Proposed amendments to update requirements for applications, licensing, contact information, and firm registration

Small Business Impact Survey Results
Q1 Type of Business (primary service offered)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>88.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Surveying</td>
<td>8.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2 Number of Full-Time Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;150</td>
<td>35.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;150</td>
<td>64.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3 Business Managing Office Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in Nevada</td>
<td>38.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other US State</td>
<td>59.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside US</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 Will a specific proposed regulatory provision in the application, licensing, contact information, and firm registration regulations have an adverse economic effect upon your business?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>92.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 Any comments or explanation relating to your answer to Question 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Changes to NAC 625.210, item 3. While outside the scope of the Board, this change removes the protections afforded to US and Nevada businesses and professionals by a license. Without protections from &quot;offshore&quot; companies and individuals the license fee is just another tax. This is &quot;globalism&quot; at it's worst and unfortunately the result of single party control of the Legislature.</td>
<td>6/10/2020 4:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/10/2020 2:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6/10/2020 1:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>6/10/2020 9:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I am employed by a Government Agency.</td>
<td>6/9/2020 4:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6/9/2020 12:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>State of Nevada entity</td>
<td>6/6/2020 8:44 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NAC 625.210 requires an engineer to have a NCEES record, NCEES record extracts a fee when the information is transmitted to a State. In this case to transmit to NV would cost $175 (if you have not already transmitted and this was your first state).</td>
<td>6/4/2020 4:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/4/2020 11:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6/2/2020 2:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6/2/2020 6:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>6/1/2020 8:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/30/2020 10:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Thank you for involving us in this process!</td>
<td>5/29/2020 7:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Necessary safeguards need to be put in place for PE in Canada in NAC 625.240. PE in NV wishing to apply for PE in Canada has to go thru a lot of hurdles as per Email to Patty Mamola on 05/27/2019. NVBELS has indicated it is taking up the matter with concerned authorities in Canada. Any dilution of rules for PE in Canada in NAC 625.240 vis-a-vis PE in NV applying for PE in Canada must be reciprocal, balanced, ethical and just.</td>
<td>5/28/2020 12:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The way we understand this is that a firm can open an office in this state but the work would be performed and overseen from anywhere. All that office could have is a person advertising for work creating more competition. Seems harder to pursue responsible parties to engineering product and the ability to provide less responsible work at cheaper rates.</td>
<td>5/28/2020 9:26 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/27/2020 12:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I will most likely not provide engineering services directly in the state due to requirements of setting up the firm with the State, business license in county of project, etc. to simply be able to provide a proposal on a project.</td>
<td>5/27/2020 11:32 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>5/27/2020 8:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/27/2020 6:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>PHA hour for license renewal are excessive and without NVBPELS offerings in anything other than civil engineering are totally lacking. There are no professional societies operating in NW Nevada where PHA hours can be accumulated in area of expertise.</td>
<td>5/26/2020 3:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/26/2020 12:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I'm not sure if or how (pg 14) - NAC 625.425 Registration of firm: Application; requirements; renewal; fees. NRS 625.140 625.177 625.179 - Nevada State Business License - affects me. I'll have to look into it.</td>
<td>5/26/2020 10:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/26/2020 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/26/2020 7:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I use a PO Box for security and convenience that mail is not lost when placed in an exterior mail box. I would like the option of having a separate residence and mailing address to keep my</td>
<td>5/24/2020 2:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Requirements of the NCEES record adds another layer of bureaucracy to the application process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>We need to work together for a better business environment and continue to push the curve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>The changes doesn't affect our firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS ARE IN ALIGNMENT WITH OTHER STATES THAT WE ALREADY FOLLOW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Looks like they are eliminating things, which we like. Less bureaucracy, more production.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Any additional costs or additional time is adverse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Business &quot;Bay Cities Engineering&quot; has no employees and is located at 101 Avenida Veracruz, Anaheim, CA, 92808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>The proposed modifications will be great for new engineers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Glad to see the application fee is affordable!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Your regulation are good and in fact are similar to other States in the Country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>NAC 625.220.3(a) &amp; (e): Agricultural Engineering concerns growing food (e.g., farming); Biological Engineering concerns designing systems to produce medicines and other man-made organics. They are not related and someone knowledgeable in one would generally not be qualified to work in the other field. Electrical Engineers design building power systems, power stations and other constructed works. Quite a few EE's would not know a computer if it was dropped on them. Computer Engineers are concerned with information technology and the software and hardware related thereto. CE's generally have no familiarity with the building codes that govern EE work. For both of these situations, you need a new classification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments to update requirements for applications, licensing, contact information, and firm registration

