	2/10/2020 3:51 PM
445	I think that technical competency is important especially in the ever changing technology development and its implications.	2/10/2020 3:50 PM
446	I feel what we have is sufficient to entice continuing education.	2/10/2020 3:45 PM
447	In regard to the intent of the survey, 30 pdhs may be a little excessive and expensive.	2/10/2020 3:45 PM
448	I stay abreast with the industry through attending seminars, conventions, etc.	2/10/2020 3:43 PM
449	Seminars make up the majority of CE Hrs. I support the 3 hrs of ethics and NV law.	2/10/2020 3:41 PM
450	It meets the intent, but not sure if really should be a requirement. I learn a great deal just working with other engineers. We all seem to go to conventions, seminars, etc. I think it's up to the individual to be current with projects they are stamping regardless of how many PDH's they can rack up.	2/10/2020 3:40 PM
451	I feel that if you are a professional that is getting your 30 PDH's you are participating in conferences and seminars. It is almost impossible to not learn in these type of settings and you are also meeting and networking with other professionals in your area of licensure. Having the requirements for PDH's also helps promote professional originations such as ASCE & NALS. These are all positive things.	2/10/2020 3:39 PM
452	I think that reducing the requirement is a terrible idea. 30 is the standard in the US (I'm registered in over 30 states) and it forces us to keep current, which, in this day and age is mandatory to perform as an engineer where public health and safety are involved. Please do not reduce this requirement.	2/10/2020 3:38 PM
453	Here in Illinois we have 20 hours, which I think is too much. 10 hours would be better imo. Thank you	2/10/2020 3:38 PM
454	PDH hours have no merit on the technical competency of an engineer. Engineer professionals that are practicing engineering on a regular basis receive no added value or become a better engineer from PDH requirement.	2/10/2020 3:37 PM
455	I don't think 30 hours is too many, and I do like the idea of requiring some ethics and legal training. Although, most of the available training is repetitive and not directly applicable to public safety.	2/10/2020 3:36 PM
456	I don't like being told what to study as we are currently able to benefit by choosing our topics and activities. 30-hours is fine as it is reflected in the requirements of other states that we practice in. Studying Nevada specific laws (which we already did during lincensure) would not	2/10/2020 3:36 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

be a big benefit and would actually increase the amount of effort involved with my continuing education requirements.

457	I believe it meets the intent but also believe it could be reduced.	2/10/2020 3:35 PM
458	In truth, I think it is comparable to other states with similar regulations, but the education you receive is uneven. If there are aspects of the law that are unique to Nevada, then I think that is a useful addition, but if it isn't truly unique, then I would shy away from including that as an educational requirement. Having ethics requirements is common though. I think the SE Licensing requirement is more effective at improving the quality of structural engineering practice in Nevada than continuing education is.	2/10/2020 3:34 PM
459	In my view, 30 hours is excessive. Very few courses relate to my area of practice so I take courses in my general area so I can get the 30 hours. I do think that hours in ethics and in NV law and rules is time well spent.	2/10/2020 3:33 PM
460	30 hours is too many. We have to learn to do our jobs but much learning is informal and does not come with PDHs. 30 PDH requirements has always seemed like it is just catering to the training community to promote their businesses.	2/10/2020 3:33 PM
461	PDH's keep Engineers more informed and provides engineers to work for bettering themselves	2/10/2020 3:32 PM
462	no	2/10/2020 3:32 PM
463	none	2/10/2020 3:31 PM
464	I think it is too many hours. Sometimes it is hard to fine all the hours necessary for renewal.	2/10/2020 3:31 PM
465	It may be a bit much, but should be no lower than 20 hrs.	2/10/2020 3:31 PM
466	CE hours earned for any state should be acceptable in NV. This should include both technical and Ethics/Rules/Regs.	2/10/2020 3:30 PM
467	Technical competency is a lot more than ethics...	2/10/2020 3:29 PM
468	I am registered in 8 or more states and Canada , some states do not require any training others require more training. I find the Ethics requirment the most importent part of the trainng requirments. Being a practicing engineer just about every day I learn something therefore additional training is helpfull but is somewhat redundant. Requiring a review of state Laws also seems reasonable.	2/10/2020 3:28 PM
469	I think that the competency of each engineer depends on his/her ethics. They are not going to design projects that they are not knowledgeable in, unless of course, they have a Trump attitude (everything is allowable as long as it puts money in my bank account).	2/10/2020 3:25 PM
470	10 per year may be sufficient	2/10/2020 3:23 PM
471	3 Hours for ethics and law are enough with respect to public protection	2/10/2020 3:22 PM
472	go to annual convention get credit for session	2/10/2020 3:21 PM
473	30 is way too much. I'm 66 and have learned little in my 20+ years of continuing education.	2/10/2020 3:21 PM
474	The development hours would be best fit if the state offered them and they were specific to the professionals continuing education. Most engineers wait until the last month and take as many free courses as they can. Many of these courses don't apply to the real practices.	2/10/2020 3:21 PM
475	N/A	2/10/2020 3:20 PM
476	15 hours of PDH per year is not to difficult to achieve and is necessary to stay up to date.	2/10/2020 3:17 PM
477	It takes several courses to stay current on a number of design topics and practice areas.	2/10/2020 3:16 PM
478	It could be less	2/10/2020 3:15 PM
479	None.	2/10/2020 3:14 PM
480	Most classes are 7 hours. to achieve 30 hours is 4 full days of classes away from work and then something to make up the last bit of hours. There are not enough classes without repeating after a few iterations.	2/10/2020 3:14 PM
481	no	2/10/2020 3:14 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

482	Feels as though most license holders see how many webinars they can do versus focusing on ethics or laws.	2/10/2020 3:14 PM
483	Other states generally require 15 PDHs per year so I would be on board with the reduction to 3 hours as suggested. I am hopeful that there would be some direct training provided online related to NV Ethics and laws in regards to practice in NV. If online classes are not provided, it will be difficult to ensure Licensed Engineers will actually obtain the 3 hours required.	2/10/2020 3:12 PM
484	30 hours are difficult to achieve with a 50+ hour work week and while trying to maintain a work-life balance	2/10/2020 3:10 PM
485	Works for me.	2/10/2020 3:10 PM
486	Competency comes from practice more than online courses.	2/10/2020 3:10 PM
487	Unlike other states, it at least forces engineers to take some kind of training. If there was no requirement, I'm not sure all would remain current.	2/10/2020 3:09 PM
488	Excessive Hours	2/10/2020 3:09 PM
489	Any active practice mandates various aspects of continuing education and learning that are hard to define for the standard typical categories, and don't occur in a classroom or seminar and are a function of advances in technology and methods of engineering as they evolve.	2/10/2020 3:09 PM
490	I believe it is important for professionals to stay abreast on design changes and the industry as a whole and I feel that requires more than 3 hours of continuing education. I would support requiring a portion of the 30 hours be specific to ethics and NV law.	2/10/2020 3:08 PM
491	No one pays attention to PDH activities as it is.	2/10/2020 3:08 PM
492	no	2/10/2020 3:06 PM
493	None	2/10/2020 3:03 PM
494	No	2/10/2020 3:03 PM
495	no	2/10/2020 3:02 PM
496	Keeping the 30 hours is great for the individual. making some of those 30 hours be related to ethics is a step in the right direction. This also brings Nevada in line with a lot of other states.	2/10/2020 3:02 PM
497	No comment	2/10/2020 3:01 PM
498	Although continuing ed may assist an active PE with staying current with new ideas and designs, new products and installation, it does not meet the intent for public protection. An active PE will stay relevant in her/his area of expertise, including what is required to meet regulations and safety requirements, regardless of continuing education that is not related to ethics and laws and regulations.	2/10/2020 2:59 PM
499	No comments	2/10/2020 2:57 PM
500	At this time NO	2/10/2020 2:54 PM
501	None	2/10/2020 2:53 PM
502	This is more important than a legal review.	2/10/2020 2:53 PM
503	I like your new proposal but i may not drop it just 3 hrs may be half of that with the Nevada requirement included	2/10/2020 2:53 PM
504	The current system provides a realistic and flexible approach to continuing education. The proposed approach ignores the need for technical and managerial updates. It will likely create a simplistic and bureaucratic system with little benefit.	2/10/2020 2:48 PM
505	No	2/10/2020 2:48 PM
506	I believe the emphasis should reflect public safety and not keeping up with technology since in Civil Engineering technology does not change like other fields such as electronics. Recurring seminars in Ethics would be great.	2/10/2020 2:47 PM
507	30 hours every two years is similar to many other states and helps us to stay updated with different aspects of our field.	2/10/2020 2:47 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

508	I think there should be a requirement for 1 hour of ethics each year.	2/10/2020 2:46 PM
509	I think the requirement was well intended but I don't see that it actually results in public protection.	2/10/2020 2:46 PM
510	The current requirements assist us in getting training on our professional development. Ethics and Laws are what we had to know to become licensed. Stipulating that 3 hours are required for laws and ethics doesn't hurt but do not drop the requirement for the 30 biennial hours needed to renew.	2/10/2020 2:46 PM
511	have taken many seminars over the decades that I have been licensed. Most have been good programs, but a few have been terrible. There doesn't seem to be any qualifications for people to meet requirements set in order to be competent to teach professional level programs. Just piling on PDH's is not the answer. Quality is far more important than just numbers.	2/10/2020 2:43 PM
512	Need to. Consider comity either states. Need to maintain 30 hrs .	2/10/2020 2:43 PM
513	The number of hours is fine... probably less than a practicing P.E. will spend on knowledge issues. The type of acceptable hours is wrong and should credit self study which most engineers do every day via periodicals, newsletters, blogs, etc.	2/10/2020 2:41 PM
514	It has been effective in keeping practicing professionals current in their respective fields.	2/10/2020 2:40 PM
515	None	2/10/2020 2:37 PM
516	I agree there should be some level of CEU required. #0 hours is too high and not required. I think you will find most PEs do not do design type work. In my 46 years of experience I most of my expansion of my skills has been directly related to my specific work activities and not taking a class, seminar, instruction or other similar type CEU.	2/10/2020 2:36 PM
517	Professional Engineers should continuously seek to maintain their knowledge and expertise in their discipline of practice, and to keep current on the regulations which govern their discipline. Although irritating, obtaining the current number of PDH's is essential. As long as new courses are being made available for practicing professional engineers, professional land surveyors, and structural engineers.	2/10/2020 2:36 PM
518	I don't think the requirements are specific to enhancing competency in the specific fields.	2/10/2020 2:33 PM
519	Great idea to have requirements for technical issues, should maybe in Claude requirements for administrative and ethical issues.	2/10/2020 2:33 PM
520	30 credits is sufficient	2/10/2020 2:31 PM
521	Engineers are initially licensed after meeting standards of minimal competency. If that standard isn't adequate, then they should never have been licensed in the first place and continuing education is a moot point. And most disciplinary cases are related to ethics, not technical issues.	2/10/2020 2:30 PM
522	PDH can be given/earned for items that are not related to public protection.	2/10/2020 2:30 PM
523	The 30 hours every 2 years is a minimal effort to put in to maintain competency.	2/10/2020 2:28 PM
524	Maybe thirty hours per two years is a bit much, but keeping current with professional standing and laws is crucial to protecting the public. Don't wipe it out or reduce the requirement to meaninglessness. Some out of state licensees will let their licenses expire due to the CE mandate in NV. Is that a bad thing? Don't think so.	2/10/2020 2:28 PM
525	I FEEL MOST ENGINEERS IN NEVADA ARE RUSHING TO COMPLETE THEIR 30 HOURS A FEW MONTHS PRIOR TO THEIR LICENSE RENEWAL. NO COMPETENCY COMES FROM SIMPLY DOING THE MINIMUM AND IN A RUSH, FOR THAT MATTER.	2/10/2020 2:28 PM
526	With changing technology I think technical courses are important, not just ethics and regulations.	2/10/2020 2:26 PM
527	If you are a LEED AP and a member of ASHRAE, required courses and attending meetings will get you the 30 points every two years.	2/10/2020 2:25 PM
528	No.	2/10/2020 2:24 PM
529	I think the 30 biennial hour requirement could be revisited and provide more clarity on what hours constitute meeting the required competency intent.	2/10/2020 2:21 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

530	It requires us to attend seminars that expose us to new and emerging trends and areas for concern.	2/10/2020 2:20 PM
531	Most active engineers attend various trainings/conferences each year to keep updated of new standards/guidelines/etc.	2/10/2020 2:18 PM
532	I think that the public is better served if surveyors stay current with the accepted legal and ethical standards we should be operating under. Technical competency falls under the heading of due diligence; which in turn is part of one's professional ethics. So if it were to remain part of the requirements, it should be treated within that context. Ethics courses are already out there in the marketplace, but providing NRS/ NAC specific courses could be an issue. A minor downside would be that for those of us with multiple licenses, this would require one extra course we'd have to take as we'll still need to get our 30 hours to satisfy the other states' requirements. Ethics would be transferable, but not the Nevada specific courses.	2/10/2020 2:18 PM
533	I feel that the 30 hours is reasonable and warranted for all of the reasons why it was originally instituted.	2/10/2020 2:18 PM
534	I believe that the standards and practices are evolving enough that PDH are a necessary evil to keep pace.	2/10/2020 2:17 PM
535	Yes, 30 hours meets the intent but I don't think 30 hours is required to meet the intent with regard to public protection.	2/10/2020 2:17 PM
536	no	2/10/2020 2:17 PM
537	I think a minimum 1-2 of those credits should be required to be engineering ethics.	2/10/2020 2:14 PM
538	Seems like 20 hours every 2 years is adequate. Also these hours are usually expensive.	2/10/2020 2:14 PM
539	None	2/10/2020 2:13 PM
540	Universal requirements are more effective than State law requirements. I spend more time learning new structural techniques that keep me up to date than State specific law and ethics.	2/10/2020 2:12 PM
541	I believe competency is pretty much guaranteed through practice, not through training classes. If one charts the disciplinary actions administered since continuing education became mandatory, I believe one would find that most actions were taken against persons practicing outside of Nevada licensing requirements, not for lack of expertise; hence arguing against technical training requirements enhancing safety.	2/10/2020 2:09 PM
542	I get CEU hours regularly, but stay inactive licensure because of lack of work in Nevada	2/10/2020 2:09 PM
543	I think the current requirement is excessive and does not ensure knowledge of ethics or regulations. Credit hours are filled up with a mix of conferences which provide passing economic data and or current governmental project profiles.	2/10/2020 2:08 PM
544	Most effective training in my area of practice is on-the-job, passed from more senior or more experienced engineers. It is however hard to track as formal continuing education. Courses, conferences, seminars are valuable, and easy to track for continuing education, but are not as effective as on-the-job.	2/10/2020 2:07 PM
545	The courses are worthless and costly	2/10/2020 2:07 PM
546	30 credit hours are way too much. Knowledge can be obtained from practical work experience.	2/10/2020 2:05 PM
547	No	2/10/2020 2:05 PM
548	30 is good	2/10/2020 2:03 PM
549	30 hours is relatively low. Especially when compared to other jurisdictions, such as Canadian provinces.	2/10/2020 2:03 PM
550	I think some technical hours is important. But maybe not 30. Laws and ethics would also be important.	2/10/2020 2:03 PM
551	I think it would be in the public's best interest to have an Engineer who is more educated on the latest and greatest in his field than time spent on ethics and state regulations. We already spend plenty of time staying current with state & federal regulation in our normal jobs as is.	2/10/2020 2:02 PM
552	the focus should be moved towards Nevada laws & regulations and ethics to provide better	2/10/2020 2:02 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

	protection to the public	
553	In my opinion, the worthwhile PDH courses are few and far between, (at least in my neck of the woods) and very few of those deal with new technology or methods. To get 30 hours of truly worthwhile courses I would have to spent half of my vacation time traveling around the State (the online courses are not that great).	2/10/2020 2:01 PM
554	I believe that in regards to technical competency, the licensed Engineer should be responsible for maintaining his or her competency and not be policed by the Board. As Professional Engineers, we are held to a high standard already for ethics and competency. For me professionally, I will still maintain my current educational standard even if this law is passed.	2/10/2020 1:59 PM
555	I believe the continuing education requirements are extra head ache work. We as engineers must and will stay informed about our industry and Code requirements; no need for the C.E.	2/10/2020 1:59 PM
556	For me, the current CE requirements are adequate - I take them seriously. Occasionally I attend a course in another State and I get the opinion many of the attendees do not take it seriously (exceptions are CA, NV, OR and WA)	2/10/2020 1:59 PM
557	The 30 hours is a bit excessive and think the same can be accomplished with fewer hours.	2/10/2020 1:58 PM
558	I THINK THAT 20 HOURS, INCLUDING TECHNICAL COMPETENCY, NEVADA LAWS AND ETHICS WOULD BE A MORE REASONABLE APPROACH.	2/10/2020 1:58 PM
559	30 hours every two years is not onerous. Also I believe the intention is to safeguard the public so 15 hours per year would keep the knowledge base up and the hours can mostly be gotten at the annual conference as well as the classes provided by the Land Surveyors Association. Which help provide the necessary interactions with other professionals and therefore ultimately help protect the general public. I for one have noticed when professionals get together they discuss problems as well as procedures.	2/10/2020 1:58 PM
560	Since there is no audit of CEUs, it seems like the current requirement is used to express the intention for continued education. This intention setting could just as easily be covered by ethics training.	2/10/2020 1:55 PM
561	This is consistent with many other states. But I believe it does exceed what is needed since some classes are done purely to get the hours rather than for the information provided.	2/10/2020 1:52 PM
562	The is no guarantee that the PDH's one completes are meeting the intent unless all persons are audited/reviewed.	2/10/2020 1:52 PM
563	It meets the intent but I don't think all of the NV licensed PLS are truthfully keeping up with changes in our profession sufficient to protect the general public. I think the majority are in compliance and we will always have members of our society that believe in the status quo and will not put any effort in keeping up with the damands in our profession. I don't think ethics & NV Laws, alone, are sufficient.	2/10/2020 1:51 PM
564	Maintaining technical competency provides best interest to public protection.	2/10/2020 1:51 PM
565	Continuing education is absolutely critical for practicing engineers to be exposed to current practices in their field and particularly advances by those outside of their immediate region.	2/10/2020 1:51 PM
566	Less would be good	2/10/2020 1:50 PM
567	Licensed since 1975. I find that continuing education is not helpful. I take additional training to improve my skills but could as easily just take classes to "meet the requirements".	2/10/2020 1:49 PM
568	I like it the way it is.	2/10/2020 1:47 PM
569	none	2/10/2020 1:47 PM
570	N/A	2/10/2020 1:44 PM
571	N/A	2/10/2020 1:43 PM
572	Reduce to 10 Hours.. But maintain all areas of education. I wish California required it as well. This helps reduce need for more government plan check time.	2/10/2020 1:42 PM
573	I think most of the certified PDH hours that I have taken are not value adding to my professional knowledge base. I agree that training more concentrated on just the state laws would be more useful.	2/10/2020 1:41 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

574	I believe that the PDHs do help to maintain technical competency; however, it is important to know the ethics and NRS/NAC regarding professional engineers.	2/10/2020 1:38 PM
575	I believe the 15 hours per year of continuing education is essential in learning about new technology from vendors and outside engineering firms in the industry.	2/10/2020 1:37 PM
576	Ethics should be the focus	2/10/2020 1:36 PM
577	I think 30 is too many. Adding more specific to so many hours in this area and so many in that area is hard to track when a person is licensed in multiple states. My opinion is 24 pdh per biennial period with a separation for ethics but not necessarily state specific ethics but ethics that can be applied to any state.	2/10/2020 1:36 PM
578	Most jurisdictions are running 10-12 PDH per annum, with one or 2 PDH specific to Ethics. I think that's a fair model	2/10/2020 1:35 PM
579	I have to have about 30 hours of continuing education for other states anyway. If Nevada was the only state I was registered in, I would support the 3 hour proposal.	2/10/2020 1:33 PM
580	No	2/10/2020 1:33 PM
581	Include the ethics hours in the total of 30 hours.	2/10/2020 1:33 PM
582	Being required to meet a certain number of CEUs is not a measure of technical competency. Many CEUs are obtained through on-line companies whose sole purpose is to sell courses. Technical competency is (or should be) obtained through self-study relating to specific projects or types of projects.	2/10/2020 1:32 PM
583	Generally the requirement meets the intent	2/10/2020 1:31 PM
584	I believe the PDH requirements are not a burden, and they exemplify the importance of professional integrity. There will always be a handful of engineers who unfortunately require board inquiry, review, and/or disciplinary action. The amount of CEUs required or what the CEUs are will never change this unfortunate small percentage of people.	2/10/2020 1:31 PM
585	YES, it meets it's just that it is too much and since all active PE are practicing their profession that means PDH that much is not needed	2/10/2020 1:31 PM
586	Technical competency of engineers is demonstrated in the field. Professional development hours do not prove or enhance technical competency.	2/10/2020 1:30 PM
587	None	2/10/2020 1:30 PM
588	Most of the continuing education is pointless and as professional engineers grow in their career, this serves less validity. 30-hrs is often accumulated by attending conferences with little educational value that would impact a professional engineer's ability to make sound engineering judgement.	2/10/2020 1:29 PM
589	no	2/10/2020 1:29 PM
590	Most of my experience with continuing education is that some of it is valid for learning new technologies or sharpening some old skills that haven't been utilized in the past, but very often there are only a few of the 30 hour requirement that provide an impact. The others tend to be fillers that don't provide much due to the cost and time constraints that continuing education can have.	2/10/2020 1:28 PM
591	I believe the intent was for engineers to seek information in their area of practice	2/10/2020 1:28 PM
592	May consider a modification of the 30 CEU hrs down to fewer hrs that were to include (1) ethics, (1) NV laws and rules, and 8 to 12 hrs in the area of practice for a total of 10 to 12 hrs / biannual cycle as similarly done in other states, such as Florida.	2/10/2020 1:27 PM
593	This seems to be above and beyond what other states require. It also puts a burden on both the person and his employer to meet this requirement.	2/10/2020 1:25 PM
594	I get PDH's that are relevant to my field.	2/10/2020 1:25 PM
595	30 hours matches most other States	2/10/2020 1:24 PM
596	No comment	2/10/2020 1:24 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

597	1 or 2 pdh in Ethics could be included in the pdh requirement so that the focus is still on technical competency while acknowledging the importance of ethical practice also. Detailed review of Nevada laws does not need to be part of the ethics requirements.	2/10/2020 1:23 PM
598	Current requirements further the education of licensed Professional Engineers, but the focus is not on protection of the Public	2/10/2020 1:23 PM
599	no	2/10/2020 1:23 PM
600	My understanding of the regulation was to ensure the licensee maintains, improves, or expands the skills and knowledge of their discipline and was not specifically intended to focus on professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulations.	2/10/2020 1:21 PM
601	15 to 30 hrs/biennial seems common amongst other states, 15-20 is plenty as long as the continuing education is relevant and meets minimum requirements.	2/10/2020 1:20 PM
602	With any effort at all, a practicing engineer can achieve this requirement. It is also a way to get out and meet other engineers.	2/10/2020 1:19 PM
603	the email proving the link to this survey states "least two (2) of the hours are related to professional ethics and that one (1) hour is related to Nevada laws and regulations" this is a concern that every 2 years we would not be able to identify training of this type, unless the BOE has a free or fee based training. attorney generals office will provide ethics training and not sure it would qualify. usually the local governments have their boards trained and we could attend those for credit would be an option as well.	2/10/2020 1:19 PM
604	The number of credits is on the high side. Consider reducing.	2/10/2020 1:18 PM
605	I think it's important to continually learn about industry developments to stay up to date with products and practices that help make engineering safe for the public.	2/10/2020 1:18 PM
606	Work experience and references would be better gauges of public protection.	2/10/2020 1:18 PM
607	I believe there is a more concise and effective way to emphasize the importance of public protection. For example, a board approved seminar.	2/10/2020 1:18 PM
608	I think most people just take classes to check the box on this requirement.	2/10/2020 1:18 PM
609	I stay with my area of expertise. The continuing 30 hours. I take courses in any other areas just to fill the requirements. Not a real benefit to me. The laws and ethics is important to stay on top of.	2/10/2020 1:17 PM
610	There are several states that I am also licensed in that require the 30 professional development hours, and as part of that, 1 to 2 hours of ethics courses.	2/10/2020 1:16 PM
611	no	2/10/2020 1:16 PM
612	Thirty hours away from productive work is a bit excessive. Good engineers are gaining professional development every day just in their normal work. Ethical and legal training would go far in public protection.	2/10/2020 1:16 PM
613	the issue is not with the requirements but rather the content. how much of the current technology is impacting the practice and how does it relate to what is currently being done. 16 hours of this type of renewal would be sufficient in my opinion	2/10/2020 1:15 PM
614	Often I sign up for courses that are available, not usable just to satisfy the requirements.	2/10/2020 1:14 PM
615	It is my opinion that should be 16 hours biennial or somewhere there about, making it possible to get the required hours in just one day a year vs. multiple days. I also believe the annual surveyors conference should be directed more specifically to state specific regulations with some general survey principals included.	2/10/2020 1:14 PM
616	30 hour biennium is 1) hard to meet with a full time job, 2) costly, and 3)has become a paper pushing exercise in that people tend to pick webinars and seminars that are easy so they can punch their ticket on the required hours.	2/10/2020 1:12 PM
617	multiple issues 1- attending a luncheon and interacting with other engineers for 1 CEU each time. the topic may or may not be in my area of expertise (but its a unit) 2 - on-line webinars. Some of these are relevant to my area of practice. others are not. I actually enjoy a number not realted to area of practice but take them for the CEU. 3 - attending conferences - you may or may not have a seminar that has relevance to your practice.	2/10/2020 1:12 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

618	in line with other states	2/10/2020 1:12 PM
619	I find that with code changes, the time is needed to keep current and proficient.	2/10/2020 1:11 PM
620	I think the CE credit hours is an effective way of ensuring that engineers remain up to date on technology and refresh their engineering knowledge	2/10/2020 1:09 PM
621	.	2/10/2020 1:09 PM
622	The 30hr requirement is excessive	2/10/2020 1:08 PM
623	I think it's excessive. Arizona has no such requirement, and I haven't noted its lack causing any public protection issues.	2/10/2020 1:08 PM
624	No	2/10/2020 1:08 PM
625	None	2/10/2020 1:03 PM
626	I believe continuing education keeps engineers current and abreast with improvements in design and practice, and 15 hours per year is a reasonable expectation.	2/10/2020 1:03 PM
627	Often times training is taken to fulfill the requirement but may not be directly applicable to engineering decisions being made or questions being answered. As responsible professionals, it is incumbent upon individuals to stay abreast of new developments, techniques and technology in their field and apply those when needed without being required to do so in order to maintain their licensure.	2/10/2020 1:00 PM
628	The classes, etc that can be attended to satisfy the requirements can range pretty broadly, and may not even advance the licensee's knowledge of their area.	2/10/2020 1:00 PM
629	This should be less hours with more of a focus on what is important.	2/10/2020 1:00 PM
630	Quantity does not replace targeted quality courses.	2/10/2020 1:00 PM
631	The PDH are necessary to keep the engineer more up to speed with technology, practices, etc.	2/10/2020 12:59 PM
632	I do not think the current requirements are an effective method to maintain/increase public safety. Too much diversity to be effective - a lot of education hours are essentially wasted, just we can get our requirement. These hours are not necessarily providing an increase in safety.	2/10/2020 12:59 PM
633	In practice we get the education we need to effectively do our job. The number of hours we spend doing that is large but not always easily documented. Basically tracking and recording is a waste of time.	2/10/2020 12:59 PM
634	I am in favor for a reduction in hours but not an elimination.	2/10/2020 12:57 PM
635	I think the requirement for CEU's every year is fine. They are pretty easy to do, if people are active. However, there is a lot of confusion as to the Nevada PE regulations, particularly from people outside of the US.	2/10/2020 12:57 PM
636	Any decrease in the requirement for education hours would not conform with the standards established for other professional sectors of public health. There should be extra emphasis on ethics and morals for design professionals as it's seriously lacking in Nevada...probably less than 10% of professionals are actively focused on protecting public health while performing their jobs. It's all about the profit..."show me the money!" RLA = 8 units per year Arch = 8 units per year REHS = 12 units per year Nurse = 15 units per year PE/PLS = 15 units per year	2/10/2020 12:56 PM
637	No Comment	2/10/2020 12:55 PM
638	i am registered in a number of states. it is important that c.ed. hours be useful across jurisdictions and not just in one. some eastetn states require 3 hours of ethics/regs. so there is soon no professional development except ethics.	2/10/2020 12:54 PM
639	Most US States have similar requirements. I'm not convinced these PDHs actually produce better engineers, but they aren't too onerous.	2/10/2020 12:51 PM
640	Professional engineers stay current in their field of expertise without having an arbitrary mandate from a licensing board.	2/10/2020 12:51 PM
641	no	2/10/2020 12:48 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

642	I learn far more in my field of expertise by working and researching the projects I deal with. I live in rural Nevada. It's hard to find classes that don't cost me days in travel.	2/10/2020 12:47 PM
643	30 hrs is a reasonable requirement	2/10/2020 12:47 PM
644	I am of the opinion that in order to stay relevant in a profession such as engineering where technology is rapidly evolving, PE's really have no choice but to stay up to date with equipment, construction techniques, design best practices, etc. Most PE's naturally are 'continuing their education' as a natural part of their day-to-day work. Requiring 30 hours, while beneficial, may not necessarily improve public protection. I think state-specific laws and rules and ethics would more adequately help PE's protect the public.	2/10/2020 12:47 PM
645	No	2/10/2020 12:44 PM
646	There are many classes one can take to get the credits that don't require much additional learning. And conversely many times I need to learn things for work that don't transfer as a credit for CEU.	2/10/2020 12:44 PM
647	No	2/10/2020 12:43 PM
648	30 credits are enough as long as the verification system works and the credits are actually furthering knowledge.	2/10/2020 12:43 PM
649	NA	2/10/2020 12:42 PM
650	I think it certainly encourages engineers to keep their knowledge current. I also think those who desire to stay current will do so regardless of continuing education requirements, and anyone not interested probably doesn't gain a lot from it.	2/10/2020 12:41 PM
651	It'd be helpful to provide more training opportunities in continuing education.	2/10/2020 12:41 PM
652	In my opinion, continuing education is not the solution. Look to California where there are no continuing education requirements. The public in California is protected via a rigorous review process on all structural designs. Instead of requiring engineers to sit through seminars and webinars, there should be more focus on double checking their work via plan review.	2/10/2020 12:41 PM
653	I believe that 3 hours on ethics, laws and regulations is adequate and necessary to maintain our license.	2/10/2020 12:40 PM
654	Maybe require 1 of these 30 should be updating the professional on current laws per Nevada.	2/10/2020 12:40 PM
655	I think an ethics training is a good idea but reducing professional development training is not a good idea.	2/10/2020 12:39 PM
656	would be better to concentrate on ethics, laws, and regulations	2/10/2020 12:39 PM
657	I believe the requirements meet the intent. However, the 30 hours can be a stretch sometimes and the stress of having a license suspended for being a few hours short is heavy. I believe a reduction to 15-20 hours would be a benefit.	2/10/2020 12:39 PM
658	Many things (almost anything) seem to qualify for continuing education. An entire industry has been formed to provide continuing education. I would rather see fewer required hours, but more focused (quality) classes/seminars, ethics, rules, etc. being required to meet the criteria	2/10/2020 12:38 PM
659	I believe that education should mean college credit courses and not the expensive lecture circuit that exists in the profession.	2/10/2020 12:38 PM
660	No	2/10/2020 12:37 PM
661	Conscientious surveyors will continue with their professional education in order to maintain their skills and knowledge. Ones that don't may get into trouble and at that point the Board can step in with any disciplinary action necessary. The mandated courses waste time and money and reduce our effectiveness in providing services and protecting the public.	2/10/2020 12:37 PM
662	I generally sign up for courses related to my expertise. It does help keep me sharp but I don't think it does much to protect the public from poor engineering practice.	2/10/2020 12:36 PM
663	I have multiple registrations, so this change really wouldn't affect me. But in general, I end up having to take courses to meet certain rules that really don't improve me professionally. I study and read articles in my specialty and that is how I improve and update my engineering knowledge.	2/10/2020 12:36 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

664	reduce to 20 is ok but 3 is too low.	2/10/2020 12:36 PM
665	I think most people, especially those who have been engineers for a long time, only take pdh courses just to fulfill the requirement and to "get it over with" when their license is up for renewal. 30 hours isn't necessary. It's hard to find 30 hours worth of material relevant to my area of practice, so I just retake courses on topics I'm already very familiar with, but I don't learn anything.	2/10/2020 12:36 PM
666	It is very consistent to what other states require.	2/10/2020 12:35 PM
667	I am registered in multiple states that do not require any professional development hours. In my view the public in those states have equal protection from technical incompetence of professional engineers. Qualifying and obtaining professional engineering licenses are difficult processes that require a large amount of time, funding and dedication. The people who obtain these licenses are typically committed to continuing education on their own.	2/10/2020 12:35 PM
668	There are too many fields of expertise to account for whether or not a professional is getting current in their field of expertise.	2/10/2020 12:34 PM
669	I do feel that professional are just taking classes to fill the requirement.	2/10/2020 12:34 PM
670	Raise the number of hours to 60.	2/10/2020 12:33 PM
671	no	2/10/2020 12:32 PM
672	I think CEU credits should be able to be carried over until the next licensing period. I had 57 hours last period and can carry over only 25% of them.	2/10/2020 12:32 PM
673	Any PLS is fully aware of "keeping up with the times". Keeping up with new technology and methods is a must in staying in business and requires study and learning to be "state of the art". All this did was drive the price of achieving this way up, making it necessary for most of us to just focus on taking the cheapest way out to satisfy the requirements for PDH's.	2/10/2020 12:30 PM
674	By and large the continuing education requirements are a waste of time	2/10/2020 12:30 PM
675	I haven't renewed in Nevada yet. If Nevada accepts the same "PDH" hours that other states accept, there's very little learning there. You get a PDF, you use Ctrl+F to find words relevant to the quiz question, you pass the quiz without understanding the content.	2/10/2020 12:29 PM
676	I think that 30 hours per biennial renewal period is adequate granted the information presented is meaningful and pertinent to the professional practice of the individual. I would not remove the requirements for technical competency.	2/10/2020 12:29 PM
677	Lowering the number of hours would be helpful, but three hours seems to be too few.	2/10/2020 12:29 PM
678	Essentially, 15 PDHs a year including ethics is not unreasonable, and encourages the professional to make the time to take courses and/or attend seminars. The interface with other engineers is a side benefit.	2/10/2020 12:29 PM
679	No	2/10/2020 12:27 PM
680	Fairly, that's what other States required.	2/10/2020 12:27 PM
681	Easy to comply. Smart to require.	2/10/2020 12:26 PM
682	No	2/10/2020 12:26 PM
683	I think the classes should be up to the engineer, on their time. Also, if we don't stay up to date then we get passed.	2/10/2020 12:24 PM
684	It seems that some continuing ed coursework is meant to satisfy the requirements without actually contributing real learning.	2/10/2020 12:23 PM
685	Too many hours requiring excessive time to track and complete the requirement.	2/10/2020 12:23 PM
686	I think that 30 is excessive in that one would have to attend nearly every session of every NALS Conference to attain that amount. 12 - 15 hours is doable and sufficient.	2/10/2020 12:23 PM
687	Keeps professional engineers relevant with changing technology.	2/10/2020 12:22 PM
688	This requirement wastes time and money as all practicing engineers do this as part or their regular work.	2/10/2020 12:22 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

689	With regard to engineering design, most practicing engineers already keep up with current codes and regulations for building department permit approval. As far as new technologies, I have seen new products in the markets, but engineering principals have been the same for a very long time. Specifying a different product will depend on understanding how the product performs and its limitations such as Helix micro rebar. Most of the technical incompetencies that I have seen in industry is heavy reliance on engineering software without fully understanding how and what the software is performing. It has literally become a black box with answers on the other side of the inputs, if the inputs are incorrect, results will be incorrect as well.	2/10/2020 12:21 PM
690	Reducing the requirement to 3 PDH credits focusing on ethics would eliminate the continued education that can benefit an engineer on new practices and new technologies in his/her field. Reducing the overall requirement would help however not eliminating the need for further education (maybe 8 to 10 PDH per year?)	2/10/2020 12:21 PM
691	Sometimes the nature of courses available is somewhat repetitious. Local professional organizations should try to make a better effort to increase the availability of courses involving ethics, standards of practice and changes in legislation affecting the profession.	2/10/2020 12:19 PM
692	None	2/10/2020 12:19 PM
693	I think it's a hoop that we jump through that's not related to useful information. When I'm approached with a novel condition, I generally search all available information, sometimes for weeks, but none of it is ever considered continuing education.	2/10/2020 12:18 PM
694	There should be more focus on training for ethics and on the rules and regulations. These could be more heavily emphasized than technical training. Often times the professional development costs too much or becomes a checkbox activity.	2/10/2020 12:18 PM
695	This will only help if the licensee has technical competency deficiencies in his/her field of practice and provided that the education is specifically related to those deficiencies.	2/10/2020 12:18 PM
696	If it were an option, I would have answered "It Depends" to question 4 because the circumstances of each practicing professional can vary widely. For those whose professional practice is primarily managerial, a requirement to engage in regular efforts to retain technical competency is easily justified. For those who daily engage in technical applications as part of their professional practice, additional training may be of marginal benefit. So, yes, efforts to maintain technical competency are good in principle, but 1) such efforts are usually not necessary to protect the public and 2) the current system for encouraging and monitoring professional development is of limited effect in ensuring technical competency. Of more importance to my answer of "No" is the belief that professional engineers and surveyors are already highly motivated by their ethics and the potential risks of incompetency to maintain a high degree of technical competency.	2/10/2020 12:18 PM
697	I think the concept of CEU is greatly overrated. It gains engineers little if any knowledge. If anything, the CEU cost and time factors discourage engineers from becoming PE's in a state, which is not desirable. So the whole concept in my mind is counterproductive.	2/10/2020 12:17 PM
698	No	2/10/2020 12:17 PM
699	Good to have licensees stay current. Not difficult to do 30 hrs of professional development in a two year period.	2/10/2020 12:16 PM
700	30 hours is insufficient - Should be increased, say doubled.	2/10/2020 12:16 PM
701	Way to many hours. Since we are talking about professionals, it should be a given that registrants are keeping up with their education as a natural part of their business.	2/10/2020 12:16 PM
702	The 30 hours biennially coincide with the 15 hours yearly requirement of my home state, so It's convenient for me.	2/10/2020 12:15 PM
703	The limitation of the type of hours earned may be counteractive. For example, I am a member of the IEEE substation committee working group which develops standards for use world wide in the field that I practice. Restricting these hours is counter productive. Much of the disciplinary actions that PE boards enforce are Ethical in nature with few that are performance based. The Ethics and Rules and Laws proposition for the change are agreeable.	2/10/2020 12:15 PM
704	no comments	2/10/2020 12:14 PM
705	REDUCE TO 3	2/10/2020 12:13 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

706	No the 30 hours needs to be more focused on the individual types engineering disciplines. In addition the way the hours are accumulated needs to be better tracked by providing documentation. Right now in my opinion the honor system isn't necessarily honored.	2/10/2020 12:13 PM
707	No	2/10/2020 12:12 PM
708	Licensed in multiple states 24 Hours is Average	2/10/2020 12:12 PM
709	There are so many hours required that in reality the content of the hours claimed, although often relevant to current industry trends, doesn't necessarily reinforce technical competencies. For example, monthly local ASCE chapter lunches are often interesting and great networking opportunities, but they don't provide relevant technical training that will directly serve the public interest.	2/10/2020 12:12 PM
710	Current requirement is sufficient	2/10/2020 12:12 PM
711	engineers should be taking continuing education courses that increase their knowledge of design which will protect the public	2/10/2020 12:11 PM
712	If the engineer is doing his/her job and designing with the safety of the public in mind...it doesn't matter how many CE hours he/she gets.	2/10/2020 12:11 PM
713	I am very active in my profession and have been doing so for 37 years, I believe that a lot of engineers have lost sight of the ethics criteria and this is important to be reminded	2/10/2020 12:11 PM
714	I do believe that ethics being a mandatory component for each renewal. I think 1 hour would be sufficient. However, I strongly believe in the 30 hour requirement (or near to that amount). The land surveying profession has drastically changed and continues to do so. Not just with advances in technology but legally as well. I'm unaware of this trend of lowering continuing education requirements are being contemplated in other professions but I strongly believe that it should stay in place.	2/10/2020 12:10 PM
715	No	2/10/2020 12:10 PM
716	The amount is a little excessive compared to Colorado which doesn't require any	2/10/2020 12:10 PM
717	30-PDH's sound good in theory, but in practice becomes an exercise in trying to find the lowest cost PDH's available, not always based on content, but on PDH's awarded and schedule.	2/10/2020 12:09 PM
718	Ethics is more inline with public protection than conferences and workshops.	2/10/2020 12:09 PM
719	I feel that the convention like seminars that the majority of professionals use to get PDH credit is useless. Practicing design engineers get more continuing education on a daily basis than any over priced seminar will provide. Its the Professionals who no longer hold design positions at large firms that are the problem. A project manager or supervisor who stamps is the most dangerous person in the industry because most of the time it is not their own due diligence put forth into the design work. I feel like the ethics and legal aspects that you are mentioning to take the place of the developmental hours is to address cultural problems in large design firms. However hypothetically if all states were to go to the system that you are proposing it would make it even harder for small independent designers to conduct their business in multiple states due to the efforts required for renewing licenses. This in my opinion could have the exact opposite of the intentions for what you are proposing which could make it easier for large legally driven companies to hold multiple state licensing, and harder for smaller independent designers to do so.	2/10/2020 12:08 PM
720	No	2/10/2020 12:07 PM
721	The name says it all -- Professional Development. Engineering design evolves as years go by. PD helps keep an engineer current with design issues and solutions.	2/10/2020 12:07 PM
722	Its a good system, but it doesn't account for what is being learned/taught. If the emphasis is ethics and State law knowledge then those should be required. Every professional should keep up to date on their profession not because its law to do so, but because they are a professional.	2/10/2020 12:07 PM
723	30 hours is excessive. Technical competency is inherently worked on every day that I am working. 3 hours of professional ethics/and or Nevada law and regulation would be much better.	2/10/2020 12:06 PM
724	It might be a bit excessive, sometimes it's hard to find the right classes or activities to fulfill this requirement.	2/10/2020 12:05 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