58. no

59. None

60. no

61. Planning for any cost impact we can adjust budgets as necessary.

62. no

63. None

64. At this point in my career, I am only a part time employee.

65. no

66. n/a

67. No comments

68. PE license required by defense contract

69. none

70. None

71. No.

72. no

73. no

74. n/a

75. NAC 625.210 Sec. 2 and 3 should not be deleted. School transcripts shall be enforced to be as a proof of college education. Sec. 3 shall remain. It is in order with NRS 625.183. Hiring illegals may lead to disaster projects and a bad company reputation.

76. N/A

77. I am a sole proprietor.

78. Work for the Dept of Defense

79. n/a

80. None

81. It appears fees are going down. That will be a positive for us.

82. Thanks for streamlining with NCEES. That’s a significant improvement for my needs.

83. The weakening of reference requirements undermines the quality and value of licensure. If an individual cannot obtain references, which include character, outside their employer, they probably shouldn’t be licensed. I also strongly disagree with licensing non-citizens who do not have a right to work in this country. The applicable legislation apparently driving this is nothing more than virtue-signaling. What possible purpose could licensing someone who cannot legally work in the US serve, other than to undermine the reputation of every other licensee and set the stage for illegal acts for which there may be no recourse.

84. The removal of NAC625.210,3 is ridiculous. A person can be a non citizen and be licensed in the state? I would have to compete against people who are not even citizens of this country?

85. I held LS licenses in multiple states, including Nevada, prior to becoming the County Surveyor for the County of Alameda, California. The County does not perform any work in Nevada, but I will maintain my license

86. no

87. Did not identify any proposed changes that would result in increased effort or cost for our employees pursuing registration in Nevada.