725	Essentially the competency issues are relevant in making sure that all registrants stay on top of current issues and practices. Ehtics while important is difficult to find relevant courses outside of NV which would more than likely classes will be held in NV to meet the requirements. NM just requires 2 hours of Ethics and it is a broad spectrum of issues regarding Ethics, would it be relevant to cover the ethics requirement proposed?	2/10/2020 12:05 PM
726	Waste of time finding applicable PDH classes just to satisfy the requirements. When to stay competitive you have to continually be up to date on technology and codes.	2/10/2020 12:04 PM
727	For the most part I don't think that the majority of the professional development hours that I take result in my being a better engineer or any more well-equipped in my function of protecting the public.	2/10/2020 12:04 PM
728	Life-long learning is important. Some toil to achieve and maintain licensure is also important.	2/10/2020 12:04 PM
729	No	2/10/2020 12:03 PM
730	IF A REDUCTION IS DESIRED, REDUCING FROM 30 HOURS TO 24 HOURS WOULD BE RECOMMENDED. REDUCING TO 3 HOURS WOULD BE EXTREME.	2/10/2020 12:03 PM
731	30 hours is a good amount of hours that typically cover multiple topics and not just a single topic that the engineer is knowledgeable in. I think the 30 hours provides for increased and expansive growth.	2/10/2020 12:02 PM
732	I think it is a reasonable requirement and benefits the professional engineer and the public.	2/10/2020 12:01 PM
733	Being that we are professionals, we have the options of choosing the courses that best fit the need. Enforcing a professional to take the "same" course(s) over and over does not protect the health, safety and welfare of the public. Being a professional, I need to stay aware of any changes in the laws/rules and should always be ethical not only in business, but in life itself.	2/10/2020 12:01 PM
734	This is fine. However, the reduction will not reduce public protection.	2/10/2020 12:01 PM
735	None	2/10/2020 12:01 PM
736	More random auditing would result in better adherence to the criteria.	2/10/2020 12:00 PM
737	While it meets the intent I think 30 hours is too much time.	2/10/2020 12:00 PM
738	While I do feel the courses taken for PDH requirements provide for "some" insight into Professional Engineering designs/practices, I do not feel they provide any additional protection to the general public given the ultimate protection resides in the ethical conduct of the Professional, and their ability to operate with a given knowledge within their profession. I personally do not think the PDH courses to much of anything to benefit or safeguard the public from a Professional who is not willing to follow the ethics, standards and laws governing their practice. Also, none of the PDH courses I have taken over the last two decades would have provided any additional relevant usable skills, expertise or knowledge to operate outside of my "comfy zone" of expertise. I truly believe the protections for the general public resides more in each Professionals ethics and actions.	2/10/2020 12:00 PM
739	The proposed three(3) hours of continue education requirement is reasonable. Many of our professional have continued in our field of practice which would provide adequate education to keep current in our field of practice. Additionally, Building Code changes frequency has keep our design update and requirements up to the current high standards.	2/10/2020 12:00 PM
740	I'm a plan check engineer and I'm a big proponent of engineer's staying current on technologies and techniques to enhance their practice.	2/10/2020 12:00 PM
741	It is difficult to find worthwhile CE opportunities that respond to the goals of the CE requirement. Classes that offer CE credit are given priority over others potentially more worthwhile with no credits.	2/10/2020 12:00 PM
742	Being an Electrical Engineer, we have naturally stay up to date with new technology to stay competent in our field of expertise.	2/10/2020 11:59 AM
743	Most continuing education credits are treated as checklist items. I believe very little benefit comes from most CEs other than being able to claim the credit for licensure. Much more is learned doing the job on a consistent basis. I would be more interested in seeing a requirement that you must be working in the industry without a lapse greater than a specified amount of time (perhaps 2 years).	2/10/2020 11:59 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

744	I believe that continuing education is already a requirement of all registrants without making a rule or law. The rule has mainly generated business companies that offer CEUs. The things they offer mainly "check a box" rather than providing substance to protect the public.	2/10/2020 11:58 AM
745	None	2/10/2020 11:58 AM
746	It matches the requirements of other states	2/10/2020 11:57 AM
747	"Somewhat" would be a better answer. I think the amount of hours required are excessive. They're more than doctors or lawyers are required to complete. It's a hardship for a small practice to be required to take so much time away from the business.	2/10/2020 11:57 AM
748	It is too nebulous and easy to meet the requirement without really learning anything.	2/10/2020 11:57 AM
749	I worked in the private sector for 20 years, I worked for the US Forest Service for 10 years until I retired in 2017. I did all of my continuing ed. But most of it was with federally required training for my job administering construction grants. I always did building code update seminars. The current requirement does not really cover needed code change knowledge and legal/ethical requirements. We need less hours and they should be very focused on what we specialize in plus ethics and law.	2/10/2020 11:56 AM
750	The overall cost to achieve the total quantity of PDH credit is hard to absorb as not only is it the registration costs but also the time expended.	2/10/2020 11:56 AM
751	At this stage in my career (age 59) I am heavily involved in my community now chairing a second high profile committee for the mayor of the City of Reno to improve our community and quality of life. I have dedicated over 2,000 hours in the past four years and simply did not have time last year for CE. thus, I had to go inactive. But having such a high profile in our community has been very positive for our engineering community. In fact, I have used my engineering skills to help guide the committee on several occasions including development of goals and priorities. Seems like this should be recognized by the board.	2/10/2020 11:56 AM
752	Even though it takes effort to accomplish, I think it's good to have the requirement to keep up-to-date with the ever changing technical software programs, etc. It's too easy to think we are just too busy. I like the requirement.	2/10/2020 11:55 AM
753	15 hours of continuing education per year is roughly 2 days of work per year which cuts into our time to get work finished. I use mostly free webinars because the expense is another issue.	2/10/2020 11:54 AM
754	We are practicing engineers so we always follow the changes in codes and regulations even without professional development hours.	2/10/2020 11:54 AM
755	Professional Ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulation are two different things, but they are linked. One can learn laws and regulation, but it takes an ethical person to comply and follow them. Some Professionals will keep up with the NRS and NAC as they are amended, but most won't on their own. I think that making this a requirement for continued licensure would be a benefit, and may decrease the amount of compliance cases going to the Board for review. It would also benefit the public, by possibly keeping professionals from offering services outside their areas of expertise.	2/10/2020 11:54 AM
756	I believe the original intent of the continuing education requirement is to ensure that licensees are accountable to current codes, trends, practices, and methodologies. I am a firm believer in the "if you don't use it, you'll lose it" phrase. Established engineers should continue to learn and improve and not sit on their laurels.	2/10/2020 11:53 AM
757	It takes intentional effort to pursue continued education to meet this requirement. Most cannot just fall into 30 hours bi-annually.	2/10/2020 11:53 AM
758	Good Engineers will keep current regardless of CPD and others will just take courses just to fulfill the CPD requirements and forget what they learned in a week.	2/10/2020 11:53 AM
759	None	2/10/2020 11:52 AM
760	Most webinars are useless for practicing engineers. What is to say they are listening and not doing other things on their desks. Multitasking is the latest buzz word.	2/10/2020 11:52 AM
761	Engineers should always be learning.	2/10/2020 11:52 AM
762	If the requirement for CEUs is continued, education regarding updates to state law and regulation regarding the practice of engineering or land surveying would be valuable.	2/10/2020 11:52 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

Otherwise, the current requirement seems unlikely to protect the public as PE/LS licensees must already maintain competence in their technical discipline to practice regardless of a requirement to enroll in PDHs. Thank you.

763	I feel that 30 hours is excessive.	2/10/2020 11:52 AM
764	At least half of the PDH should be earned from face to face seminar or CEU, not online webinar. And professional ethics should be required.	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
765	The 30 hour regulation indicates that the licensee is still reasonably active practicing the in the a subject field.	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
766	N/A	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
767	Continuing education should remain as-is.	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
768	The intent is not met in the quantity of hours, but in the quality. More often than not engineers are scrambling to get their minimum PDH's in at the last minute online and wasting their time on courses that have little to no applicability to their regular practice.	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
769	N/A	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
770	In my case, I work as an engineer and we gain the technical competency by performing design work rather by PDH.	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
771	It would be wise to incorporate the review of Nevada Statutes into the required PDHs. However the other hours force review of other engineering topics.	2/10/2020 11:50 AM
772	No	2/10/2020 11:50 AM
773	I think this should be a minimum requirement - however, some ceu for professional ethics should also be required	2/10/2020 11:50 AM
774	Reduce to 10 hours max per 2 year period	2/10/2020 11:49 AM
775	I am licensed in over 20 states. The requirement of 30 hours over two years is somewhat high, but not entirely unreasonable when compared to other states.	2/10/2020 11:49 AM
776	The current thirty-professional-development hours does meet the intent of the regulation for public protection however this requirement present a burden on the licensees that does necessarily justify the high number of required hours.	2/10/2020 11:49 AM
777	This is consistent with other states.	2/10/2020 11:48 AM
778	The 30 hours helps keep design professional up to date on current and relevant design and construction practices.	2/10/2020 11:48 AM
779	If you do a take home test, it will be better to ensure that LS's are up to date on current laws. Have them take it every 2 years, with a 90% passing score. Then keep some of the CE hour requirements, but not so high. Maybe 8 hours, or 12? This way every 2 years they are focused on ethics and the law. Learning how to do a drone survey is great, but better for business, not necessarily protecting the public.	2/10/2020 11:48 AM
780	About 16 hours for two years would be sufficient	2/10/2020 11:47 AM
781	There are many technical advances occurring all the time. Investing 15 per year to keep abreast of current practice is a small investment to make to remain technically competent.	2/10/2020 11:47 AM
782	I can access the internet for training on subjects I need help with. This is done on a continual basis without the continuing education requirement.	2/10/2020 11:47 AM
783	Proposal to lower continuing education requirement from 30 to 3 seems problematic, and not sure what is driving this issue. Most states that have CEU requirements have this threshold, ie 15 hrs per year. If a lower threshold is desired, consider maybe 10 hrs per year in lieu of 15, so 20 hours in a biennial renewal period in lieu of 30.	2/10/2020 11:45 AM
784	Ethics and state laws are important; other states have these requirements also. However, I believe technical competency outweighs the ethics requirements.	2/10/2020 11:45 AM
785	30 pdh in 2 year period is consistent with requirements in several other US states	2/10/2020 11:45 AM
786	The PDHs earned rarely pertain to public safety.	2/10/2020 11:44 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

787	no
788	none
789	If there is a desire to include ethics / laws & rules, there is a roadmap that other states (WI, TX, FL, IN, for example) use that works very well. They require 30 hours in the biennium, with 2 hours of the 30 required to be ethics / laws & rules.
790	The intent is necessary and the number of hours is fine but the things that qualify as professional development need work. Simply sitting in a seminar is not as valuable as actually preparing documents (specifications or calculations). I think the concept is sound but it needs to be refined.
791	Too many hours required, does not contribute to public safety.
792	Continuing Education is required for both technical and ethics and laws.
793	this is a waste of money. A professional engineer is constantly educating themselves with learning new product and technologies to keep up with todays engineering needs. I don't need to spend money and time on something that is a refresher course
794	No comment
795	While I believe that the requirement does meet the spirit for which it was intent, I think there is opportunity to refine this requirement so that it better aligns with the goal.
796	Helpful, but should not be a requirement except for ethical standards. A class suggestion would be beneficial with less hours instead of the 30 hours.
797	30 hours is constant with most of the states that have a continuing education requirement
798	Ethics is OK, but knowledge on State law is not, especially for those who have limited contact with PLS, unless there is a significant change.
799	No
800	The current PDH requirement provides incentive for PEs to continue seeking educational opportunities.
801	No
802	Through the audit process, PDH's are reviewed to meet the intent of the regulation and those that don't are not allowed to count.
803	With the various changes to codes and recommended practices, I believe it is necessary to remain relevant and professional education provides a reasonable means of responsibility. In my opinion, an engineer designing in the public domain, cannot remain relevant without continuing professional education. It would be advantageous and remove barriers if ALL states would adopt a consistent system for documentation. The NCEES's CPC Tracking module is an easy to use platform.
804	Since PDHs are not specific to public safety, many of the PDHs favor new technology and products.
805	While meeting the the intent of the public protection regulation, I do not believe that the current environment really addresses truly updating or honing of skills. In my areas of expertise, the updating of skills is accomplished through project related challenges that require research and creative thinking/engineering to solve. Trying to learn from a lecture or seminar rarely lends clear insight into where technology is trending or where skills development may be desired or needed. I also believe that most of the PDH industry focuses on fee income for attendance at seminars or conferences, but the takeaway knowledge and gain by attendees is often lacking. In that respect, "keeping one's skills updated in order to protect the public trust" is not well served. Some states such as Arizona do not require any CEU/PDH. I am not aware of their reasoning, but in any case shows a different approach to continuing education.
806	No
807	the CE requirements are of some value.
808	Continuing education can help if people are taking the right classes. From some of my observations, I see people taking classes to check the boxes for CE that aren't necessarily

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

making them better at their jobs.

809	The current PDH requirement does not require a focus or minimum number of hours concerning public protection.	2/10/2020 11:38 AM
810	The current CEU is meeting the intent, but maybe professionals do not need as many hours to stay current and proficient in regard to public protection.	2/10/2020 11:38 AM
811	If a Professional Engineer needs to learn about a new process or equipment or procedure, he does it. The current process is a boondoggle created to make the regulators feel good.	2/10/2020 11:37 AM
812	I think it is important to keep up with what is happening in your field. This provides some encouragement- although there are those who will find their way around it.	2/10/2020 11:37 AM
813	no	2/10/2020 11:37 AM
814	No.	2/10/2020 11:37 AM
815	While I value continuing education, I don't think the practice of regulating it adds any value to the tax payers and citizens of Nevada.	2/10/2020 11:36 AM
816	just staying relevant with codes, equipment and advances in technology is more relevant than obtaining PDH (which are available through simple online courses).	2/10/2020 11:35 AM
817	No	2/10/2020 11:34 AM
818	N/A	2/10/2020 11:33 AM
819	I believe any engineer who is actively involved with associations, webinars, and training seminars will keep up with the standards and can meet the 30 hour requirements.	2/10/2020 11:33 AM
820	Hours are usually spent on subjects about which we are already knowledgeable. Time and money spent that really does not enhance knowledge significantly	2/10/2020 11:33 AM
821	If you an active engineer you should be learning more from your day-to-day work and client interaction to learn as much or more than in settingn or taking online classes just to meeting the credits required for reknewal.	2/10/2020 11:32 AM
822	I think it is all window dressing for the public. Most competent engineers stay current with ethics, laws and technological changes in their fields of practice. These rule punish everyone for the misbehavior or lack of competence of a few individuals.	2/10/2020 11:32 AM
823	PDH requirements keeps engineers in the know on the latest and greatest. I'm a proponent of the requirement of 30 hours.	2/10/2020 11:32 AM
824	NA	2/10/2020 11:32 AM
825	30 hurs may seem a bit much, but 3 hours seems to be going to the opposite extreme.	2/10/2020 11:32 AM
826	As an active design engineer the added CEUs are not required in Arizona or California.	2/10/2020 11:32 AM
827	It seems to be consistent with what I'm seeing although I do feel like it is a lot of hours.	2/10/2020 11:31 AM
828	The 30 hours requirement is too much and taking the courses does not necessarily result in more public safety	2/10/2020 11:31 AM
829	Continuing Education is always key to keeping up with changing materials and techniques in the industry.	2/10/2020 11:31 AM
830	It has been a good regulation as it requires that the professional keep to date with the new and advanced technologies and alternate and improved engineering solution to issues at hand.	2/10/2020 11:31 AM
831	I do not believe the 30 hours of professional development requirement make a difference when it comes to public protection. I think the obtaining and maintaining the PE license means more to meeting the intent of public protection than required professional development hours. If a registrant does not keep current in their particular industry they practice in, they most likely won't continue to get work to practice.	2/10/2020 11:31 AM
832	The 30 hours of continuing education every two years must be achieved with technical courses and seminars and is not necessarily enhancing ethical or legal knowledge.	2/10/2020 11:30 AM
833	no	2/10/2020 11:30 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

834	I have not been able to meet the requirements, so I do not practice in Nevada.	2/10/2020 11:30 AM
835	15 hours a year is a very managable and necessary requirement in order to keep current with our changing technologies.	2/10/2020 11:30 AM
836	no	2/10/2020 11:30 AM
837	Technology changes and technical learning is critical to an engineer being up to date and able to provide their clients with the latest design.	2/10/2020 11:30 AM
838	Yes, it is a fair requirement. I like the flexibility given to the professional in terms of the type of continuing education.	2/10/2020 11:28 AM
839	After being in this business for more than 40 years, I think that 30 hours is way too much to ask for. Technology is changing, but the application of codes and ethics is not so much.	2/10/2020 11:28 AM
840	I believe the current requirement CAN meet the intent of the regulation if the licensee is intentional in their continuing education selection and diligent in engaging in the professional development activity to really grow in their understanding and abilities. On the other hand, it is possible for a licensee to simply accumulate hours by attending mostly personally irrelevant meetings and webinars just to "check a box". To differentiate these two paths, which both end with the required number of credits, is difficult.	2/10/2020 11:27 AM
841	Good professionals will perform continuing education as-needed to maintain an acceptable level of expertise. Changes in the industry vary, so some years there are lots of changes and more than the required number of hours are really necessary. In other years, there are not a lot of changes in some industries so the level of continuing education effort is less. One struggle I have is I spend a lot of time reading and learning about current industry updates, but often don't get "credit" for this effort because it is not an "approved" method of learning. The goal of continuing education should be staying current with the industry, however you accomplish that goal.	2/10/2020 11:27 AM
842	Please don't reduce the hours of continuing education	2/10/2020 11:26 AM
843	There is a tendency to find classes to meet the 30 instead of quality education focused. It is sometimes hard to find 30 focused, good classes.	2/10/2020 11:26 AM
844	Educators (i.e., academics) should be able to count teaching courses.	2/10/2020 11:26 AM
845	The current requirement is keeping licensees current with what is generally going on in our profession but I don't know that it's significantly impacting our technical knowledge.	2/10/2020 11:25 AM
846	Ineffective and a waste of my time	2/10/2020 11:25 AM
847	Please do not dilute this requirement which can easily be met by a practicing Professional Engineer and is necessary to keep abreast of new technology, processes, codes, and engineering methods.	2/10/2020 11:25 AM
848	No comments	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
849	Bssed on my experience, PEs proactively stay up to date,	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
850	I believe those who are teaching classes, go to seminars, or writing papers about engineering practice/ethics have a positive impact on public protection because the word "gets out" about what is going on and areas of concern can be addressed. The more knowledge an engineer gets both ethically and technical competency, will in the end, have a positive impact on the public protection.	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
851	no	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
852	As a professional engineer, I am constantly trying to increase my knowledge thru seminars, webinars, working on projects, keep up with current trends and code changes. I see no reason why it necessary to try to document this.	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
853	none	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
854	Too many hours required.	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
855	While sometimes completing 30hrs every two years might be difficult, I do try to find courses relevant to my area of Engineering, or areas of Engineering I would like to learn a little more about. Standards are always changing, so keeping current is very important in our trade.	2/10/2020 11:24 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

856	I am registered in multiple states and 30 hrs per biennial period seems to be the predominate requirement.	2/10/2020 11:23 AM
857	For me it helps. I subscribe to the Lucas Letter which I find is very relevant to my surveying practice. There are other ways to get the PDU's, but many I've found are worthless.	2/10/2020 11:23 AM
858	No	2/10/2020 11:23 AM
859	From my experience in meeting the 30 hours of continuing education most pdh's are geared towards technical education and very little, if any geared towards State Law requirements of protecting the public's interest. It is more towards how to do things quicker and more efficient for profitability versus educating Licensee's as to how to protect the public and not just the client.	2/10/2020 11:23 AM
860	This requirement does not ensure the competency or ethical behavior of a professional engineer. Thus it is not effective with regard to public protection.	2/10/2020 11:23 AM
861	I am licensed in many states and nearly all have a similar requirement.	2/10/2020 11:23 AM
862	I think 10 pdh's per year would suffice. The three for ethics and state laws are some of the hardest types of pdh's to find.	2/10/2020 11:22 AM
863	I feel the requirements are not effective and are an unnecesasry burden	2/10/2020 11:22 AM
864	I would oppose any proposal to lower the number of continuing education hours required to maintain licensure.	2/10/2020 11:22 AM
865	I do not believe that continuing education requirements implemented by many states have elevated the level of practice of my peers. However, it has made continuing education much more accessible and available over a wider variety of topics. Unfortunately, I have not seen those whom I felt needed additional training use these opportunities to increase their skills in any meaningful way.	2/10/2020 11:20 AM
866	There are too many instances where it is questionable whether a particular presentation; i.e. 1-hour professional luncheon and others, would warrant a PDH.	2/10/2020 11:20 AM
867	I think generally speaking this is a good requirement particularly with ever-changing Codes and technical advancements. However, may need to consider what qualifies as meeting continuing education or setting some minimum standards.	2/10/2020 11:19 AM
868	I did struggle in that ultimately it depends on the person/individual and what continuing education that are doing and are they applying it.	2/10/2020 11:19 AM
869	In general, the professional development requirement is neither embracing nor upholding the intent for which it was originally intended. It has become an exercise in simply 'working to gain the hours needed to comply'	2/10/2020 11:19 AM
870	Retaining a reasonable amount of continuing education (30 h / biennium) encourages engineers to more actively engage in their chosen professions and stay abreast of changes in industry.	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
871	Technical competency is one of those things you either have or don't. Engineering school and the PE exam should weed that out. We're in a profession where the technical aspect is governed by formulas and methods that have existed for a long time with little change. What does change are laws and regulations.	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
872	No comments	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
873	It is consistent with other states	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
874	This requirement may result in people taking classes/courses to 'just get it done' rather than allowing for them to select meaningful educational units.	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
875	30 hours might be too much, compare to State of California, which doesn't require any continuing education hours.	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
876	On going training is not proof of competence nor of good engineering design and practice. Like a standardized test, the resulting goal is to pass the test not do good work.	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
877	It is alot of hours to dedicate to professional development. Engineering practice is better determination.	2/10/2020 11:17 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

878	I'm registered in 49 states and what you require is not out of the ordinary. I think maintaining 30 hours is fine and making 3 of those being state laws and rules and professional ethics would be more in keeping with other states. Reducing to just 3 hours and not requiring any technical training would be a big step backwards	2/10/2020 11:17 AM
879	30 hours is extreme for any practicing professional.	2/10/2020 11:17 AM
880	15 hours per year is not difficult to obtain and does help an engineer to stay current.	2/10/2020 11:17 AM
881	Licensed PLS in seven states. Six of them require continuing education. All are very similar in hours required and acceptable coursework, etc. In other words, pretty standard.	2/10/2020 11:17 AM
882	Continuing education offerings have little or nothing to do with day-to-day practice, and are often vendor sales pitches or weakly academic. I learn far more about engineering from practicing engineering.	2/10/2020 11:16 AM
883	I think the hours need to be reduced, it is very difficult and costly to get continueing education credits. In addition I live in an area where the closest Classes are 300 mile away in both directions and this adds an additionaal cost and time away form work and family.	2/10/2020 11:16 AM
884	Most of the states I am registered in require anywhere from 24 to 30 PDH in a two year period.	2/10/2020 11:16 AM
885	I believe it meets the intent, but I also think it's too much. I think less, like 10 PDH would be sufficient. Hawaii, where I currently live and practice, has no PDH requirement for license renewal. I do think ethics is of high importance, and should always be required for biennial renewal of our professional licenses.	2/10/2020 11:16 AM
886	I wouldn't reduce the CEU requirement as it is in line with most other states I am registered in	2/10/2020 11:16 AM
887	I am licensed in 3 states and only NV requires continuing education. If you specialize in certain fields available courses are somewhat limited if you want to minimize duplication. It makes no sense to repeat classes for the only purpose of meeting the 30 hr requirement. Free courses are offered through various associations but tend to be repeated over and over.	2/10/2020 11:15 AM
888	I am not sure if the intent is for public protection.	2/10/2020 11:14 AM
889	Any practicing engineer will maintain their education and assure that they are in compliance with the changing codes. This is incumbent on any practitioner both for life safety and risk management. Anyone can get on line and fill in the blanks.	2/10/2020 11:14 AM
890	Tracking of fewer hours (half or less) would suffice. In my experience, this has not changed the amount of my continuing education efforts. The proposed change to fewer credits with focus on professional ethics and NV-specific requirements makes sense but takes a extra effort to find applicable courses and accomplish - would NV also offer online courses / webinars	2/10/2020 11:14 AM
891	I think this is something that it pushed through by training companies.	2/10/2020 11:13 AM
892	I believe it's ok, but I really think that making us do more with the NRS and ethics would be better suited.	2/10/2020 11:13 AM
893	Requirements are too loose and don't promote actual advancement/continuation of education related to the PE.	2/10/2020 11:13 AM
894	30 hours is a large number. Other states require 20	2/10/2020 11:13 AM
895	I don't think it is helpful.	2/10/2020 11:12 AM
896	I believe the current requirements barely meet the regulation and SHOULD NOT be reduced. If anything, additional continued education should be required.	2/10/2020 11:12 AM
897	Interesting, I have no trouble getting the credits due to articles written, numerous presentations each year, course and on-line courses, I enjoy them but at times it is a hassle to keep track of them. But I do see the value as things do change. Just requiring ethics courses does not seem like enough to stay current with new methods, materials, codes, test methods etc.	2/10/2020 11:12 AM
898	30 hrs seems a little high, maybe 20	2/10/2020 11:12 AM
899	I believe the concept of having some connection of Continuing Education to Nevade laws and regulations is a good idea. Especially for those who reside outside the state. This could be a web-based training.	2/10/2020 11:11 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

900	Subjects covered by 30 PDH does not necessarily increase the technical competency of practicing engineers.	2/10/2020 11:11 AM
901	Continuing education is not necessary for engineers engaged in design and not sufficient for academics or administrators.	2/10/2020 11:11 AM
902	The 30 hours can be regarding almost any subject. Some of the 30 hours should be required to be on ethics, NV laws, changes in the code, etc.	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
903	In my humble opinion the PDH system is a tax on practicing engineers. PDH's, if required should be free. Furthermore any practicing engineer would remain current through the act of being a practicing engineer. I always found it frustrating that I was required to listen to paid seminars, and then take exams as a licensed, practicing engineer. If the intent is to make sure people stay current on engineering ethics and Nevada law; ask them to complete a multiple choice exam at the time of renewal. In my mind that would achieve the same intent of staying current on changes that affect their ability to practice. Continuing education is a money making enterprise that has lost sight of what's important.	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
904	N.C.	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
905	I think 30 hours is too many, and should not exceed half of that.	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
906	It is nearly impossible to find continuing ed classes with subject matter close enough to my actual area of practice to be valuable. Most of the classes taken are taken to satisfy the required hours, not to improve expertise.	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
907	n/a	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
908	I haven't seen any evidence that PDHs have reduced or prevented an accident from a lack of engineering judgment, engineering design, or ethics.	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
909	I think it does what it is supposed to do but it is excessive. I believe 8 or 10 a year would be adequate if combined with ethics and regulation.	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
910	30 might be a lot but 10 a year is about right	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
911	no	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
912	The current requirement of 30 PDH is excessive and sometimes it is difficult to find proper venues to satisfy that requirement. A lower requirement would be more appropriate.	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
913	I think the existing requirement is necessary for engineers to keep abreast of current technology and maintain skill sets.	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
914	none	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
915	Industry advancements communicated through product representatives often do not count for continuing education credits, even through the intent to stay current with innovation is being met	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
916	30 hours is a large expense spent on education that is not particularly pertaining to Nevada Laws	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
917	The current 30 PDH requirement mainly supports attendance at professional society meetings with little to no educational component.	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
918	30-Hours should include minimum 2-Hours ethics	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
919	Being with professionals in my field and attending seminars and classes is highly beneficial. I think taking that away in favor of only 3 hours of ethics and related training is a mistake. If the ethics and related training is seen as a critical addition, then my suggestion would be to include those as requirements within the 30 pdh hours.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
920	No	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
921	No	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
922	I think keeping current with the industry is an important aspect of our practice of engineering.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
923	It does help keep an engineer current with new practices and procedures, but does not really protect the public	2/10/2020 11:08 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

924	Adding an ethics requirement would be OK. Many states require one hour per year. Adding the Nevada Laws requirement will just add another class for Red Vector or similar on line CEU company to ding for \$50.00.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
925	Continued education is a very important part of holding a license, and removing the requirement would disincentivize keeping up with current trends and technology. It would also make it more difficult for engineers desiring to do continuing education on their own, as financial support from companies may fall away if it is not a requirement.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
926	Public safety is the main criteria and the current PDH requirement at least provides some assurance that engineers are staying current.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
927	The change wouldn't affect me very much as I am licensed in multiple states and would need to complete 30 hours to fulfill other PDH obligations.	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
928	With regards to public protection, no. These are a good opportunity for an engineer to keep up to date with the latest methods, although any engineer who desires to do so will. If an engineer is indifferent about that even going through credit courses will not have an effect.	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
929	No	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
930	I think it could be reduced and still meet the intent	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
931	I think concentrating on Nevada law and ethics is more pertinent and beneficial in regards to engineering. This day and age it is imperative to keep up with advancement in engineering technology to remain competitive in today's market anyway.	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
932	I frequently get more than 30 hours if not actually closer to 30 per year or 60 per biennial. This is to stay on top of changes and to improve my knowledge in protecting the public.	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
933	what this requirement has produced is a business of providing CE seminars/classes to engineers in order to meet the requirements. As a multi-state registrant, it has complicated the registration process and not, in my opinion, kept engineers in technical knowledge. These days, if one is not up to date, one will not have a job.	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
934	There should be more emphasis on safety and well being of citizens in new or existing facilities.	2/10/2020 11:05 AM
935	No	2/10/2020 11:05 AM
936	This is similar to the other states in which I am licensed. I have no problem with this continuing education requirement.	2/10/2020 11:05 AM
937	Diversity in educational topics should be encouraged.	2/10/2020 11:05 AM
938	1) Two or three states that I'm licensed in, once or twice a year offer a webinar where they go over new state requirements and sometimes cover ethics issues. These are great for keeping up to date with state requirements. 2) Ethics classes get monotonous having essentially the same discussions and issues covered in the same way every year. The requirement loses it's effectiveness when it's required every year.	2/10/2020 11:05 AM
939	It is an Engineer's professional obligation to continue professional development throughout their career and to keep current in their specialty field. I do not believe the requirement for 30 professional development hours per renewal period provides benefits to public protection.	2/10/2020 11:05 AM
940	No.	2/10/2020 11:05 AM
941	I believe CE is crucial as the industry is ever evolving. Not keeping abreast of these changes can significantly increase the likelihood of providing a sub-par service. Remaining current in technology and area specific improvements/changes is as important as law and ethics!	2/10/2020 11:04 AM
942	I just wish all jurisdictions would have one standard for this. It is very difficult for those of us licensed in multiple states to keep track of it all. And I think 8 per year is plenty.	2/10/2020 11:04 AM
943	The continuing education hours should be reduced	2/10/2020 11:04 AM
944	The continued education available out there for me is difficult to find that is directly applicable to my profession (structural engineering). The live seminars available are so expensive to attend and doesn't fit into my budget and you have to take off one or two days of work to attend them. Therefore I fall back to online courses and the available classes are limited for my profession and once I'm finished with them I don't feel like I learned all that much that I didn't already know.	2/10/2020 11:04 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

I just find myself spending over \$600 on online courses just to get a passing score on a test on things I already know.

945	The amount is consistent with other states in which I practice, so is not inordinate.	2/10/2020 11:04 AM
946	Most engineers I know do not learn technical skills from their CEs; they just do them to complete the requirement.	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
947	Public protection is ethics and need to work and provide engineering service as a professional.	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
948	I think that continuing education is a noble pursuit but I do not feel that it necessarily contributes to protecting the public. As an active PE, I work 50+ hours a week generating plans and dealing with changing regulations and feel that the actual practice of engineering is the best way to maintain and improve technical competency. The continuing education credits I usually obtain are less related to technical competency and more towards areas of general interest in engineering topics related to what I do.	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
949	It is more of a welfare for educators and people that give course.	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
950	I agree, a lower hourly requirement focused on ethics and law would be an improvement	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
951	I've found that most professional hours are too watered down and trivial, and as such, do little if any real education	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
952	none	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
953	The number of hours required is probably excessive.	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
954	I feel that often times the system can be "coerced" into the obtaining the proper number of "hours" for a renewal. When this happens, there is not really any competency, or learning, obtained	2/10/2020 11:02 AM
955	In my opinion, my engineers seek out the least costly PDH that satisfy the easiest to achieve parameters of the regulations. I will often see some engineers engaged in other activities (reading or using a phone/tablet/laptop) while attending a seminar. To me, passive observation of a presentations fails to demonstrate any advancement or development of an engineer's competency.	2/10/2020 11:02 AM
956	none	2/10/2020 11:02 AM
957	30 hrs is common across the US	2/10/2020 11:02 AM
958	I think too many hours are taken "just to get it done". I think more focused hours would be more beneficial.	2/10/2020 11:02 AM
959	I see a lot of work from developers and private engineering that do not demonstrate understanding of guidelines and local requirements.	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
960	There are many new ideas and techniques that are continually evolving in the civil Engineering world. As an engineer we should have the thirst for life-long learning.	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
961	I don't have problems with the existing system. It's worked well as my career has advanced and broadened. I think the flexibility in having a broad set of development options is more beneficial.	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
962	I would have concerns if the requirement reduced so significantly and was concentrated only on professional ethics and knowledge of laws and regulation.	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
963	This requirement is roughly the same in other states I am licensed in.	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
964	I think the 30 hours requirement is reasonable. It is more than many other states, but not difficult to obtain if you are engaged in your profession and also if you treat your career as a profession.	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
965	No	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
966	Don't see a need to reduce the # of hours	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
967	While I can see benefit in requiring ethics and code education, I do not believe that eliminating the requirement for technical continuing education will be in the best interest of the public. Achieving 15 credits a year is very easy to do and should not be considered a barrier to professional practice.	2/10/2020 11:01 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

968	Engineers in private practice should always be redefining and improving upon their skills as the market provides new technologies, materials, and systems to be utilized in practice. Otherwise, those engineers that do not keep current generally fade away. The mere imposition of educational requirements in the current training environment only means that most engineers seek the easiest way to satisfy the minimum CEU count. The goal is not actually learning or improving upon a skill set, it is to exercise the minimum effort and cost to comply with the requirements. So reducing the number of hours in the current format will only reduce what are questionable efforts by the engineering community to re-learn and expand its individual capabilities. The solution might be to permit a reduction in the number of hours of training , but exerting more control over the value and content of the course work	2/10/2020 11:00 AM
969	Yes. But I've always taken issue that no credit is given for practical work experience, signing plans and actively practicing as a professional engineer. Sitting in a class and paying someone to teach you something you probably already know is not the only way to learn or stay up to date with the field of engineering	2/10/2020 11:00 AM
970	30 hours every two years could be reduced to maybe 20 hours but don't think it should be eliminated. Engineers should be required to keep learning	2/10/2020 11:00 AM
971	Ethical issues seem to be the most prevalent reasons for discipline by the board, so I think the new proposal would better serve the public.	2/10/2020 11:00 AM
972	Different states have different requiremnets. If you want to have engineers know your laws do the 3 pdh program. Do not go to NV approved program. State approved programs only helps a vendor sell it. Look at CA Real Estate program.	2/10/2020 11:00 AM
973	30 pdh forces a broad survey of engineering related topics to ensure competency related to changing codes and procedures necessary for public protection.	2/10/2020 11:00 AM
974	There is no way to confirm that a professional is maintaining or improving knowledge in their field based on self study. A professional who is engaged in their field and is interested in growing or advancing will take the time to self study and grow in knowledge.	2/10/2020 10:59 AM
975	The individuals who care about the competency of their work will conduct their own training or know enough to invoke the expertise of someone else who is trained.	2/10/2020 10:59 AM
976	I, and many other co-workers and associates, meet our CE requirements by attending our, or another State association convention. I, and others, feel that the material presented is merely a rehashing of the same topics year after year. In other words, its just an exercise in putting in the hours.	2/10/2020 10:59 AM
977	The 30 professional development hours is a challenge; perhaps it could be reduced to 20 hours. Since the PE certification isn't specifically linked to Nevada regulations, perhaps PE registrants should not be required to study the Nevada regulations.	2/10/2020 10:59 AM
978	Several states require the 30 hours which seems appropriate for code updates and continuing education.	2/10/2020 10:59 AM
979	Although I answer Yes above, and I think there is some benefit in helping engineers stay current and up to speed on the latest and greatest in their fields, I don't feel it is a significant benefit and probably does little for public protection as law and ethics does not seem to be the focus at most conferences and learning opportunities. I am also fortunate that my employer provides and pays for many learning opportunities, but I think that the current requirement can be somewhat of a hardship for many small engineering firms.	2/10/2020 10:59 AM
980	30 hours is excessive.	2/10/2020 10:59 AM
981	I think the 30 hour requirement is just about right. I think the rule change of requiring 2 hour of ethics is a good idea.	2/10/2020 10:58 AM
982	I believe in order to maintain a higher standard of the Survey profession, we should not change the hours and make the proposed classes a mandatory part of the 30 hours.	2/10/2020 10:58 AM
983	PDH's requirement motivates and promotes learning.	2/10/2020 10:58 AM
984	I believe that continuing education courses should focus not only on the technical aspect of the design but also on the Life Cycle Safety of the mechanical system which includes installation safety, maintenance safety and removal safety. Courses offered by various companies barely touch on Life Cycle Safety Analysis of mechanical systems.	2/10/2020 10:57 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

985	I also believe 30 is too many hours. After each renewal, the same continuing education classes are offered. No real info.	2/10/2020 10:57 AM
986	I think its too open, and the value that you get isn't really improving your knowledge. I think our current rules has it extremely open, rather than focused with something more defined. Experience is the best to improve your abilities.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
987	If the intent was to keep engineers up on current codes and public safety. The 30 CEUs does not necessarily do that.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
988	I spend most of my time searching for inexpensive conferences since I am maintaining my license while being a stay at home dad. Most of these talks are related to what I did but fill more of an interest. I think that public protection needs to be more focused on laws and ethics as there are unfortunately situations that occur where engineers need to be better suited to do what is right without question when external pressures are applied.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
989	The number of required units is too high, so I suspect some licensees focus on quantity and not quality.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
990	In my opinion, current requirement focus on technical development and I believe that others have the same opinion. While technical competency is relevant, the role of ethical behavior in relation to public safety is not addressed at all in courses of a technical nature.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
991	One might debate the magnitude (30 hours), but eliminating it entirely is not wise.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
992	Many PDH courses are a complete waste of time and do nothing to elevate my technical competency. Good engineers will maintain their professional competency regardless of any PDH requirements.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
993	Technical competence is one of the most important areas. Ethics is also important.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
994	A professional engineer should already be working only within their area of competency. This should mean that the engineers should already be continuing their education to maintain their competency. Classes to expand their competency to additional areas should be at their own discretion.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
995	Compared with my experience in other jurisdictions, 30 is above the norm. Do not believe, however, that dropping to only 3 is appropriate.	2/10/2020 10:55 AM
996	I never understood that the intent was specifically for public protection, as that is typically accomplished by the internal peer review process.	2/10/2020 10:55 AM
997	Most professionals can teach the courses, present the papers and write the books in their core areas of specialization. The CE forces us to expand our area of specialization into related and completely unconnected areas. Not bad, but not the intent.	2/10/2020 10:55 AM
998	There are other states where there is no requirement of any PDH, that doesnt mean that the quality of PE's licensed there suffers over the years or the PE's licensed there are prone to decreased levels of productivity and competency. This requirement should either be slashed drastically or totally removed. It makes NV less attractive as a state to get a PE license and also imposes considerable financial costs on the license PE engineer to undertake such courses that satisfy the PDH requirement. This also leads to spending more time on studying and devoting more time away from family and work for such commitments, which affects the mental health of the PE. I urge the board to seriously consider all the points here and take a decision that reflects the 21st century ideas of making NV an attractive state in welcoming more PEs.	2/10/2020 10:55 AM
999	n/a	2/10/2020 10:54 AM
1000	All design codes are updated every few years. Most practicing licensed engineers stay up-to-date with the code changes and they do not even get PDH for this effort. I think this effort is far more important and effective than attending seminars for PDH.	2/10/2020 10:54 AM
1001	As a professional it is my responsibility to ensure I am designing using the most current codes and procedures.	2/10/2020 10:54 AM
1002	Many people utilize either generic on-line training or professional networking events as PDH's. At the same time, most violations that come to the board appear to be related to ethics violations and/or lack of knowledge of existing state regulations. Focusing PDH's on Ethics and State laws is a much better approach.	2/10/2020 10:54 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

1003	It seems like many of the courses that you CEUs or PDHs are not very technical. They are very general in scope.	2/10/2020 10:53 AM
1004	I do research in my daily practice, and this is not considered professional development hours.	2/10/2020 10:53 AM
1005	Most get their PDH from luncheons or conferences which can have a multitude of subjects including current/past projects. The focus isn't necessarily on public protection, but it's implicit because projects are trying to better the infrastructure for public protection. Such as better roadways, widened sidewalks, better lighting, etc.	2/10/2020 10:53 AM
1006	I think the continuing education requirement should be dropped completely	2/10/2020 10:53 AM
1007	no	2/10/2020 10:52 AM
1008	None	2/10/2020 10:52 AM
1009	30 biennial hours (15 annual average) may be a bit more than is really needed, but reducing the requirement to 3 is not meeting the regulation by a long shot. Suggest an annual average of 12 hours would suffice.	2/10/2020 10:52 AM
1010	I believe competition already drives engineers to keep up with technical competency. We need to put relevant technology in our design. We learn through the application. There is no need for classroom learning.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
1011	Any PE active in design will naturally stay invested in recent developments specific to their area of expertise. Forums for continuing education such as symposia have gradually become less valuable due to companies trying to monetize new developments. Other areas such as authoring papers or serving on committees similarly do not provide the continuing education as anticipated in the requirement. In my experience, literature reviews and one-on-one discussions with peers are the most valuable tool a PE has to stay informed on new developments.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
1012	PDH's are pointless for technical competency if you are working in the field that you are licensed as a PE. I do Structural Engineering every single day of my life for the past 16 years. Forcing me to spend time and money on PDH's do nothing to reinforce my understanding of the field that I'm licensed in. Ethics are different and personally I think this is a great requirement because if we don't review these rules from time to time it's easy to cross an ethical line that you may think is harmless.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
1013	Continuing Education does not proves the individual licensed is actually competent in their field of practice it merely means they took a few courses.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
1014	Focus should be on Ethics, Safety rather than on 30 hours but with vagueness on the quality/type of CE. That would be better suited to public protection. There are companies offering, for a fee, the CE but it is not always meeting this requirement. Those are good courses and I think all Engineers shold be learning/reviewing fundamentals related to the current work they do. But that is not always aligned with public safety goals.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
1015	There are so many methods to achieve PDHs, and so many of these methods don't truly address technical competency. So, if technical competency is the goal, I don't feel that PDHs (30hrs or 3hrs) could positively guarantee that a licensee is achieving that goal.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
1016	The intent is there. For those that want though, there are always options to do the minimum and not continually grow but rather just check the boxes.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
1017	PDHs are easily obtained from a variety of avenues, many of which are organized around professional functions where the main goal is raising money for the organization, not continuing education.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
1018	I feel that reuired education should be limited to ethics	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
1019	No.	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
1020	I do lean towards requiring less hours. Changes to regulations and technology do not happen quickly, resulting in substantial time being spent in seminars reviewing the same material over and over.	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
1021	I am licensed in several jurisdictions and how the current regulation is being implemented is in line with other jurisdictions.	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
1022	none	2/10/2020 10:50 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

1023	none	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
1024	Hi ours should be related to updating/increasing technical knowledge of licensees	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
1025	I get more education in personal research than I do from the "courses" offered. The conferences offered are great for corporate attendance but, not very practical for the independent registrant. Cost of travel and lodging isn't efficient.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
1026	I work in the land development sector and most of my experience and knowledge is gained on projects and in dealing with agencies during plan approval process. Most of the work in my sector does not change so CE is not needed but if it was, we would attend a class regardless of the requirement.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
1027	The PDH requirement seems to have become a token accomplishment that people do not take seriously and end up doing the minimum to get the hours documented. It has also created an industry where credits are expensive to earn.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
1028	PDH's are typically focused on new technology or processes and have little to do with public protection.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
1029	no	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
1030	I think it accomplishes the intent but could better served through fewer hours focused on ethics, law and case histories.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
1031	I don't believe the requirement for continuing education does much to actually increase the knowledge base of the practicing engineer. Those that are interested in continuing their education do so, others find a way to fulfill the requirement without really learning anything.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
1032	I have no issues with 30 PDHs or even to lower it to 15 PDHs, but I do think that it does need to be spelled out that a certain portion should be for say ethics and a portion for statute or law and a portion for technology or say miscellaneous. If 15 PDHs where needed, it could be broken down something like 6 ethics, 6 statute, and 3 miscellaneous.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
1033	None	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
1034	I believe it is adequate.	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
1035	The professional development hours do improve the engineer's competency. However, those hours can be on any approved engineering topic, not only on "regard to public protection" topics. Rarely an hour our two, out of the 30, are on this "regard to public protection" topic, because it is not required. If the intent of the 30 professional development hours was specifically for "regard to public protection," it should then be required that all 30 hours are for this topic.	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
1036	There are only so many classes/seminars available that actually relate to public safety/ethics, beyond that, we find ourselves taking continuing educational credits on topics that are either not really relevant, or on topics that almost all engineers would keep themselves informed on regardless of licensing requirements.	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
1037	30 hours in 2 years is higher than most other states requir. the typical is equivalent to 1 hour per month.	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
1038	Once an engineer receives his/her professional license, he/she has demonstrated competency in their field. The requirement for 30 PDH every other year is not guaranteeing any additional competence, only time that has been spent trying to maintain the 30 PDH every other year.	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
1039	No, everything is good	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
1040	No	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
1041	none	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
1042	I think their should be a minimum of 8 hours of the 30 should be on Ethics.	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
1043	Excessive continuing education	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
1044	More emphasis on engineering ethics may be helpful.	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
1045	I am in favor of keeping the 30 PDH's per renewal period. This is not too difficult to accomplish (averages out to less than 1.25 hours per month), and is also in line with what most states	2/10/2020 10:47 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

currently require. If states decide to reduce the requirement, I would expect companies would cover only the costs associate with getting the licenses, and engineers in those states would be less likely to obtain PDH's on their own. I've heard studies that say taking more PDH's does not necessarily improve outcome, but I can say from personal experience what I learned in these classes made me a better, more well-rounded engineer. PDH courses provide an opportunity for engineers to share their experience and knowledge that otherwise would be more difficult to obtain.

1046	The 30 hours requirement didn't really increase technical competency as it is intended. I do learn some new tech when attending seminars or watching webinars, but it could be done in a lot less hours. I always feel like I'm just trying to get to the 30 hour requirement each biennial.	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
1047	A mix of technical and ethical education is important. As engineering evolves with lessons learned (and codes updated with some of these lessons) it is important to have a mix.	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
1048	For engineers that design bridges 30hrs of continuing education should be the minimum.	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
1049	I support continuing education requirements. I was the managing partner of a 500-person engineering firm and from day 1 we had an even stricter policy overing all licensed professionals.	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
1050	The requirement for regular education and maintenance of skills as a PE are necessary.	2/10/2020 10:46 AM
1051	I don't think that 15 PDH/yr (30 PDH biennially) is onerous.	2/10/2020 10:46 AM
1052	I would suggest that a quick review of state related rules in the form of a online quiz would suffice to ensure awareness of these important matters. Paying for specific courses would be very costly and unnecessary.	2/10/2020 10:46 AM
1053	All too often, CPE is done just to check boxes as a requirement of licensure. Personally, I think the CPE hours in ethics AND NV laws and regulations are the best courses to protect the public.	2/10/2020 10:46 AM
1054	none	2/10/2020 10:45 AM
1055	Although I think having a portion of the CE focused on Ethics and changes to NV law is important, I have concerns that the changes in technology and resulting Engineering practice may be lost in the proposed changes to the detriment of public health and safety	2/10/2020 10:45 AM
1056	I think there should absolutely be continuing education to keep people up to date on technical developments. 30 hours may be too much.	2/10/2020 10:45 AM
1057	It is critical that engineers continue to keep up with changes in technical analysis and design methods and building code requirements. Requiring continuing education on engineering and technical topics is important to the goal of protecting the public.	2/10/2020 10:45 AM
1058	30 hours every renewal period is consistent with most other states and is not a burden. Two hours ethics is more than enough.	2/10/2020 10:45 AM
1059	not practical nore much useful	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
1060	I agree with the email that preceded this survey.	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
1061	NO	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
1062	no	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
1063	I have always felt that it is too many hours, though well intentioned. The lucky people, (not me), can have their entire stay at the NALS Conference paid for, and pretty much meet the requirement, doing it only once in two years. I support the new format, and would require a more stringent verification of having done so. Thanks. Greg Rice	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
1064	I find the courses I've taken to satisfy the PDH requirements refresh my memory of areas not commonly encountered.	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
1065	similar to other states. Florida has a regulations test.	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
1066	30 PDH's over a 2-year period is standard for most States	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
1067	I believe staying up to date with the engineering laws & ethics of each state is more significant. The technical background required for first obtaining and then maintaining your license is	2/10/2020 10:43 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

something that is expected on an every day basis as part of your job responsibilities.

1068	The requirement is excessive	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
1069	The options for earning CE hours are too restrictive, so the available course-ware really does not directly correlate to improved professional competency. Frequently the things I really need to learn and improve are not available as a CE course.	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
1070	This matches well with the requirements for the other states that I maintain licenses. Although a few states also require 1-2 hours of ethics training every renewal cycle.	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
1071	Any engineer involved in day to day project/design engineering is almost forced to stay up to date by the current 3year code/standards cycle or become irrelevant quickly and suffer serious problems with project approval by OHJ and building officials. The technical training aspect is ongoing daily to stay competitive. Technical training CE requirements are just a needless monetary drain annually on the practicing engineer.	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
1072	I like the reconnect forums but it would be nice if the Board was more proactive in providing to engineers qualifying seminars, meetings, luncheons and classes.	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
1073	Specifically with regards to the "latest developments and technology" in the field; the current number of PDHs required pushes engineers towards online coursework which is frequently outdated and of little value for practicing engineers. Engineers keep up-to-date on newer technologies and trends through their regular work.	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
1074	The building, development codes, standards and regulations for private developments do not change to reflect any changes in the engineering field. Technology designs or construction design improvements are being implemented by the regulatory agencies.	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
1075	I feel the 30 hours is excessive to those who have been licensed over 10 years and is currently working in the state.	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
1076	I believe there is value in a PDH requirement.	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
1077	You need to keep current to remain competitive. The continuing education requirement is an exercise in finding PDH's that satisfy the rules which may or may not be specifically useful for my practice.	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
1078	none	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
1079	30 hours is excessive	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
1080	none	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
1081	no comment	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
1082	No need for 30 hours, continue working is meaning continue education. 3 hours is good as it deal with the most important are which is ethics.	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
1083	30 hours PED requirements is an outdated, cumbersome requirement that provides no benefit to anyone. The only net beneficiary is those who have managed to make a business by creating PED educational courses.	2/10/2020 10:41 AM
1084	Yes but. It has been my experience here both with the AZ Board and my Professional Society that some areas are not covered enough such as ethics. I do feel that more could be done with less hours needed if those hours were specific as suggested	2/10/2020 10:41 AM
1085	I think technical competency is gained through project experience rather than attending courses. The key to technical competency is involvement with current engineering-related projects as this generally requires knowledge of pertinent regulations, codes and ordinances. It is difficult to attain 30 PDHs when you are working in private practice due to work load and opportunity cost to the employees firm.	2/10/2020 10:41 AM
1086	The continuing education is helpful to keep your knowledge up to date and learn additional skills. Not necessarily for "public protection"...	2/10/2020 10:41 AM
1087	I am practicing my profession every day. If I need to research a new topic, I do so on an as needed basis. The current policy rarely results in anything material being learned	2/10/2020 10:41 AM
1088	The nature of the 30 CE hours is not specified, and therefore may not achieve the intended effect.	2/10/2020 10:41 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

1089	It forces me to keep my head in the game and to break out of my day-to-day work bubble. Even if I don't put my CE coursework to use, I have an awareness of what is new and happening.	2/10/2020 10:41 AM
1090	No	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
1091	No	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
1092	I think that the 30-hour biennial requirement should be maintained, but amended to include at least 3 to 4 hours covering ethics and NV regulations.	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
1093	NA	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
1094	none	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
1095	I see little value in continuing education requirements. It is simply another bureaucratic hoop to jump through and does little to ensure competency.	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
1096	None	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
1097	I can accept a modest change to the number of hours required will still meet the requirements, but not the drastic change proposed.	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
1098	I just think it is excessive and the cost for compliance is excessive.	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
1099	Basically, it just adds costs to maintaining my licenses. I complete my requirements online basically by loading the course pdf file and search for key phrases to find the text answers. It probably takes me 10 minutes to complete 3 pdh units. I learn practically nothing and much of the material is not applicable to my work. I learn much more by researching and keeping abreast with all the building code changes required for my work. In my opinion, the continuing education requirements are pretty ridiculous.	2/10/2020 10:39 AM
1100	In private practice, project output is the first priority in order to keep clients satisfied. PDH classes are taken mostly to satisfy licensing requirements and don't necessarily add to technical competency. After a few years of licensure and experience, most coursework becomes redundant.	2/10/2020 10:39 AM
1101	I think the 30 hours is excessive, and at the end of the day has no relation to public protection and technical competency. It forces engineers to look for pdh's in areas that end up having little to do with the area of practice and expertise.	2/10/2020 10:39 AM
1102	Many States require 2 hours of Ethics as part of the Educational requirements - All OK	2/10/2020 10:39 AM
1103	courses for general purposes, need to be more specific	2/10/2020 10:39 AM
1104	I think yes, but it's limited in scope. I would prefer to see PDH's be fewer but more directed towards specific education with regards to code and regulations.	2/10/2020 10:39 AM
1105	Continuing education is important, but 30 hours may be an excessive amount. A reduction in the required hours would be appreciated.	2/10/2020 10:39 AM
1106	Not needed and puts undue burden on senior level staff.	2/10/2020 10:38 AM
1107	NV should strive to match the national average of CEU requirements	2/10/2020 10:38 AM
1108	Practicing engineers must stay current with trends in their profession, or else they will soon be out of work. Many of the CE courses offered don't really offer content to expand a licensee's competency. They may offer some new information or knowledge, but competency is maintained by practice, not webinars or correspondence courses. Maintaining a strong ethical foundation is the best way to make sure engineers don't practice beyond their competency limits. Courses on law might keep the engineers informed of certain statutory changes, but the laws pretty much remain constant over the years.	2/10/2020 10:38 AM
1109	-	2/10/2020 10:38 AM
1110	There are many ways to "continue our education" however the current program is so limited that it negates its positive intent. It is a box that needs to be checked. Personally, I have done many things to further my professional education, but if the board would not acknowledge (give me credit) my efforts so I had to take a worthless online course to renew my license. The current system is a waste of our time and money.	2/10/2020 10:38 AM
1111	I believe that professionals who are serious about remaining current in their professions will	2/10/2020 10:37 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

seek continuing education regardless of the requirement. The professionals who see no value in CEU's will only seek the shortest and cheapest path to meeting the state requirement with little or no benefit to additional protection to the public. CEU requirements are largely a revenue stream for professional associations or for-profit on-line schools.

1112	Most of available classes are best to death. Seems more like a money maker for same review year after year.	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
1113	The training requirement is non-specific and allows for training in non-technical fields to be counted	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
1114	It seems slightly onerous if you are an actively practicing engineering, but it is common requirement from other states.	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
1115	I think the pdh system works OK, but professional ethics and Nevada Law specific to professional registration would be a great benefit	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
1116	I think the total number of hours should be reduced to something more manageable like 20. I practice structural engineering specifically and we make less money per hour than your typical or nurse with a bachelors degree straight Out of college. Having stringent requirements from a cost standpoint does not attract people from entering the engineer in profession it just makes him regret it for the rest of their lives	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
1117	I think the Board could require that some portion of the 30-hours for continuing education say 3, be specifically in ethics and Nevada Laws. Further, the 3-hours should be a course furnished by the board.	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
1118	Of the total of 30 hours - the requirements should specify at least two (2) of the hours are related to professional ethics and that one (1) hour is related to Nevada laws and regulations. At least 24 should relate to the specific field of practice. And the rest can be ancillary related fields.	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
1119	Whilst I firmly believe that there should be a requirement for professional development for a PE, (especially younger engineers), it is questionable to what degree the training assists with "public protection"	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
1120	I do think the idea of continuing education is a good idea. It is sometimes difficult to get in 30 hours of CEU.	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
1121	Yes, I think these hours exceed their effectiveness for the given task	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
1122	30 may be a little overkill, 10-15 could keep the registrant up-to-date without being in excess.	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
1123	With the rapid pace of technology changes, continuing education is important.	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
1124	The 30 PDHs biennial are similar to other states and satisfies the requirement. Education and continual learning are key as national codes are continually updated which provide the public protection. As long as code knowledge is increased and code changes are learned that would satisfy the requirement for public protection.	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
1125	A professional spends more than 30 hours bi-year to keep up with code changes, etc. required 30 hours of 'documentation' for time is not productive	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
1126	Practicing engineers must constantly enhance their knowledge to remain current with the industry and building codes. We spend an inordinate amount of time researching new techniques, mastering current techniques, and staying current with the code. The PDH requirements have placed an unnecessary financial and regulatory burden on practicing engineers.	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
1127	As part of our creative efforts, engineers should automatically keep up to date on the latest technology, safety, and ecological topics. Forcing engineers to attend and track simply causes the cost of engineering services to needlessly increase.	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
1128	It requires much continuing education hours	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
1129	In meeting the current hours, I can go to any educational source or webinar to obtain the hours. Subjects very rarely relate to Electrical Engineering, and never relate to radio system or communications engineering. Why should a webinar on, for example, chemical or geo-thermal count towards my education? But it does. Lowering the hours and requiring them to relate to my	2/10/2020 10:35 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

specialty or even just my license type (EE) would be more meaningful. Plus perhaps a couple of hours related to Nevada.

1130	The on line courses are all over the place. They lack any professional continuity. Courses in current law and responsible should be required,	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1131	30 hours seems arbitrary and no state has ever followed up to see if continuing education requirements have actually been beneficial to the intended goals	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1132	Waste of time and money.	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1133	30 hours seems excessive	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1134	Working in your field if expertise You automatically keep up with the changing technology. I agree the legal aspects are more challenging. An on line legal up date class would me more useful.	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1135	Yes, several. But I will refrain from attempting a long response here.	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1136	As engineers progress in their careers they may be removed from the basics and understanding of their technical tasks by the use of computer aided calculations, reliance on other entry level engineers in their practice, or the focus on the business and management side of a practice. A reinforcement of the foundation of the technical aspects is essential.	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1137	Practicing engineers by definition are staying up to date with their respective areas of expertise. It is unnecessary (IMHO) to seek out 30 PDH. It has proven to be very costly with not enough ROI	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1138	Continuing education still provides value to staying current with practice. Consider adding the 2 hours of ethics / 1 hour board rules / reducing to 20 or 25 technical hours. It's really not hard to active this requirement.	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1139	15 hrs a year is typical for what is required by other states, so it is not an onerous burden to maintain current knowledge of the code and practice of engineering	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1140	My general opinion is that PDHs end up being satisfied with some form of session given by a firm marketing a product and then supplying a PDH for the attendees who listen to their 'technical session.' There are obvious provides (ACI, AISC, etc) who give valuable technical presentations, but by enlarge, these sessions miss the intent of providing valuable technical information to the practicing professional.	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1141	I typically don't have a problem meeting the 30 units every 2 years. I am a licensed water treatment operator in CA (T5) and need 36 hours just in water every 3 years so I can use at least 24 hours of these plus my activity in professional societies etc. I get 2 hr ethics as a result of NM requirements. For some getting 30 in 2yrs might be difficult. I would propose cutting to 12 to 15 hrs every 2 years of which 2 hr are ethics and 1 hr on laws.	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1142	The technical expertise that is gained through job experience far exceeds what is gained from doing seminars and classes that sometimes don't even relate to your field. For example, as a fire protection engineer, I can count a lecture on a bridge design that meets CEU requirements, when it is not applicable to my field. Obtaining CEUs for PEs that are active in the profession turns into a search for the fastest and free courses available. Applicable projects or work in your profession are a more appropriate gauge of professional knowledge.	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1143	Continuing education requirements for technical competency is not necessary as long as you are an active PE practicing your field of expertise.	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1144	I don't personally feel that the 30 hr requirement has any benefit for the public good. Most engineers either need to go to classes to learn things for work (like code changes or new materials/etc), or just simply try to fulfill the 30 hr requirements and don't really care what the classes are on. I think to be a practicing engineer, you need to do continuing education on your own	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1145	I think 30 hours is too long	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1146	-	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1147	It's difficult to find 30 hours of CEUs in your specialty area when you have to depend on on-line courses. I've needed to take the some course more than once. Attending seminars out of town can be expensive, but do that regularly as well.	2/10/2020 10:34 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

1148	30 every 2 years is good for active license	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1149	No	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1150	Requirement is a waste of valuable time. Competent engineers are already spending time in keeping up with technological changes.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1151	I think it is good to have the accountability. It really should not be an issue for any decent engineer.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1152	It is similar to all other states and I believe it is important to continue to require technical / technological / research development, in addition to state rules/laws and ethics.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1153	Many states in the west do not have a pdh requirement	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1154	I don't know the original intent of the 30 hours, as it is difficult to attain 30 hours of development hours. In the field of engineering, I don't believe the principles of engineering change in 2 years time. Only marketing materials change, and the general practices of engineering have not changed.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1155	Question 4 is not a true NO, as some classes that keep one current on design standards I feel is a public protection type of class. I do like the concept of ethics and Nevada Law being required parts of the requirements.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1156	I don't feel I have a way of assessing this. I get my credits through participation in associations and providing technical presentations.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1157	no	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1158	30 hours in 5 years would be better	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1159	How will people in academia figure into these new requirements? Perhaps considering say a 2 point credit with each point be considered for a published article will do per year?	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1160	None	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1161	NO	2/10/2020 10:32 AM
1162	The majority of the hours used are to meet the intent of the PDH hours and not necessarily for development or changes in regulations.	2/10/2020 10:32 AM
1163	I live in a rural area. Continuing education in this area is hard to com by. It seems at times that we are just going through the motions in an attempt to satisfy the requirement even though every attempt is being made to honestly meet the intent of the requirement.	2/10/2020 10:32 AM
1164	Adding an ethics requirement would be beneficial, but not at the expense of other continuing education.	2/10/2020 10:32 AM
1165	Many states in which I am licensed require 30 PDHs every 2-years. New Mexico requires 2 PDHs every 2-years on ethics and the remaining 28 PDHs involving continuing education in my discipline. I think this is a good requirement. I also think Nevada should keep their 30 PDH requirement every 2-years; they can require ethics and Nevada laws and regulations as a part of the 30 PDHs. I do not think Nevada should reduce the required continuing education.	2/10/2020 10:32 AM
1166	no	2/10/2020 10:32 AM
1167	Current requirements are adequate and very similar to many other states.	2/10/2020 10:31 AM
1168	I do believe the 30 PDHs is a little much and do not have the intended purpose, but I do not believe we should reduce the PDHs to zero with only training in ethics and regulations. I think reducing the training hours to twelve, or an average of one hour every two months, is a good number with three of those hours as described in these questions.	2/10/2020 10:31 AM
1169	The 2 hours of ethics is a good idea. If the form of the 1 hour of Nevada laws & regs can be online with a quiz vs. in person meetings I am for it.	2/10/2020 10:31 AM
1170	PDH's gathering is more about making sure you meet the PDH requirements by finding anything that will give you a credit hour and less about maintaining professional expertise. For the engineers who produce plans, calculations, and specifications daily are constantly learning and adapting to new technology and code requirements. PDH's would make more sense for	2/10/2020 10:31 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

those who no longer actively stamp documents or have jobs that no longer are related to engineering.

1171	30 hrs in 2 years results in superfluous material, in an attempt to reach the required amount. 3 more focused hours can achieve the same goal of protecting the public.	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1172	N/A	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1173	I think it is good as it allows a person to focus the cont ed on those items most in line with the type of work they do. My experience is that you cannot train people to be ethical. So I am not sure that focus will work.	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1174	no	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1175	30 hrs is excessive. With so many avenues to obtain the 30 hr quota, they don't mean as much as a lesser (3 hr), very specific CER geared towards professional ethics, laws and regulations.	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1176	I think the 30 hours has a potential of meeting the intent. But It really depends on the person. Someone can sit through 90 hours of continuing education and not learn anything. Others can sit through 30 minutes and gain a lot.	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1177	None	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1178	As engineers, we're expected to learn and understand the evolving trends, as well as be able to make sound engineering decisions so that we can design safe, cost effective structures. By fulfilling the continuing education requirement, we're required to gain more knowledge and deepen our understanding of laws, codes, and design practices.	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1179	As a practicing engineer, I am always continuing my education to better serve my clients and the public. Most of my continuing education comes in the form of working with other geotechnical engineers and reading journal articles. I don't believe a classroom setting should be required.	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1180	The 30-hr biennium CEU requirement is important to keep engineers current on latest trends or code changes. Having been in the private sector previously, this requirement justifies consultants to pay for courses or conference fees. Otherwise, sometimes engineers will not get this support from their employers.	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1181	This is a reasonable requirement and is in line with other states.	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1182	A professional should be held to a minimum standard, however, each professional should, as part of their career and professionalism, strive to keep up their education.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1183	I think it is beneficial to me as a PE to have to take CE credits.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1184	This is typical of the various state licenses that I have - with the exception of Colorado, which does not have a continuing education requirement.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1185	I am licensed in 7 states, 5 of which require PDF's. Most of my units have been in law & ethics & all those states accept the same units, which are general in nature, but some are NV specific. I would prefer 3 PDF specific to NV.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1186	I do think that requiring some CE is good, as it forces us to attend classes we would otherwise think we were too busy for or think we already know.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1187	no	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1188	I am licensed in 20 states and have been since the 80's. No State required Cont. Education at that time. It's just more Gov. regulation and a waste of time and money.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1189	none	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1190	Most states required 30 every 2 years or 15 hours per year. So Nevada seems to be match the requirements of other states.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1191	No	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1192	Engineers can study current while practicing with 15 credits	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1193	Keeping up with code/reg changes as well as technological changes is essential for good practice. Without continuing education there is a chance of reduced public safety.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

1194	None	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1195	the hours requirement is not in alignment with most states already and is often not highly regarded as critical among the civil engineering community. Most education on current regulation changes and best practices comes through daily work already and is not documented as "continuing education."	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1196	NONE	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1197	I believe that 20 hours during the biennial period would be sufficient.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1198	Most topics are refresher topics in lieu of getting up to speed on new technology. Usually we learn more about new technology from local reps who are promoting their product. These do not count toward professional development as they are sales related.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1199	For the most part Technical competency is learned on the job, not from professional development hours	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1200	The requirements vary significantly from state to state and there is not agreement or definition in each state for hours obtained online, online live versus video courses, self development, mfr presentations, code committees, and seminars. I have been audited in a state that declared that none of my project management continuing education applied which is ridiculous since the delivery, quality control, and management of projects can be as important as technical topics. I also feel that the allowance for committee work is low in many states based on attendance at monthly meetings, preparation for those meetings including the review and writing of new code provisions. I can easily spend 4 hours a month and then 8 hours CEU plus for annual meetings while writing new code or revised code provisions yet only obtain 3 CEU's for that work per year.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1201	It's nothing more than a money making operation for the CE providers who lobby states to increase their CE hours.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1202	Reducing it to 10% of the current requirement is too little training to be of value.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1203	If you do make the change I suggest that on-line courses specifically addressing the types of issues needing work are made available.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1204	Requiring 2 hours for professional ethics and 1 hour for Nevada laws and regulations every two years would be a great idea for the first renewal cycle but a waste of time every renewal cycle after that unless there were significant changes to the laws. I think a minimum requirement for professional development hours is still a good idea, especially for people just starting out in the field. I would recommend the 30 hours for everyone in their first 10 years, 15 hours for everyone in years 10-20 and a minimum of 5 for anyone registered longer than 20 years. If you wanted to make a certain amount of those hours in ethics and laws and regulations I think that would be fine but I wouldn't make that a requirement every renewal cycle. There just isn't that much to cover.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1205	30 Hours seems to be exorbitant and could be reduced.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1206	I am not in favor of the NV specific law CE requirement.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1207	The email was proposing 3 (three). That seems awfully LOW! NYS requires about 12/year, so I would think a maximum of 24 is more appropriate. As far as what is reasonable on the low end? I don't know. Three sounds insufficient.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1208	It is reasonable to assume that technical competence is maintained by practice, much more so than by continuing education.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1209	I am a "Facilities Engineer" for the Forest Service. I am tasked with the engineering of: the Building Safety and Efficiency, for four hundred buildings, on 40 some sites. This means I have to stay current on the ICC Family of Building Codes, State and Federal Regulations regarding water and wastewater systems, electrical and propane distribution systems, and building science. I spend five to ten hours a week reading journals, and doing online classes. Plus another 40 to 60-hours annually in formal classroom training. I find it hard to think any engineer can spend less than 30-hrs every two years and stay current with the best practices in any field of engineering. The science behind every field of our profession is rapidly developing, and if we wish to provide state of the art, science based engineering, we need to devote at least thirty hours per year to training.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1210	Those who are proficient by virtue of being in active professional practice protect the public	2/10/2020 10:27 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

holistically as there is an automatic need to stay current on industry standards and code requirements just to stay in business. So why would there be a need to monitor professional development hours? It's relatively meaningless and might give a false sense of security to those who are marginally qualified to be in the profession in the first place.

1211	I think it helps to keep engineer's current and there seems to be ample training available for engineer's to sharpen skills and knowledge base.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1212	The 30 hours requirement is too great. To get that 30 hours requires probably 50 hours, when one considers travel time to an educational event. If you do on-line CEUs, these are also time consuming and the questions are very strict, so that you might answer the 12 questions, and get one wrong in their opinion and then not qualify for the offered CEU's. Also, the requirement that the 30 hours be certified by an organization does not account for what engineers do to keep up with their professions by reading the new editions of the codes, by reading professional magazines in the industry, by talking with fellow engineers and colleagues, by working on project designs that are requiring new technology, new standards like "Green" and "sustainable", new codes, and new products to be used. The PDH requirement does not recognize these normal learning experiences that one has while pursuing an engineering career.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1213	Many of us are specialized in a particular industry. Trying to find 30 hours of training that is specifically useful for our field at a reasonable cost is difficult. As such we end up taking seminars that are very unrelated to our field in order to meet the arbitrary educational requirements. It's silly really since in order to stay up on our areas of expertise we are constantly getting training and researching our field online. So the requirements are just a tedious thing that needs to happen every two years. Does this make the world safer? No.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1214	I think there needs to be a better understanding of what ceu's are acceptable and meets the intent.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1215	Reducing biennial total professional hours to 20 and 2 hours on ethics will be more in-line with other states and public protection. Entirely removing professional development to only ethics will not help engineers updated their knowledge on new materials and codes.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1216	It can be reduced down to low numbers.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1217	PEOPLE ARE TAKING COURSE TO TAKE COURSES. aFTER A COUPLE YEARS THE INDIVIDUAL IS RUNNING OUT OF COURSES TO TAKE	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1218	None	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1219	As each registrant such as me practice ion geotechnical engineering, it become a redundant to take similar courses every two years without really given proper exposure to new development. I really did not see any usefulness. Rather teaching in ethics and code seem to be more appropriate.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1220	With the majority of the PDH hours that I receive I feel like there is not enough focus on the technical components and more opinion (lack of someone wanting to take responsibility) than teaching actual facts.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1221	However; the 30 hours appeared to be too broad and excessive. Three hours of ethics and applicable laws (local, state and federal) would be more effective with regard our responsibilities to property and life safety.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1222	I think that some/many/most engineers consider this requirement as just something to get thru as quicky as possible. I think some engineers take whatever technical courses are easy instead of developing new knowledge or skills. I think that the drive to learn and develop engineering knowledge is handled the need to stay up to date to serve their clients and community not by the regulation. I think the focus on ethics would be more effective.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1223	No	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1224	I don't believe the criteria for PDH's require anyone to take courses that deals the public protection. It's up to the individual to determine what courses they want to take.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1225	I believe the amount of hours and content does not provide an increase in technical competency in regard to public protection, rather a reason to develop your professional capabilities.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

1226	continuing education is necessary for competence	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1227	I think the 30 hour requirement is too much.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1228	It models other state requirements. Keeps audit simpler.	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1229	I believe the same intent can be reached with a lower number of hours however not as low as 3. At least 20 to 25.	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1230	The existing 30 hour requirement helps me keep up to date on new processes/ technology that insures my designs remain code compliant while helping increase my project efficiency.	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1231	no	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1232	I believe that the 30 hours can be sufficient, but it can also be very easy to just get some internet education hours that don't teach anything. I know that I have probably fallen into that category on occasion when I was behind getting formal continuing education. Other times though, I have taken courses that have been tremendously helpful to my knowledge and made me a better engineer. It comes down to personal attitude and diligence, which is hard to quantify. All-in-all though, I think that it is a good system	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1233	Ethics and law education should be included at 10-20% of the total	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1234	30 hours is an awful lot without a specific focus on requirements relevant from the State. I assume most folks use that requirement to stay up on technical hours, but some guideline for new rules, etc. would be appropriate.	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1235	No	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1236	3 hours PDH is way too few!	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1237	Keeps up as awareness of latest technology.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1238	I always far exceed what is needed and I think any engineer would just to stay current.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1239	We do not want to lower our standard of professionalism and knowledge in a field changing technology wise, case law wise and process wise so frequently.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1240	15 hours of professional development per year is reasonable. This should include any hours required for ethics or the State's laws and regulations.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1241	Continuing to enhance your professional competence has to be beneficial to the built environment.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1242	Reducing down to the 2x1 hour requirement between ethics and NRS knowledge would seem to shift the focus of technical ability over the simple understanding of regulation knowledge. Ethics could still be a part of the 30 hours PDUs. Also, most credential typically require PDU versus ethics and regulations.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1243	30 hr requirement is excessive and seemingly not focused on any particular outcome.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1244	In my opinion, there is no need for 30 hours of PD courses for every 2 years. As long as the individual is practicing in his or her field, the experience will suffice.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1245	none	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1246	Being technically competent is the best way to protect the public.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1247	No	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1248	Technical proficiency requirements should remain. Ethics are also important, but demanding only ethics continuing education seems to be a bit Draconian. I find the real-life case studies of violators to be a far more interesting read with a deeper understanding. However, the specific Nevada laws and regulations are not significantly different from other states. I suggest an on-line self-paced quiz of these and other case studies (with names redacted) with a brief summary and the specific violation stated should be prepared by the Nevada board, and also make it mandatory for license renewal. That way, tracking all those who complete the quiz does not invoke excessive time and effort by the Board.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1249	3 hours of ethics does not guarantee competence. If ethics is specific to NV, it will be in addition to hours other states that require ethics and would reduce the hours used to gain knowledge in field. I d not recommend reducing the hours.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

1250	NO.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1251	The requirement is too broad to be applied to protecting the public.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1252	Continuing Education associates with updating knowledge and it is required for engineers. I think reducing continuing education fro 30 hours to 15 hours is much more reasonable.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1253	Focusing on ethics and Nevada law are better suited to serve the public. Information on the latest design tools and methods are available with an internet search and other engineers.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1254	Currently I already have to do continuning education in my home state.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1255	Typically most engineers use Simpson Strong Tie online classes. We learn some of the code information but more about their products. It is difficult to find affordable classes on engineering subjects.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1256	No	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1257	California does not require PDHs, My employer puts on lunch hour sessions providing PDHs but they are not specifically for the Electrical, Mechanical, or Civil disciplines. There are some of each discipline as well as general sessions.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1258	Mandatory Continuing education is not effective. Day-to-day job activities require engineers to educate themselves on their tasks. Classroom training or online courses rarely correspond to actual job duties, and the lessons learned are usually forgotten if the information is not applied inside a reasonable timeframe. Education, while helpful and interesting, does not instill the necessary personal virtues needed to protect the public from malpractice. Malpractice is most often a moral failing, not an intellectual failing.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1259	I have similar CE requirements in my home state and since I practice exclusively as a structural engineer I try to take SE classes to keep up with changing codes. I think it is important to take classes that make a difference.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1260	Those with a structural license should have the PDH more focused on technical issues, and less practice matters	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1261	I believe 30 hours is beneficial. Originally, I wasn't happy about PDH's, and California doesn't require them; however, since I am licensed in several states, I have to satisfy these requirements. I have gotten more out of these than I originally thought and have implemented Lunch and Learn webinars for our staff.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1262	Depending on how the engineer gains PDHs, many online seminars, lunch-and-learn presentations, etc., are more or less superfluous. Would be better if fewer PDHs that are tailored to PE's specific location and practice discipline were required.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1263	Needs to be keyed specifically to the area of practice. Not basket weaving	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1264	No	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1265	With public protection being the concern, a lesser amount of hours but hours should be related to codes, standards and best practices and other safety related courses.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1266	Yes, it is important to stay abreast of changes in the standard of care.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1267	As soon as professional development was added to maintain Licenses it created a lot of busy work, cost and taking of courses that many participants could probably do a better job of teaching. If the PDU's are not directly related to life codes, safety, fire protection and similar classes, learning about the latest technology only serves to maintain marketable relevance. I don't see that it protects the public.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1268	The 30 PDHs don't seem to necessarily translate into a high level of technical competency, especially in developer-driven projects. Either the licensed engineer is not getting PDHs they are directly relevant to their normal work product, or they are simply not reviewing the work performed under their "director supervision." A reminder of ethics and Nevada law pertaining to their work might be more helpful.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1269	Similar protection could be obtained at 20 hours per biennial renewal.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1270	N/A	2/10/2020 10:21 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

1271	I think 30 hrs is too high. I think requirement should be reduced but not eliminated	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1272	NA	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1273	A quality focus should be put on Nevada related laws as opposed to a quantity focus on relevant discipline knowledge.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1274	I do not think it is unreasonable to require continuing education credits. I also think that adding an ethics and legal review course would be a good idea.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1275	It is important to be aware and up to date with respect to new technologies, regulations, and business standards. The continuing education requirements serve this need well.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1276	I am sure that it is helpful for some. I suspect that most who practice meet these requirements without any extraordinary effort.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1277	I am in favor of the proposed change. It is a scramble to keep the hours up with a busy work load. The lower more focused requirement would definitely help the busy field surveyor meet the goals.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1278	None	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1279	You have to keep learning new things.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1280	I like the idea of fewer, but more detailed course structured hours.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1281	Adding a requirement to include 3 development hours focused on ethics and law would be more appropriate.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1282	Number should be reduced.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1283	Most engineers need to use on line training due to time constraints but sometimes the on line classes do not have topics fully in line with development opportunities.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1284	While the opportunity exists to take classes and attend discussions which are beneficial in regards to public protection, the majority of the classes taken are to meet to 30 hour goal, often the material not truly beneficial beyond meeting the 30 hour requirement. Would rather focus on quality courses.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1285	While it's a good thing to encourage continuing education, I don't believe that the requirement provides any further protection to the public. Cheaters gonna cheat, so to speak.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1286	This is consistent with most states and is a reasonable requirement - especially for engineers licensed in multiple states.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1287	The number of hours required is too high and in my opinion results in dilution of the quality continuing education attended by many in an effort to "get it done". There should be a focus on higher-quality continuing education requirements and a lower number of hours required. I would propose 15 hours, inclusive of the professional ethics and requirement in question 6.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1288	I feel there are few seminars that engage the attendee fully make it only partial beneficial. I also feel that many people are very busy and rush through requirements just to stay current.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1289	30 is a lot. Suggest 8-10 hours per year with 1 specific to ethics/laws. Offer free webinars for ethics and Nevada Law updates pertaining to engineers.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1290	The required continuing education requirements has not helped protect the public as the scope of the continuing education is too broad. It is also a burden to have to take so many hours of classes that provide little to no long term benefit.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1291	Continuing Education should encourage individuals to broaden their professional horizons and understanding of the field they work in.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1292	Way too many hours unduly burdening the professional engineer and taking him away from his main responsibility of designing for public safety. In my opinion the continuing education hours do not further professional skills.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1293	I am registered in multiple states, some don't have CE requirements, but believe it is not a bad requirement	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1294	30 hours per biennial is not excessive and is comparable to other states' requirements	2/10/2020 10:20 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

1295	at some point you run out of relevant courses to take. if same pe discipline you end up acquiring pdh in non-related disciplines just to satisfy the qty pdh required.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1296	I believe a minimum of 3-10 hours of continuing education is better, because the latest and greatest technology professional development happens almost everyday either at present jobs and present task of the job. 2 hours of Professional Ethics is very important (Engineers Ethics) One hour for Nevada code, Laws and Regulations. Other Continuing education shall be Technical pdh from Online or Face to face. As an Engineer I always have myself a mandatory continuing education all the time.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1297	I do think it's too many hours annually	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1298	Having a requirement for ONLY ethics and law does not reassure me on the technical expertise of engineers. possibly reducing hours to 15 and requiring 2 ethic and 1 law would be a compromise?	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1299	Reduce 30 PDH to 3.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1300	A certain minimum number of hours dedicated to ethics and state laws should be required. A large portion of the remaining hours should be closely related to the licensee's area(s) of licensure. Some hours that are not related to the licensee's area(s) of licensure should also be allowed.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1301	Think 30 is excessive.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1302	Way too many credits required for continuing registration. Most Land Surveyors have taken college level and/or apprenticeship courses as a part of their respective registration and most of the on-line courses re simply rehashing the same information.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1303	no	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1304	Do not eliminate this requirement.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1305	I am already doing all I can to maintain professional competency in my chosen area of practice	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1306	No.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1307	Practicing engineers like myself are constantly looking into new technologies. When audited I produced 100 hrs. The requirement wastes a great deal of time.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1308	The number of hours could be reduced.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1309	I believe it creates more busy work and PEs are tasked to attend sometimes irrelevant workshops to obtain their PDHs. If it were lowered and the board would provide specific courses, it would be more beneficial.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1310	A practicing engineer must keep appraised of the state of the practice and I cannot fathom how this accomplished without 15-20 professional development hours per year. If an engineer is not current with the state of the practice we risk them endangering the public through ignorance.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1311	My opinion is that On the Job working experinece is much much more applicable to maintianing skills that are relevent to the trade than taking continuing educationcourses. As a manager I recongnize the Continuing Education requirement as an opportunity for the staff to go on a trip somewhere to spend time in a seminar. While education is always good my opinion is that 30 hours is too much considering the training that the staff gets working on projects. I would support the decision to reduce the requirment.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1312	30 is excessive. 4-6 per year would be adequate, equal to one per quarter.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1313	I have always been opposed formal mandated CE. I feel that an engineer who does not keep up with developments in his field will be left behind.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1314	I think it is a waste of time. I was originally registered in AZ which had no professional development requirements and there is no difference in the quality of engineer between the states. In order to be competitive you have to professionally develop.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1315	30 can be high from a documentation standpoint.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1316	I support education around professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulations. The 30 hour bi-annual requirement in my opinion does not drive the right behavior but rather	2/10/2020 10:19 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

the idea of cramming in CEUs to meet the renewal requirements. In my case of being in the private sector, it brings me nothing but frustration.