88. The section on firm licensing remains vague. For example, a firm with an engineer that has a Nevada license but no location within the state of Nevada and works only for clients outside of
Nevada is arguably not doing business in Nevada. Therefore they do not need a Nevada business license and firm registration should not be needed. Many states attempt to force outside businesses to obtain business licenses, pay taxes and file firm licenses as it is an additional source of revenue but in the absence of money exchanging hands in Nevada, it is unenforceable. I recommend that the Board clearly indicate that entities without offices and personnel and who do not send or receive instruments of service nor payments with clients within the state not be required to hold a firm license.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Proof of Citizenship should be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>nope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Requiring applicants to go through NCEES process only is overly restrictive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>No economic impact. This should make the application process easier / more efficient for new engineers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>I concur with the changes being made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>These regulation changes are helpful and focus on the technical proficiency of an engineer, rather than forcing artificial check boxes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Although I am registered in NV, I do not do business there currently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>No Comments. The proposal appears reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 Will a specific proposed regulatory provision in the application, licensing, contact information, and firm registration regulations have a beneficial effect upon your business?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7 Any comments or explanation relating to your answer to Question 6.
## S1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments to update requirements for applications, licensing, contact information, and firm registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>6/10/2020 4:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/10/2020 2:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fees and means for future employees</td>
<td>6/10/2020 1:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>6/10/2020 9:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Re: NAC 625.425: The change that removes the requirement to list branch offices for firm registration makes the process more simple.</td>
<td>6/8/2020 4:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>State of Nevada entity</td>
<td>6/6/2020 8:44 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Most of it just removes outdated language, which is important, but does it benefit my business, I would say no.</td>
<td>6/4/2020 4:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/4/2020 11:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>6/2/2020 2:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6/2/2020 6:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>6/1/2020 8:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>5/30/2020 10:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The changes are helpful to our operations, both practically and economically; particularly the deletions.</td>
<td>5/30/2020 10:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Neutral effects</td>
<td>5/29/2020 8:54 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Updating and electronic notification options are beneficial. Simplifying the process is also helpful.</td>
<td>5/29/2020 7:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NCEES record streamlining process</td>
<td>5/28/2020 12:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>moving to NCEES record is a good idea</td>
<td>5/27/2020 4:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Requiring the NCEES record for licensure simplifies the application process our engineers follow for licensure in Nevada.</td>
<td>5/27/2020 12:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I do like that Nevada requires continuing education hours. I think it is important.</td>
<td>5/27/2020 11:32 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>5/27/2020 8:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/27/2020 6:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/26/2020 12:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/26/2020 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5/26/2020 7:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Many of our engineers only have internal contacts to use as references.</td>
<td>5/26/2020 7:32 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Seems like a lot of very good changes. Fully support using NCEES Records as the Board does compared to other states.</td>
<td>5/26/2020 5:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/24/2020 12:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>It can help someone looking for an Engineering Firm to do work in Nevada. Past project information can be referenced.</td>
<td>5/24/2020 8:22 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>5/24/2020 8:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/24/2020 7:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/23/2020 7:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>It'll be a little cheaper for our engineers to get licensed</td>
<td>5/22/2020 3:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/22/2020 2:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/22/2020 11:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>5/22/2020 10:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS ARE EASIER TO READ AND UNDERSTAND;</td>
<td>5/22/2020 10:07 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEREFORE, EASIER TO FOLLOW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Eliminating unnecessary wording and extra steps is a good thing.</td>
<td>5/22/2020 9:52 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/22/2020 9:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5/22/2020 8:28 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/22/2020 8:16 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/21/2020 4:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>The modification to the References section.</td>
<td>5/21/2020 2:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>It depends on the regulatory provision but it definitely won't have</td>
<td>5/21/2020 12:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>any adverse effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/21/2020 12:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/21/2020 11:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/21/2020 11:25 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/21/2020 11:22 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5/21/2020 11:07 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>It is a good thing that references can be from the same company</td>
<td>5/21/2020 10:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Makes process easier.</td>
<td>5/21/2020 10:11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/21/2020 10:11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/21/2020 10:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Lower fees</td>
<td>5/21/2020 9:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Reduced fees are better for junior employees. Encourages them to</td>
<td>5/21/2020 8:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>apply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>It didn't effect us negatively either.</td>
<td>5/21/2020 8:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>See previous comment</td>
<td>5/21/2020 8:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/21/2020 8:11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/21/2020 8:10 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Simplifies some activities</td>
<td>5/21/2020 8:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/21/2020 7:48 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/21/2020 7:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/21/2020 6:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>All requirements are reasonable.</td>
<td>5/21/2020 6:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5/21/2020 5:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5/21/2020 5:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>5/21/2020 4:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Costs of licensure going down is helpful. Having a requirement for</td>
<td>5/21/2020 4:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the NCEES record in lieu of things like transcripts is most</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>helpful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>PE registration required by contract</td>
<td>5/21/2020 4:04 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 8:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/20/2020 6:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>NAC 625.210 Sec1. is not clear. While I agree that original requirement is hard to fulfill, who would even know the Executive Director of the Board personally to give him as a professional reference? Please revise this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Work for the Dept of Defense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Fees appear to be going down.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>OOps - That NCEES streamlining, plus clearing out the need for listing branch offices. We sometimes set up for a project and then depart when it needs, and making that construction trailer a branch office can be confusing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Accepting professional references from persons who are all members of the same organization makes getting licensed less burdensome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>I agree with the removal and reasoning behind the removal of the requirement for an applicant to submit references from multiple sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>nope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>It looks like renewals will be simpler and more standardized based on using NCEES records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Not a licensing board issue, but the requirements for out-of-state corporations has resulted in us not offering to perform engineering or surveying services in Nevada. Maybe that was the intended result.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>No business effect, but it will make the process easier for engineer applicants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>removing the requirement limiting the number of recommendations from within one organization will help most emerging engineers who have stayed with our firm through their formative years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments to update requirements for applications, licensing, contact information, and firm registration