1317	It could be less and I don't feel it would reduce the public risk. The core PE and SE exams shall be a basis of public protection but perhaps have at a least a class or two for a total of 6 hrs in the field for which the engineer practices.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1318	Currently meeting the intent of the regulations. However, some PE, PLS, and PE/PLS holders are competent in the scope of their fields of expertise and do not want to expand. Are the 30 hours every two years necessary?	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1319	30 hours each renewal is not a problem to get.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1320	no	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1321	I think 30 hours is a bit too much, perhaps 16-20 is more appropriate especially if there are mandatory topics.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1322	The nature of engineering work requires continually updating skills, usually while working on specific projects. The formal classes I've taken to meet the CE requirements really don't provide much more information, if any, than the research I do to complete projects.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1323	30 hours is easy to complete in a two year period.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1324	Building codes are updated every three years due to technology changes. Standards every 5 years. Engineers must keep up with this and continuing education is necessary.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1325	None	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1326	Spend too much time trying to find the hours to meet requirements. Can be filled with non-critical hours to meet reqs.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1327	no	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1328	Continuing education providers are lobbying boards to require continuing education. This was intended to be a money grab by them (essentially a tax on engineers). It has not been as intended for them as they are all lowering their costs. Thier latest approach is to lobby for state specific rules and ethics courses. Dont fall victim to this BS. Leave the rules as is.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1329	Continuing education happens naturally as we keep up with new regulations/codes and new technologies. Many of these activities are not allowed to be used for credit and therefore additional time is required to take the "approved" course types in order to fulfill the arbitrary requirement.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1330	For the most part, I believe 30 is quite a bit and lends to luncheon fatigue.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1331	While I believe continuing education is valuable, there is always a risk that the classes people are taking just to get their hours may not be aligned with this goal.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1332	I understand the need for continuing education, it's is just that after 25 years of practice, the requirement should be omitted since the engineer should still learn on their own, and/or won't improved their professionalism (ethics) just because they took a class.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1333	The value of continuing education depends on how much effort is put into it. Contentious effort improves technical competency. Minimal effort does not.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1334	no	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1335	I'm busy. PDH hours become an exercise in finding credits to meet the requirements, not necessarily learning new things. I get more value out of vendor lunch and learns than organized PDH coursework. Also less cost.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1336	I would not eliminate the requirement for professional development. Nevada's PDH requirements are not overly tight or onerous to meet and I like the underlying intent of forcing us to keep up on an ever changing and very diverse professional field.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1337	I think mostly the continuing education is on topics that you can expand you own education and do not necessarily provide an public protection. If an engineer is incompetent in a practice area they should know that they need additional knowledge and not just think since they are licensed to provide this service that they are competent. SO I agree with a couple hours for ethics and competent practice.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

1338	No changes are needed to the current law.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1339	It is my opinion that requiring a minimum of 15 professional development hours is a good practice in terms of keeping engineers current in their practice	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1340	Hours are excessive and you end up getting most of the hours through education that is not really helpful due to a limited number of free courses available.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1341	I believe the 30 hours is adequate, but would like to see the ethics requirement included within.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1342	I believe the current thirty hour requirement is appropriate.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1343	Those that are technically competent tend to keep themselves informed/relevant, but there are those that just pay for the credit and don't learn anything.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1344	Most people seem to obtain there pdhs by attending conferences with little public safety protection gained	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1345	Wide variety of ways to meet this requirement	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1346	This policy encourages employers to send their employees to conferences, and other meetings. Removal of such will reduce attendance to said meetings.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1347	Reducing the requirements will water down the integrity of licensure. If a need for additional ethics and integrity is needed, perhaps make some of the 30 hours specific to ethics, but do not reduce the requirements for licensing	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1348	I gave them in 1997. They were ignored.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1349	this is consistent with other states	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1350	I believe that it is important to professionally develop and some continuing educational courses are worthwhile. However, most of the time I feel like I'm just checking off a box.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1351	I would support a requirement for 3 hours per year in ethics and Nevada laws and rules IF it part of a 30 pdh biennial requirement	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1352	certainly meets the intent, but may not be specific enough to actually do any real good. Attending APWA 2x per year does not really put the focus on the public protection.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1353	I've found that most people who have to accumulate hours to satisfy the 30 hours are simply taking classes that are easy and also cost affordable (mostly looking for free courses). Consequently, they aren't improving capabilities or understanding of their responsibilities. I also agree that refreshers in ethics and state regulations would be more appropriate.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1354	Many individuals, including myself, are getting PDH's from conferences where the session are primarily project specific and while beneficial, not necessarily keeping up with innovations, etc.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1355	The question as to what applies and what doesn't is my issue. The expense of some of the relevant materials is prohibitive when you are not positive that they will count toward the requirement.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1356	Although I think continuing education is valuable for practicing engineers, the 30 hours is often made up of last-minute "filler" to meet the licensing standard. Not reflective of other continuing education and reading I do throughout the year	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1357	I think mostly it is just going through the motions. Also, I have run out of available PDH's that relate to my area of expertise so I choose others just to get hours but not necessarily that will benefit me.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1358	30 PD hrs. in 2 years is not too tough. 3 PD hrs. in 2 years is too light. What's the point?	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1359	None	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1360	no	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1361	no	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1362	It seems that the Continuing Education requirement is a bit excessive and instead of focusing on enhancing public safety it has only created and Continuing Ed industry that constantly tries to sell to the engineering community.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

1363	I feel that it does serve to keep the professionals a bit up to date on innovations in the industry, but I don't think that translates to increased public safety.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1364	The technical CE is so vast in engineering that should be left with the employers and individual engineers. Ethics, rules and laws should be required.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1365	none	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1366	Technology is always changing and we need to keep up.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1367	no commnets	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1368	individuals who care will take the time to learn and stay on top of new design guidelines and codes and always look to improve regardless if a PDH comes with the work/effort	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1369	As a registered metallurgical engineer, it is next to impossible to find courses that suffice for the 30 hours of continuing education. For the past two cycles, I have not met the 30-hour requirement, and as such, am not making active use of my professional registration. I maintain my licensure but do not practice.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1370	Most methods of meeting the requirements are irrelevant to public protection	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1371	I think professionals need to keep up with times and should be required to take 15 PDH per year. This is not a difficult task.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1372	N/A	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1373	none	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1374	None	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1375	Submittal of form creates extra work with little perceived value.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1376	I find that continuing education helps me to stay sharp and up to date with current technology and trends.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1377	Unfortunately, continuing education credits are not contributing to developemnt of better engineering industry and they have become more a business for other parties.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1378	Improvements could be made, but it's better than many alternatives.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1379	None	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1380	Requirements for on-going education duplicate the requirements of our ethical standard to protect the public's safety and welfare. The general format of continuing education available to full-time practitioners is focused on stand-alone, easily digestible modules. This does not dovetail into a designer's need to research and learn about topics as they come up in daily work. Engineers are constantly learning in order to ply our trade effectively. The requirements to attend a series of short seminars does not enhance this, but instead seem only to satisfy the needs of the "pdh" cottage industry that has developed around these continuing education requirements.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1381	I believe keeping the continuing education requirement of 30 professional development hours is essential to ensuring technical competency as technology advances at ever increasing speed.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1382	It is difficult to find the hours that relate to the engineering field of interest. Trying to find specific legal, ethical, etc. credit hours could be very, very difficult. the current format serves the intent of the law; I think technical competence is critical to the reputation of the profession.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1383	The thirty units are typically related to professional areas that are practiced not ethics and knowledge of laws and regulations.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1384	I think it is important that engineers recognize that the state demands they stay current. I say this despite the fact that at age 70 I find it hard to find new areas of learning and am 'relearning many courses already taken. As part of the standard, I think it should be a requirement that PE's take courses in (a) NV Laws and Rules, and (b) ethics. A good model to go to school on in this regard: Florida	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1385	It is too many hours.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1386	24 hours per year may be appropriate with a specific requirement for ethics.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

1387	no	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1388	none	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1389	30 hours is pretty high compared to a lot of States. Would prefer 12-18 hours of pdh.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1390	staying current in knowledge base is required to stay relevant in the workforce anyway. It shouldn't require a mandate	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1391	no	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1392	Continuing education should be discipline related, with ethics-related courses included as acceptable for credit.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1393	Continuing education is good, but it's very difficult for independents to obtain. The lost work to go to seminars is worth thousands, and the seminars are not cheap to travel to or attend. We don't even get 30 hours in vacation a year, so it's a struggle. Please be lenient in accepting online credits. Not complaining, just letting you know.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1394	The number of hours at 30 may be excessive, but I believe at least some (+/-15) CE/PDH requirement beyond just reviewing the NV regulations is good.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1395	I am licensed and practice in multiple states and Nevada is the only one requiring continuing education. I think continuing education is a good thing, but 30 hours is a lot and costs a lot of money for professionals to meet that criteria.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1396	Some aspects of technical practice have changed greatly and gotten much more sophisticated since I first got my PE. I think staying current on the technical is important.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1397	Engineers find the hours wherever they can.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1398	Most	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1399	no	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1400	n/a	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1401	The intent is good but most of the CE obtained does not translate into stronger engineering in regard to public protection	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1402	No	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1403	There are too many courses that are acceptable that meet the letter of the law, but not the intent. Do the courses that are acceptable as continuing education credits really maintain a practicing engineer's professional competency?	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1404	no	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1405	30 hours is a bit too high to me. I would be in favor of reducing hours to 20	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1406	Believe that ethics and law should be part of the CEU requirement. May not be every renewal cycle but do think it is required.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1407	I think it is good for professionals to expand their technical knowledge in addition to ethic training. I would be open to reducing the 30 hours to something lower (say 20-24) if members are having a tough time satisfying this requirement.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1408	Continuing education helpful but shouldn't be required.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1409	No	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1410	Most if not all courses irrelevant to my career	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1411	Arbitrary number of hours. Should be less.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1412	This is a typical requirement as compared to other states.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1413	Current regulation is an annoyance since my field of competency, HVAC, does not change significantly so warrant 30 hours of formal training.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1414	It really depends on the person and how interested they are in learning and improving their skills. Some people will do that regardless, others will do the bare minimum	2/10/2020 10:13 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing
Education Survey

1415	none	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1416	I think the current 30 hour requirement is fine. The total hours could be reduced to 20 and probably still meet the intent just fine for an active licensee.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1417	Yes, and only to a minimum level. Standards of practice within engineering - all disciplines - is not static. Requiring continuing education, requires practitioners, to a minimum level, stay up to date with the changing standards of practice in design, analysis and assessment. 30 hours over two year intervals is not a high standard and should not be lowered, and definitely not to 3.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1418	No comments	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1419	I think the continuing education requirement is valuable and an appropriate level. Without a requirement for this training, it becomes difficult to make it happen.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1420	Too many hours, because of that, the actual "learning" is watered down	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1421	I believe the 30 hours is excessive.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1422	There are very few PDH classes that deal with public protection.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1423	I believe the proposed three (3) professional development hours would better achieve the intent of the regulation with respect to public protection.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1424	Engineers should be participating in continuing education to stay current in their field and to have an awareness of changes in the field.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1425	no	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1426	Nevada continuing education requirement is similar to the other central and western states. WI requires the 30 hours plus a couple of hours of ethics.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1427	I think it is possible to protect public interests with fewer hours required - perhaps 10 to 15.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1428	It is not always easy to find continuing education related to what the engineer is doing therefore the ones provided really do not have any relation to the public protection.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1429	None	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1430	15 Hours per year is standard for most engineering boards. I am licensed in I think 15 states and they all have similar requirements.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1431	I feel practicing engineers are required to continually review practices the promote public protection by requiring periodic review of updated codes, standards, and technical documents. These sources of materials are typically encountered when designing projects - and not necessarily as a dedicated PDH effort. I do feel ethics is not routinely reviewed as part of an engineer's PDH development and should be.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1432	no	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1433	Because I have multiple P.E.'s I waiill continue to get 15 hours of CE every year because it's needed for most of my other PE's	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1434	Too many items such as the attendance of ASCE lunches are considered under the umbrella of continuing education.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1435	The current continuing education requirements are not only laughable, but also a racket. If the board wants to further protect the public, require all structures regardless of height or number of stories to be sealed by a structural engineer	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1436	The intent is fine. Leaving the requirement as-is would be acceptable. (My "yes" response to #4) Also, the proposal to refine and reduce the requirement could be an IMPROVEMENT to the requirement related to the intent. (My "no" response to #4)	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1437	It is not really all that great of a system, it has developed a niche industry that is not the best use of limited time and resources.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1438	It is excessive and actually does nothing to protect the public. All it does is create headache and hassle for engineers.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1439	I feel it is burdensome for managers who are supervising work or running a business. They get technical training every day on the job.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

1440	I believe in some ways it exceeds the intent of the regulation with regard to public protection	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1441	no	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1442	None	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1443	30 is too much.	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1444	Most people would stay current in their areas of specialization without any continuing education requirements. For the most part, it's a money making scheme.	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1445	This is more than many other states require.	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1446	30 hours per two-year span is OK. But I would prefer a little less. Some years it is hard to fit in 15 hours.	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1447	CA does not require any continuing education and I feel CA surveyors are equal to NV in all regards	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1448	I prefer a focus on ethics, law and regulation.	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1449	N/A	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1450	Both technical training and ethical/regulation training should be accepted into the 30 hours	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1451	none	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1452	Three hours would be fine	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1453	none	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1454	no comments	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1455	No	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1456	No comment	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1457	No	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1458	Completing 30 hours of training over a two year period just doesn't seem that it would actually protect the public.	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1459	I think requiring 3 to 5 hours of ethics professional development as a part of the hours would be smart	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1460	It's easy to get PDH hours without learning anything meaningful	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1461	none	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1462	The classes I take do not help with public protection	2/10/2020 10:09 AM
1463	Continue self-reporting of relevant pdh credits	2/10/2020 10:09 AM
1464	No	2/10/2020 10:09 AM
1465	N/A	2/10/2020 10:09 AM
1466	xlxxlxledlelelelel.,f,f,f.,f.,a,d,,d,f,afd	2/10/2020 9:43 AM

Q7 Any comments related to answer to Question 6

Answered: 1,307 Skipped: 782

Question 6 was:

How do you think focusing the continuing education requirement only on professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulation will impact public protection?

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	see comment for question 5	2/13/2020 10:37 AM
2	I appreciate being able to take this survey and give my opinion. I know the board has the best intentions and the fact that they allow us to comment is admirable. I, by my nature, try to be an ethical person in every facet of my life. Unethical behavior will negatively impact my business and personal life, so I do my best to conduct myself in a professional and ethical manner. I acknowledge that there is always room to improve, so I would be willing to get behind this endeavor, but I don't think there would be much of an impact. Thank you	2/13/2020 9:43 AM
3	See question 5	2/13/2020 9:28 AM
4	I find it difficult to know what continuing education efforts qualify under which category. Also the more specific the credit requirement gets the fewer providers offer such credit which drives up the cost.	2/13/2020 9:17 AM
5	No	2/13/2020 9:06 AM
6	None	2/13/2020 8:50 AM
7	I'm licensed in more states than just Nevada, so regardless if you keep the requirement or change it, its not going to change that I still need to accrue an average of 30 hrs every two years to satisfy other state requirements.	2/13/2020 8:39 AM
8	The knowledge I obtain each year from continuing education is worthwhile. I just feel the time and cost to get 30 hours forces me to find anything instead of good hours.	2/13/2020 8:14 AM
9	NV being a 85% PLSS federal land state, more emphasis on federal rules and laws governing PLSS retracement, corner recovery/replacement needs to continue.	2/13/2020 8:05 AM
10	It needs to be with mandatory classes for ethics and law AND 30 hours per 2 years.	2/13/2020 8:04 AM
11	Ethics and laws are something that engineers need to know, but in conjunction with keeping their skills sharp and learning new techniques. Continuing education needs to embrace the entire spectrum of learning; including skills, new technologies, career skills, people skills, and ethical training.	2/13/2020 7:38 AM
12	I regard the current system of 30 hours a minimum. Reducing it would not help to keep us aware of new developments as well as refresh old ones.	2/13/2020 7:35 AM
13	While ethics is very important, you will be losing the technical aspects of keeping up with the industry. I would propose a compromise somewhere in between - 20 hrs technically related plus 5 hrs ethics & NV law.	2/13/2020 6:36 AM
14	While professional ethics are certainly important, so is the knowledge of the current principals and practices of engineering. I would not support a reduction in hours, or the elimination of engineering subject matter within the current CE requirement.	2/12/2020 9:01 PM
15	I live in California so knowledge of Nevada laws is not an asset for me.	2/12/2020 8:42 PM
16	The 30 hour requirement had little effect on public safety, so removing it won't have an effect either.	2/12/2020 8:34 PM
17	Focusing simply on professional ethics will not require engineers to continually develop their professional competence. In my case, this will simply be an additional burdensome administrative layer on top of meeting other jurisdictions professional requirements. I see no value to this	2/12/2020 8:15 PM
18	Remembering the requirements for being in 'responsible charge' will likely do more to improve public protection. I like the	2/12/2020 8:08 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

proposed change.

19	Knowing the state laws relating to engineering is very different than knowing engineering.	2/12/2020 7:38 PM
20	Those who have ethic will continue to have ethics those that don't will continue to not to.	2/12/2020 7:32 PM
21	The laws in an individual state are ambiguous and somewhat mundane. Having an ethics requirement is slowly becoming more popular with other states and I would agree that 1 -2 credit requirement every 2 years would be good.	2/12/2020 6:25 PM
22	Any required classes should be readily available	2/12/2020 4:49 PM
23	There should be a mix of ethics training and general engineering education required with licensure.	2/12/2020 4:36 PM
24	Technical competency, not knowledge of State laws is what guarantees public safety.	2/12/2020 4:07 PM
25	The focus on any area may cause or result in the PE's priorities changing and thus potentially weakening the learning opportunities regarding safety, technology, standard practices, etc.	2/12/2020 3:24 PM
26	California used to have continuing education requirements, but the material was sent by the board to cover state related issues, environmental and earthquake regulations in those days. I can see NV doing something around state regulations, use of solar whenever possible, water saving.....	2/12/2020 3:22 PM
27	I think ethics and regulation knowledge are important and should be included but I do believe some other involvement (technical training, conference attendance, etc.) should be included as well.	2/12/2020 3:00 PM
28	I have always believed that you are an ethically sound person or you are unethical and no amount of training will ever change that. It's the morals that individuals were raised by. If one was raised to think, act, behave, and react in a certain manner; no amount of training or education is going to change that. I understand why ethics is important but I do not believe it can be easily taught or very well received. If you have to ask, don't do it. That's ethics. Move on to educating the engineering population with emerging, beneficial, and innovative technologies.	2/12/2020 2:51 PM
29	I think the goal of the PDHs needs to be identified. The 30 credits encourages technical growth, but the 3 credits could be useful if the goal is to focus on ethics and understanding of state laws.	2/12/2020 2:50 PM
30	3 quality hours are much more effective than 30 uninspired hours	2/12/2020 2:08 PM
31	None	2/12/2020 2:00 PM
32	What would be helpful would be studies of court cases rendered in Nevada which affected land.	2/12/2020 1:48 PM
33	You can memorize the instruction manual, but if you cant implement it by application nothing is gained.	2/12/2020 1:30 PM
34	Technical Competency is paramount in engineering	2/12/2020 1:02 PM
35	Maintaining technical competence is the best way to ensure public safety.	2/12/2020 12:50 PM
36	Mandatory ethics training implies their is an issue with ethics.....is there an issue??	2/12/2020 11:40 AM
37	NV regulations and ethics could be made a required part of the 30 hours.	2/12/2020 10:56 AM
38	We as professionals will not be prtecting the health and welfare of the public if you reduce the amount of hours to 3!!	2/12/2020 10:27 AM
39	I think refocusing on Nevada laws and regulations is a great idea. Most engineers are lacking in this category.	2/12/2020 10:15 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

40	I think there are probably more problems related to lack of knowledge of the law and to unethical behavior than to any specific technical knowledge.	2/12/2020 10:10 AM
41	It's a perspective issue. Does the Board really feel ethics & knowledge of the NRS/NAC is the main problem in protecting the Public's experience of the Profession? If so, included them in the 30 CEU already on the books.	2/12/2020 9:38 AM
42	I think it will help remind engineers to not design things that is not in their area of expertise.	2/12/2020 9:37 AM
43	Agree 100%.	2/12/2020 9:11 AM
44	Ethics etc. are obviously important. It is also helpful to be certain your conduct is in compliance with the licensure regulations.	2/12/2020 9:09 AM
45	I think that it is important to be able to apply technical knowledge in a manner that protects public safety. Therefore, technical competency should be required ongoing training.	2/12/2020 9:05 AM
46	No	2/12/2020 9:04 AM
47	If you would like to focus on Nevada ethics, it would be best if you have periodic webinars that count for this credit. This is what the State of Texas does and it seems better than having to go through a private firm.	2/12/2020 9:03 AM
48	Ethics and laws and regulations aren't directly tied to code changes. Code changes are designed to protect the public.	2/12/2020 8:52 AM
49	By having a shorter and more targeted requirement will ensure better maintenance.	2/12/2020 8:50 AM
50	Engineering and Land Surveying are in a continuous process of evolution. Without continuing education the knowledge used by licensees will stagnate and possibly be performed incorrectly and damage the public.	2/12/2020 8:48 AM
51	A refresher on ethics and Nevada laws and regulations would at least force all engineers to participate in something that is directly related to public safety.	2/12/2020 8:38 AM
52	Some states require ethics, up to 4 hours every two years. It becomes too much because after 10 years you have few offerings for ethics types classes. I would recommend no more than 1 hour of ethics training.	2/12/2020 8:31 AM
53	I think technical CEUs are also helpful as opportunities to learn/relearn about new or existing technology that can benefit the public.	2/12/2020 8:03 AM
54	I think having this would be good but without requiring any sort of continued education seems a little concerning since the industry is always changing.	2/12/2020 7:57 AM
55	In my opinion, being a licensed engineer should automatically qualify a person as being ethical as the profession demands it. Unfortunately I understand that that may not always be the case. Based on this, I reluctantly agree that ethics training should be a requirement as a safeguard. However, the main focus of the required continuing education has correctly been on staying current on technical issues, which, assuming that a licensed engineer is always ethical, is appropriate. Dropping the requirement to stay current on technical issues and only requiring ethical training seems to be placing an emphasis on the wrong issue. In a perfect world, the regulations would continue to require continuing training on technical issues and drop the requirement for ethics. On another note, staying current on technical issues by a licensed engineer is demanded by the profession. Based on this one could argue that the requirement for continuing education could be dropped entirely, as is the policy of many other states.	2/12/2020 7:56 AM
56	What will be manner of 1-hr course that focuses on Nevada rules and regulations? Most ethics courses are more generic than that.	2/12/2020 7:39 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

57	It will require engineers to understand Nevada regs more thoroughly.	2/12/2020 7:33 AM
58	Is Engineering a profession or simply a job? That is the question the Nevada board must address. The Board should also address the overall question of licensure and WHY engineers and professional land surveyors should be held to a standard of knowledge.	2/12/2020 7:32 AM
59	None.	2/12/2020 7:23 AM
60	This would allow us to focus on important and relevant trainings where we can benefit instead of just selecting sessions to meet our 30 hour requirement.	2/12/2020 7:19 AM
61	I live in New Mexico, Nevada was the first state of licensure. The continuing education requirements are the same for both states. If I return to practice in Nevada, familiarization with Nevada Laws and regulations would be required. How would this be accomplished? Traveling back to Nevada may not be possible.	2/12/2020 7:18 AM
62	A required response to board news or information on recent changes in rules related to practice and not applications would be adequate and probably take one hour	2/12/2020 7:14 AM
63	No	2/12/2020 7:08 AM
64	Of course our profession has some issues of ethics from time to time as well as issues with policing licensed professionals within our own ranks however; reducing the amount of continuing ed is a step in the wrong direction with regard to protecting the health and welfare of the public. I think there needs to be specific coursework aimed toward the fundamental basics of analysis, acceptance of corners and of previous surveys, perpetuation of corners, and of course, ethics. There needs to be a sustained focus on the importance of staying involved in this profession and the ever changing dynamics of how we perform our duties; not a step back from what Justice Cooley described as our "quasi-judicial functions". I believe there is room to add professional ethics and NV laws and regulations into the requirements for license renewal without taking away from the overall import of continuing education. The annual professional conferences hinge upon these requirements and play an integral role in bringing professionals together in a forum where there is a natural sharing of experience, thoughts and opinions; where participation in discussions is encouraged and welcome. No, the reduction of PDH's would be a big mistake for our profession as we endeavor to institute a minor degree program at UNLV and bring awareness to our profession through social media and other youth platforms. We need to build up the academic aspects of our work and shine a light on the importance of our profession in protecting the most important piece of the American Dream, our right to own property.	2/12/2020 6:51 AM
65	none	2/12/2020 6:42 AM
66	the requirements should require continuing education in the areas deemed most important by the board. And if that is public protection, then the requirements should specifically help meet that	2/12/2020 6:40 AM
67	While knowledge of the law and ethical education are important, ethical people need little or no reinforcement, and unethical people will not be changed by it. I'm not sure what a governing board could do to compel ethical conduct, other than strict policing.	2/12/2020 6:22 AM
68	bad idea.	2/12/2020 5:20 AM
69	See my comments under item #5.	2/12/2020 5:19 AM
70	Several other States I am licensed in require at least one hour of ethics per year. I think the requirement for Nevada Rules and Regulations continuing education will be more of a benefit to the Engineers to help them be compliant with State Laws and Regulations.	2/12/2020 5:13 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

71	None	2/12/2020 4:47 AM
72	See comments in Question 5	2/12/2020 4:04 AM
73	it is worth a trying	2/12/2020 3:15 AM
74	Reduction of the need for continuing engineering education would harm our profession as technological improvements are coming at increasing rates, and failure to implement these technologies is detrimental to engineering efficiency and productiveness. Continuing education at least promotes learning in new ares of efficiency and productiveness. I support keeping at least 24 hours per 2 years of CE as a requirement for maintaining a PE license. That is the minimum requirement in any other state I am licensed in.	2/11/2020 11:11 PM
75	Periodic refreshers on the ethical practice and Nevada law is a good thing but should not be the only continuing education subject matter.	2/11/2020 10:13 PM
76	Engineers will be more updated on the lawful requirements but less capable of meeting them.	2/11/2020 9:57 PM
77	Engineers should be continually educating themselves as would any other professional.	2/11/2020 8:51 PM
78	Ethics is only one category of professional development, not the whole license. You should be able to have development hours in any area related to your occupation: technical, ethics, project management, contract admin, legal, National and state environmental laws, labor regulation, etc. a professional should be able to choose the fields they feel they need for their specific needs.	2/11/2020 8:50 PM
79	None	2/11/2020 8:39 PM
80	Whoever wants to change the requirement from 30 to 3 is an idiot. 30 is barely enough to keep up with the fast-paced and changing world. A couple of ethics is not going to change this culture and regurgitating a couple of laws is mindless babble with no useful purpose. The people who started this 30 to 3 movement are clearly incompetent and I would never hire them for anything. Obviously the "reduce to 3" movement people need far more than 30 to up level their skills and mindset. So no. I vote no to reduce the qualifications.	2/11/2020 7:59 PM
81	Good ethics will properly follows all others issues	2/11/2020 7:58 PM
82	"Knowledge" of Nevada laws and regulation does NOTHING to improve public protection! Try USE of good engineering practices, instead! With some of the rule changes over the years, PE Registration doesn't convey the prestige it used to. I'm glad I'm nearing retirement.	2/11/2020 7:58 PM
83	Any engineer that "reads" the NAC section that addresses the engineer's "ethic" requirements and understands it knows the legal charge engineers must operate under! No amount of public ethic/legal education will reform scoundrels.	2/11/2020 7:40 PM
84	I don't believe continuing education will prevent bad engineers from continuing to be bad. Focusing on ethics is something that engineers do not necessarily learn through the practice of engineering.	2/11/2020 7:28 PM
85	Locks only keep honest people honest. knowledge of law and ethic has no real effect on financial motivation.	2/11/2020 7:27 PM
86	no	2/11/2020 7:25 PM
87	When I went through the PE licensing requirements in British Columbia, there was a 16 hour CD that was provided to review ethics. Interesting CD and enjoyed it. Non value to the professional application. You either have an ethical standard or you do not. Course work and involvement with Professional organization and your peers is more important. Just ethics has to be a suggestion that comes from academia. Keep things as they are.	2/11/2020 7:18 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

88	I think professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws are both important, but reducing the total number of hours from 30 to 3 will do the opposite of protecting the general public. More education the better.	2/11/2020 7:13 PM
89	Options are limited for ethics courses. I also believe that some will continue to cheat the system - probably better to require such training prior to licensure.	2/11/2020 7:11 PM
90	It will only improve if the participants are serious about protecting the public.	2/11/2020 7:09 PM
91	Engineers trained in ethics rather than engineering craft will do more harm than good. High technical competency is the best way to protect the public. Continuing technical education requirement is the easiest way to force it on the practicing engineers. I think one hour of law/ethics (similar to other states) would be a reasonable requirement.	2/11/2020 6:48 PM
92	It's focus is on Nevada and not general practices that might improve safety or design that would be applicable across all states.	2/11/2020 6:36 PM
93	Technical engineering courses and testing should remain in the continuing education requirements. The current number of PDHs required for renewal/to become active is sufficient.	2/11/2020 6:32 PM
94	How much is that going to cost? When implimenting material that has to do with law, I would think it will be MORE expensive.	2/11/2020 6:24 PM
95	It's good to have a requirement to look at the state laws and regulation every couple of years, one hour should suffice. Would be helpful to see a summary of changes in the biennium at that time.	2/11/2020 6:24 PM
96	N/A	2/11/2020 6:05 PM
97	I take ethics and law CE for other states and have found that the material tends to be VERY repetitive. I think it would be far more beneficial to keep the required hours at or near 25-30 with a one or two hour requirement for ethics and/or state law. But, the Board should put on an annual or bi-annual webinar to facilitate good law information being passed on to the registrants	2/11/2020 6:05 PM
98	Continued education on Nevada law would increase my understanding of state-specific laws.	2/11/2020 6:05 PM
99	Changing to ethics and laws will servely harm the continued technical improvement needed in the profession. I see some licensees now that scrabble to accive the thirty hours. Those in the propsted situation will only get what is required and could severly harm the reputation of the profession.	2/11/2020 5:51 PM
100	Focus of continuing education should be to advance knowledge or exposure to new ideas in the profession.	2/11/2020 5:46 PM
101	A person who does not conduct themselves ethically may not change their behavior just by knowing the laws and regulations. Character and integrity should be the hallmark of the professional.	2/11/2020 5:45 PM
102	Understanding Law would be more useful.	2/11/2020 5:35 PM
103	I think that there needs to be a requirement for professional ethics and Nevada law, whereas now there is none. However, I also think that there need to be continuing technical education. My suggestion: keep the total requirement of 30 hours, but of that, require 2 hours for ethics and an hour for Nevada law.	2/11/2020 5:29 PM
104	I think that there may be better options to increase the emphasis on professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws without impacting the availability of opportunities to continue to advance a person's knowledge base and skill set through the current 30 PDH requirement. Public protection is also provided by professionals staying abreast of industry trends and a commitment to lifelong learning.	2/11/2020 5:17 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

105	This is a much better option.	2/11/2020 5:08 PM
106	I suspect many engineers are not aware of all the laws and regulations they work under.	2/11/2020 5:06 PM
107	Some focus on ethics and state law would help with the image of engineers in the community and with client relations. Understanding our ethical duties to the public and client is key in moving our profession forward.	2/11/2020 4:59 PM
108	Registered in multiple states. I have one hour of ethics required in another state. Having one hour pertaining to Nevada laws and rules would be acceptable	2/11/2020 4:38 PM
109	Technologies can change rapidly and not requiring some minimal CEUs in technical aspects has the potential to jeopardize public safety.	2/11/2020 4:28 PM
110	Professional development hours that are not limited to ethics or Nevada laws are more effective in keeping professionals current in their areas of practice.	2/11/2020 4:24 PM
111	I think the 30 hours are great but need to at least require the ethics and public protection training. My only concern is if training hour reductions companies and agencies will limit professional conference attendance.	2/11/2020 4:04 PM
112	30 professional development hours are required in a biennial renewal period. Of which, two hours PDH must include professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulation. A training course must be made available by the board or professional society. Perhaps the entity can earn revenue by charging a nominal admission fee.	2/11/2020 3:45 PM
113	Each day, my work has some aspect of current trends in engineering application. If most engineers are the same, I believe that is covered. Ethics and law, in my experience, are not focused on but are important for public protections.	2/11/2020 3:44 PM
114	There needs to be a definition of what "public protection" means. The way I see it, there are two different meanings of "public protection". First is to protect the public financially from unethical business dealings. Second, is to protect the public physically, and a different financial component, from an engineering design failure or compromise. It sounds like the proposed regulations are to attempt to protect the public from the first meaning type. The required ethics and law continuing education will refresh the State laws for good, competent engineers who may unwittingly violate one of the regulations. If this were to happen, the competent engineer should easily address this to the Public's satisfaction. It would have no effect on a bad or intentionally clueless engineer whose intent is to defraud the Public. Protecting the public from the second meaning of the term goes back to the core competency of the engineer, which is not addressed by the proposed regulations. However, the two types of meaning can merge that I have really not seen stressed enough in any training. This occurs when the right thing to design to protect the client for the long run is beyond the client's understanding/budget and pressure is brought to bear on the engineer by the client and the engineering firms' owner to take shortcuts to reduce costs. In these cases, the client is usually a developer who does not have a long term interest in the project. There is no long run for the developer, but the new owner is then stuck with the project with the shortcuts in the design.	2/11/2020 3:06 PM
115	Ethics is necessary but should not be seen as a substitution for the 30-hours currently required.	2/11/2020 3:01 PM
116	I have no issue with requiring one hour to be based on Nevada laws but don't think that will have any impact to the public	2/11/2020 2:43 PM
117	Rather than change from 30 hours to only 3 hours, could the 3 hours covering ethics and Nevada law be included in the 30 hours of professional development?	2/11/2020 2:40 PM
118	I don't think memorizing ethics and laws is sufficient to ensure that we are acting in the public's best interest. We should be required to keep abreast of new code language, design methodologies, and structural systems.	2/11/2020 2:40 PM
119	Many times I think that the 30 hours however legitimate may not be directly related to the area of practice of the engineer.	2/11/2020 2:38 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

Ethics and Nevada Law is always directly related to the area of practice.

120	Such a focus would drive priority away from new safety technical knowledge; and may close focus of engineer to NV only items	2/11/2020 2:37 PM
121	I would say emphasizing ethics and laws will help motivate the engineer to do his own self directed study, seminars, and research, etc. to be sure he is up to date.	2/11/2020 2:36 PM
122	I can see the benefit I guess in trying to reduce the number practicing outside their skills/abilities/qualifications, but realistically at that point why not just have an online training coarse for ethics and new Nevada laws/regulations that you must complete before renewing your license and leave it at that? I would keep an open mind, but I really wouldn't see it as a positive change.	2/11/2020 2:36 PM
123	Support the Reduction to 3 PDH's. Board should provide free yearly class that covers the public protection.	2/11/2020 2:32 PM
124	I believe adding a requirement that a certain number or ethic and/or Nevada law questions is a good addition, but eliminating all requirements for technical continuing education would be a negative.	2/11/2020 1:59 PM
125	Anything to reduce the insanity would be a step in the right direction.	2/11/2020 1:53 PM
126	i think this change would be good for out-of-state NV PE's because it would focus on state specific requirements. I would hope that the state would provide a free class to meet the new PDH requirement.	2/11/2020 1:50 PM
127	No	2/11/2020 1:47 PM
128	Surely the requiremenst should improve the professional capability of the PE? The suggestion does not acheive that?	2/11/2020 1:41 PM
129	If the required CE requirements were narrowly focus on ethics and state law, I think that it would emphasize the importance of both to engineers. This would translate into a better understanding and application of both.	2/11/2020 1:34 PM
130	In today's world, I feel that professionals know how to engineer and survey. Due to human nature, ethics needs to be revisited and promoted so as to protect the public.	2/11/2020 1:32 PM
131	Technical continuing educations is foundational to public safety. Adding a check box for ethics or laws does not directly address public safety.	2/11/2020 1:21 PM
132	I think it is good to focus on our responsibility to the public at this time.	2/11/2020 1:21 PM
133	I'm a fan of the ethics requirement - though I think it goes in one ear and out the other for most who are just checking the box. The only impact of the laws and regs requirement will be to line the pockets of people selling a class.	2/11/2020 1:14 PM
134	While a greater knowledge of ethics and the law would benefit the community it should not be at the expense of technical knowledge. Most people only do what is minimally required of them and to focus solely on ethics and law would be to a detriment of the engineering taking place in the state.	2/11/2020 1:14 PM
135	N/A	2/11/2020 1:07 PM
136	NO COMMENT	2/11/2020 12:45 PM
137	I think it is imperative that professionals keep with with current developments and practices in their specific fields. A ethics only requirement will not achieve this.	2/11/2020 12:40 PM
138	Both Cont. Ed. requirements within the practicing engineer's discipline and ethics/regulations are needed.	2/11/2020 12:36 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

139	See question 5.	2/11/2020 12:28 PM
140	I support the change to focus on professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulation.	2/11/2020 12:22 PM
141	Very much out the engineering scope	2/11/2020 12:22 PM
142	I think there is so much more we should know and would help us.	2/11/2020 12:14 PM
143	A more specific approach with approved courses but less credits required would better assume the licensees are getting the right education.	2/11/2020 11:56 AM
144	I think both ways help protect, when at conferences I usually take ethic courses	2/11/2020 11:51 AM
145	ethics is one of the biggest problems a land survey in private practice encounters. Ethic will not change until a method is found to bring offenders before the board for their actions, then examine the alleged offence and assess penalties. The problem is that ethical conduct is different for different people. Personal integrity is a variable commodity. The older surveyors have a much more rigid definition of ethical conduct than the younger persons. Personally I like doing the technical updates but they are becoming very expensive.	2/11/2020 11:48 AM
146	Ethics are important but so is professional competence	2/11/2020 11:39 AM
147	I believe there should still be a requirement for pdh's related to construction materials/methods and building codes.	2/11/2020 11:39 AM
148	While I like the concept of requiring some level of continuing education focused specifically on the topics of professional ethics and knowledge of state laws and regulations; these items are foundational to being a professional engineer. If only these items are required to fulfill the continuing education requirements, it may effectively divert a PE's attention away from maintaining and nurturing their technical competencies. Achieving and maintaining a professional licensure to practice engineering must continue to rely on a delicate balance of technical competency, professional ethics, and overall engineering experience. If any one of those items falter or diminish, the effectiveness of the PE also diminishes.	2/11/2020 11:33 AM
149	see comments related to question 4	2/11/2020 11:29 AM
150	I feel that the current system allows for the development of community in the engineering field. If the PDH's are limited to those fields, there will be limited opportunity to attain them, probably through only a few vendors at a high cost.	2/11/2020 11:12 AM
151	Virtually every state already requires continuing education in ethics.	2/11/2020 11:06 AM
152	No	2/11/2020 11:03 AM
153	Focusing on Ethics and laws ignores the need to stay technically aware	2/11/2020 10:58 AM
154	I have been doing the professional development for over 20 years now. It has been something of a pain, but I believe it strengthens the practice of engineering.	2/11/2020 10:48 AM
155	Ethics and legal education is not something that engineers will encounter as often as the technical aspects of their jobs. In other words, we continually learn to become better engineers, but may not be guided as often to be ethical engineers. The government is not there to enforce technical capabilities, but rather the protection of the public and sustainable means of business. Focusing on legal and ethical education will ensure these are highlighted, which is important.	2/11/2020 10:43 AM
156	Professional Ethics should have a strong focus on practicing within one's area of competence. A licensee should be able to provide evidence of competency if/when needed.	2/11/2020 10:39 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

157	I am not a fan of the ethics requirement. You are either ethical or not. Training is not going to change the situation. A periodic course to cover interesting cases is fine. Two courses in a biennial cycle is not overly burdensome - IF RECIPROCITY AMONG OTHER JURISDICTIONS IS RECOGNIZED!	2/11/2020 10:31 AM
158	I read the laws and further explanation would be helpful.	2/11/2020 10:18 AM
159	I have a license in New Mexico, along 6 others. NM requires ethics education at every biannual renewal. I believe it is 4 hours, but it might be less. I feel it is highly valuable because it requires (forces) all applicants to review the laws which guide us in our professional lives. My home state, CA, has nothing like this. I was the Chairman of the Professional Practices Committee of Orange County for many years, and as such, I reviewed the work and mind set of hundreds of Land Surveyors , good and bad. Many had been in business for years and had not reviewed the law or been apprised of the details, or changes in the law from the time they took their licensing test. No way to run a profession - it can only go downhill. I personally feel the New Mexico system is great, and have encouraged our folks in Sacramento to do the same, with no success. As to the 30 hours, that matches most states that require Continuing Ed. My personal belief is that anyone who is active in the profession should be able to attain that level of Conted without undue struggle, and should to maintain any kind of professionalism.	2/11/2020 10:15 AM
160	Removing or reducing the requirement would take away the motivation for most engineers to attend conferences and seminars where new technologies and best practices are often taught. This would ultimately impact the understanding of our engineers and the safety of the public.	2/11/2020 10:14 AM
161	Only focusing on these issues does not satisfy the concept of continuing education.	2/11/2020 10:02 AM
162	We are generally very busy and tend to chose the easiest way to the 30 hour requirement.	2/11/2020 10:00 AM
163	From my observation, engineering design safety is primarily related to technical competence and this is where continuing education should be focused, if required.	2/11/2020 9:55 AM
164	The training on current NV requirements is beneficial to keep the design professionals current on Nevada requirements.	2/11/2020 9:50 AM
165	no	2/11/2020 9:46 AM
166	Focusing on ethics and law would make the engineer/surveyor think more about his responsibilities as it pertains to public safety.	2/11/2020 9:39 AM
167	I think having the requirement for ethics and Nevada laws/regulations is a good addition but I think the continuing education requirement is still needed to make sure engineers stay up to date with the latest standards.	2/11/2020 9:32 AM
168	While focusing on professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada Laws and Regulations is important, it is also important to have PDH to stay up on new technology and studies to better enhance our abilities as engineers to solve the problems of society. By going to conferences and learning about what other agencies in other states are doing or have done is a tremendous benefit and we as engineers should never stop learning. Having said that. I am not opposed to reducing the PDH amount from 30 to say 20, but certainly not from 30 to 3.	2/11/2020 9:29 AM
169	I have seen numerous violations of NRS with respect to Records of Survey and Corner Records, from surveyors licensed in the 1960's to surveyors practicing in the present day. This does not strike me as ignorance of the law so much as willful behavior for financial reasons. While the proposed change in continuing education is likely aimed at this problem and others like it, I think it is doubtful that this behavior will be eliminated by the proposed change, while at the same time, other worthy continuing education topics will be shoved to the back of the shelf.	2/11/2020 9:28 AM
170	As noted in Question 4. When I took the ethics test to become a professional engineer I was provided with a license based	2/11/2020 9:21 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

on my performance and understanding of the Nevada State Law.

171	I don't have an opinion on whether this revision will have added value to public protection, but if the intent for the requirement is to have a better understanding and review of Nevada laws and regulations, then I think it will achieve that. Honestly I believe many engineers avoid these types of hours in lieu of information that is more pertinent to their specific discipline. Therefore this change would likely implement the type of continuing education that this regulation has intended.	2/11/2020 9:21 AM
172	There may be some improvement, but probably not significant improvement to public safety. The first part of our creed is to protect the public. Better understanding of risk may have a bigger impact on how we protect the public. The FIU bridge collapse is a good case in point.	2/11/2020 9:18 AM
173	Public safety is ensured if all engineers/engineering companies follow the codes of practice and act accordingly in an ethical manner; as relates to their area of expertise.	2/11/2020 9:16 AM
174	Nope	2/11/2020 9:15 AM
175	The state of practice is constantly evolving and the PE is ethically required to stay informed of current and future trends in the field.	2/11/2020 9:08 AM
176	I think this should be added to the existing requirements. Maybe, reduce the amount of technical hours required so and add professional ethics.	2/11/2020 9:04 AM
177	I agree with the amendment	2/11/2020 9:00 AM
178	None	2/11/2020 8:57 AM
179	See my answer to 5.	2/11/2020 8:50 AM
180	A slight improvement might be expected if an engineer who might otherwise have slightly cut corners is really inspired to protect the public, in accord with good ethical and moral values.	2/11/2020 8:49 AM
181	12 to 15 hours of continuing education per biennial period would be sufficient such that it will not negatively impact public protection.	2/11/2020 8:48 AM
182	Nevada law and ethics do not change much over a two year period so I don't see this helping the public much. In addition, would the board be setting up courses on the Nevada Law?	2/11/2020 8:47 AM
183	no	2/11/2020 8:36 AM
184	No Comment	2/11/2020 8:34 AM
185	As a professional, you should practice ethically as part of your responsibilities to the public and your client. Keeping up with NRS is also simply part of your duty as a professional. To reduce the number of CEU's required and focus on the bare minimum aspects of your responsibilities would in my opinion be a great disservice to the public at large. I feel that CEU's should be used to strengthen your knowledge base, keep up with trends and technology, as well as keeping up with NRS. Ethics are generally core values that do not change much in any given 2 year period, so to reduce CEU's to focus on something that is not changing would be bad for the profession going forward.	2/11/2020 8:33 AM
186	By only requiring three hours on ethics and law then engineers will only do the three hours required and be done. It would greatly reduce certain engineers learning about updated products and devices. Three hours on Nevada law is not enough to learn about everything that would be needed for what is actually out there. Also law is not something that is easily retained. It isn't something that will be remembered 8 months from the hour class that is taken. I believe this also creates very little	2/11/2020 8:33 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

opportunities for people to get their hours. Only certain people would be able to put on a class, which is probably not going to be free, so a lot of money will be going to one place.

187	I think this would be great. Ethics is something that isn't taught in school these days. Some people either have it instilled via their parents and some don't.	2/11/2020 8:32 AM
188	I am for this idea, however I do not think that these should be the ONLY focus. I believe licensed Engineers should have ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws as a requirement along with getting other technical hours.	2/11/2020 8:31 AM
189	While introducing a requirement for professional ethics courses and NV law & regs courses would be a benefit, there are other subjects and topics that will improve the overall competence and professionalism of licensees which will also improve the public protection. I do not support the proposed reduction and change of focus in the continuing education requirement.	2/11/2020 8:30 AM
190	Professional development hours are necessary to keep current your technical competency. Reduce the number of hours required in conjunction with the ethics and law requirements would be an improvement.	2/11/2020 8:30 AM
191	I prefer 3 hours of ethics in addition to the current 30 PDHs +instead of either-or option. Competency and integrity should go hand in hand. The process of earning PDHs could help meet the other goal of building character based on competency, but just 3 hours spent on re-learning? ('re-learning' - surely scope of ethics is not going to change?) ethics alone without routines of continuous professional development/learning could fall short of overall professional goals & needs of individuals and problem-solving needs of the community.	2/11/2020 8:29 AM
192	My experience is that many professionals are not aware of proper professional ethics beyond very basic ideas. Also, NV engineering law has some unique requirements that could easily cause a problem for engineers not familiar with the requirements.	2/11/2020 8:25 AM
193	By limiting the focus of PDH to only law and ethics I don't see how this will improve public protection. If you attend conferences and lectures to get your 30 PDHs then you will encounter law and ethics issues regularly. If this is the direction the board decides to go, then provide us with the study material that meets the requirement and allow self study for the credit. I'd rather not travel to a conference just to get my 3 hours or pay some 3rd party to issue me the credits.	2/11/2020 8:19 AM
194	The ethics and Nevada law requirements are fine, but I think other continuing education subjects also serve to protect the public.	2/11/2020 8:18 AM
195	The amount of paperwork is therefore the same. Only now you can sell enrollment in classes that teach NV laws. See California's continuing education requirements and reduce the NV bureaucratic processes to match it please. People say California is the most regulated state with respect to government requirements... on this issue NV wins with these additional requirements.	2/11/2020 8:14 AM
196	Having licenses in multiple states makes your proposed rules changes a bit problematic since the other states still require 30 hours and your 3 hours will be specific to only Nevada law. But i think you might be headed in the right direction.	2/11/2020 8:14 AM
197	N/A	2/11/2020 8:13 AM
198	I am strongly against us. For people licensed in multiple states, it is a burden to require state specific education requirements. 1 Hour of state specific requirements in 25 states creates an extra 25 hours of CEU. Requiring general ethics is not bad since that can be accepted in multiple states.	2/11/2020 8:13 AM
199	A majority of us strive to be both professional and ethical. This is our livelihood. Sometimes things go south on projects. I think the focus should be on repeat offenders who do not care to get it right. The current 30 hour requirement helps to keep us engaged in the engineering community. I don't see a reason or benefit to change the current system.	2/11/2020 8:12 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

200	Ethical behavior is ethical behavior. I don't need training to be reminded to behave ethically. If the board needs to update us on changes to Nevada laws, I think that can be accomplished with a monthly newsletter. Or - if the board feels strongly about a certain issue or policy, they can require license holders to take a short on-line training video before completing their next PE renewal. We do videos like that all the time at work for things like safety training, corporate compliance, workplace behavior, environmental policies, etc. They have a short quiz at the end that requires a passing score of at least 9/10.	2/11/2020 8:11 AM
201	All we design has economy and safety in mind. Further, it is always important to be ethical in all we do. As for Laws/regulations that are part of the Nevada Statutes -- those have to be read on a case x case basis. They are written in legaleese (slang word but well known) and subject to interpretation. Nevada is not alone with this. It took me several attempts to pass the Texas Ethics Exam. This is because of two things -- finding the exact answer was hard to do and finding the applicable section was hard to do. I don't know for sure but it seems that these sections (Ethics) are written by attorneys and they love to make things confusing.	2/11/2020 8:11 AM
202	The emphasis should be on engineering competence, and on sanctions against any who are unethical or violate the law. Focusing on laws and ethics will do little for those who are already ethical and will not alter the behavior of those who are not. Further, the legal profession, including its expression through code and procedure and the inconsistent interpretation of same, is largely antithetical to engineering ideals.	2/11/2020 8:09 AM
203	Florida and Texas require courses in ethics and law. I am amazed at how many Nevada engineers have zero knowledge in these areas, but need it the most. If you offer these courses as seminars or webinars, don't require it at all. Don't screw around with this. Do it right or not at all. Ethics, ethics, ethics!	2/11/2020 8:07 AM
204	I have been practicing engineering for 35+ years and have seen ethics steadily decline as the emphasis on profitability has taken its place. It is time we as a profession reverse the trend.	2/11/2020 8:05 AM
205	Codes and design documents (such as ASCE-7) change, so additional CE should be required.	2/11/2020 8:04 AM
206	I marked "no change," but I actually think that required regular training on ethics and Nevada law is a positive requirement and will improve professional's understanding of both ethics and practice law. I really like how Texas does their ethics training. The board sponsors/executes webinars every year that satisfy the Texas ethics requirement. They talk not just about ethics, but provide example situations and a poll to test attendees understanding of the ethical question in discussion. This kind of interaction keeps a dry subject interesting and engaging. It also engages the attendees and provides feedback to the instructors on the percentage of attendees who are actively paying attention.	2/11/2020 7:57 AM
207	Professional ethical violations versus the problems and the cost of items related to the public safety in is important but the safety of the public is more. Review the quantity of ethics violations versus engineering accidents. All that is needed is ti mandate part of the 30 hours be in ethics.	2/11/2020 7:57 AM
208	none	2/11/2020 7:57 AM
209	Hold the 30 hr biennial requirement but make 2/30 related to ethics. I would forgo the 1/30 based on NV specific rules unless the board plans on offering a free online webinar to fulfill this requirement.	2/11/2020 7:54 AM
210	Our professional service to the public goes well beyond just ethics, laws and regulations. We best serve our profession and the public with an expanded knowledge not a focused one.	2/11/2020 7:49 AM
211	Many states have the ethics requirement. The best managed that I have participated in is Texas. Do not make this a gift to CEU providers, but instead conduct a telephonic seminar as Texas does that is educational and interesting. You could handle both the law and ethics this way	2/11/2020 7:46 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

212	In my experience, most violations are related to practitioners violating laws and ignoring ethical obligations and requirements.	2/11/2020 7:39 AM
213	For those with comity in numerous states the focus on Nevada laws dilutes the technical and ethical knowledge a licensee should gain from continuing education. For instance, suppose a person is registered in 10 states and each state required a continuing education requirements for knowledge of their state's laws. One could quickly a mass PDH for simply conforming to laws of each state rather than keeping up with the knowledge in the area of their expertise.	2/11/2020 7:32 AM
214	Good idea	2/11/2020 7:26 AM
215	Ethics training doesn't make one ethical. I highly doubt that any professional behaving in an unethical manner would treat ethics training with the seriousness required that would cause them to rethink their behavior. Those who follow the rules don't need it, but they take it anyway in order to follow the rules. Those that need it, skirt by the requirements with the minimum possible effort and it doesn't really change their behavior.	2/11/2020 7:21 AM
216	Why would continuing education need to be completely deleted to focus on ethics when both are essential to the profession? A proposal should be made to include both. Improvements in ethical conduct are desperately needed.	2/11/2020 7:19 AM
217	Ethics learning will be helpful, and nothing substantial will be lost in practice.	2/11/2020 7:17 AM
218	Most states have an ethics CPD requirement. State specific ethics training would be redundant and offer no added benefit to public safety.	2/11/2020 7:17 AM
219	No	2/11/2020 7:15 AM
220	The incentive to stay abreast of latest developments would be reduced which would effect public safety in my opinion.	2/11/2020 7:12 AM
221	None	2/11/2020 7:08 AM
222	Professional ethics are required continuously and should not require more training. Having an annual course/webinar covering changes in the Nevada laws and regulations should improve public protection.	2/11/2020 7:08 AM
223	I think the current requirement encourages people to attend conferences and professional presentations to stay current on the state of the practice, which is beneficial to public protection. Only requiring 3 hours will reduce the attendance at professional meetings and conferences.	2/11/2020 7:07 AM
224	It seems to me that in a biennium, 1 hour of ethics (not 2) plus one more hour that could be either ethics or NV laws, without other continuing ed, would not provide adequate assurance that a licensee is striving to maintain competence. However, I also feel that an hour of NV law every biennium is too much - maybe one hour every 4 years?	2/11/2020 7:07 AM
225	Same as above comment	2/11/2020 7:06 AM
226	I believe that learning about ethics contributes very little to wether a person behaves ethically or not. Additionally, learning about the state laws, while useful, will contribute very little to the practice of engineering.	2/11/2020 7:06 AM
227	As indicated in my previous answer, those actively working in their field of licensing are already keeping abreast of what they must know and should not be required to take additional PDHs. I totally disagree with any PE having to pay for PDHs.	2/11/2020 7:05 AM
228	This would allow me to focus on technical education that is actually meaningful to me, along with hitting the base of ethics and laws. I hope that this base training could be provided by the board, and help take the guesswork out of what is accepts training and begat is not.	2/11/2020 7:03 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

229	None	2/11/2020 7:03 AM
230	More focused attention to the state rules/laws is never a bad idea. A combination of the ethics/laws and a total of 30 hours is the best I have seen to take care of both needs. AKA 30 hours with 3 hours being in ethics & rules/laws.	2/11/2020 7:00 AM
231	None	2/11/2020 6:58 AM
232	If this is going to be a requirement from the state board I think the state needs to provide the educational opportunity.	2/11/2020 6:57 AM
233	Technical knowledge is more important.	2/11/2020 6:57 AM
234	No	2/11/2020 6:55 AM
235	Understanding the laws is the responsibility of being a professional engineer, saying that I took a class isn't going to make me a more ethical or law abiding professional.	2/11/2020 6:53 AM
236	Structures is the concern, especially in Nevada where "flash" and "exotic" are what is expected - on the edge in a design sense	2/11/2020 6:52 AM
237	no	2/11/2020 6:51 AM
238	Lowering the minimum requirements for PDH's will more than likely NOT have a negative impact on the intent of these regulations or public protection. Especially if the three (3) hours proposed are more closely scrutinized. If possible the courses and or seminars required to adhere to the three hours should be board approved and automatically marked as "attended" in the licensee's file once completed.	2/11/2020 6:48 AM
239	I would like to see Professional Ethics and knowledge of Nevada Laws included in the 30-hours requirement as a distinct category.	2/11/2020 6:46 AM
240	no	2/11/2020 6:46 AM
241	Focusing the requirements will remind the licensee what they should be doing and what is important in providing a safe environment for the public.	2/11/2020 6:45 AM
242	I'm licensed in several states that require professional ethics or state law. This requirement is redundant. Perhaps you could opt out if you can demonstrate you have taken similar seminars in the past biennium.	2/11/2020 6:34 AM
243	As long as there are courses provided by some resource I think this is a major improvement.	2/11/2020 6:33 AM
244	Nothing wrong with a focus on ethics but a focus on Nevada law does nothing to protect the public.	2/11/2020 6:27 AM
245	Wish all States would have the same criteria and standards for continuing education requirements	2/11/2020 6:22 AM
246	No	2/11/2020 6:17 AM
247	I would not want to see technical training totally eliminated, but a reduction in hours required would be helpful	2/11/2020 6:17 AM
248	Only requiring three continuing education hours per renewal period does not seem like a positive change for the good of the public. There are several states that require one ethics hour to be completed in the 30 total hours every two years. I would suggest doing something like this so that licensees are still required to get several technical hours related to their field of expertise.	2/11/2020 6:16 AM
249	I also have my Florida PE which has changed the requirements over the years. At one point it was 8 hours - 4 on Laws and	2/11/2020 6:06 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

Rules and 4 in Areas of practice but it was tight control on what could be taken. It then got loosened up and less on Laws and Rules, added an Ethics requirement, and kept a number of Areas of Practice hours - and also reduced the stringency for which sessions could be utilized. And it is 18 hours over 2 years. The big issue is that there needs to be a number of Laws and Rules type of training specific to Nevada created. In the past for FL it has been on ADA access requirements which doesn't really help for a Mech PE. There also used to be watching the FPBE that provided hours. These were lengthy. While I like the idea for the Ethics and then on specific to Nevada for PE rules - those need to readily available. And cutting it to just 3 hours over 2 years would be too little and many PEs would skip the other items.

250	N/A	2/11/2020 6:05 AM
251	Ethical competency is far more valuable to public safety than a 1-hour lunch and learn taken 15 times a year.	2/11/2020 5:55 AM
252	None	2/11/2020 5:52 AM
253	It is great to require knowledge of the Nevada rules, but the requirements would need to be increased in specificity and difficulty in order to really cause improvement in public safety.	2/11/2020 5:51 AM
254	Lesser number of hours on personal improvement will help	2/11/2020 5:51 AM
255	I think it not make a change as this should be the expected minimum criteria.	2/11/2020 5:33 AM
256	Those who do not follow the law will continue in that fashion.	2/11/2020 5:30 AM
257	I am licensed in 2 other states and they do require ethics which i believe is good. Also because i am in a different state it would be nice to have plenty of opportunity to get PDH's regarding Nevada laws and regs online.	2/11/2020 5:23 AM
258	Every aspect of surveying continuing education is important but Ethics, Laws and Boundary Standards are the top three	2/11/2020 5:22 AM
259	Focusing solely on ethics and state laws and regulations will be insufficient to meet the intent of continuing education. It lacks the requirment to keep up with changes in technology and methods of design.	2/11/2020 5:22 AM
260	30 in two years is do-able.	2/11/2020 5:22 AM
261	-	2/11/2020 5:22 AM
262	None	2/11/2020 5:19 AM
263	Engineering knowledge and qualification is not stagnant. And experience doesn't add to the knowledge and qualification because engineers simply continue to do as they've always done, therefore where's the experience? I believe that every engineer should continue to improve and expand their knowledge, in both the areas that they work in and in areas that they may only touch or skirt. Technology advancements and interactions with their clients and peers almost demands it.	2/11/2020 5:19 AM
264	Those who are out of state are likely already getting 30 hours likely of a technical nature + ethics. And for those, it would result in engineers being refreshed on Nevada law. However, for those only licensed in Nevada, this would be a step in the wrong direction. Thus I believe it would reduce the impact to public protection.	2/11/2020 5:18 AM
265	Ethical thinking is life-long and more a matter of personality and integrity (internal) than learning the rules. I would like to see 30 hours, of which at least XX hours shall be related to ethics and Nevada law. Nevada is particularly good at preparing readable, infrequent publications; perhaps they could be required reading!	2/11/2020 5:16 AM
266	I am in favor of keeping some additional hours to legitimately involve engineers in the technical improvements and development of our profession. The only effective way to implement this, in my opinion, is trough real enforcement by the	2/11/2020 5:05 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

board and rejecting fluff hours. If Boards hold us accountable - there will be improvement. I have been audited multiple times, including by the Nevada Board in 2010. I keep good records and have no problem explaining my choices in pdh. If the rules were more strict, I might have to change how I get my pdh's.

267	The ethics and laws portion is the primary part that keeps engineers thinking about the public safety and the decisions they make.	2/11/2020 4:58 AM
268	If the requirement for technical continuing education is reduced, then engineers may not seek to expand their knowledge and become too focused in their comfort zone.	2/11/2020 4:55 AM
269	Most people try to do the right thing, mandatory training required for those individuals that are not interested in acting in an ethical manner is seldom effective.	2/11/2020 4:51 AM
270	I think it could be very helpful to learn or review more in depth about the Nevada regulations. Some states require the ethics credit and I definitely think that's a good objective. I am a member of the Order of the Engineer and so I can very much appreciate the intent there. My only consideration would be to make sure there are various online and in person opportunities throughout the year to engage in these specific PDH types so that all are able to appropriately maintain their responsibilities to continued education as schedules allow.	2/11/2020 4:34 AM
271	Nevada law changes much more slowly than technology. And Nevada based classes would have to be available to those out of state.	2/11/2020 4:33 AM
272	None	2/11/2020 4:25 AM
273	No	2/11/2020 3:58 AM
274	No	2/11/2020 3:22 AM
275	Emphasis should be on technical knowledge i.e. design correctly so the structures would not collapse on occupants.	2/11/2020 12:25 AM
276	Seems obvious	2/10/2020 11:30 PM
277	I don't believe it will have a real effect..	2/10/2020 11:06 PM
278	Other knowledge is gained thru daily work duties. Ethics and board rules are the ones engineers must train on regularly outside their normal work.	2/10/2020 10:52 PM
279	Focusing on ethics may help, but I need to know more than just Nevada laws since my company works out of state as well as in state.	2/10/2020 10:41 PM
280	Those professionals who act unethically will continue to do so. Having them take a class will not change that.	2/10/2020 10:28 PM
281	See Answer 5 above.	2/10/2020 10:28 PM
282	None	2/10/2020 10:07 PM
283	This engineer agrees.	2/10/2020 10:00 PM
284	Most engineers including myself need to keep current with ethics and professional laws, and the 3 hours would serve the engineering profession well, and much better than the current system.	2/10/2020 10:00 PM
285	We would be far better asking registrants to be more critical in providing references to applicants for registration. Too often existing registrants give applicants for registration positive references like it was a right of passage and not an earned reward	2/10/2020 9:59 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

based on knowledge and professional character and ethical behavior

286	Keep the 30 pdh.	2/10/2020 9:55 PM
287	None	2/10/2020 9:49 PM
288	New products are constantly being introduced and codes are constantly changing.	2/10/2020 9:49 PM
289	No further comments.	2/10/2020 9:31 PM
290	Ethics in the engineering profession creates a level playing field in competition and private and public practice.	2/10/2020 9:28 PM
291	Removing requirements for technical knowledge will reduce the capacity for engineers to further their professional development.	2/10/2020 9:23 PM
292	Shouldn't focus continuing education on the 1% that are a problem.	2/10/2020 9:21 PM
293	Most engineers do not keep up with the rules and ethics and don't understand how their decisions could be violating the rules.	2/10/2020 9:15 PM
294	With respect to Land Surveying, there is a reason that the majority of states require continuing education. That is to make sure that the practice standard is at a level to protect the public.	2/10/2020 9:11 PM
295	i don't know if it will help public protection, but in the age of quickly changing technology and processes, i think i will help with getting everyone up to speed on current changes, e.g. digital signatures / electronic submittals	2/10/2020 9:06 PM
296	I like the idea of having certain topic areas (laws, etc.) being covered, but I also think it's important for the board to also require ongoing technical competency training.	2/10/2020 9:03 PM
297	An emphasis on ethics and public safety would be beneficial. Engineers will recognize & respect the importance of this type of Qualified Education compared to the current system that requires satisfaction of a Quantitated Criteria.	2/10/2020 8:54 PM
298	Engineers must understand the responsibility and liability of their work. Enforcing this understanding will encourage their need to be technically educated in areas pertinent to their expertise, thus eliminating the need for pdh's solely for the sake of licensing.	2/10/2020 8:51 PM
299	No comments	2/10/2020 8:50 PM
300	A clear regulatory path to revoking licenses of engineer's for work that is incomplete or incorrect may reduce malpractice without increasing lawsuits.	2/10/2020 8:43 PM
301	Agreed - narrowed focus would be an improvement	2/10/2020 8:34 PM
302	While a change to ethics and statute only PDH would likely make a change for some; is there is sufficient data to suggest that we have issues in ethics to the magnitude to use force upon all who maintain licensure? Also, I prefer the freedom to make choices based upon interest and determination of personal value. Also, one of my licenses requires a portion of course work in ethics and it's always difficult to find material and course offered that satisfy same.	2/10/2020 8:32 PM
303	Do not change.	2/10/2020 8:25 PM
304	Study of ethics will result in public protection.	2/10/2020 8:21 PM
305	Gives a specific focus and meaning to the hours required.	2/10/2020 8:21 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

306	A good replacement that is concentrated on what is important for the profession.	2/10/2020 8:18 PM
307	Refreshers/ reminders of the guidelines will deter violations that endanger the public.	2/10/2020 8:18 PM
308	could the continuing education include ethics and code as a common offering at association conferences such as AWWA, APWA , ULI, and so on. The 30 hour requirement is not burdensome and does increase professional interaction and experience sharing. If more focus on code and ethics is needed as viewed by the professional governing body let's get the information out without the notion of a specific requirement , at least for starting the focus.	2/10/2020 8:09 PM
309	An engineer is by nature a technically trained individual. So its necessary to keep training. However 3 PDHs dedicated to ethics is reasonable.	2/10/2020 8:09 PM
310	Not the way that we should go. If anything we should increase the required hours	2/10/2020 8:08 PM
311	We have seen the Lawyers try to make criminal activity acceptable, but engineers are a different breed.	2/10/2020 8:05 PM
312	It is the charge of every licensed professional to always be acting in the interests of public and client safety. That should not be different whether you have some level of CEU's requiring knowledge of the state statutes or not.	2/10/2020 8:04 PM
313	Engineers in general are ethical. As with any licensed professional there will be bad ones. With the thought of losing one's license, they should think twice about ethics.	2/10/2020 8:01 PM
314	I think it's a good idea to focus on local regulations and statutes, but it may be cumbersome for professionals registered in multiple states	2/10/2020 7:59 PM
315	no	2/10/2020 7:58 PM
316	I have licenses in a few different states and found with the recent NCEES update, most laws are basically the same. I would rather spend time on technical education.	2/10/2020 7:58 PM
317	Once again, compulsory continuing education like many mandated programs loses its impact as people learn to game the system simply to get credits.	2/10/2020 7:56 PM
318	State specifics in regards to regulations would be inconsistent with the NCEES and other state reasons for continuing education which is to keep licenses in a continual state of learning and polishing their engineering knowledge. This in turn leads to safer and more informed engineers.	2/10/2020 7:54 PM
319	NO	2/10/2020 7:51 PM
320	Following laws and regulations don't result in better engineering. Following proper engineering standards (gained from education and experience) better protect the public.	2/10/2020 7:47 PM
321	I think having a grasp on Nevada laws are good. I am registered in Indiana and they have similar requirements. The only negative is that it is non transferable to other states.	2/10/2020 7:43 PM
322	If an engineer is going to be unprofessional it doesn't really matter about his ethics he's going to do whatever he's gonna do anyway	2/10/2020 7:42 PM
323	Although a focus on ethics and state law is important, to only require this training could put the public at risk as technology is ever changing, as is the application of engineering. I am also registered in two other states. One state requires no continuing education. The other requires 15 hours annually. The 30 hours biennially is reasonable.	2/10/2020 7:39 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

324	No.	2/10/2020 7:34 PM
325	The requirements should focus on codes	2/10/2020 7:34 PM
326	None	2/10/2020 7:28 PM
327	We should all be ethical and lawful because we are ENGINEERS, but the proposal is too much emphasis on the wrong items. An Engineer needs to stay competent in his field.	2/10/2020 7:26 PM
328	You can make people aware of professional ethics but this may or may not cause him or her to change their procedures. If State Laws are adhered to and enforced " by whom" is a serious question.	2/10/2020 7:23 PM
329	This could be good for some PEs specifically doing design work, but not for others who aren't specifically in design. If law changes would be helpful for the board to provide online classes.	2/10/2020 7:21 PM
330	Every public servant, politician, doctor or engineer adheres to a code on selflessly serving humanity to the best of their ability. This tenet needs constant reinforcement as we are human & tend to 'forget'...an essay test evaluating a PE's commonsense should be administered, prior to granting CEU's, that hones into logic, existing rules & regulations, course of action & integrity...all set with the public's interest in mind.	2/10/2020 7:06 PM
331	Continuing education should focus on ethics, laws and professional competency.	2/10/2020 7:00 PM
332	The Codes change every three years, and new technologies emerge. It's critical to understand how things are changing.	2/10/2020 7:00 PM
333	Reducing the number of required hours is fine. There should still be hours required related to technology changes as well as ethics and law.	2/10/2020 6:59 PM
334	Although Nevada Laws and ethics are very important, the engineer needs to "hone" his/her engineering skills in addition to keeping abreast of Nevada Laws and ethics.	2/10/2020 6:59 PM
335	No.	2/10/2020 6:52 PM
336	I think that adding the requirement would be a bonus, but it should not be the only requirement. Make the 3-hours mandatory, and then 27-hours shall be elective hours.	2/10/2020 6:46 PM
337	i agree with the ethics and NRS proposal but I don't agree with eliminating the need for mandatory professional development. Professional development is critical for new engineers as well as those that have been around for a long time. The new engineers don't know what they don't know and the older engineers get complacent. With our ever changing technology and demands on infrastructure, it has never been more important to have mandatory professional development. I will say that the opportunity for quality professional development hours can be lacking at times in the northern nv area so I can see why people don't like the requirements.	2/10/2020 6:44 PM
338	No further comment	2/10/2020 6:43 PM
339	Ethics and knowledge of Nevada law is important. Perhaps even more important than continuing education. I'm not certain this will improve public safety. But it is better than nothing.	2/10/2020 6:37 PM
340	There are usually a list of those with expired licenses and other issues. This might reduce this	2/10/2020 6:35 PM
341	No.	2/10/2020 6:31 PM
342	The problem is not the subject matter, the problem is that the attendees have no motivation to pay attention, because they	2/10/2020 6:26 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

know they can just pay, show up, and walk out with credits. In other words, without knowledge testing, to prove that some actual learning occurred, the current system is a sham.

343	Knowledge of the law and Ethics are something we need to have when we in training and by the time we are eligible for registration. we need to keep up with changes of course however this is "education" new processes and techniques need to be kept up or we stagnate as a profession.	2/10/2020 6:14 PM
344	I really don't believe my comment would be valid if I am not using the license at my current employment, nor my answer to question 6	2/10/2020 6:11 PM
345	If a PE is ethical and also current of their knowledge of Nevada Laws and Regulations, but falls behind on technical abilities or knowledge of codes, then they could fail to meet the goal of public protection.	2/10/2020 6:11 PM
346	I like the idea of having some minimum specific requirements but would hope licensee holders would also maintain training relevant to their work.	2/10/2020 6:08 PM
347	No	2/10/2020 5:59 PM
348	Focus on laws and ethics do not necessarily relate to public protection any more than engineering. All of these subjects can contribute, but don't necessarily, so coursework could be completely unrelated to public protection. If the goal is to protect the public, whether related to safety, taxpayer money, fraud or otherwise, then the focus should be specific to the topics of concern.	2/10/2020 5:52 PM
349	None.	2/10/2020 5:50 PM
350	All aspects of the discipline should be tested,	2/10/2020 5:49 PM
351	Ethics and laws knowledge seem to be a weakness, and understanding those will improve public protection. Taking a 2 hour web course on intersection design will not. the 2 hour course is not enough to train, refresh or protect anyone.	2/10/2020 5:42 PM
352	No comment.	2/10/2020 5:41 PM
353	It is my feeling that there is so much more to knowledge and working in a licensed profession than ethics & laws. Both ethics and laws are important but with the need to continue to provide a professional service to the private sector, there needs to be as much on the knowledge of how to do. Also, it is very hard to enforce or teach someone how to be ethical; in society now, anything can be justified.	2/10/2020 5:37 PM
354	This really just fragments licensing requirements between states even more. Personally I am licensed in about a dozen states, and keeping up with the various renewal requirements approaches a week of effort per year. The professional development requirements in my area should really be focused on code changes and best practices to best serve public protection.	2/10/2020 5:31 PM
355	None	2/10/2020 5:31 PM
356	None	2/10/2020 5:28 PM
357	I think the continuing ed is reasonable and necessary to keep skills sharp and to be engaged technically	2/10/2020 5:27 PM
358	Given the focus on professional ethics and Nevada laws & regulations, we need some specific guidance on requisite material and available formats; otherwise it must be created.	2/10/2020 5:25 PM
359	maintaining PDH requirements as-is will ensure and encourage practicing engineers to stay abreast of technological	2/10/2020 5:20 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

developments and changes to governing codes and standards

360	I think it should be more than just Nevada Laws , there should be some technical engineering education	2/10/2020 5:19 PM
361	Stature review & ethics should become a portion on the required 30 hrs.	2/10/2020 5:09 PM
362	I believe the newsletter accomplishes the requirement that the engineer stay up with current law changes and ethics. Nothing does it better than reading about disciplinary actions.	2/10/2020 5:04 PM
363	I am licensed in several states. If the requirement is general ethics, that would be better than something specific to Nevada. It is onerous if every state has their own specific courses	2/10/2020 4:58 PM
364	Engineers should stay current with engineering practice and knowledge. I'm not sure that reducing required hours by 90% will achieve this.	2/10/2020 4:55 PM
365	There are other questions, such as how the ethics and knowledge of the law will be measured. Will there be courses offered on these subjects? How will compliance be verified?	2/10/2020 4:49 PM
366	no	2/10/2020 4:47 PM
367	I am all for continuing education and staying current.	2/10/2020 4:47 PM
368	It is my opinion that technical competency is paramount to the protection of the health, safety and welfare of the public. To not have requirements to keep engineers getting technical continuing education would be detrimental to the purpose of engineering. I believe it is analogous to leaving a car unlocked with the keys in it. I would rather make sure that the people that steal the car are competent drivers and dont kill anyone while driving than merely teach people that stealing a car is against the law.	2/10/2020 4:42 PM
369	A broad approach to skill refreshers and new engineering knowledge would be better for the public good.	2/10/2020 4:39 PM
370	There are some that believe that education on ethics will help teach us about ethics, but I believe that we already know what is ethical. A requirement of Nevada law cont. Education would make more sense.	2/10/2020 4:39 PM
371	The NV ethics seem more focused on small to medium businesses and as an employee of a engineering firm, the ethical question really occur by the PM and the PE doesn't see it.	2/10/2020 4:35 PM
372	It would improve an engineers understanding of rules and regulations, and keep these requirements fresh in everyone's mind.	2/10/2020 4:34 PM
373	I think the requirements related to professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws should be part of the 30 hours, or 20 hours. 3 Hours seems to be not enough as a stand alone requirement without any technical requirements related to it.	2/10/2020 4:32 PM
374	You could make 3 hours out of the thirty required hours be on ethics and Nevada law. But keep the education requirements at 30 per two years.	2/10/2020 4:30 PM
375	That is the proper regulatory requirement to enforce ethics and laws. It is your professional duty to pursue education and improvement. That is not a regulatory matter.	2/10/2020 4:26 PM
376	Continuing education is useless. I can teach all of the classes I have taken.	2/10/2020 4:26 PM
377	I have been practicing civil and geotechnical engineering in the highly seismic areas of the State of California for about 20 years now, including public schools, hospitals, and essential service facilities (such as water tanks and fire stations). The	2/10/2020 4:25 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

California Board of Engineers, Land Surveyors, and Geologists has never required Professional Development Hours since I obtained my PE license in California in 2002 and my Geotechnical Engineering license in 2007.

378	More ethics is better. Technical competency is learned on the job.	2/10/2020 4:25 PM
379	The biggest issues that I had to deal with during my time as a public employee was ethical training not technical.	2/10/2020 4:22 PM
380	Not sure where I could find training specific to the Nevada statutes.	2/10/2020 4:16 PM
381	As noted above, some ethics training is good but reducing the overall hours is not good.	2/10/2020 4:14 PM
382	I would prefer that 2 or 3 hours of the current 30 hour requirement be directed towards professional ethics.	2/10/2020 4:13 PM
383	Provides reason to review Nevada specific rules and make the requirement more purposeful	2/10/2020 4:10 PM
384	The very specific laws and regulation classes can be difficult to find and obtain. The ethics requirements are more standard and are found in Mississippi and Alabama. The Nevada specific laws while beneficial to review the state laws a course on it could be difficult to find. The other difficulty with adding these specific requirements is that it takes away time required in the technical competency.	2/10/2020 4:07 PM
385	Highlighting the need for professional ethics could reduce the number of litigations	2/10/2020 4:05 PM
386	Most professionals that following the continuing education requirements are most likely the individuals that understand the ethical side of the profession. Knowledge of Nevada laws is a good and should be acknowledged. This could be monitored at initial licensure and at renewal. Prior to licensure you take an exam on current laws. At renewal you take a test on updated or revised laws.	2/10/2020 4:04 PM
387	It seems that if the requirement for training related to the technical aspects of a discipline is removed, the potential for reduction of public protection is higher than any improvement that might be made by training only on ethics and regulations. To the extent 30 hours may be considered too much, I'd suggest simply reducing the total to 10 or 15. In addition, I question whether training on professional ethics will necessarily curb any unethical behavior (ethics should be a core part of a licensee, not something that needs repetitive training). Also, it seems like after an initial training on the Nevada regulations, subsequent training will be redundant (and may already be since basic knowledge of the regulations was needed at the time of licensing). Perhaps consider making one initial refresher training mandatory, and then any future changes to the regulations may be best handled by an update newsletter to all licensees, or by a requirement that a licensee certify every two years upon renewal that they have read a summary of any updates to the regulations.	2/10/2020 4:03 PM
388	I think if you reduce the hours then it would need to be mandatory to focus in professional ethics and Nevada law	2/10/2020 4:01 PM
389	A more focused emphasis on bureaucracy will not improve public safety.	2/10/2020 4:00 PM
390	It is sad that we live in a society that no longer has core beliefs in Ethics and that you have to propose a program that focuses on ethics. I do understand the dilemma and the desire to educate the professionals on what it means to be ethical. But I do not believe that only focusing on Ethics and the law will be a long term benefit to the engineering society. We will lose engineering knowledge, just as society has lost ethics, over the long run. In the end we will get back that which we put time and effort into.	2/10/2020 3:51 PM
391	The new focus may not improve public protection but it certainly will not reduce it. I have personally had to take PDH training in various areas of Civil Engineering that don't pertain to my area of specialization just to get the 30 PDH required to maintain my PE. Besides being a waste of money for me, such training does nothing to provide "public protection".	2/10/2020 3:51 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

392	I think that we should have some requirement to include ethics and NV laws to our PHD, but dont increase the total PHDs	2/10/2020 3:50 PM
393	The current format of allowing the individual to choose the content and subject of the course and how it relates to their work appears to be more relevant.	2/10/2020 3:45 PM
394	No	2/10/2020 3:43 PM
395	No	2/10/2020 3:41 PM
396	I look up Nevada and Federal codes and regulation all the time. I also usually confer with a college when straddling disciplines to make sure it's correct. It's better to know how to look it up than try to remember all the intricacies.	2/10/2020 3:40 PM
397	I agree that ethics and knowledge of statutes and codes are where the majority of the disciplinary cases stem from. I also feel that most of the people that are disciplined for ethics and statute violations are also not getting their 30 PDH's. Maybe a requirement that of the 30 PDH's 1 must be in Ethics and 2 must be in NV Statutes & Codes?	2/10/2020 3:39 PM
398	see comment from questions 4.	2/10/2020 3:38 PM
399	I think most surveyors decide to be good ones or bad ones and PDH's do little to change that. Enforcement is key.	2/10/2020 3:38 PM
400	At least some technical training should be required.	2/10/2020 3:36 PM
401	I believe some practice CEU's still need to be required.	2/10/2020 3:35 PM
402	Most engineers are very ethical and even if they didn't do something defined in the law (like signing documents with the appropriate procedures or posting their license in their office), they would have made a good effort to design things that keep the public safe and well served. I think they are more likely to do something that they misunderstood technically rather than something that they knew they didn't understand. You can't really regulate that either and it is a good thing that this happens infrequently.	2/10/2020 3:34 PM
403	These are the courses which are of the most benefit in my experience	2/10/2020 3:33 PM
404	Unless the Board is providing an online method to obtain Nevada Specific method of obtaining the PDH'S it would be difficult for professionals residing out of state to meet the requirements I try to attend Nevada conferences every three years to stay current with the mind set in Nevada such a requirement would necessitate forgoing conferences in the other states I currently work in	2/10/2020 3:33 PM
405	It is more feasible to just have the fewer hour requirement although in a very specific content. If this passes, hopefully the State will facilitate affordable online classes particularly for those of us that are out of state. Finding a class specifically about Nevada laws would be unlikely outside of Nevada.	2/10/2020 3:33 PM
406	no	2/10/2020 3:32 PM
407	none	2/10/2020 3:31 PM
408	This does not help the Professional Engineer stay up to date in their profession knowledge	2/10/2020 3:31 PM
409	Technology moves too quick not to have up to date knowledge of it not be part of the requirements.	2/10/2020 3:31 PM
410	PE's need to keep up with state-of-the-art tech	2/10/2020 3:30 PM
411	The Ethics part of the requirment is very important.	2/10/2020 3:28 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

412	See 5.	2/10/2020 3:25 PM
413	None	2/10/2020 3:23 PM
414	N/A	2/10/2020 3:22 PM
415	trying to keep good people honest - slackers will cheat the system	2/10/2020 3:21 PM
416	No	2/10/2020 3:15 PM
417	More focus may be good, but to only focus on those subjects would be detrimental overall.	2/10/2020 3:14 PM
418	I don't think the current requirement helps, it is more of a burden than anything. The new change will focus and not waste time.	2/10/2020 3:14 PM
419	None	2/10/2020 3:14 PM
420	Less training hours would allow more thoughtful choices in training opportunities. Instead of getting any training in wherever we can get them (because so many hours are currently required), we would be able to wait to find meaningful/ useful trainings.	2/10/2020 3:10 PM
421	Where would I ever find an appropriate venue for this training? I haven't seen anything since the CDH requirement began that would fulfill what I think is required.	2/10/2020 3:10 PM
422	None	2/10/2020 3:10 PM
423	I think engineering ethics in general are important, but I do not see where a replacement of engineering training by training of State laws would increase public safety. It may alert some engineers as to illegal activities, but not sure how it would protect the public other than maybe practicing outside of their expertise.	2/10/2020 3:09 PM
424	In today's litigious society, the need for an understanding of relevant laws and professional ethics, needs to be addressed during each registration period. It seems a 3 pdh class would satisfy this	2/10/2020 3:09 PM
425	I support requiring a portion of the 30 continuing education hours being tied to ethics and NV laws. I think we cheapen the industry and profession by not requiring a robust continuing education requirements. We are already treated as a commodity and such a drastic reduction in continuing education reinforces those beliefs.	2/10/2020 3:08 PM
426	It will keep a licensee informed to not violate regulations.	2/10/2020 3:08 PM
427	None	2/10/2020 3:03 PM
428	no	2/10/2020 3:02 PM
429	Again make ethics a part of the 30 hour requirement.	2/10/2020 3:02 PM
430	None	2/10/2020 3:01 PM
431	Most of the violations that I have reviewed relate to a PE violating laws and regulations, and ethical slips. I believe focusing on these areas will improve public safety.	2/10/2020 2:59 PM
432	No comments	2/10/2020 2:57 PM
433	N/A	2/10/2020 2:54 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