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>No Comments. The proposal appears reasonable.</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:12 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 Do you anticipate any indirect adverse effects from the proposed amendments on your business?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9 Any comments or explanation relating to your answer to Question 8.
S1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments to update requirements for applications, licensing, contact information, and firm registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Same as Question 5: Changes to NAC 625.210, item 3. While outside the scope of the Board, this change removes the protections afforded to US and Nevada businesses and professionals by a license. Without protections from &quot;offshore&quot; companies and individuals the license fee is just another tax. This is &quot;globalism&quot; at it's worst and unfortunately the result of single party control of the Legislature.</td>
<td>6/10/2020 4:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/10/2020 2:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6/10/2020 1:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>6/10/2020 9:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>State of Nevada entity</td>
<td>6/6/2020 8:44 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>As someone who prefers to have the leadership of the organization close to those they are regulating, it is unclear what the future will hold as the control is being given away to national organizations. Although I understand the desire for conformity between the states and organizations, the concern is that the local control will also be lost. Be careful as you give your powers away to others. An example is the &quot;NCEES Model Law Engineer&quot;. What happens if they change the Model Law Engineer and you do not agree, is it easy to decline certain aspects of it? Just something to consider, the local Board having control is ultimately better.</td>
<td>6/4/2020 4:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/4/2020 11:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>6/2/2020 2:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6/2/2020 6:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>6/1/2020 8:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>5/30/2020 10:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No concerns.</td>
<td>5/29/2020 7:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Inview of the Covid situation, licensing fees must be moderated for a time period.</td>
<td>5/28/2020 12:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We could witness work going out of state losing jobs locally.</td>
<td>5/28/2020 9:26 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/27/2020 12:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>5/27/2020 8:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/27/2020 6:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>See question 6</td>
<td>5/26/2020 3:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/26/2020 12:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/26/2020 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5/26/2020 7:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/24/2020 12:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>5/24/2020 8:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/24/2020 7:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/23/2020 7:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Don't See any effects</td>
<td>5/22/2020 3:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/22/2020 2:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/22/2020 11:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>5/22/2020 10:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/22/2020 10:07 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/22/2020 9:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5/22/2020 8:28 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/22/2020 8:16 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/21/2020 4:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/21/2020 2:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>It depends on the regulatory provision but it definitely won’t have any adverse effects</td>
<td>5/21/2020 12:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/21/2020 12:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/21/2020 11:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/21/2020 11:25 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/21/2020 11:22 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>5/21/2020 11:07 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/21/2020 10:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Why mandate National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying as the only source of University data? Why not both the individual university and NCEES?</td>
<td>5/21/2020 10:32 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Keep in 625.210 #3 requiring proof of USA citizenship.</td>
<td>5/21/2020 10:19 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/21/2020 10:11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/21/2020 10:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/21/2020 9:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I certainly do not want a computer engineer designing the electrical system for my next building project!</td>
<td>5/21/2020 8:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>The removal of NAC 625.210 (3) could have an adverse effect on businesses as a whole.</td>
<td>5/21/2020 8:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/21/2020 8:11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/21/2020 8:10 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/21/2020 7:48 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/21/2020 7:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/21/2020 6:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/21/2020 6:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5/21/2020 5:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5/21/2020 5:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/21/2020 4:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5/21/2020 4:04 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 8:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/20/2020 6:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 6:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 5:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5/20/2020 5:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Eliminating Sec. 3 and removing Transcript as a proof from Sec. 2 NAC 625.210 is worrisome.</td>
<td>5/20/2020 5:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/20/2020 4:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/20/2020 4:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Work for the Dept of Defense</td>
<td>5/20/2020 4:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5/20/2020 4:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/20/2020 4:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/20/2020 3:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>as noted above</td>
<td>5/20/2020 3:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Teaching at an ABET accredited university requires consistent improvements in curriculum and course content. Disallowing all beneficial credits for repeated teaching of the same course is not equitable to teaching faculty. Recommend allowing some partial credit for development of new course content.</td>
<td>5/20/2020 3:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5/20/2020 3:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Only offering the NRS 625 exam once a year will delay licensing for individuals.</td>
<td>5/20/2020 3:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 3:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>5/20/2020 3:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/20/2020 3:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>See previous comment on firm licenses.</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>NAC 625.220 lumps the fields of electrical engineering and computer engineering into a single bin of expertise and licensing. This is a bad idea. There is little in common in expertise, knowledge and experience between electrical engineering and computer engineering. I recommend splitting these as two distinct disciplines.</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>nope</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:12 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 Do you anticipate any indirect beneficial effects from the proposed amendments on your business?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11 Any comments or explanation relating to your answer to Question 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/10/2020 2:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6/10/2020 1:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>6/10/2020 9:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>State of Nevada entity</td>
<td>6/6/2020 8:44 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Most of it just removes outdated language, which is important, but does it benefit my business, I would say no.</td>
<td>6/4/2020 4:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6/4/2020 11:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>6/2/2020 2:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6/2/2020 6:39 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>6/1/2020 8:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/30/2020 10:43 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Simple and plain language is always better!</td>
<td>5/29/2020 7:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Same as 7</td>
<td>5/28/2020 12:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/27/2020 12:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>5/27/2020 8:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/27/2020 6:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/26/2020 12:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Proposed changes appear to place more substantiation on applicants.</td>
<td>5/26/2020 10:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/26/2020 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5/26/2020 7:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The new rules clarify the requirements for licensure and testing.</td>
<td>5/24/2020 2:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
<td>5/24/2020 8:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/24/2020 7:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/23/2020 7:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Don't See any effects</td>
<td>5/22/2020 3:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5/22/2020 2:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>none.</td>
<td>5/22/2020 11:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/22/2020 10:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/22/2020 10:07 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Looks like it will be a little easier to negotiate the paperwork jungle.</td>
<td>5/22/2020 9:52 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/22/2020 9:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5/22/2020 8:28 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/22/2020 8:16 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/21/2020 4:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/21/2020 2:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Possibly increased business</td>
<td>5/21/2020 12:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/21/2020 12:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/21/2020 11:43 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments to update requirements for applications, licensing, contact information, and firm registration