434	1. Currently there are no continuing education readily available for ethics or the law relating to Professional Engineering. The current requirements provide information and knowledge that increase the competency of Registered members, limiting the requirement to subjects that do not change or have minor changes will not provide a benefit to the public. In my day ethics were a required coarse of stude and a prudent and honest engineer will conduct his practice ethically, a dishonest person will not and all the ethical training will not help or be beneficial.	2/10/2020 2:53 PM
435	People depend on safe engineering. Technology is changing rapidly. Our engineers need to stay on top of those changes.	2/10/2020 2:53 PM
436	only focusing on Nevada laws does not keep the engineer up to date on current practices	2/10/2020 2:53 PM
437	Please see previous comment	2/10/2020 2:48 PM
438	No	2/10/2020 2:48 PM
439	Two hours of ethics is similar to other states. The one hour of association with NRS/NAC 625 is excessive. The laws should not change every two years. This hour can be encompassed in the 30 hours if we decide as professionals that we need it. The Ethics, NRS/NAC and PDH should all be part of the 30 hours.	2/10/2020 2:47 PM
440	I am registered in 24 States and 4 provinces of Canada and only 4 or 5 require Ethics. My home state of Texas is one and requires 1 hour per year. So I'm OK with 2 hours for a 2 year period. Only 1 or 2 states requires 1 hour of state regulations	2/10/2020 2:46 PM
441	It becomes a specific requirement rather than open and left to the registrant to decide what to take. I always get value from ethics and reviewing the regs when that is a focused course item	2/10/2020 2:46 PM
442	I design large buildings and usually I am hired by architects. Know the current codes and standards is the most important thing for my clients. Ethics and the laws and rules is important on how I conduct business and how I treat others in the industry. Passing a test of Laws and Rules isn't going to make the public safer. Knowing the codes, is.	2/10/2020 2:46 PM
443	There are always a few practioners out there that don't want to or can't follow the laws. It causes "low ball" type people that end up getting projects and then don't file maps or provide a professional service to the people that hire them. This has a terrible effect on all of the professionals in the State.	2/10/2020 2:43 PM
444	"Ethics" is a great buzz word but requiring continuing education will not make an engineer more ethical. Publishing disciplinary actions against P.E.'s is more effective.	2/10/2020 2:41 PM
445	Eliminating professional discipline specific education will defeat the purpose of continuing education requirements	2/10/2020 2:40 PM
446	I already need 1 ethics hour per year for other states, so no change for me there. As an active member of my state SEA, I usually average far in excess of min technical hours. But the 1 hour on NV law biennially seems difficult to meet without essentially taking the same course over & over. I already have to certify that I've read the statutes when I renew...	2/10/2020 2:40 PM
447	I would be for the reduction in hours...obviously. My initial concern is, what would qualify as an acceptable PDH? Looking through my classes/courses/webinars I am doing for the current criteria, I only see (1) hour that would qualify for ethics and nothing for NV laws & regulations. I am concerned about the availability and options for that criteria. Would these classes be provided through the Board? If yes, would they be posted online for us to view convenient with our work schedules (e.g. ASPE & ASHRAE webinars)?	2/10/2020 2:39 PM
448	Wisconsin does 30 hours with 2 hours focused on ethics	2/10/2020 2:37 PM
449	I believe if a professional buys into public protection they will by a normal course of their work remain current in their field. For professionals who do no buy into public protection any amount of CEUs will not help.	2/10/2020 2:36 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

450	Only concentrating on government regulations will not ensure the public safety. Engineers and Surveyors should be allowed to take course in the areas they feel necessary to strengthen their technical, business, and regulation understanding and knowledge. To require less Continuing Education will only reduce the quality of engineering in the State of Nevada and perhaps harm the public unintentionally.	2/10/2020 2:36 PM
451	The current proposal is a terrible idea. Only a seriously mentally unstable engineer, or drug addict, would want to lower the current professional development requirements.	2/10/2020 2:36 PM
452	Perhaps a combination of both, the proposed 3-hour requirement seems low.	2/10/2020 2:33 PM
453	I think it is good to have continual education whether it is required or not. It would be good for Nevada to have a course on state law, but the board may have to provide it. ASCE and NSPE already offer ethics courses.	2/10/2020 2:31 PM
454	Disciplinary cases tend to be related to ethical issues, not technical issues, so I wholeheartedly agree with making changes that reduce the current burdensome technical-related continuing education requirements in favor of a more reasonable amount of ethics-related continuing education.	2/10/2020 2:30 PM
455	If the goal of PDH requirement is to improve public protection, require that PDH apply directly to the improvement of public protection.	2/10/2020 2:30 PM
456	3 hours of ethics training every 2 years is not going to help maintain competency and protect the public. I think the technical is more important as a refresher than the ethics portion. If you are not ethical you are in the wrong profession.	2/10/2020 2:28 PM
457	Knowledge of ethics and laws is crucial, but professional development also includes the technical component. It should be all of the above.	2/10/2020 2:28 PM
458	MOST NEW LAWS GET OVERLOOKED BY CIVIL ENGINEERS. FOCUSING ON THAT AND PUBLIC SAFETY AND ETHICS WOULD IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF ENGINEERING DOCUMENTS PRODUCED.	2/10/2020 2:28 PM
459	Maybe young engineers, whose technical knowledge is current should have ethics training, but anyone who has practiced engineering for decades surely knows the ethics of the profession, but needs updating on the technical side.	2/10/2020 2:26 PM
460	For out-of-state PEs, knowing the differences for each State is more important	2/10/2020 2:25 PM
461	No.	2/10/2020 2:24 PM
462	I would put more emphasis on the items that directly impact a design and can periodically change specifically to the state. It should be the duty of the professional to maintain their own technical skills.	2/10/2020 2:21 PM
463	Civil Engineers are bound by various code of ethics based on their professional society memberships (e.g. ASCE, ITE). Being required to take training would be considered a waste of resources by many in the industry. There does not appear to be a run of unethical engineers practicing the State or the region. Are we in search of an answer to a problem we do not have? In addition, Nevada laws, similar to the states around it, deal more with contractual and indemnity language. A portion of engineering that is dealt with by higher level staff, many of them not engineers. Engineers deal with set standards and guidelines that drive their design/work. While the the laws and standards do go together within a project (i.e. you need a contract to do the work), the standards drive the engineering design/work, not necessarily the laws.	2/10/2020 2:18 PM
464	All Nevada PLSs should be technically proficient enough to perform their jobs for their bosses or clients. If one lacks the necessary expertise or knowledge of the latest in technical advances that apply to a specific task, one should know how to educate one's self or acquire the services of someone who does. In the medical profession, a general practitioner knows how and when to engage the services of a cardiologist for a heart patient. If a PLS needs an expert mapper, or construction	2/10/2020 2:18 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

surveyor, or someone who is an FAA certified drone pilot, they should know how to engage their services. Surveying has become much more diversified than it used to be. But it is still a profession that provides the traditional services we always have; yet it is growing and developing specialized niche markets. All of which require specialized knowledge to remain competitive. That knowledge is readily available for anyone who wishes to learn it. But the basics of being in this profession (relying on ethics and the law) are common to all. This is where we should be held to a minimum standard common of proficiency.

465	I don't see how implementing this help to protect the public.	2/10/2020 2:18 PM
466	Ethics hours should be a part of each renewal.	2/10/2020 2:17 PM
467	I have no issue with requiring 1 hour to focus on Nevada Laws and Regulation. However, for ethics you need to give consideration to equivalents. Ethical behavior is that same no matter what state you are working in. If I attend a 4 hour ACEC sponsored seminar on ethics in Colorado is that equivalent to 2 hours in Nevada? If the 2 hour requirement in Nevada is an on-line course, how is that better than an in-person attended seminar? I am registered in 15 states. If each state required a 2 hour on-line class, I would spend my entire 30 biennial PDH requirement taking ethics classes. The focus on ethics is good but having to take individual state classes on ethics is getting to be problematic.	2/10/2020 2:17 PM
468	no	2/10/2020 2:17 PM
469	I think it's important to 'nudge' engineers to keep learning and to not let themselves make excuses that they are too busy.	2/10/2020 2:14 PM
470	Seems very narrow. The current system allows a wide array of choices to learn or refresh about	2/10/2020 2:14 PM
471	Pursuing continuing education to maintain technical proficiency is just as important as ethics and NV laws.	2/10/2020 2:13 PM
472	None	2/10/2020 2:13 PM
473	Requiring some of the hours to focus on ethics and laws but also include staying abreast in ones field.	2/10/2020 2:12 PM
474	I think it will have little effect because so many of the disciplinary actions are against those who are not even licensed in Nevada.	2/10/2020 2:09 PM
475	Yes this is a good idea and long overdue.	2/10/2020 2:08 PM
476	This will result in focused attention on the regulatory measures, and changes to them, that effect our practice in Nevada.	2/10/2020 2:07 PM
477	It will simplify the renewal process	2/10/2020 2:05 PM
478	No	2/10/2020 2:05 PM
479	What is the purpose/intent in reducing the continuing education requirement? If ethics courses and a law and rules course is important to the board, they could be included in the continuing education requirement without removing the requirement for other learning. Or reduce the requirement if desired, but I don't think reducing learning about codes and your field should be reduced to zero. Will the law and rules course be available online? There are ethics courses available online - will that be an option for compliance?	2/10/2020 2:04 PM
480	keep the 30 and focus the requirement to 3 of the 30 for ethics	2/10/2020 2:03 PM
481	Continuing education isn't just about ethics, it's about learning the latest techniques and technologies for the ultimate benefit of society. Ethics is a critical component, but simply being ethical should not be the sole focus of an engineer or their governing body.	2/10/2020 2:03 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

482	I think the technical hours are important	2/10/2020 2:03 PM
483	We as Engineers are already forced to keep up to date with government regulation. The continual education is an opportunity to become better at what we do, not just keep doing the same thing over and over again.	2/10/2020 2:02 PM
484	Since the PDH courses I've been able to take advantage of don't deal with new technology or methods, I honestly see no benefit. So requiring only ethics or law courses would have the same effect as what we are currently doing.	2/10/2020 2:01 PM
485	C.E. does not provide any additional protections to any sector.	2/10/2020 1:59 PM
486	Many of the engineers I have observed do not have current codes nor are they familiar with current code requirements	2/10/2020 1:59 PM
487	Would rather see the emphasis on the individual choosing between technical, ethical, and/or legal topics.	2/10/2020 1:58 PM
488	Already have professional ethics classes provided as annual conference.	2/10/2020 1:58 PM
489	Currently there is no requirement for the Nevada laws. I think the board should provide 1 to 2 hours annually that cover the Nevada laws and regulations and can emphasize observed shortcomings.	2/10/2020 1:52 PM
490	I agree that Ethics should be part of the requirement, along with knowledge of NV Laws. However, reducing down to only three (3) hours is insufficient to cover our constantly evolving profession.	2/10/2020 1:51 PM
491	Professional ethics should be examined at the first registration application. Nevada laws and regulations may be updated through the news letters and/or other means.	2/10/2020 1:51 PM
492	While ethics and laws are important, they are only two of the many aspects of engineering practice in which engineers must have proficiency to ensure protection of the public.	2/10/2020 1:51 PM
493	Everyone already has the law	2/10/2020 1:50 PM
494	Most of my practice is in other countries and I don't do business in Nevada any more. It would be difficult to do Nevada law. Keep it the way it is for people who are out of Nevada	2/10/2020 1:47 PM
495	N/A	2/10/2020 1:44 PM
496	All registered technical professionals must be aware of current and future technologies and industry trends. While a very important component of continuing education, concentrating CE requirements solely on state laws and ethics prevents good 'sword sharpening' of the industry, so to speak.	2/10/2020 1:44 PM
497	N/A	2/10/2020 1:43 PM
498	No	2/10/2020 1:42 PM
499	It is important for engineers to remain current by engaging in continuing professional development	2/10/2020 1:42 PM
500	I think that it may improve public protection, but I think that PDHs involving things other than ethics and NRS/NAC are also very important. How widely available are classes going to be concerning engineering ethics and NRS/NAC? How much are they going to cost? Are they going to be the same class every 2 years? Or are they going to be dynamic?	2/10/2020 1:38 PM
501	I believe the PDH educate engineers in the use of products and construction methods as the industry changes. Without these classes, you run the risk of not understanding new products and technologies, or obtaining first hand experience from the Engineers and vendors who use them on a regular basis. You'd take away some of the ability to discuss among our	2/10/2020 1:37 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

peers. This lack of communication and education could result in a lack of understanding and increase in risk associated with public safety.

502	Ethics and rules are important but not everything or even the majority of what PE's are responsible for. Public health, safety, and welfare is paramount no matter what state the work is in. Not just ethics and rules.	2/10/2020 1:36 PM
503	I think you need to remain up to date on practice areas - it's good for the state of the practice	2/10/2020 1:35 PM
504	The ethics hours can be really useful, or really useless, depending on how the course material is put together.	2/10/2020 1:33 PM
505	Continuing education must include technical and engineering subjects.	2/10/2020 1:33 PM
506	See No. 5 above - Eliminating technical courses will generally have no impact on public protection. By concentrating on CEUs for Ethics, public protection will either be maintained or will improve.	2/10/2020 1:32 PM
507	I believe that requiring ongoing education on technical topics, rather than just ethics and laws, is intended to ensure that engineers maintain an understanding of knowledge base and code changes in the industry. This impacts public protection, especially regarding seismic design.	2/10/2020 1:32 PM
508	Ethics in all engineering practices and political positions is now more important than ever	2/10/2020 1:31 PM
509	It will provide awareness on Ethics and laws	2/10/2020 1:31 PM
510	Licensed professional engineers generally belong to the class of engineers willing to take responsibility. They do their homework to protect their own professional career and assets. They do not need a reminder for there is so much for them to lose if they fail to protect the public.	2/10/2020 1:30 PM
511	I would recommend a combination of reducing the overall number of hours in combination with the ethics and Nevada law requirements. The ethics and Nevada law requirements would need to be made available for people who are not currently residing in Nevada.	2/10/2020 1:30 PM
512	Ethics is critical to an engineer using good judgment. This should always be a priority and I would most definitely support.	2/10/2020 1:29 PM
513	none	2/10/2020 1:29 PM
514	No additional comments on this topic.	2/10/2020 1:28 PM
515	I would not encourage seeking new information	2/10/2020 1:28 PM
516	It is my opinion that keeping requirements focused in the area of practice are quite beneficial, as per the original NV CEU intent, and done in other states.	2/10/2020 1:27 PM
517	Ethics specific to Nevada unnecessary.	2/10/2020 1:26 PM
518	I feel the engineer needs to keep up on what the laws are for the state, engineers should be keeping up in their knowledge for career advancement or understand the lack knowledge before using their stamp.	2/10/2020 1:25 PM
519	I think letting the PE determine the most applicable type of PDH's is the best option.	2/10/2020 1:25 PM
520	No comment	2/10/2020 1:24 PM
521	Detailed review of Nevada laws does not need to be part of the ethics pdh requirements.	2/10/2020 1:23 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

522	Continuing education is believed to keep one current with industry best practices and new technologies. Requiring ethics and Nevada law knowledge should be part of the total 30 hours, but more than those things are needed to stay relevant in the industry.	2/10/2020 1:23 PM
523	It should improve the public protection aspect. However, it appears the proposal will eliminate the continuing education requirement for licensees to keep current with the latest developments and technology in the profession. Isn't it still appropriate for engineers to participate in continuing education to ensure they maintain, improve, or expand their knowledge? Doesn't the public also benefit from engineers staying current with new technologies and product improvements? Maybe the proposal could be revised to include both requirements; staying current with latest developments and public protection.	2/10/2020 1:21 PM
524	most engineers should have had some type of ethics education when they first got licensed and the laws and rules continuing education tests usually ask unimportant questions, e.g. "how many members make up the board of professional engineers"	2/10/2020 1:20 PM
525	people are going to justify what they are doing. it may help if the specific issue is covered.	2/10/2020 1:19 PM
526	Protecting the public requires continuing education on technical issues in addition to ethics.	2/10/2020 1:18 PM
527	While ethics and knowledge about Nevada laws and regulations are important, they don't make engineering safer for the public. What helps make engineering safer is for engineers to stay up to date on new products and technologies that improve the safety of construction. While some engineers will stay up to date on their own, I feel that removing the requirement for continuing education (aside from ethics and Nevada laws) will result in many engineers not staying up to date on new developments in their industry.	2/10/2020 1:18 PM
528	Laws of Nevada don't play into a lot of what I deal with in holding my PE.	2/10/2020 1:18 PM
529	Focusing on professional ethics and the laws and regulations will keep public protection in the forefront of engineer's minds versus just trying to acquire technical competency hours.	2/10/2020 1:18 PM
530	None	2/10/2020 1:17 PM
531	When I took my PE Exam, I saw some metrics on it. At the time they still had an ethics portion on the exam, and I saw that the average test taker got 0 of 2 right for ethics.	2/10/2020 1:16 PM
532	no	2/10/2020 1:16 PM
533	See above comment.	2/10/2020 1:16 PM
534	I would make it an even two hours for each changing the total requirement from 30 to 20 hours, two of which include ethics and two of which include NV law	2/10/2020 1:15 PM
535	IF.....it is in addition to or added as a required part of the current 30 hours.	2/10/2020 1:15 PM
536	Are there documented courses on Nevada State Law that can be offered to the professionals?	2/10/2020 1:14 PM
537	I think that focusing on state specific laws and regulations will improve the surveyors knowledge and applications of the laws in place.	2/10/2020 1:14 PM
538	i would be in favor of this as some many people have a lack of ethics, professional or not. As long as the classes are relevant. I have done professional ethics CEU's and quite frankly, did not come away with anything I didn;t already know.	2/10/2020 1:12 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

539	NV-focus will hurt public protection. As someone who is licensed in multiple states, state-specific requirements only lead to professionals doing the minimum just to pass the requirements -- and then will confirm the appropriate regulations when working on projects in that state anyway. Requiring individuals to "study" state-specific requirements for what amount to open-book tests only confirm that the user can find the regulations when they need them -- and I'm sure leads to decrease renewals among individuals who might do infrequent work in that state.	2/10/2020 1:12 PM
540	Professional ethics is important and I think it's good to include it, especially considering the fact that many of the younger engineers have had very little contact with actual ethics as it relates to business and our profession. Any ethics classes they may have had contact with probably was much more weighted on social justice and whether they were nice to transgender people. Nothing wrong with that, just not particularly useful in our day to day activities.	2/10/2020 1:11 PM
541	Ethics is an important core trait to the engineering profession, but should be from a general point of view with regard to CE. As industry changes and the body of knowledge grows there is a need to ensure this information is passed on the practicing engineers.	2/10/2020 1:11 PM
542	I believe a focus on law and ethic s is important, but engineers must remain fresh on technology, new innovations	2/10/2020 1:09 PM
543	In my experience ethics are more often the issue rather than technical competence	2/10/2020 1:08 PM
544	I believe any concentrated training specific to Nevada's laws can only be advantageous. I'm a little less sanguine about professional ethics. You're either ethical or you're not. An hour a year of training won't change that.	2/10/2020 1:08 PM
545	No	2/10/2020 1:08 PM
546	None	2/10/2020 1:05 PM
547	Focus should remain on technical competency.	2/10/2020 1:03 PM
548	Ethics is only one aspect of what is required for an engineer to protect the public. Technical competency is also vital.	2/10/2020 1:03 PM
549	I don't see how this change would better protect the public.	2/10/2020 1:00 PM
550	There should still be some requirement for technical in addition to the 3 hours proposed.	2/10/2020 1:00 PM
551	No comment	2/10/2020 1:00 PM
552	Adding three hours for professional ethics and knowledge are fine, but in place of PDH I am definitely, NOT IN FAVOR.	2/10/2020 12:59 PM
553	I fully support this proposal. Fewer hours and more directed towards knowledge of the requirements. This will increase safety.	2/10/2020 12:59 PM
554	I believe this is an area that we would not study during our daily work but is an important area that could keep us informed to protect the engineer and the public. I suggest providing free on line material targeted in these subjects to allow engineers to access the specific material and meet the requirements.	2/10/2020 12:59 PM
555	I cannot quantify if there would be an improvement on public protection with the proposed changes. If there is a need for additional focus on ethics and Nevada laws, I would suggest retaking the NRS and NAC test from the original licensure process, or have the Board provide an online web-based course.	2/10/2020 12:57 PM
556	I think the professional ethics is reasonable, but also think that the continuing education track is worthwhile.	2/10/2020 12:57 PM
557	Too many of the design professionals in Nevada have no idea of ethics or the law is simply ignored. If a person breaks the	2/10/2020 12:56 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

law every day and isn't punished, will they suddenly decide to not follow the law? Extremely doubtful. Especially given the belief that following the law will require more work and less profit. There needs to be more active enforcement and review of the "professional" work of design professionals. Nearly every public authority performs "design by review" by correcting the mistakes of a design during review. So a design professional can knowingly submit an incorrect design and feel confident that the public authority will dot the i's and cross the t's to make a design correct.

558	Part of the continuing education should incorporate learning about advancements and new best practices. Modifying the development hours to just ethics and laws or regulations would stop promotion of innovation and improvements in practices.	2/10/2020 12:55 PM
559	Texas board does a free on line 1hr ethics webinar a couple of times a year. This makes it easy and I hope NV can do the same.	2/10/2020 12:54 PM
560	There are continual changes to the building code that SE's need to continue to stay aware of. Just focusing on ethics and laws/regulations doesn't consider that.	2/10/2020 12:53 PM
561	At some level, all continuing education is only as valuable as the recipient makes it. PEs are supposed to already know the relevant legal, ethical and technical principles - before earning another PDH in any of these areas.	2/10/2020 12:51 PM
562	It is good to stay current on state and federal laws as they relate to professional practice. Ethics are just a refresher; the majority of professionals have a high ethical standard.	2/10/2020 12:51 PM
563	professional ethics hours should also be counted as part of the 30 hours	2/10/2020 12:50 PM
564	I am registered in 30 states. I do not see value in requiring ethics classes or laws & rules classes	2/10/2020 12:48 PM
565	How about being honest and avoiding conflicts of interest? Why should an honest person avoiding conflicts of interest need a class on ethics? The law review is OK, but make it where rural dwellers don't spend a fortune in time, etc. getting the training.	2/10/2020 12:47 PM
566	Engineers need to focus on the actual design-build-inspect concept. Emphasis on keeping up with rules, regulations and ethics is important, but not at the time expense of actual engineering work.	2/10/2020 12:47 PM
567	No further comment	2/10/2020 12:47 PM
568	No	2/10/2020 12:44 PM
569	Unless there is a change to the statutes I don't think that it will improve public impacts.	2/10/2020 12:44 PM
570	I believe an ethical engineer would get any CEU they needed to do a project that had material they might not be totally up to speed on. Also it seems more common where engineers are presented with requests that are less ethical, and I don't even know if the clients do it on purpose.	2/10/2020 12:44 PM
571	I am in favor of the revision/reduction	2/10/2020 12:43 PM
572	Ethics is important to be sure. My past Canadian license had very strict ethics requirements that were helpful at time of licensing but the current need to focus on ethics for some of this is not helpful. Some need help technically or in terms of general ethics not so specific to Nevada. I think overall this reduces the intent of continuing education and reduces safety.	2/10/2020 12:43 PM
573	Offer open forum lectures at universities to better understand ethical issues within our industry	2/10/2020 12:42 PM
574	I think generally those who have public protection in mind will do so. Knowledge of ethics and laws would help reinforce those people's efforts and educate about some of the finer, lesser known laws and regulations. If other states don't make the	2/10/2020 12:41 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

same change, it could negatively impact license reciprocity in other states.

575	Continuing education needs to be on both professional ethics and technical areas (keep current in design code updates, etc)	2/10/2020 12:41 PM
576	I'm not sure how big of an ethics problem there is in Nevada, so I can't speak to that. I doubt that Nevada has any laws related to Structural Engineering that protect the public beyond the IBC's requirements. If the IBC 2018 was adopted statewide, without amendments, and if permit officials reviewed submittals to confirm conformance of designs with IBC 2018, I think the public would be plenty safe with just that. Also, a bad engineer who is ethical and knows the laws well is still a bad engineer if he can't design properly.	2/10/2020 12:41 PM
577	no	2/10/2020 12:40 PM
578	Codes change continuously 30 hours is not enough to even keep up in all areas of practice. Ethics should just be a common sense practice maybe require it as another 1 hour of the 30 required every fifth year.	2/10/2020 12:40 PM
579	This would be detrimental to the skills of individual professional engineers. Ethics training is good but we can read the laws ourselves.	2/10/2020 12:39 PM
580	great idea folks. the technical comes automatically for many of us as we remain committed to meeting code etc. so in my opinion a change is needed	2/10/2020 12:39 PM
581	I don't not believe that ethics are required to be state specific. In general, ethical practice is the same regardless of state.	2/10/2020 12:39 PM
582	Continuing to a be a practicing PE provides opportunities to further our knowledge. Limiting to Ethics and the NV laws and regulations could have an impact on learning topics outside our particular focus, but would not negatively impact each PE's role on public protection.	2/10/2020 12:39 PM
583	I think it is good to continually review ethics and Nevada laws and regulations, but I also think it is good to be a lifetime technical learner as well	2/10/2020 12:38 PM
584	It is a good thing to keep up on the Licensing Laws and also on ethics issues.	2/10/2020 12:38 PM
585	No	2/10/2020 12:37 PM
586	There aren't that many useful courses available to be effective and most practicing surveyors have a pretty good idea of what they need to know already.	2/10/2020 12:37 PM
587	I would also suggest courses on how to enter into business agreements in such a way as to avoid misunderstandings and disagreements about fees and scope of work.	2/10/2020 12:36 PM
588	we need engineers to focus on the ethics and relearn them sometimes, but not take away form the technical requirements. we still need those in place as well.	2/10/2020 12:36 PM
589	I think this is a very good idea.	2/10/2020 12:36 PM
590	I am not sure how much ANY continuing education protects the public. There are too many courses available that do not improve my personal ability to be a better engineer, but the meet the requirements.	2/10/2020 12:35 PM
591	Professional engineers are generally competent and effective at keeping abreast of laws and regulations related to their work. I have had to deal with unethical behaviour on projects in the past (30+ years); however, I have never encountered a professional engineer who exhibited unethical behaviour.	2/10/2020 12:35 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

592	This would definitely be an improvement as the 30 pdh requirement is more of a nuance than for benefitting the public. California doesn't have requirements for pdhs and they seem to be doing fine with that.	2/10/2020 12:34 PM
593	This is a great idea. I feel that it will allow the engineer to study and improve their skills in a way that will be more efficient.	2/10/2020 12:34 PM
594	Technology is changing very rapidly, all engineers need to keep up with the current state of the art. Decreasing the requirements will not do that.	2/10/2020 12:33 PM
595	no	2/10/2020 12:32 PM
596	With a smaller, tighter requirement, you can focus on having more engaging class content within that requirement to give deeper learning.	2/10/2020 12:29 PM
597	See previous comment.	2/10/2020 12:29 PM
598	See comment above. Three hours of continuing ed focusing on ethics and NV law does not seem adequate. Public safety would be enhanced were engineers tasked to complete fewer CE hours, but with a focus on technical aspects and technical improvements within their specific field of expertise.	2/10/2020 12:29 PM
599	Ethics is essential, but we still need the technical education to ensure the complete protection of the public.	2/10/2020 12:29 PM
600	No	2/10/2020 12:27 PM
601	We must have continuing education to their discipline. Like electrical and computer engineers.	2/10/2020 12:27 PM
602	I honestly think reducing CE to 3 hours will have negative impact. Very unusual direction compared to other states PE requirements. You must be having ethics problems? You have PE's who are not taking the time to read/ ask and understand the regulations? How about hold a class (ethics / regs focus) and require your PE's to attend, either on site or web in a renewal period. I don't see where dramatically reducing the CE hours is going to do anything but decrease the level of professionalism, particularly in NV.	2/10/2020 12:26 PM
603	Nevada laws and regulations might help a little although if you know what you are doing from a technical standpoint that would be more important. Most of the ethics classes are bordering useless and you are just checking a box or making someone money.	2/10/2020 12:26 PM
604	The ethics and state law requirements do nothing to promote competence within our industry. I can take the same ethics course every two years. The examples and course changes but it's really the same old thing.	2/10/2020 12:23 PM
605	Ethics and NV regulations are important, but need some on-going technical education as well. Some states require 1 hour of Ethics so compatibility with this is good. I recommend 1 hour Ethics, 1 hour NV regulations, and a small amount of technical education such as 3 hours for instance. This would be in a biennial period.	2/10/2020 12:23 PM
606	I like that surveyors are compelled to attend education workshops that expand our professional knowledge and wherewithal.	2/10/2020 12:23 PM
607	Ethics are important but technical knowledge growth is also important.	2/10/2020 12:22 PM
608	None	2/10/2020 12:22 PM
609	Education in ethics would be a convicting reminder to the ones practicing to be experienced in what they are designing. The hope is that engineers would never practice outside their area of expertise. It will also give engineers more time to focus on their job and the projects they are involved with.	2/10/2020 12:21 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

610	In my experience, most problems occur in the areas of ethics and Nevada Law.	2/10/2020 12:19 PM
611	Focusing specifically on one topic versus the broader application of engineering within one's field will limit an engineer's ability to gain access to continuing education. Many engineers rely on the requirement of continuing education for licensing to ensure that time and funds are granted to accomplish those hours within the framework of their job. A mix of the traditional continuing education - say 15 hours every 2 years - plus and ethics or Nevada laws and regulations questionnaire or quiz might be a better balance.	2/10/2020 12:19 PM
612	I don't think it could hurt. The last large project I did in Nevada, however, convinced me your excellent plan to have a 'professional' in charge of every project is as easily circumvented as all others. An unlicensed 'civil' engineer called all the shots during design & construction, overruled my decisions, and generally made the project unmanageable, aided by the client (RTC Transportation) Engineer.	2/10/2020 12:18 PM
613	Reminders of the law are always helpful especially due to the fact that the laws change periodically.	2/10/2020 12:18 PM
614	Shifting the continuing education requirement to emphasize professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulations would be useful for the first exposure to such a curriculum, but after too much repetition, the participants will find it redundant and of limited value. Just reading the periodic issues of the Nevada Register would give you pretty much the same benefit.	2/10/2020 12:18 PM
615	Lessening the CEU burden will encourage more engineers to get PE's--Good for public protection.	2/10/2020 12:17 PM
616	No	2/10/2020 12:17 PM
617	There is more to the profession than ethics and NV state laws. Three hours is not enough.	2/10/2020 12:16 PM
618	While requiring some portion on ethics/laws would be beneficial, most continuing education should be primarily technical relating to one's area of expertise.	2/10/2020 12:16 PM
619	See my response to #5 above.	2/10/2020 12:16 PM
620	n/a	2/10/2020 12:15 PM
621	For multi state licensees state specific Laws and Rules will mean taking the course for each specific state (can be as high as 50) and yet it will not allow for any professional development related to technical expertise. I think there should be Ethics and/or Laws and Rules, but not state specific, and additional technical pdh related to the profession. Another issue with state specific Law and Rules requirement is that after a couple of years of learning there is very little opportunity for learning anything new and we end up repeating the same again and again after each year.	2/10/2020 12:14 PM
622	Reducing to just three hours will reduce the overall effectiveness of the PDH intent. Do not weaken the existing program by reducing hours. It would be better to make it mandatory that at least 3 of the current 30 hour requirement addresses ethics, laws and regulations.	2/10/2020 12:13 PM
623	No	2/10/2020 12:12 PM
624	If you run an unethical practice a continuing educational course will not change your practice until someone complains	2/10/2020 12:12 PM
625	No	2/10/2020 12:12 PM
626	Having a few hours focus on professional ethics and laws/regulations is fine but I think that the total hours should remain at 30. Given the diverse roles that engineers play in today's society, the relevant topic areas should be construed broadly to include, in addition to traditional technical topics, such things as economics, public policy, demographics, etc.	2/10/2020 12:12 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

627	I believe current CEU and adding ethics and NV laws will enhance safety.	2/10/2020 12:12 PM
628	engineers should be conscientious in decision making anyway, only taking ethics and rules may help in decision making but won't necessarily help with new knowledge and ideas	2/10/2020 12:11 PM
629	If we focus people on their ethics...the rest SHOULD take care of itself...if the engineer is truly honest and truly an engineer who cares of safety.	2/10/2020 12:11 PM
630	No	2/10/2020 12:10 PM
631	Ethics and meeting regulations are at the heart of engineering. Latest technology innovations not as applicable as approved BAT.	2/10/2020 12:09 PM
632	Sometimes it is nice to reiterate the importance of ethics.	2/10/2020 12:09 PM
633	I think it is more important that licensees are maintaining their knowledge of state statues and requirements in the state(s) they are licensed in. These things can change over time. An individuals knowledge of restrictions and ethical considerations should guide them as well as any measure to ensure that they maintain their professional acuity and only practice within the bounds of their specialization.	2/10/2020 12:09 PM
634	The current amount of pdh hours is quite a lot and doesnt seem to be contributing to public protection as intended.	2/10/2020 12:08 PM
635	I feel like a small quiz or something similar to the test that had to be taken during the initial licensing process every two years would likely be as if not more effective. Or basically you take a small legal and ethics exam in which the board has determined to be most relevant information in order to renew your license. I do feel however that reducing or removing the 30 educational credits has some merit. I've witness professionals falling asleep in large expensive seminars. Maybe the best way to keep people up to date with state ethics and legalities is to just give it to them. Let them read and process it to ask any questions and then give them a short quiz to take like in order to renew or something.	2/10/2020 12:08 PM
636	No	2/10/2020 12:07 PM
637	Need to have online or distance learning opportunities for non-NV residents.	2/10/2020 12:07 PM
638	An ethics hour every year is a nice idea. Board rules are worthy of review. Ethics and board rules are worthy topics. In my opinion, the engineering PE renewal should go further to enhance engineering design skill sets.	2/10/2020 12:07 PM
639	Required study for the areas that will mostly impact the public. the other education requirements may make you a better surveyor, but I feel it dose little to protect the public.	2/10/2020 12:07 PM
640	Ethics focused would definitely protect the public.	2/10/2020 12:05 PM
641	Most ethic courses offered in many state conferences are basic ethic related issues involving one's perspective of how one's ethics are involved in his/hers practice. It is one meeting basic ethical issues when involving working with the public and how one protects the interests of clients while meeting the requirements of the states standards. As to NV rules and regulations, as in NM, the question is asked if one has read the rules and regulations of the states requirements, this usually suffices the question of acknowledging the rules and regulations.	2/10/2020 12:05 PM
642	More in-line with why you would license individuals...	2/10/2020 12:04 PM
643	Of the professional development that I have taken, ones on ethics/laws are the most useful with regards to the intent of protecting the public and for that matter engineers also. I have PE licenses in many states and several have ethical and/or	2/10/2020 12:04 PM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

law continuing education requirements. In my opinion these and a smaller amount of technical requirements that truly link to a licensee's current employment would be ideal although that link would be hard to define. Reducing the requirements and specifying ethics and legal is a good direction to go in my opinion.

644	Rather than reducing 30 hours to 3, I suggest maintaining the 30 hour requirement, but modifying it to state that at least 3 of the 30 hours be in laws, regulations and ethics.	2/10/2020 12:04 PM
645	No	2/10/2020 12:03 PM
646	As engineers we are obligated to put the public first - making a reminder course of that shouldn't change our most fundamental duty. I think over time this change may defer or decrease the speed of adapting newer technologies that could have been utilized in future design and keeping Nevada as a state of the art state.	2/10/2020 12:02 PM
647	The continuing education requirement increases the Professionals awareness of changes in codes and technical changes and the importance of keeping up on the evolving practice.	2/10/2020 12:01 PM
648	See previous comment.	2/10/2020 12:01 PM
649	see comment 5	2/10/2020 12:01 PM
650	None	2/10/2020 12:01 PM
651	I think that requiring a portion of the 15 hours to be dedicated to Nevada specific topics would be advisable. I am registered in 28 states. Several of the states , like Florida, already test for state specific topics	2/10/2020 12:00 PM
652	It gets the training to be more focused.	2/10/2020 12:00 PM
653	I and the structural engineers that I know, generally take the concern of protecting the public very seriously. I/we usually focus the continuing education seminars and courses that we take towards the area of engineering that we focus on in our work. Ethics courses although beneficial are not the only important concern that we have when it comes to public safety.	2/10/2020 12:00 PM
654	As mentioned in my previous comments, I believe the ability to do "right" or "wrong" is more of an ethical dilemma related to each Professional, and not an educational issue that is solved by PDH courses. It seems to me there are Professionals that need to be reminded of ethics, conduct and ability to operate within their specific area of expertise, and this typically requires individual discipline that cannot be gained from short courses. Perhaps being reminded of the rules and regulations, and the BOE discipline that may occur would be a better help.	2/10/2020 12:00 PM
655	Professional ethicc and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulation is help the professional to be alert of new legal requirements. It will enhance the alertness of business practices.	2/10/2020 12:00 PM
656	Please reduce the 30 hr requirement.	2/10/2020 12:00 PM
657	Having to review ethics and state laws will be for the common good of public safety.	2/10/2020 11:59 AM
658	I find that registrants do not know what there responsibilities are with respect to standard of care and ethics. A regular reminder would improve the public safety.	2/10/2020 11:58 AM
659	Agree	2/10/2020 11:58 AM
660	It would need to be reciprocal with other states to meet their requirements	2/10/2020 11:57 AM
661	Those that are ignoring the rules are going to continue to ignore the rules! You "can't fix stupid."	2/10/2020 11:57 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

662	Those who violate ethics won't care about ethics courses. What, exactly, is the Board trying to protect the public from? Bad engineering (that leads to accidents and deaths) ins't helped by ethics courses.	2/10/2020 11:57 AM
663	Some hours on changes in code in our area of expertise should be required.	2/10/2020 11:56 AM
664	None	2/10/2020 11:56 AM
665	I feel strongly that an engineer in responsible charge learns and grows as an engineer every week as far as technical skills. However, many engineers I work with and mentor could use more knowledge on Nevada and local laws and ordinances. I do feel that the vast majority of Nevada engineers are very ethical but it's easy to sometimes get caught up in the moment on a big and important project and lose recognition of professional ethics so ongoing education to keep ethics in the back of your mind is a good thing.	2/10/2020 11:56 AM
666	Being in California, I am not a fan of this as I am not sure how I would find classes related to Nevada law here in California to attend.	2/10/2020 11:55 AM
667	I'd be willing to partipate but I anticipate it will be difficult to find qualifying PDHs specific to ethics and Nevada Law. If the	2/10/2020 11:54 AM
668	Changes in law and regulations will be sent out to the publics and practicing engineers are typically following them anyway.	2/10/2020 11:54 AM
669	I think it will help professionals understand NRS and NAC, and thus directly understand how to keep themselves in compliance. This could indirectly help the Professional to pay more attention to his or her practice, and the service he or she is providing; which results in a positive impact to public protection.	2/10/2020 11:54 AM
670	Maybe 2 or 3 hours on ethics and Nevada laws, but not 30.	2/10/2020 11:53 AM
671	Many states have similar legislative rules and regulations for practicing engineers. We are registered in multiple western states, so we are familiar with the intent of the legislative rules. It is my opinion that the technical should be sharpest when considering life/safety for the public.	2/10/2020 11:53 AM
672	It is important to include ethics as a required part of the CE requirements. More quality ethics educations leads to a more equal understanding of the issues in the industry and provides better protection for the public, clients, contractors, consultants, companies & individuals. Engineering is an honorable professions that needs to be upheld as such.	2/10/2020 11:53 AM
673	Reputation of competency and actions demonstrate needs.	2/10/2020 11:52 AM
674	I think your new program will make people understand the law.	2/10/2020 11:52 AM
675	Ethics are important and should be required within the 30 hours.	2/10/2020 11:52 AM
676	30 hours is excessive.	2/10/2020 11:52 AM
677	Professional ethics should be part of the current requirement NOT REPLACING the current requirement.	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
678	I feel that requiring a portion of the 30 PDH's be dedicated to keeping the licensee current on regulations to be a fabulous idea. The Nevada State Engineer's Office requires as part of the Well Driller Licensing program that in order to renew the annual license, that every to years the Well Driller is required to attend a 4-hour refresher course in order to be current on Nevada Well Drilling Regulations, (NAC Chapter 534.)	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
679	none	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
680	Lowering the hours and having the requirements be more content focused is a good start. But I'm not sure that leaving out	2/10/2020 11:51 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

technical requirements entirely is going to have a positive impact. CA has no PDH requirements, while states like FL are very stringent. I think there's a middle road between the two that makes more sense. It's worth considering maybe 10 hours per biennial period with 2 hours being laws and ethics.

681	That also forces review of commitment to protecting the public. However there are still idiots out there that will break the rules	2/10/2020 11:50 AM
682	No	2/10/2020 11:50 AM
683	I think if you change to this you should abolish ceu's altogether	2/10/2020 11:50 AM
684	If you're a licensed professional engineer and you need an ethics class to tell you what is and isn't in the public interest, they should probably take your license. I think it's a good idea to require an ethics class with every renewal period, but I think reducing the total hours to three is borderline dangerous. I think general education is far more relevant to public safety than an ethics class: codes change, technology changes, standards get overturned, what was right yesterday can be wrong today... but ethics are mostly baked into the core of your being. I doubt many nefarious folks are going to be deterred by the taking of an ethics course and I seriously doubt many well intended engineers are on the verge of harming the public because they were in need of an ethics class. Require the ethics course every two years. Drop the requirement to 20 hours every two years... that should put you in the middle of what most other states do.	2/10/2020 11:49 AM
685	The focus of required professional development hours on ethics and regulation will certainly target and improve public safety and protection as required of licensees. Continuing education as intended to make sure licensees are keeping abreast of latest developments and technology in their field , and expanding their knowledge within their discipline is inherent to the requirements of their day-to-day jobs and does not directly impact public protection as much as individuals' skills improvement.	2/10/2020 11:49 AM
686	This allows the information to be focused on the specific requirements of the state and the intent of the regulations of the board.	2/10/2020 11:49 AM
687	Ethics requirements are fine, but knowing the laws and regulations doesn't help be an engineer that is up to speed with the constantly changing technical aspects of the industry.	2/10/2020 11:48 AM
688	Are you really want to reduce the requirement down to only 3 hours? I don' t like that although 30 hours is too much. What about testing the licensee every 2 years with a take home test on current laws? This will force us to keep us with current laws. It will "guide" those currently licensed to read the latest laws, and send in the test. This will likely accomplish the same thing as requiring 3 hours of CE. You could keep the CE by reducing that to 8 hours, and the take home test requirement. This way it's not JUST a take home test, but there is some requirement for continuing education beyond the test. The passing grade should have a cutoff of 90%.	2/10/2020 11:48 AM
689	no	2/10/2020 11:47 AM
690	Ethics and Nevada laws are regulation are important, however, I view public protection in a technical sense vis-a-vie good engineering versus legal protections.	2/10/2020 11:47 AM
691	Laws do change. Keeping up with these changes is very necessary.	2/10/2020 11:47 AM
692	none	2/10/2020 11:45 AM
693	change would be too radical. Reducing PDH to 10 or 12 maybe, tub allowing engineer to practice for 25 to 30 years without any updates is too risky.	2/10/2020 11:45 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

694	For those in the surveying and civil industries, I believe the change would be a good change, however for those in other industries not directly related to the public, it may be more cumbersome. updating an engineers knowledge of ethics and Nevada law is something that would be good for all.	2/10/2020 11:44 AM
695	Ethics is an essential requirement. Getting course time is not an issue. I would have some concern as to how the knowledge of Nevada Laws would be administered for a non-resident that only has sporadic work in the state. I see no issue with having but how it would be implemented does cause a bit of concern.	2/10/2020 11:44 AM
696	30 hours to 3 hours is too large of a reduction	2/10/2020 11:44 AM
697	Any reduction in the technical requirements of the continuing education is a disservice to the profession. The ethics / laws & rules are important and should be included in the CE, but we all work in professions that change rapidly, so the technical requirements must remain.	2/10/2020 11:44 AM
698	That sounds like an idea coming from lawyers. Engineers absolutely need to stay abreast of technical issues as much as they need to know laws and ethics. Can't have one without the other and still be competent.	2/10/2020 11:43 AM
699	no	2/10/2020 11:41 AM
700	Issue engineering bulletins for new Nevada ethic or state engineering requirements. If legislation completely changes, then hold a required class to learn about the new requirements.	2/10/2020 11:41 AM
701	Only focusing on ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulation, while very important, will not fully encompass the fast paced and continuing changes occurring in our profession.	2/10/2020 11:41 AM
702	No. See Item No. 5.	2/10/2020 11:40 AM
703	Staying current on engineering practice is the intent of the continuing education requirement.	2/10/2020 11:40 AM
704	Continuing education should focus on technical skill building mostly.	2/10/2020 11:40 AM
705	While the focused training will reinforce the professional ethics and highlight any changes in the regulations, PEs should already be very respectful of both the law and professional ethics.	2/10/2020 11:40 AM
706	Staying professionally competent is accomplished by existing CE requirements as well as public protection.	2/10/2020 11:40 AM
707	My only concern would be making these professional ethics and Nevada law and regulation courses available on line for those that would not be able to attend in person due to being from other states. Might make it harder for those that have their Nevada license as primary to get comity in other states where required to have 30 hours.	2/10/2020 11:39 AM
708	With the various changes to codes and recommended practices, I believe it is necessary to remain relevant and professional education provides a reasonable means of responsibility. In my opinion, an engineer designing in the public domain, cannot remain relevant without continuing professional education.	2/10/2020 11:39 AM
709	If the intent of the law is for public safety, all hours should be required to be on public safety.	2/10/2020 11:39 AM
710	It will reduce the pressure to merely throw time and money at just any general PDH to meet the requirement of 30, and instead foster a measured approach to keeping abreast of things that truly affect our profession.	2/10/2020 11:39 AM
711	I will allow my Nevada license to lapse if this becomes a requirement since it doesn't have relate to the work I perform.	2/10/2020 11:38 AM
712	Technical competence is a given in engineering practice. We must learn all the time to compete. Where we struggle is	2/10/2020 11:38 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

keeping up with state requirements and changes to law.

713	I think an ethics course would be beneficial as well as reviewing applicable laws.	2/10/2020 11:38 AM
714	If the board could/would direct, recommend or require licensees to obtain quality PDH hours that are related to their area(s) of expertise which included case studies about how the professional put other needs before public protection then the intent of the PDH's obtained would/could be meaningful.	2/10/2020 11:38 AM
715	Thanks for allowing me to provide feedback.	2/10/2020 11:38 AM
716	It does not hurt to be aware of the laws but if a person is going to do something dishonest, he has already decided to ignore the law.	2/10/2020 11:37 AM
717	This is a completely different focus. I would not object if 3 of the 30 hours were required to be ethics and rules	2/10/2020 11:37 AM
718	that change may not adequately address changes in materials, technology, design methodology, construction methodology, and federal regulations.	2/10/2020 11:37 AM
719	I believe it would focus the hours on the topics of interest. Currently engineers are taking an course that will count towards hours regardless of if it truly increases ones knowledge of current laws or ethics.	2/10/2020 11:37 AM
720	No.	2/10/2020 11:37 AM
721	PDH should stress Code awareness. The main purpose of the Codes is for protection of the public.	2/10/2020 11:35 AM
722	Require ethics/regs as part of the 30	2/10/2020 11:34 AM
723	N/A	2/10/2020 11:33 AM
724	These are subjects that will help the Pu Liv and the practice	2/10/2020 11:33 AM
725	Most engineers are quite ethical. The major issue appears to be engineers stamping drawings not under their direction or control. That needs to stop.	2/10/2020 11:32 AM
726	I think the requirement of only NV related items will make it more difficult to complete and unnecessary. Hours should be in relation to their specific area of practice. A requirement of an ethic number of hours is appropriate.	2/10/2020 11:32 AM
727	Perhaps the ethics and regulations could be part of the required continuing ed but I don't think it should be the only requirement.	2/10/2020 11:32 AM
728	I held a P.E. in Florida that had the ethics requirement. Each renewal period, I had to pay a fee to go to some website and answer some questions about ethics. The questions were on the line of "if someone bribes you and tells you to change your calculations for a structure, would you do it"? So I think a new requirement of "ethics", while it means well, is in my humble opinion not a good way for a successful honest engineer to spend 3 hours doing.	2/10/2020 11:32 AM
729	Focusing the continuing education directly on state specific rules, regulations, and ethics seems like a more effective approach.	2/10/2020 11:31 AM
730	The licensee will be more familiar with the laws and regulations and ethics regarding the practice of professional engineering	2/10/2020 11:31 AM
731	If you are not ethical, no number of seminars going to make you one! Maybe it will be better than the board communicates new regulations via email as you have done for this survey.	2/10/2020 11:31 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

732	I support it and think it is a good idea.	2/10/2020 11:31 AM
733	Most of the discipline issues that the Board addresses are due to breeches of law, regulations and professional ethics, not technical practices.	2/10/2020 11:30 AM
734	Reducing CE to 3 hours will diminish PE status perception by general public. It would be similar to someone renewing their drivers license and studying the Rules of the Road.	2/10/2020 11:30 AM
735	Ethics is important, but updating knowledge and methods is more important to public safety. Having this requirement is necessary to provide justification for training for many employees to their companies	2/10/2020 11:30 AM
736	no	2/10/2020 11:30 AM
737	I do not think professional ethics in unimportant, but it is the least important update skill that engineers need. Unfortunately the Board and staff deal with ethics issues far too often so they feel it is the most important issue. Do they often get claims that an engineer used an out of date design/product/etc. instead of the latest technology.	2/10/2020 11:30 AM
738	It might be good to have 3 hours towards ethics and State law as a part of the 30 hours	2/10/2020 11:30 AM
739	It will take away the emphasis on technical learning and put focus on just legal and ethics issues which should already exist in the manner in which we as professionals conduct ourselves. I would like to requirement to remain unchanged.	2/10/2020 11:28 AM
740	I do believe, whether the regulation stays with the prior requirement of 30 hours or focuses down to 3, it is a great idea to require some portion to be on ethics.	2/10/2020 11:27 AM
741	Keep the continuing education program strong	2/10/2020 11:26 AM
742	It is sometimes difficult to find qualifying ethics classes. It would be good to have Companies like RedVector and PDH Engineer to use for the training.	2/10/2020 11:26 AM
743	Same old Same old	2/10/2020 11:25 AM
744	See answer and comment to Question 4.	2/10/2020 11:25 AM
745	No comments	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
746	No	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
747	I believe that while it is important to have professional ethics, and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulations, technical competency can't be completely forgotten, otherwise, in the future, issues that could arise because of doing away with technical competency. Whether or not 30 hours of technical competency is needed every 2 years can be debated. I really liked the 2019 Nevada Board's Rejuvenate Conference and guest speakers. I came away from the experience, thinking about what the guest speakers had to say and that I hadn't heard that in quite awhile. It was an EXCELLENT refresher discussion we all had!!! I feel it is extremely important to keep this conference going!	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
748	I'm licensed in a couple of states that require PDH's in ethics. I generally have found those PDH's to be of little value in regards to public safety. In large part, board violations tend to center around unlicensed professions so they aren't going to be exposed to an ethics couarse that says not to practive unlicensed anyway. The laws and regulations PDH"s that I've taken in states that require that, are generally hard to find and not very well put together. They come off as another way to extract money out of professionals rather than something that actually serves to better public protection. Technical seminars are far more valuable in my opinion, when it comes to impacting public protection.	2/10/2020 11:24 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

749	For some other states I am licensed with, they require professional ethics PDH's, so every year I take online classes to refresh my commitment to professional ethics. It's also important to know each state's law's as related to professional ethics.	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
750	none	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
751	I think professional ethics AND knowledge of Nevada laws and regulations should be a part of the 30hrs minimum continuing education. Not less time. I have noticed that Arizona is also trying to change the make-up of its Board from Professional Engineers to non-professionals. I believe loosening of Professionals Standards will "water-down" the importance of our profession. Please keep it difficult to acquire and keep our P.E. status.	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
752	Ethics and knowledge of the Nevada laws is important but technical continuing education in one's area of competency is equally if not more important.	2/10/2020 11:23 AM
753	The people that are interested in providing the public with a good product will do so. Those that aren't will continue to do substandard service. All of this regardless if they have PDU's or not.	2/10/2020 11:23 AM
754	Continuing education in an engineer's field of practice is important. Technology is constantly changing. Ethics are constant. Has there been an increase in unethical behavior among engineers?	2/10/2020 11:23 AM
755	My fear is that the 4 year degree program has taken away much needed mentoring and experience in properly protecting the public's best interest, properly recognizing adjacent property rights in lieu of profitability and doing what the client want's since they are paying for a service. I also see too many young licensees filing documents that they claim are "Technically Correct" (mathematically) versus following in the footsteps of those before them. This can seriously affect the bona fide rights of the adjacent property owners. Additionally I have seen where community development departments, with un-licensed employees, have allowed a licensee to submit documents that do not protect the public's bona fide rights because these employees lack the education or training themselves as do the city or county elected officials that ultimately approve these documents.	2/10/2020 11:23 AM
756	I think it is important for engineers to continue to learn. Changing the reported number of continuing education credits will not impact public protection (construction codes must still be followed).	2/10/2020 11:23 AM
757	The addition of ethics and Nevada Laws to the existing requirements while keeping the education requirements at 30 hours is the best course of action. For those of us who are licensed in multiple states the state specific laws and regulations is always an additional burden but good since we are required to know the requirements for each state.	2/10/2020 11:22 AM
758	Keeping up with changes and improvements in the industry also protects the public	2/10/2020 11:22 AM
759	I would include a mandatory course on new code requirements every code cycle.	2/10/2020 11:22 AM
760	Having a requirement for 3 hours of continuing education on professional ethics and knowledge of the Nevada laws and regulations included in the 30 hour total would be acceptable.	2/10/2020 11:22 AM
761	Florida currently has a similar requirement. Because the market for those classes is small, the quality of the state specific code classes is not good in my opinion. I have not found that their state specific requirements have changed the level of practice that I have observed, but it is certainly a burden to obtain those classes in addition to all the other classes one has to obtain if you're practicing in a variety of states.	2/10/2020 11:20 AM
762	Refreshing knowledge of professional ethics is a worthy and important goal, but constant technical knowledge improvement is also important. There should not need to be a binary choice between ethics and technical instruction.	2/10/2020 11:20 AM
763	Yes, changing rules and regulations coupled with taking courses that provide case studies of ethical behavior would benefit	2/10/2020 11:20 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

registrants. However, in lieu of what is being proposed, I would suggest eliminating PDH requirements in its entirety and retest registrants every 8-year period, or other period deemed appropriate the by Board. The exam would be the same format and questions as the NCEES exams administered to individuals approved to take the exam for consideration as a professional engineer. By doing this, a high number of registrants would in all likelihood take technical courses, and study engineering and technical elements in order to keep their license current.

764	I don't think eleminating technical competency from continuing education is a good idea.	2/10/2020 11:19 AM
765	Again, it is going to be the individual. The one's that are going to do things correctly, still study new/best practices on their own, generally will be ethical and have the public's best interest at the forefront regardless of if NV changes the regulations. I understand why someone(s) would believe that having continuing education based on ethics would "make it better", but your dealing with a human behavior - taking 2 credits on ethics is not what will change someone's behavior.	2/10/2020 11:19 AM
766	Although it has become cumbersome and tedious to acquire the continuing education hours, it would certainly be more impactful if the requirement would focus on pertinent codes, laws, and regulations.	2/10/2020 11:19 AM
767	Having a portion of the renewal hours (10%) focused on ethics is reasonable. However, reducing the continuing education requirement to focus solely on ethics diminishes other important areas of engineering and professional development. Continuing education as currently required, benefits the public through enhanced safety, greater efficiency and improved economy.	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
768	I would like to see the time requirement being proposed reversed. 2 hours of ethics (which is generally the same consistent subject) seems redundant, whereas only 1 hour of laws and regulations (which get changed every legislative session) seems light. What will qualify for each of these time requirements? If I sit on a committee that is responsible for meeting certain regulations for an agency, does that count? I also think technical CEU requirements should remain, but at a much lower level. Maybe instead of 30 CEU's, make it 10 for each 2-year period, with 3 of those being ethics / laws?	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
769	No comment	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
770	Although this may limit the availability to CEUs, the focusing of the education will result in more applicable learning.	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
771	We all took an ethics exam to apply for Nevada license. How can it impact public protection by studying the same material more?	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
772	I am licensed in 7 states, if each state requires 2-3 hours in that states law, all my training will be to pass the test for those states. A uniform standardized ethics curriculum is needed that can be administered by all states. A general ethics training requirement seems more reasonable.	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
773	Most engineers continue to learn as they practice their professions. Ethics need to reinforced on occasion.	2/10/2020 11:17 AM
774	Without a requirement to take continuing ed, engineers have the opportunity to become stale and not broaden their knowledge on latest techniques.	2/10/2020 11:17 AM
775	This suggestion would simplify the requirements, but would lessen an engineer's expertise.	2/10/2020 11:17 AM
776	Mississippi, Tennessee, and Alabama have specific requirements for continuing education in Ethics and Standards of Practice. It is a good thing but will be difficult for me to comply with all of these.	2/10/2020 11:17 AM
777	I like this idea, it practical and to the point. Reminders about professional ethics are needed, and reminders about current law are also helpful. I have not found CEU/PDH requirements to be a benefit to me professionally.	2/10/2020 11:16 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

778	Need to make classes more affordable and have classes closer to rural areas as to minimize travel.	2/10/2020 11:16 AM
779	Professional engineering bylaws already hold professional engineers to high ethical standards.	2/10/2020 11:16 AM
780	I think exhibiting a requirement for license renewal specifically on ethical concerns and practice sends a strong message as to the importance in the ethical practice of engineering. Plus requiring a refresher on Nevada laws and regulations keeps engineers fresh on current changes to the public law. Finally, most all of us read magazine articles, and belong to professional associations, and take seminars or workshops for various aspects of our specific area of practice. I don't think this would change or reduce just because you reduce the PDH requirement. I know I will still take the same amount. My company pays for almost all my continuing education, and professional association dues. Plus there are free PDH online from ASCE that I always take advantage of. This will not change for me personally if you were to change the renewal requirements.	2/10/2020 11:16 AM
781	I would recommend keeping ethics and NV laws and regulations as part of the 30 hours required every two years. Unless you require the technical hours most registrants will not train and I believe it is crucial to have continuing technical training.	2/10/2020 11:16 AM
782	Most competent engineers spend way more than 30 hrs in meaningful or related self study in the engineer's area of practice. Most continuing education seminars provide little to no increase in engineering proficiency and are nothing more than a waste of time, or opportunity for networking.	2/10/2020 11:15 AM
783	The changing laws, and codes have a big impact on my business.	2/10/2020 11:15 AM
784	It does not make a difference	2/10/2020 11:14 AM
785	Ethics focus should continue to help achieve a consistent professional standard of care. Links / info on NV website to webinars or self-paced courses, especially for NV regulations, would be very helpful	2/10/2020 11:14 AM
786	Would require that Nevada laws are at the forefront of state of the art design. Not likely and not their role.	2/10/2020 11:13 AM
787	I think it would help for sure in this area	2/10/2020 11:13 AM
788	Being an out of state PE getting CEUs out of state that are Nevada specific will be difficult	2/10/2020 11:13 AM
789	If there is a change from 30 to the specific 3 hours, how would the courses be implemented, especially for those who are not residents of Nevada? On-line access to required courses?	2/10/2020 11:13 AM
790	The board laws are written poorly and are vague. Education on ambiguous laws will not help technical competency.	2/10/2020 11:13 AM
791	I don't think we need continuing education requirements. Every state has different requirements. Some have none. There is no relationship between quality of practice and the amount of and requirements regarding continuing education with respect to the various states I am licensed in.	2/10/2020 11:12 AM
792	I believe reducing the continuing education requirements would adversely impact public safety. If anything, more continued education should be required.	2/10/2020 11:12 AM
793	It doesn't encourage the practitioner to search out info on Engineering advancements.	2/10/2020 11:12 AM
794	Reduction in hours does not appear to be consistent with typical state trends concerning professional hours. The hours, at a minimum, encourage practicing engineers to attend professional meetings and stay connected to the industry as a whole.	2/10/2020 11:12 AM
795	Improved knowledge of laws improves the compliance with laws, however not all laws improve public protection. Some laws just add more burden on the engineer.	2/10/2020 11:12 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

796	Professional ethics courses will improve protection of the public.	2/10/2020 11:11 AM
797	This will be adequate for practicing engineers engaged in design. People working primarily in academia or administration will need to undertake enough study to remain current. Working within ones competence should be stressed in the required CE.	2/10/2020 11:11 AM
798	Three hours seem inadequate	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
799	See my comment for No.4. I believe the same thing could be achieved with a multiple choice exam at the time of license renewal.	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
800	N. C.	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
801	No.	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
802	I am licensed in 21 states. Five of those states require one or two hours in ethics and three require one hour on rules particular to that specific state. The states need to coordinate their rules and make them either the same or nearly the same. One hour per biennial renewal period reviewing the hours of a particular state does not keep the rules fresh, especially when I deal with rules from 21 states. I have to review the rules whenever an issue arises anyway, the one hour class will not provide any more understanding.	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
803	It is more important for a licensee to be appraised of local (state) laws which they are licensed than any other information within professional development courses.	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
804	I say no change because only having ethics training won't necessarily improve the quality of the work but will avoid practice issues that are rampant in the light commercial and multi family sectors as well as design build markets	2/10/2020 11:10 AM
805	Statutes are not professional development. Design requirements are changing and engineers need to be up to date.	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
806	While focusing on ethics and Nevada law may improve public protection, I think a few technical competency PDH should be required in addition to the ethics and NV law hours, for a total of 5 PDH in a biennial period.	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
807	I think the technical proficiency requirement of CEUs is more important to protect the public than the ethics and review of laws and regulations.	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
808	Without having information on how much unethical practice impacts the public, I can't say if this is necessary.	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
809	I believe hours should be a combination of Technical, State Law, and Ethics	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
810	I think we should keep the requirement of 30 hours but require that 3 of the 30 are in professional ethics and Knowledge of NV law and regs.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
811	The technical continuing education pdhs are important and valuable.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
812	Keeping up with technological changes in an industry has a greater impact on public sector safety and well being. Ethics courses keeps one up to date on governmental changes in how an engineer conducts their business.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
813	Could incorporate the 3 hrs on rules and ethics as part of the 30 hr requirement or reduce the 30 hr requirement accordingly.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
814	Knowledge of laws and regulations don't necessarily improve professional competency.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
815	Including the legal and ethical requirements as a portion of the 30 hours makes sense, but moving to only to these 3 hours would reduce proficiency and collaboration.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

816	Professional ethics are a common-sense-given that would prove difficult to ensure compliance with unless there are blatant violations in which case the current oversight system employed by the Board is effective. Adherence to Law and regulation changes is accomplished by periodic review and memorization. As such, knowledge-testing is not necessary and would really only benefit companies that offer exam-preparation training classes.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
817	I would say it would be between a no-change and reduce as a lot of the continuing education I do is related to various code updates.	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
818	Having the focus being on these things will cause engineers to review these items regularly, and keep up with any changes.	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
819	No	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
820	Focusing on ethics and regulations does not equate to staying current on all engineering practices	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
821	Laws seem to change yearly in response to situations that arise over the years and it's important to stay abreast of all changes that affect the engineering profession	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
822	Focus on ethics or NV laws is a large step BACKWARDS.	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
823	Common practices and design methodologies change over time. It is important that an engineer stay up-to-date on those and utilize design criteria that is current. The PDH requirements help to "force" an engineer to look at the new criteria and not to just rely on what they learned decades ago. If you are to reduce the required hours, I would recommend that you keep the PDH requirements set to actual hands on trainings (as opposed to conferences), whether in person or online.	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
824	Engineers will spend more time understanding and learning about the specific knowledge needed for particular states.	2/10/2020 11:06 AM
825	15 hours per year is a lot of time to spend on professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada law. There is no correlation that this type of training will help resolve professionals inability to work within the requirements, only fear of enforcement action will do that. In addition swift and consistent enforcement will help rid us of the individuals that do not have the proper ethic to practice in this state.	2/10/2020 11:05 AM
826	As engineers we need to continually improve on our knowledge base and the continuing education program is a good vehicle for that. I still think that the professional ethics portion of the requirement is important and should be an integral part of the continuing education.	2/10/2020 11:05 AM
827	Ethics are only part of an engineer's responsibilities. While ethics are important, competence is equally important.	2/10/2020 11:05 AM
828	Any good engineer spends hundreds out hours a year upgrading his skills and knowledge whether there are continuing education requirements or not. Most of these hours do not count as "continuing education" because it's done independently. I'm all for state provided webinars on rules and regulations. Ethics too should be state provided so that a class can address issues that have occurred within the state.	2/10/2020 11:05 AM
829	I will get the 15 hours a year of continual education regardless of the regulation change, as I am registered in many other states with similar requirements. I do not believe I am unique in this regard.	2/10/2020 11:05 AM
830	No.	2/10/2020 11:05 AM
831	See above comments regarding CE.	2/10/2020 11:04 AM
832	If you're intent is to protect the public, then I feel it is a good idea to remind engineers of that main goal in our profession on a regular basis. As we are reminded, I feel like we would pay closer attention to our designs to do just that (public protection).	2/10/2020 11:04 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

833	I could go either way, really on whether there would be a reduction in value or not. Knowledge of laws and rules is important, but this would imply that there are laws and rules that substantially differ, or change often. Having a requirement to brush up is fine, as long as it is provided in a way that is easy for licensed individuals to access and fulfill. I would hope professionals continue to seek professional growth, without needing a requirement to do so. As for Ethics, my thoughts are that those who are going to operate ethically will, regardless of whether they are required to take a course each year reminding them to do so.	2/10/2020 11:04 AM
834	CE's focusing on ethics and laws would be a more effective use of a requirement, but someone will need to develop an effective and accessible curriculum that is not a profit center for the state. If the CEs become more expensive than they are now, this effort will be wasted and resented,	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
835	I think that this would have a positive impact. If the 30 contact hours would remain in place, I would recommend a small portion (3 hr+/-) be required to be in the area of ethics and regulations.	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
836	Great engineers strive to learn and grow when a project presents itself with challenges which require study and digging deeper on technical issues. The PDH seminars, on the other hand, only scratch the surface and dont improve proficiency	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
837	none	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
838	I don't see a particular problem with continuing education related to ethics, though this should be something that the Board really ought to make available. As regards continuing education regards laws, I have firsthand experience with the courts completely ignoring violation of the laws, and indeed the laws vary from state to state, whereas ethics are pretty much the same everywhere. I think that the Board would better spend their time educating the courts on the importance of licensure.	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
839	The goal to be achieved must be part of the practitioner's regular activity for it's successful incorporation into the profession. Until clients start truly demanding evidence of this (rather than lowest cost) I foresee little change. Admittedly, the state of practice is far from poor, but in my view it fails to meet the circumstances portrayed by advocates of the profession (ASCE, NCSEA, NSPE, etc.)	2/10/2020 11:02 AM
840	none	2/10/2020 11:02 AM
841	Perhaps make the 30 hours required and then say 1 hr of that is ethics? Offer free online ethics courses like Texas.	2/10/2020 11:02 AM
842	Public Safety is our highest priority and continuing education that re-enforces that should be our highest priority.	2/10/2020 11:02 AM
843	I think requiring a refresh of knowledge of ethics and laws is a good idea, but technical continuing education is also important	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
844	The civil engineer field is always evolving. It is important to stay abreast on the current advancements in our field of practice.	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
845	I think as engineers, it's important to think broader and see what we can learn elsewhere that we can apply in NV. The current system supports this.	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
846	none	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
847	I'm in favor of engineers who have a responsibility to the public to remain current with the state of the art of their profession. I have concerns particularly in the structural engineering field where it is easy to be a sole practitioner and not interact with other engineers to be able to stay current. i think the continuing education requirement of NV provides that. As i live in CA, it's still my desire that CA would adopt a similar requirement...though it is doubtful that they ever will.	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
848	I think a portion of the PDH should be devoted to NV laws and ethics. Not the entire 30 hours, but also have a requirement for some hours for technical topics.	2/10/2020 11:01 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

849	Technical competency and keeping up with advancements in the field is also important.	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
850	I agree in concept with ethics and code education, but not at the expense of technical and pertinent seminar attendance or coursework.	2/10/2020 11:01 AM
851	As long as the Board produces its own on-line, accessible (and free) courses, this will be acceptable. Do not require attendance at paid contractor-led certificate shops. They are a rip off and way too expensive	2/10/2020 11:00 AM
852	Reducing eliminates the continuing education aspect of the profession	2/10/2020 11:00 AM
853	Please verify the availability of classes in the areas of ethics and NV Law.	2/10/2020 11:00 AM
854	Suggest the ethics be general (ASCE or ?) not NV approved. The approved programs only gives vendors of classes a way to sell it. NV laws could be part of renewal program at no charge. Web based programs are being used by most professional groups.	2/10/2020 11:00 AM
855	Dropping the requirement to 3 pdh is an excuse for licensees to be lazy. It also forces licensees to isolate pdh to Nevada, causing more regulation for those licensed across the US when we already have a lot to keep track of concerning licensure.	2/10/2020 11:00 AM
856	The number of hours should be reduced, but not limited to ethics and law	2/10/2020 10:59 AM
857	It will reinforce the engineer's decision-making policy when it comes to identifying what they are competent in practicing, and what they should defer.	2/10/2020 10:59 AM
858	NA	2/10/2020 10:59 AM
859	Perhaps the requirement of education on Nevada laws and regulations should be limited to land surveyors.	2/10/2020 10:59 AM
860	Public protection/safety should take precedent and a reasonable amount of CE hours focused on this subject is fair.	2/10/2020 10:59 AM
861	I recommend making a less drastic reduction - say from 30 to 15 hours.	2/10/2020 10:59 AM
862	I believe it is important to keep up with technology as well as ethics to protect the public health and well being.	2/10/2020 10:58 AM
863	I believe having a broader range of classes other than ethics, laws and regulations would benefit the surveyor who has roles that do not include them on a continuous basis.	2/10/2020 10:58 AM
864	Concentrating on Ethics only will not serve the intended purpose of public safety, in this ever evolving construction world.	2/10/2020 10:58 AM
865	Professional ethics have nothing to do with a professional engineer's ability to provide sound engineering design for mechanical systems that will work as intended. When PE's don't improve on their technical knowledge they fall behind, hence jeopardizing public interest and safety.	2/10/2020 10:57 AM
866	I agree a focus on item 6 is important, although i think something could be more focused in other aspects, without it being 30 hours.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
867	It will be a more direct focus and help keep engineers up on new laws and issues with ethics.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
868	See my comment in answer 5. Engineers need to be more aware of the law when gray areas are approached	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
869	Ultimately, public protection is best accomplished by investigating and taking action against those that malpractice.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
870	By bringing to the forefront that the primary responsibility of engineers is to protect the health and safety of the public, both	2/10/2020 10:56 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

through technical competency and ethical behavior will improve the impact that continuing education has.

871	I hope that you are considering this in more depth than a monkey survey! My opinion of ethics seminars are quite low - they focus more on the laws than ethics in practice. Of course, the board may simply want to make sure that the law is communicated, but our profession needs much more than that. Engineering has declined in the market and contractors are in control. This needs much more attention!	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
872	Ethical conduct is very important. Knowledge of NV law isn't so important, and it makes it very difficult for people registered in multiple states, like me. It is hard for me to see how knowledge of the NV law would improve public protection.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
873	The requirements for continuing education for ethics and current Nevada law should be pointless. Professional engineers should already be staying current with laws and ethics without forcing them to sit through a seminar that typically does not relate well to their specific area of competency within the field. Waste of time and resources.	2/10/2020 10:56 AM
874	I think focusing on Nevada ethics and regulations is more beneficial for public protection than the current requirements	2/10/2020 10:55 AM
875	Nevada State's ethics are not my ethics. I'm fairly careful who I do business with, the ethical standards were kind of written for lawyers who will do business with anyone able too pay - that is not me. Ethics are pushed by the people around you, work with reasonably ethical people and issues are far less likely.	2/10/2020 10:55 AM
876	I think it is important for engineers to keep their technical competencies fresh. Have continuing education requirements to fit within their field of expertise will/can help protect the public. Many engineers work in a broad area, there may be some subjects only touched on occasionally. Continuing Ed within the technical areas are helpful.	2/10/2020 10:55 AM
877	The only reason why one was granted a PE was because we uphold public protection as our top most priority. Whether we take courses to either accumulate 3 PDH or 30 PDH or 60 PDH will make no difference. An unscrupulous engineer will do whatever he wants to endangering life of the people. On the other hand, a consistent and hardworking PE will always keep ethics and laws to the forefront in making the right decisions for the public. Hence, I feel that the Board could consider adding more questions on experience, etc in applications for initial/renewal of PE license which will give the Board an indepth understanding of the applicant rather than have 100's of licensed PE's go thru the grind of PDH biennially.	2/10/2020 10:55 AM
878	While the ethics portion would be useful, concentrating on ethics and Nevada regulations would not. Currently, I am not aware of any courses on strictly Nevada Regulations, making that portion difficult at best or impossible. Unless online course are contemplated, the proposed law would unnecessarily prevent non-Nevadans from being able to properly comply. The proposed law makes not attempt to enforce continuing education in other ares necessary to the successful protection of Nevada property owners, such as technological improvements, software improvements, national resources (NGS, State Plane, Geodetic, etc.) In short, the proposed changes would likely negatively affect Nevada by reducing the amount of continuing education required and concentrating it in areas that would reduce the number of practitioners available to the public.	2/10/2020 10:54 AM
879	CA Board does not require a PDH limit for license renewals and I do not think this has any adverse affect on the profession in CA.	2/10/2020 10:54 AM
880	These are the areas where many licensed engineers seem to lack, and focusing PDH's in these areas should improve the quality of services provided by Professional Engineers.	2/10/2020 10:54 AM
881	Need to continue technical requirements	2/10/2020 10:54 AM
882	I think knowing the states makes you more aware of what is involved	2/10/2020 10:53 AM
883	I am registered in 30 states, I would need to concentrate on ethics and laws if each state made this a requirement. Some	2/10/2020 10:53 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

states already specifically address this and do not require meeting their requirements as long as I meet Indiana's ethics and laws requirements

884	I think this will be difficult to interpret and implement. You will need someone to offer said PDH and explicitly say it will meet the new criteria. It will also decrease participation in luncheons, which can already have poor participation. These luncheons are good for networking and getting up to date in current news, but the incentive is a PDH credit for going.	2/10/2020 10:53 AM
885	I do not feel the continuing education requirement benefits practicing engineers	2/10/2020 10:53 AM
886	Professional Engineers should keep abreast of new technologies/methods, which should be one of the purposes for obtaining Professional Development credits. An "ethics refresher" (possibly online, so it is standardized) would work well every other renewal cycle and should not be a substitute for learning new techniques or technologies. Although ethics is a vital subject, it should not get top billing over new developments in the industry.	2/10/2020 10:52 AM
887	no	2/10/2020 10:52 AM
888	I think technical competency and code knowledge is more important for public safety than laws and ethics. Knowledge of laws and ethics is not what is making engineers do designs that fail.	2/10/2020 10:52 AM
889	Continuing education was intended to keep individual licensees current with the latest developments and technology in the profession, and to maintain, improve or expand knowledge relevant to their discipline. Professional ethics rarely change, thus technology is the key.	2/10/2020 10:52 AM
890	Ethical practice is different from having knowledge about ethics. Drivers for ethical practice are fear of God and upbringing to do what is right. For some, it may be the fear of disciplinary action. There is no change in what is considered ethical one year to another. What we already possess in ethical knowledge when we apply for PE license does not change even as time passes by. I do not see the need to take ethical classes year after year. It just give continued education organization a chance to generate income, and take away engineers time to build a better world.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
891	If the intent of Continuing Education is to stay abreast of current technologies and trends, the reduction of the required CE hours to 3 fails to provide this. Ethics and rules don't change much from year to year while the technology we implement on our construction documents changes rapidly.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
892	I endorse the notion that ethics are a singular hallmark of a professional engineer and should be emphasized.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
893	This is really based on the individual, but for me it will certainly help.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
894	See previous comment.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
895	See my previous comments # 5	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
896	The regulations make engineers aware of the rules a bit, but do not aide in continual growth. I do not feel instituting these 3 hours are overly relevant or aiding licensees in bettering their skills.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
897	Claims on professionals will be reduced if there is a clear understanding of risk and responsibility. Understanding potential consequences should result in greater focus on standard of care.	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
898	I think that an emphasis in completing technical education improves an engineers abilities in a everchanging field so just focusing on ethics and laws would be degradational to the engineer.	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
899	No.	2/10/2020 10:50 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

900	Most land surveyors work in a particular niche within the profession and only branch out when work within that niche is scarce. It is important to remind everyone what the law says and what is ethical.	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
901	I believe this focused approach will be much more effective and will improve the system.	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
902	I think having a number of credits needing to be about ethics is pretty common and could be implemented within the current requirement. Ultimately as engineers we are responsible in protecting the well being of the public in our designs. So I feel keeping up with lessons learned on projects and the last eat innovations better suits the purpose.	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
903	Most Professional engineers have a good understanding of ethics and Nevada law. Requiring continuing education classes on this topic could be redundant with little benefit for many engineers. I think the current system, where the engineer can identify their own deficiencies and desired areas of specialization is far superior for creating and maintaining high quality engineers in the state.	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
904	none	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
905	none	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
906	Ethical/legal courses are repetitive and waste of time. Laws and ethics do not change. Updating Technical knowledge is more important	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
907	Nevada law is promulgated for the specific purpose of protecting the public. Laws change and those changes are not always monitored on a regular basis by the public, including registrants. Periodic review of the laws, specifically recent changes would be a valuable exercise.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
908	I think the engineering profession would benefit from reminders on professional ethics and laws so the focus on this rather than business or engineering based courses would benefit engineers and the sectors we serve.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
909	More specific focused requirements may lead to better understanding of the regulations and requirements related to the NV PE Licence	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
910	With a focus on ethics and knowledge of the law/regulations, the importance of the health, safety, and welfare of the public will be front and center. The intent will be clear.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
911	no	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
912	I think by having a better understanding of the Board's position on ethics and laws illustrated by actual actions would be extremely valuable.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
913	An ethics requirement is not a bad idea. Most of the law-related issues are ethics issues, so a mandatory ethics review provided by the Board that evaluates the rules and regulations would be helpful in addition. By only requiring ethics/rules and regulations, there may be a tendency to not stay current.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
914	My understanding is that the majority of the issues today are on ethics and not on the ability to perform survey work. So, by concentrating on the are that needs the most improvement, it should improve public protection.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
915	Technical education needs to remain a required element of the 30 hours. The required number of Ethics education should probably be increase though	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
916	Staying up to date on laws and ethics is important, but the technical aspects of continuing education is just as important. Focusing on ethics and Nevada law would not be helpful to public protection.	2/10/2020 10:48 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

917	It can improve, if they seminars are taught by the board, showing what is necessary to learn and providing real-life examples.	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
918	It will improve public protection for those who are not registered in states which already require ethics. I'm registered in multiple states, so I'm already fulfilling that requirement. testing on the Nevada Laws & Regulations will help as well, provided we are being tested on relevant topics, and any changes to the rules since the last cycle.	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
919	As a profession, engineers tend to be "more ethical" than average. Continuing education in regards to current practice, materials, and methods is at least as important as "ethics" and knowledge of the law.	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
920	The continuing education requirement should include professional development in addition to professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulations.	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
921	I think professional ethics is not focused on in most P.E.'s continuing education. I think it's important to refresh on the ethical side of engineering, and the requirements for Nevada in general (especially for engineers who hold licenses in multiple states).	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
922	Ok	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
923	Limiting the PDH's to only ethics and Nevada Laws and Regulation does nothing to encourage licensed professionals to keep up-to-date with changes in their area of expertise.	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
924	none	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
925	see my answer to question 5	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
926	It's useful to protect public and professionals	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
927	I agree that ethics should be a component of the education requirement, but am concerned that I will have limited ability to take the appropriate course in Washington. The same goes for NV state laws. Personally, I appreciate having the 30 hr requirement. It gives me the support I need to request training from my employer.	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
928	No	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
929	I think focusing on ethics and knowledge of NV Laws would not drastically impact public protection. Most engineers are ethical and know the laws. There are a few "bad apples" that need ethics training and probably shouldn't be licensed to begin with, but meet the criteria for licensing. I appreciate the Board's newsletters and the updates to the NV laws it highlights (i.e. civil/structural changes). If the board chooses to enact the professional ethics/NV Law continuing education requirement, it would be advisable to provide the courses in the form of a webinar directly from the Board website at or around renewal. This would ensure equal compliance that each licensee has the same training and it would assist in easy record keeping for the Board. It wouldn't have to be 3 hours of contact, but enough time to cover the material. I know I'm busy enough and it's difficult to schedule time to maintain the continuing education requirements.	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
930	Ethics is very important but as stated in question 5 it is important that technical education be part.	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
931	I think technical competency is just as important if not more than professional ethics and knowledge of NV laws.	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
932	While ethics are critical, they are also notoriously hard to test in any standardized format.	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
933	Part of an engineers job is keeping up on technology, or reviewing topics that are not part of a daily regime. I am a proponent of keeping some, if not all, of the required (30) professional development hours. Ethics and Nevada laws should be part of the required professional development hours.	2/10/2020 10:46 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

934	Removing technical developments and focusing on ethics and Nevada law will reduce the effectiveness of the PDH's.	2/10/2020 10:46 AM
935	I think some technical-related PDHs are important. Ethics are important too, but having attended many of those sessions, they are perfunctory at best. We all recognize right and wrong in obvious situations. Those who choose wrong, will not be influenced by a course in ethics. The real issue is with situations where right and wrong are not so clear. These always include a host of conditions that cannot be easily replicated that often lead to making the wrong choice. Still, an ethics reminder is good, but 1 PDH is plenty! As for NV Laws and Regulations, that seems like an impossible ask for those of us who live out of state and I wonder how pertinent it really is. So, I think the best choice is 30 PDH biennially including 1 hr of ethics.	2/10/2020 10:46 AM
936	The ethics and law knowledge is important, but so simple for renewal while technical information is more helpful in a competent practice.	2/10/2020 10:46 AM
937	Ethics cannot not be taught in a 1-3 course. Reminders of rules and consequences will help those who are already desiring to be ethical and honest.	2/10/2020 10:46 AM
938	I think you should always continue learning from a technical perspective.	2/10/2020 10:46 AM
939	none	2/10/2020 10:45 AM
940	see comment in 5	2/10/2020 10:45 AM
941	I would reduce the 30 pdh requirement to 12-15 plus the 3 hours of ethics and Nevada laws and regulations.	2/10/2020 10:45 AM
942	I have found the content of most ethics and state laws continuing education classes to be essentially the same. So for every renewal cycle I am "learning" the same content that is not new or useful. Requiring licencees to focus on similar ethics and state laws year after year does not improve public protection. The state would be better served to have a "open book" ethics/rules test at the time of intitial licensure and then send updates to licencees of important law or rule changes as they occur. I would rather have all 30 hours of continuing education focus on technical topics that will result in better designs that protect the public.	2/10/2020 10:45 AM
943	may be interview engineer once a year in lieu of continue education init	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
944	NO	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
945	Theses are good topics that should be part of the current 30 hour requirement	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
946	None	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
947	None	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
948	In my case, continuing education is generally too simple to get much out of it. I can see that others might be learning.	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
949	Nevada could make three of the 30 PDH's relate to laws & rules	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
950	I think technical education should still be required, but support a lower threshold.	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
951	Adding an ethics requirement as part of the 30 hours would seem to be better. Technology is changing our work and engineers need to be constantly training to keep up.	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
952	Training in acting on the right side of ethics is not required at all in daily practice and in fact general business competitiveness trends in the opposite direction. Mandated ethical training would be just as beneficial if not more than	2/10/2020 10:43 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

technical training.

953	Is ethics a relevant problem among Nevada licensed engineers? The Board is best positioned to answer that question. I've taken a Board mandated ethics course, years ago, and still think about it. My recommendation is that the Board have all engineers take that course during their next renewal period and forget about requiring ethics pdh's after that and focus on Nv. Law. How about contract law? The Board requires engineers to have contracts. What about training in contract law?	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
954	I would hope courses related to Nevada laws and regulations are made easily available to those of us out-of-state.	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
955	Continuing and reviewing professional ethics and laws will help all engineers stay current with the laws.	2/10/2020 10:43 AM
956	I think continued reminders of professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada Laws can go a long ways with our profession.	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
957	Technical PDH requirements are also necessary to ensure competence.	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
958	none	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
959	none	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
960	no comment	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
961	3 hours is enough	2/10/2020 10:42 AM
962	Many states, such as California, don't even have outdated cumbersome PED requirement. Whether 30 hours of continued education or 3 hours of state laws in ethics is simply a burden on lisencc holders, provides no benefits to anyone whatsoever and if the intent is to protect the public both current practice and proposed proposal are completely ineffective in that regard.	2/10/2020 10:41 AM
963	I think you still need some technical hours. our profession uses many tools that need to kept on for one AND we can not lose site hours for baounday and PLSS survey requirements I would suggest 2 hours ethics 1 hour State laws 7 hours boundary PLSS (7 is a typical day seminar)	2/10/2020 10:41 AM
964	Move relevant requirements.	2/10/2020 10:41 AM
965	It seems that in our current society ethics is under threat. Being a person of integrity does not seem to hold the same value as it once did. I pray that a fear of God would return to our society. Meanwhile, reviewing ethics expectations regularly should help.	2/10/2020 10:41 AM
966	No	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
967	No	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
968	The continuing education requirement should encompass both encouraging registrants to stay current with the state of the practice, to receive refresher training in ethics, and to be knowledgeable about State regulations.	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
969	NA	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
970	If the Board is finding that professionals are failing or are deficient, the Board should publish guidance to educate all professionals on those laws and ethics. Continuing education from third party suppliers will be generic, bureaucratic box checking.	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
971	Ethics training as required by other states, seems only as a legal scapegoat. It comes across as checking a box so that it helps lead the liability away from the licensing entity, not growing the engineer.	2/10/2020 10:40 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

972	Do the laws regarding PEs change enough to warrant 3 hours of training every 2 years? I don't think I would be a better engineer, just better versed in ethics and regulations. I would miss out on expanding my engineering background and sharing ideas.	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
973	Technical skills are still important and must be maintained. The current requirement triggers individuals to take classes that fill out their knowledge beyond the limits of their job experience. It also encourages employers to provide resources for professional development. Also by narrowing requirements to only ethics/laws, there will be much repetition from one license period to the next, limiting new learning. The process will become a formality, with no meat on its bones.	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
974	Hope you change it quickly	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
975	the change noted in question 6 will be effective but technical skills will need to be updated whenever there is a significant change in key design codes (IBC, AISC, ACI, etc).	2/10/2020 10:39 AM
976	I think the time would be much better spent on ethics and a general understanding of Nevada law as it applies to the practice of engineering in the State of Nevada.	2/10/2020 10:39 AM
977	It is good for PE's to review the Rules and Regulations every 2 years and also if there are any changes - Email notification.	2/10/2020 10:39 AM
978	Engineers need more than ethics and State laws information. Ethics and state law knowledge should be required only every 3 to 5 years	2/10/2020 10:39 AM
979	See above	2/10/2020 10:38 AM
980	Add ethics component (27/3) split, but don't drop from 30 to less than 10 CEU.	2/10/2020 10:38 AM
981	Public protection is best preserved by the ethical action of engineers who are not practicing outside their areas of competency, not by arbitrary hours spent in classes of questionable value.	2/10/2020 10:38 AM
982	-	2/10/2020 10:38 AM
983	It may be helpful for a few years, but after say 10 to 20 years of learning about ethics and laws this too will lose its benefit. I suggest doing this new thing for 5 to 10 years, but then after that we need to take an on-line test on ethics and law every 2 years.	2/10/2020 10:38 AM
984	Review current changes that are applicable.	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
985	The 30 hr requirements have a good intent, but may or may not have the intended effect.	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
986	My experience with other "registered" engineers has shown a lack of knowledge of the electrical code, and in engineering designs. Dropping any related technical training requirements would be a mistake, makign the problem worse.	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
987	Ethics and laws are generally not a problem with engineers. Technical issues are where the public is most at risk.	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
988	professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada Laws and regulation requirements will definitely be a plus for public protection	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
989	I don't remember which one was question six I've already made my	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
990	Ethics, need to be tied to regulations such that a breach in ethics may lead to license forfeiture or suspension. Ethics need to be expanded on the subject of marketing services and how work is awarded. Price should be a consideration in RFP awards,	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
991	It should be required that we maintain and gain knowledge in our specific field of practice and in ancillary fields - our engineering practice is rapidly changing, with technology and human factors playing a greater role: We practitioners must	2/10/2020 10:37 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

stay up-to-date.

992	I believe you should still require a degree of professional development for younger or new PEs. Public protection can be improved in 2 ways: 1 - Ethics Knowledge 2 - Having adequate technical skills For new/inexperienced engineers, there should be a requirement to maintain continuing education to improve their technical skills and the "value" of a PE. Certainly, a PE with 40 years experience, should not have to undertake short course requirements.	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
993	Will the course's be on line and provided by the board? As this is so specific I am not sure how this could be done otherwise.	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
994	These suggested hours relate to practice within the state, which I agree with; while the additional hours are more for technical items within the discipline	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
995	I think their needs to be a balance. Ethics and Nevada Laws are important but don't lose site of the power of continuing education. Some Ethics and Law training would be advised if the current Board of Engineers is seeing an increase in Ethics complaints.	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
996	To practice engineering we need to know the laws and if you have an ethical issue you shouldn't be an engineer. Tracking time for this is futile, if you are unethical spending class time on it probably won't change that	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
997	People are either ethical or they are not. Making them earn PDH's will not change who they truly are. As an example, I have licenses in many states. My Illinois license is signed by Rod Blagojevich. He was required to take an oath to be ethical.	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
998	Reducing the hours and focusing on those topics seems like a step in the right direction.	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
999	It's a great idea	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
1000	That seems great to me. At least it is relevant to something meaningful.	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1001	No	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1002	I don't think this is necessary but if its a tradeoff for eliminating the 30 hour requirement I'm in favor of it.	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1003	CEU's can be very vague. Focusing on NV specifics would be more beneficial	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1004	I personally want to stay current with both the legal side and the technical side that is why I always buy the latest National Electrical Code book. Nevada has it own regulations. That should be reviewed on a semi annual basis.	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1005	No	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1006	There is some additional benefit from adding continuing education in the areas of ethics and laws to affirm practicing engineering in a proper, honorable way. I would support the addition of these ethics and law requirements to the current 30 hours, but not advocate for the removal of technical continuing education. I am aware that many organizations that provide PDHs charge excessive amounts for the training provided (e.g., ASCE, conferences), and the proliferation of discount PDH websites that may be of little benefit to a professional; however, the advancement of knowledge for the profession would be harmed if new ideas are not explored and fundamentals are not reinforced.	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1007	Hours should be maintained but maybe reduced to 15 but competency in design maintained	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
1008	anything more than 1 hour per year on ethics is a waste. State requirements are pretty similar between states, so focusing on a particular state's requirements is not helpful and does not serve the public good. In reality, there are only two points need to be made: Don't practice outside your registration. Don't practice engineering without a license. Beyond that, it is administrative topics that do not relate to the public good	2/10/2020 10:34 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

1009	The problem is really the kind of PDHs allowed to satisfy the requirements. By allowing 'what ever', you don't really meet the metrics or improve technical understanding. Requiring less, but all of a high quality, will improve public protection. Removing all requirements and focusing on the legal aspects of licensure and responsibility isn't the solution.	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1010	Without updated knowledge to maintain the technical competence, the engineer(s) would lack the methods or means, or the needed expertise to ensure the public welfare, safety, and protection. At the same time, the the reduced confidence in technical competence would adversely impact the safety and reliability in engineering design/practice. thanks	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1011	I think 2hr ethics is ok there are a number of on-line courses and NM requires it. State laws would be useful too as the laws vary from state to state significantly. If you do require 1 hr for NV laws, there should be on-line courses available or have an on-line test (or send one out to the non-computer folks) when you renew. This would force the renewal applicant to study the laws and take the test. Give him/her 3 tries; if not then require a course. Something like that would work.	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1012	-	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1013	Several states require ethics courses and offer them as webinars. Texas is an example. They are different every year.	2/10/2020 10:34 AM
1014	None	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1015	A lot of states have ethics class requirements. I believe in ethical behavior, but the "classes" online are a joke. The state should create their own or have NCEES create a test for all states.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1016	I don't know that only ethics is enough. I think that we need to also have some technical requirements too.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1017	See my other comments.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1018	The Nevada laws and regulations change every building code change and cycle, and that's what the engineering community designs to. The building industry is interested in the 'code minimum' first, and costs second. If the engineering professionals could keep up with the code changes, that's more beneficial to our group.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1019	I think it would help individuals be more aware of the ethical part of the profession, however I also feel most private engineering companies require ethics as part of our own internal continuing education.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1020	This would concentrate on important changes in rules and practices.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1021	Professionals should be challenged to maintain and expand knowledge within their area of practice in a quantifiable measure.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1022	CEU seminars on building code updates are essential - I think that only focusing on Ethics and Nevada laws would be negligent	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1023	more time to get hours, or less hours per 2 year period,	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1024	Need requirements for continuing education in technical areas as well to improve quality of performance as years go by.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1025	If you wanted to include this requirement for part of the 30 hours, I think it would improve overall protection of the public. Technology is evolving so fast, I think there should still be a requirement for continuing education based primarily on the technological side.	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
1026	NO	2/10/2020 10:32 AM
1027	It appears to me that continued knowledge of current methods to increase technical competency takes care of itself in a	2/10/2020 10:32 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

competitive business situation that would require that knowledge in order to stay competitive with others in the field. A focus on professional ethics, to me, would better serve and protect the clients we provide services for.

1028	Ethics in Engineering is an often neglected but very important aspect of our practice. I support adding in mandatory ethics study.	2/10/2020 10:32 AM
1029	Removing the requirements for additional training would definitely impact the long-term capabilities of certain segments of the profession, such as fire protection, nuclear, structural and electrical. New equipment and techniques are popping up frequently, and staying informed to the benefit of the public.	2/10/2020 10:32 AM
1030	Engineering technology is consistently changing as are codes and regulations. As a professional engineer I must keep up with all these changes; the required PDHs add an additional motivation to stay abreast of my profession. I recommend Nevada keep their present PDH policy.	2/10/2020 10:32 AM
1031	The CEC should require some review of the ethics and Nevada laws, and some for technical relevance. Both New Mexico and Texas are good examples. Require 27 hours of technical relevance, and 3 hours of ethics/Nevada laws.	2/10/2020 10:32 AM
1032	The Nevada Board could require the three hours of Regulatory Continuing Education as part of the existing 30. One hour on Nevada Ethics and one hour on Nevada Rules would be more than adequate. I see no need for three hours.	2/10/2020 10:31 AM
1033	I do think making a focus on ethics and regulations will be a good move, but shouldn't be the sole education needed. I believe reducing the PDHs will hurt the many organizations that help move our industry forward because a lot of their membership is based of professionals trying to receive their PDHs.	2/10/2020 10:31 AM
1034	Ethics will help. Nevada laws & Regs will probably not have much impact.	2/10/2020 10:31 AM
1035	See comment in Item 5	2/10/2020 10:31 AM
1036	Currently I have multiple states with which I hold registrations. I am already required to provide one hour per year in ethics. This is in relationship to other states. Reducing the hours to just ethics and Nevada Laws and Regulations would lesson the integrity of our profession. We as engineers must always strive for providing the best, safe and technologically advanced design. Not requiring engineers to continually advance their knowledge in their discipline would allow for the attitude of "that's the way we have always done it." Innovations in design would suffer greatly.	2/10/2020 10:31 AM
1037	N/A	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1038	See above	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1039	no	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1040	Reducing required hours will not delay the advancement or hinder the utilization of new technology, the market will push the need to use the latest and greatest.	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1041	It's really hard to say. I personally like the idea of less hours for me. But don't know that it will help others. I'm hesitant on the 1 hour of class based on Nevada laws because I'm not a resident and am licensed in multiple states this may just be a hurdle for me to jump through. Also I think any competent surveyor who is working outside of their home state will get themselves caught up on the law before starting any project in the other state.	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1042	None	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1043	Often, I'll register for a continuing education course to learn about post installed anchor design (or some other relevant design topic), or a webinar discussing recent code changes/updates. I feel that the knowledge gained from these courses	2/10/2020 10:30 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

helps us as engineers design safer buildings because we are familiar with the latest design and technological advances. I sign up for these because I know that I've got to fulfill 30 credit hours every 2 years. Without that requirement, my participation would likely decrease significantly is design related webinars, seminars, and lectures. Focusing solely on ethics will likely reduce the amount of relevant design and technology webinars attended.

1044	It is a good reminder to retake these courses as these laws don't come up in daily work often. However, reducing the requirement to only these topics loses the focus on keeping one's knowledge base up to date.	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1045	The limitation on just Nevada laws and ethics doesn't help engineers stay current with design requirements. It absolutely does not protect the public.	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
1046	Ethics is an important area of practice. I am licensed in about 10-12 states and several mandate it and I have found it beneficial.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1047	NM requires an Ethics course specific to NM as part of the renewal process. I would think that part of the 30 hrs should be a mandatory Ethics course specific to NV.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1048	I believe that the change will not affect public safety one bit. I really question Continuing Education in general. If an engineer is "worth his salt" he is going to stay up with current methods, materials, ethics and laws on his own.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1049	Answered previously.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1050	It's more important to encourage professional development	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1051	Focus on ethics is good. Engineers should also be continuing their education on their own, but many won't if not required to.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1052	no	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1053	A professional Engineer should know right from wrong.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1054	none	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1055	I don't think requiring the 3 hours for ethics and Nevada law hurts, but maybe still require some hours in other areas. I think a total of 30 hours every 2 years matches other states; so maybe 3 for ethics/Nevada law and 27 for the remainder in development hours similar to what is currently required. It would really be nice if the 3 hours for Nevada law and ethics was some sort of online standardized course administered by the Nevada Board through your website if you go that route.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1056	I like the current model and believe that it does a better job of reinforcing life-long learning than the proposed model.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1057	NA	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1058	I agree that keeping up with laws and regs is important. But requiring an ethics class every year or two won't help much. Either you got'em or you don't.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1059	Engineering isn't stagnant and is dynamically changing every day. Not staying current with code changes or software changes would be removing a vital part of keeping engineers at the top of their game.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1060	It will improve because ethics is not currently an area that most engineers acquire their PDHs.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1061	NONE	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
1062	You can have the courses in ethics you want, but I do not believe it will reduce the number of ethical investigations the board will have to do. Ethics is a personal, moral issue which the board really has not control over.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

1063	Most engineers are licensed in multiple states and typically 1 hour of ethics course is required by a few states and accepted by most states you are licensed.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1064	Good engineers are learning daily through QC, code research, mentoring, and attending seminars or online training when needed. The tracking of these hours with limits on how many hours can be achieved in any single area can become a financial and time burden with minimal real value. I agree with the ethics and law reviews being the baseline.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1065	Leave it at 30 hours or reduce it to something between 20 and 30 hours.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1066	This would essentially eliminate the requirement for professional development hours with respect to skills. Some engineers will take the initiative to learn the necessary skills on their own but many will not. I think this will be especially problematic for young engineers that enter the workforce with a minimum skill set that would be greatly expanded through the currently required professional development hour requirements.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1067	3 hours is a severe cut. 15 might be a good compromise which would entail two 6 hour classes on technical subjects and then 3 hours of ethics and regulation.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
1068	I don't believe practicing PEs need technical training. A refresher course focused on ethics is very appropriate. Of course implementation is key.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1069	The science behind the engineering is exploding. The job of an engineer is to be the bridge between, pure science and the real world. The difference between and accredited Engineering degree, and an accredited, Engineering Technology degree, is that the Engineering Degree focuses on the science behind the codes and standards, which the Technology degree focuses on cook booking to the codes and standards, with little emphasis on the science. Technicians, are the utilizers, with little or, no understanding of codes and standards. It is fundamental to being an Engineer, that a practitioner understand the science, behind the codes and standards. It will not happen if they do not study the science. Most good practitioners, are doing more than the minimum thirty hours every two years. The ethics is simple, my Dad taught it to me when I was about seven. And engineers fiduciary responsibility, and fealty is to Mankind, Society, Client, then self. If you remember that and it guides your work, you will not have ethics or legal complaints.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1070	The same principle applies. Those who are knowledgeable and ethical already protect the public. Those who are not ethical or knowledgeable will likely not change their ways based on a continuing education requirement. Continuing education for practicing engineers is a policy with little practical benefit.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1071	I agree that it is necessary to stay "up" with the industry, the codes and the profession, and therefore, ethics is not sufficient to assure that Nevada's licensed engineers are a educated resource for the welfare of the state.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1072	It would free up my time to focus on more important things.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1073	None	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1074	Need a combination of both ethics and updates on codes and new engineering practices.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1075	Growth in terms of engineering is already occurring through the office work. As an Engineer, I contentiously learn and perform different work types in various projects. Additional PDH is not necessary.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1076	None	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
1077	I believe that if an individual is held accountable for knowing the laws they will then strive to educate themselves on how to meet those laws.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

1078	Our responsibility and accountability to the regenral public will be more enphasis.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1079	Same as my comments for question 5.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1080	No	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1081	By this requirement it will keep everyone updated with Nevada laws and regulations as well as ethics.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1082	If there was direction in the areas the state would like licensed individuals to have continued education it would bring the mindset of the community together. This would also allow each person to perform their continued education without being concerned about tracking and reporting the hours.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1083	n/a	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1084	I am in favor of the 3 hour requirement focusing on professional ethics and NV law will help public protection.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
1085	What is driving the change?	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1086	I believe a couple hours of ethics should be mandatory however focusing solely on ethics does not help with a continuously changing industry. Engineers also should be required to complete continuing education to stay up to date.	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1087	I feel that focusing the education requirements solely on ethics and law will not insure licensed engineers will remain up to date on new technologies/processes that are developed to insure public safety while maintaining project efficiency.	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1088	A 1-1/2 hr to 2 hr ethics course required with biennial renewal is acceptable. It is good to have the remaining ~28 hrs (majority) to focus on building, mech, energy, plumbing, electrical, etc., code revisions and new technology, new systems, new equipment, sustainable design, etc., items to improve future Building Construction Projects. By only focusing on professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulation, it will take time away from staying on top of evaluating the new products and system design to ensure that the new technology systems are properly designed for public and private user safety.	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1089	I feel it would help engineers to understand Nevada regulations better. I don't know if that translates into better public safety. Most other states require 30 hours of education per renewal period. It might be implied that by moving to fewer hours of education, Nevada would be and "easy" state for renewal which might affect things like reciprocity to other states. I think that amending the Nevada statutes to stay at 30 hour of continuing education, but requiring 2 to be in ethics and 1 on NV Rules and Law would be better.	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1090	Maintaining good ethical standards is important, but continuing engineering learning is as well.	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1091	It's a dramatic decrease in CEU requirements. It seems like 7 hours of technical elective plus the 3 hour required would be more appropriate.	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1092	No	2/10/2020 10:25 AM
1093	NV will lose the ability to mitigate technical incompetence if they proceed as proposed. Engineers must be both ethical and technically competent.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1094	Statute review can be resourced when needed. Requiring 1 hour of ethics within the current 30 hours would be beneficial.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1095	Specific state law knowledge requirements are fine except finding a provider to supply them is sometimes an issue.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1096	See answer at #5	2/10/2020 10:24 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

1097	If this is enacted, it would be beneficial for the State Board to provide the resources to meet the PDH requirements. As it currently stands, it is a significant effort to find meaningful credits at a reasonable cost (in terms of both monetary and time).	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1098	The standards of our profession and the applicable building codes change and professionals should keep up on the changes.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1099	I do not believe put focus in a reduced manner on ethics and regulations will have any impact on a reduction of licensee cases.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1100	Decisions related to self determination of qualifications are important for public protection. Better ethics suggests more sound self evaluations.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1101	Most engineers have real sense of ethics and the few who violate them, will not change their ways by attending ethics and Nevada laws and regulation classes.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1102	30 hours is too much time to spend on laws and ethics.	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1103	Focusing on ethics and Nevada laws would not help, if engineers are not required to continually improve technically. Why not leave it at 30, but require 3 related to ethics and Nevada law? How will engineer's get the Nevada law PDHs?	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
1104	Of the current 30 hours require 2 of those hours focusing on professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1105	See response to Q5.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1106	Focusing on ethics won't affect behavior. Those that are unethical will remain so. Instead, will reduce education in professional development.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1107	NO.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1108	Ethics are totally independent of technical competence.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1109	Every licensee needs to be aware about updated Ethics.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1110	I feel the county employees, especially inspectors, need this as well.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1111	No	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1112	Focusing on the ethics and the law should remind engineers of their professional responsibilities.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
1113	I think it is important to understand Nevada's specific engineering requirements. Maybe at least one class should be required each renewal, or at least a signed acknowledgment of any specific rules.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1114	I think it may persuade some engineers to not practice outside of their expertise.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1115	Would expect many engineers that practice unethically or in grey areas would continue to do so, not that we all couldn't benefit from a refresher now and then. That said, think the public would be best served by the profession if continuing education requirements for engineers included both a review of ethics and more tailored PDH hours.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1116	The answer to question 6 is speculative. The Nevada License Board likely has additional information to justify the proposed change. Without the same additional information, a focus on three total hours with a focus on ethics and Nevada regulation does not seem to promote technical advancement by license holders to protect the general public. The license board needs to make the final decision and determine.... are ethics and knowing what the 12th sentence in paragraph 15 of the	2/10/2020 10:22 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

regulations really contributing to public safety concerns or is a deeper understanding related to new technical advancement, revised adopted codes, and engineering application the concern?

1117	Professional engineers are already aware of their responsibilities and the board has methods of punishing and removing those who fail to follow the rules.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1118	Many states have some requirements above national standards. This would improve safety,	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1119	We as engineers are held to the standard of care, when changes occur we need to be current with those changes.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1120	Focusing only on ethics and regulations will not advance the level of practice and skill of NV engineers. Much is changing in engineering technology and state of practice. NV engineers must keep up with the evolving state of practice.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1121	I agree professional ethics and the laws are important. I would think that ethical people will remain ethical and they will read about laws and rule changes. I feel this would be best reserved for violators rather than presuming everyone needs to do this time and again. Where the best benefit for public protection is for the licensees to maintain current with Codes, Life Safety, and Fire protection.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1122	See previous comment	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1123	I think that it should be similar to the Pharmacy board, where their board requires a minimum of an hour or 2 of laws and ethics. But they also offer either an online or in person class for this portion. Also some of the pharmacy departments around town also make their newly licensed pharmacist to go to a board meeting, to see the board interaction and also disciplinary actions, I think this would be a good program to promote with our EI programs, since most of my new engineers don't even know that the board can do disciplinary actions, they think that their engineering diploma means they know everything	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1124	Ethics is important but Nevada's laws are not all that complicated to require repeated education requirements.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
1125	N/A	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1126	I think the addition of focus on Professional Ethics is beneficial (and sometimes badly needed for younger licensees) and adding some emphasis on Nevada Laws and regulations is helpful. Those make for improvement. That said, I don't support the reduction in overall hours. There is so much change in the professions that I believe the 30 hours is necessary to stay current and reducing them will reduce public protection.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1127	More study does not ensure people do the right thing. I don't think the issue of ethics should be focused on Nevada alone.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1128	3 Hours of continuing education is not enough to remain current in the fast changing field of Engineering	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1129	For us out of state licensees, it would provide a greater knowledge of Nevada related regulations.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1130	no comments.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1131	This would be the bare minimum of professional standards, which though important, would be insufficient to ensure professionals are remaining current with respect to their disciplines.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1132	I wonder how this will be administered. Perhaps a test as part of the renewal process? A summary of Law and Regulation changes with a brief quizz?	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1133	None	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1134	None	2/10/2020 10:21 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

1135	Insurance companies work hard at ethics already. Might help with law understanding.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1136	none	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1137	Highly focused will improve competency.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1138	I think if an engineer is doing their job, he or she will be keeping up to date on these items without having to take classes, but if items have changed it would always be good to get these update notifications prior to researching the changes.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1139	Ethics classes, when focused on real world examples, are something that is easier to apply to the benefit of the public.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1140	As I said in my earlier comment, requiring someone to sit through a class, even if it's focused on the most pertinent subjects, is not going to improve public protection. Those that adhere strictly to the policy and take in the knowledge from the class are most likely those that need it least, and those that could benefit the most from a lesson in ethics will probably not change their ways as a result of a 2-hour course taken every 2 years.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
1141	Ethics requirements are consistent for most states and are drilled into most engineers. Requiring PDH specifically on Nevada laws will do nothing to improve public safety - that relates more to liability than anything else and could easily be accomplished by sending newsletters and notices to licensees. Having state specific requirements will make it more difficult for engineers licensed in multiple states to stay current and only cause a greater potential for lapses as this specific requirement is overlooked. Having an ethics requirement that would be commonly accepted by all states would be more reasonable.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1142	I think the addition of focused requirement on professional ethics and law would be a benefit, but the CEU requirement should not be reduced to only ethics and law. We should maintain a requirement for professional development of technical skills and knowledge.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1143	With the limited amount of hours required I feel people would be more focused. I think it should favor the law more.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1144	technical competency is important too.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1145	Identifying the biggest needs for engineers to improve on and then requiring engineers to improve on these areas would be the most practical approach.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1146	By forcing Continuing Education to a few limited topics, the possibilities for learning will be significantly stifled. This is counter to the intent. By focusing so much only on Nevada, we would cut ourselves off from seeing other jurisdictions approach public protection issues. By only focusing on a couple topics, we would discourage professionals from seeking ancillary knowledge that would help them professionally. This is a terrible idea.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1147	Reduce to 10 hours over 2 years	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1148	I believe the CE could be technical as well. As a structural engineer I believe it is important to refresh and learn the latest technical material. Not just ethics and bylaws. Though important, I believe the technical competence of the engineer is more important to public safety.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1149	could be a slight reduction in some practitioners' participation in continuing education activities if there is no formal requirement to do so. Most practitioners remain pretty much up to date on the latest technology and techniques anyway.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1150	ethics violations seldom directly adversely affect the public. it is usually the result of breaking an admin rule, not poor engineering.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1151	I don't think it will change. However, no matter what it is a mandatory requirement to have at least 3-10 units combined	2/10/2020 10:20 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

continuing education such as attending seminars for energy, codes, fire protection, design and commissioning and public safety.

1152	Dont think it will change much at all	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1153	Unethical persons will be unethical regardless of how many hours of ethics classes they take. Technical competence should not be pushed off to the side when it comes down to it engineers are a technical field and should be competent technically and up to date the technical classes help ensure that.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1154	None	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1155	A thorough understanding of professional ethics and Nevada laws and regulations is important, but it doesn't improve or maintain a licensee's technical abilities.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1156	3 PDUsevery two years would be appropriate.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1157	This whole issue seems silly to me. How can eliminating continued technical education not affect public protection.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1158	No amount of education is going to cause someone to be more ethical and familiarity with the law does not come into play very often in everyday practice. These things affect the individual, not the public.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1159	Maintaining professional competency is vitally important and would be seriously compromised by eliminating the training component. In addition, it would be difficult for out-of-state folks like me to get training on state law (which changes little from your to year).	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1160	no	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1161	Classes or sessions at conferences will need to be offered in order to achieve this but it's a good idea. I do not know of any currently.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
1162	The requirement should be in addition or a requirement of the 30 PDH's. This is consistent with other states.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1163	If the State provides these classes then that would be beneficial to all parties. The State could cover those aspects they would like all professionals to know. I am for reducing to 3.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1164	Either you are ethical or you are not. Training doesn't change someones disposition from unethical to ethical.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1165	State-specific training is helpful for engineers who work in multiple jurisdictions.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1166	See previous comment.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1167	3 hours of ethics and regulations in 2 years may or may not stick with engineers. Title 30 has a wealth of information that could and should be covered.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1168	Again, no matter what continuing education a state requires will not remove the few non-competent engineers from practicing in our fields.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1169	Most professionals already keep up with the NV laws and regulations. I have no problem in revising as proposed as long as their are sufficient ways to accomplish the proposed 3 hour requirements, such as on-line review or sufficient on-site review sessions. Regarding the existing 30 hour requirement there are on-line webinars that can be attended.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1170	Three units is not enough keep up with trends and regulations	2/10/2020 10:19 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

1171	no	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
1172	I don't question the need for NV specific laws/regulation training but if someone's ethics are questionable to begin with, I doubt a class will have too much impact	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1173	There are many courses that satisfy the Laws and Regulations and Ethic's portions without really having the engineer become knowledgeable of the requirements.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1174	Other aspects to be considered include energy conservation and how climate change may affect design.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1175	None	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1176	Focus should be to meet the client requirements and uphold the ethics. Specific continued education should be focused on individual work needs.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1177	no	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1178	This is a tax on engineers, promulgated by the lobbying of the continuing education providers. An annual ethics course wont improve public safety. Neither will an annual course on Nevada specific rules.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1179	Whether there is a CE requirement or not, I will continue to advance my knowledge in areas that are needed and in whatever way is the most efficient and effective for me. I take my responsibilities seriously.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1180	By reducing the focus to specific topics (ethics/laws) I feel it would improve the requirement by requiring all professionals to have similar continuing education focused on public protection. Currently the 30 PDHs can be widely varied in topics and there is no requirements for what the topics should be.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1181	I think that there should be some requirement for technical development (maybe 5 hours per year, 10 per biennium) with the additional 3 hours for ethics and Nevada Regulations. I don't think we should scrap one for the other. Requirements for both technical- and ethics-development should be included in any amendment, not just ethics/regulations. Without any requirements on continuing education as it relates to technical development, I question if that will hinder the spread of innovation as engineers will have less incentive to attend conferences/webinars and employers will look to cut costs related to financing these continuing education activities.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1182	While I like the idea of adding these topics as required, I think you lose the element of keeping up on your engineering knowledge which also adds a layer of protection especially for those that may be in management or oversight roles.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1183	In addition to ethic, laws and regulations, PDHs on other relevant topics (such as unique projects, new research and technology, etc.) encourages constant learning and improvement as an engineer. Also, reducing the requirements for PDHs will decrease collaboration among professionals.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1184	I think engineers that are ethical will remain ethical and those that look for shortcuts, will always look for shortcuts regardless of how many classes they take.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1185	Technological advances in the building sciences are so rapid that simply relying on "ethically keeping up to date" to protect safety and health is a joke.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1186	no	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
1187	Ethics, laws and regulations regarding engineering practice should be universal, instead of (Nevada) state specific.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1188	No.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

1189	Perhaps reduce the PDH requirement from 30 to 20 hours, and then require 1 hr per year in both ethics and Nevada laws (which would be 4 hrs per 2 yr cycle)	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1190	The change to 3 hours ethics is an attempt to reduce the effort put into continuing education by engineers that refuse to commit to our profession. Finding ethic related continuing education will be unrealistic and just really stupid. If engineers need ethics they should take those hours without changing the program.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1191	Focusing only on ethics, laws and rules will not encourage engineers to maintain and improve their knowledge of new developments and best practices	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1192	I believe a reduction in the requirements would diminish the level of professionalism.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1193	The hardest thing I have to deal with for professional development is dealing with systems that require submission by a third party. If we need to have a certified presenter provide and submit attendance records of ethics classes and/or Nevada law classes, it will significantly increase difficulty with compliance.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1194	This comment is for 4 and 6 because 5 wouldn't let me respond. For me there is no difference because I need The same number of units for other state licenses biannual requirements as well.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1195	Many private firms already have similar requirements.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
1196	Many other professional societies have codes of ethics (ASCE, NSPE, etc.). I do not think that a ethics requirement will make practitioners more ethical. Requirements for keeping up with state of the art in practice will do more to ensure public safety.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1197	I suggest no change to the existing policy. As mentioned before employers will have no incentive to invest in employees if the pdh requirements are reduced. Also this is a very focused topic, who is going to provide the lesson and how much is it going to cost to participate?	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1198	Even if development is more focused on ethics, removing professional knowledge requirements will hinder licensing integrity. A professional engineer must still have and maintain solid engineering knowledge in order to operate in the public interest	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1199	No	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1200	we all need to stay current with new codes and ideas we need to know about new products and continue to learn I am 71 and I still think this is important	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1201	I believe the public protection is increased by continuing education focused on technical competency and on ethics, laws, and regulations.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1202	I believe the best companies will continue to develop professionally - and overall, this change is minimizing the burden to scramble at the 11th hour to find CEC courses to "check off the box" when it is time to renew the license. I am in favor.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1203	Ethics and law/rule changes are critical but far from meeting the goals of cpd	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1204	suggest the requirement be to review and take and pass an on-line quiz on the NV laws specific to engineering or PLS practice. Other states do this as part of getting a PE in that state.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1205	As stated in question #5, I believe that improvements would result by requiring courses in these to areas particularly as regulations change. State specific info would make engineers more effective.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1206	One benefit would be just refreshing everyone's mind on the legal aspects of being a PE.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

1207	it depends on how it is done. If it is farmed out and the cost is limited by the legislation then it would definitely help. if they are left to determine the fee then it could be hard for an individual to pay for the class, and some will take the risk of getting caught.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1208	Most ethical engineers are self-motivated to know the laws of each state in which they are registered. I suppose it would keep engineers with multi-state licensure up to date on any changes to NV law	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1209	Ethics and Laws & Regs are important, but I have found that PDHs are very helpful in refreshing knowledge of a given topic and even learning new design/engineering concepts.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1210	None	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1211	California and Washington make it understood that the P.E. has to keep his/her skills updated. The PD hrs. make things interesting and make sure there is an update of skills.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1212	None	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1213	no	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1214	30 hours should include ethics every 2 years.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1215	I think focusing on the laws and ethics will have a big help, instead of focusing on esoteric technology that is 30 years off and not used often, focusing on the ethics will help engineers practice within the bounds of the law easier.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1216	I feel engineering professionals are many times not completely clear about Nevada laws. Also, just revisiting this subject each year helps to remind one of the importance of laws and ethics.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
1217	Focusing on NV laws and regulations would be helpful to those who live and work in NV, but would not be relevant to those who work elsewhere. Currently, the continuing education required has helped me to keep up with new info in the field of choice.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1218	foucs should be on we improve lives and communities. Keeping the public safe.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1219	no comments	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1220	None	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1221	Refreshing those knowledge areas could keep some engineers out of trouble	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1222	I think that the 30 hour requirement should remain, but that 3 hours of the 30 should be on laws and ethics. This is what Florida is doing.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1223	Ethic classes should be taken along with the other classes. Federal law requires coal miners to take 8 hour refreshers every year. I think professional should also take refreshers to maintain their profession.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1224	N/A	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1225	none	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1226	Other states have requirements that CE hours be specific to their laws. This makes it a bookkeeping nightmare for those of us licensed in multiple states. Please do not implement a requirement that we now take NV specific classes!	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1227	3 units is not adequate. 30 for two years is acceptable	2/10/2020 10:15 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

1228	Technical development is equally important.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1229	Ethics and understanding the law is important (don't change those requirements), but a focus on technical issues is still needed.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1230	If the licensee focuses on the rules and regulations, he/she will conduct a better practice. Technical development is achieved by practicing already.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1231	Part of public protection is expanding our knowledge and keeping up with new approaches to design. Ethics and laws are only a small part of keeping the public safe.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1232	Ethics is good and current law I see poor behavior in many instances	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1233	I think requiring a small subset of hours to focus on Nevada laws and regulations could be a positive change. However, focusing the continuing education requirement ONLY on professional ethics and Nevada laws and regulations seems like it would be a detriment as the current focus on technical competency is beneficial.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1234	Professional engineers are required to know laws and regulations of the state they practice in and work within the bounds of their expertise. Requiring a portion of the 30 development hours to ethics/laws/regulations is a good idea but the requirement for technical development hours should not be eliminated.	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
1235	technical competence is the keystone of public protection for engineering practice.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1236	I think adding these requirements, rather than deleting the other requirements would be a better way to protect the public.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1237	It's a good idea worth pursuing.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1238	See my answer above. I like addressing these areas, but also think good old course work in one's area of practice is important	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1239	Not sure about ethics, but knowledge of Nevada laws and regulation is good for public protection. However, there are not many continuing education that only focuses on Nevada Engineering Code.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1240	The only drawback to ethics training, which is a current requirement in New Mexico and Texas, is the courses are so similar from year to year the training gets pretty boring. Class content seems to be very limited.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1241	A more educated professional can better serve public protection, not just a more ethical one.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1242	none	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1243	I guess it would be ok to require 3 of the 30 to be as suggested, but do not drop the others. It's easy to fall behind and use the same old methods, but not good.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1244	Ethics and the laws are certainly important, but PE's also need to stay up on the technical part of engineering to be effective.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1245	I don't think researching the rules and ethics is going to make anyone a better engineer for the public. It'll just be studying rules not technical knowledge.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1246	Unless the classes would be administered by the State Board, or qualified contractors, and there are tests/quizzes to ensure participation, the license holders will typically treat this requirement as a tax, and pay the cost just to comply. I do not think just requiring 3 PDH's that can be acquired from a variety of sources , without much scrutiny would amount to much increased knowledge.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

1247	It is my observation that where ethics are lacking, no improvement will result from ethics classes. Enforcement where clear ethics violations occur is the only mechanism for weeding out unethical practitioners.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1248	I am unaware of the proposed change. It would help me out, but there might be others who would benefit from the skills portion of continuing education.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1249	Currently, Engineers find the hours wherever they can. Updating the requirements per this discussion will force Engineers to focus on those things having a direct impact on public safety and protection	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
1250	Just knowing the law, doesn't mean your up to date on the technical aspects of engineering. Also, how often would there related seminars/webinars be offered. Even though, just 3 hours, unless I can do it wholly be recorded webinars, if needed, may be difficult to schedule.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1251	N/A	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1252	Code application and enforcement directly relates to public protection and as such focusing CE in that area will have a direct impact.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1253	No	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1254	While it is important to understand ethical behavior and the regulations adopted by each state, those requirements are more "administrative" than requirements that focus on the ever changing technical changes in our industry.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1255	More important to keep up with technological advancements	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1256	knowledge of ethics and law is fine but some technical requirements should also be required	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1257	Different jurisdictions have similar requirement for professional understanding his practice under the state specific or geographic requirement. Hence, focusing on state need should improve professional practicing within the state.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1258	No	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1259	No	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1260	No	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1261	Asking for more focus on building code or for discipline-relevant CEUs would better protect the public. CEUs that are only ethics focused do not directly protect the public.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1262	How will technical competency be addressed if the only subjects are ethics and knowledge of the law?	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1263	I think the ethics and state law classes are good, not sure I would eliminate all other pdhs, but I don't think you need 30	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1264	none	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1265	I would only make the change if the Board feels that ethics knowledge would address a specific need or shortcoming in current licensees. For the most part I think that licensees understand their professional ethical duties. Keeping technically current is important too.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1266	Same comment as before: Yes, and only to a minimum level. Standards of practice within engineering - all disciplines - is not static. Requiring continuing education, requires practitioners, to a minimum level, stay up to date with the changing	2/10/2020 10:13 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

standards of practice in design, analysis and assessment. 30 hours over two year intervals is not a high standard and should not be lowered, and definitely not to 3.

1267	No comments	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1268	Although professional ethics is important, three hours on this topic will not lead to engineers staying current on the latest technical issues.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1269	Per my previous comment, I believe that the hours will be vastly improved	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1270	this would be a good change.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1271	I believe the proposed three (3) professional development hours would better achieve the intent of the regulation with respect to public protection.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1272	no	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
1273	Each state has its own regulation and by focusing on the specific requirements of NV it will improve the knowledge of the engineer and the safety of the public.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1274	None	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1275	The codes are constantly changing and new building products are continuously being introduced to the construction field. I think our profession needs to keep up.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1276	no	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1277	Just add the professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada State Laws to the requirement and setup a web page were the training can be completed.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1278	If these classes are mandatory, who will teach them and who's going to pay for it?	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1279	I applaud the board's efforts in regard to the possible thoughtful reform of the continuing education requirement.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1280	The 30 hours should be technical	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1281	Professional ethics are definitely important but related to public protection misses mark, it is akin to having aboard meeting and relying on Roberts rules of order being the focus, not the purpose and content of the meeting	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1282	Engineers don't need reminders to be ethical. Telling engineers to ethical will not help the public.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1283	It would be best to include a portion of the 30 professional development hours that must be on professional ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws and regulations. Professional development hours in the technical field should be kept so all professionals can stay on top of the latest design trends and information. This will continue to keep public protection high.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1284	I believe it's more important for supervisory and management professionals to stay current with the law as opposed to technical training.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
1285	no	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1286	My understanding of continuing education is continuous learning and staying up to date on design practices, materials, and safety provisions. I don't think more ethics classes or Nevada law knowledge puts me in any better place when it comes to protecting the public or making informed design decisions.	2/10/2020 10:11 AM

Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors Legislative Committee Continuing Education Survey

1287	None	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1288	Several states in which I am registered have this requirement, and it is pretty boring; dealing mostly with governmental claptrap with little to do with true ethics.	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1289	Technical education is also important	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1290	Just do away with continuing education credits all together.	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1291	Improve	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1292	The continuing education currently is not targeted directly at the areas mentioned in question 6. But rather a broad scope. The current pertains more to a design competency as opposed to an ethical competency.	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1293	Cutting education down 90% is not a good idea. 30hrs should be maintained with 3hrs of those being the required ethical/regulatory training.	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1294	I think knowledge of professional ethics and Nevada laws should be part of the 30 hours, but the current requirement of 30 hours should be maintained.	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1295	I think that reduction of continuing education requirements would be a detriment to the profession and society.	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1296	I feel that the requirement for Ethics and knowledge of Nevada laws should be mandatory and included in the thirty hours	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
1297	no comments	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1298	No	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1299	No	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1300	State specific AND the emphasis on Ethics seems to be more apt to provide protection.	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1301	The engineers that do not care will not change.	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1302	thanks	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
1303	I believe this is a much better idea	2/10/2020 10:09 AM
1304	Engineers should be encourage to continue developing technical competencies, and breadth in other disciplines and practice areas.	2/10/2020 10:09 AM
1305	No	2/10/2020 10:09 AM
1306	Ethics and laws are great, but people need to keep up with industry standards, and learn about material, design, and standards updates.	2/10/2020 10:09 AM
1307	fsdfklasdfjasdfwearew fvmd faweoirte vmzvmaetj g av	2/10/2020 9:43 AM