38  None 5/21/2020 11:25 AM
39  No 5/21/2020 11:22 AM
40  n 5/21/2020 11:07 AM
41  no 5/21/2020 10:47 AM
42  Don't mandate NCEES as the only source of university information. 5/21/2020 10:32 AM
43  none 5/21/2020 10:11 AM
44  none 5/21/2020 10:09 AM
45  NA 5/21/2020 9:39 AM
46  No effects either way. Its a professional practice that all registered professionals should do. 5/21/2020 8:40 AM
47  no 5/21/2020 8:11 AM
48  None 5/21/2020 8:10 AM
49  no 5/21/2020 7:48 AM
50  no 5/21/2020 7:39 AM
51  None 5/21/2020 6:38 AM
52  None 5/21/2020 6:35 AM
53  n/a 5/21/2020 5:30 AM
54  No 5/21/2020 4:34 AM
55  change is healthy 5/21/2020 4:04 AM
56  no 5/20/2020 8:35 PM
57  None 5/20/2020 8:11 AM
58  no 5/20/2020 6:33 PM
59  no 5/20/2020 5:43 PM
60  n/a 5/20/2020 5:20 PM
61  Fees were decreased and also rules were eased to apply for license. Do not agree with it. 5/20/2020 5:05 PM
62  N/A 5/20/2020 4:46 PM
63  No 5/20/2020 4:38 PM
64  Work for the Dept of Defense 5/20/2020 4:32 PM
65  n/a 5/20/2020 4:21 PM
66  None 5/20/2020 4:17 PM
67  New employees licensed in Nevada won't skirt the experience requirements using concurrent experience. Didn't know that was happening, but glad to see it won't if the provisions pass. 5/20/2020 4:14 PM
68  nope 5/20/2020 3:47 PM
69  no 5/20/2020 3:33 PM
70  While accepting professional references from persons who are all members of the same organization makes getting licensed less burdensome, it can also present conflicts of interest where an organization will benefit from an employee (within the organization) to become licensed. Although this may incentivize unethical behavior, I believe it is a practical/fair trade-off, since for many applicants, the accessibility to quality references can be extremely difficult. I don't believe it would be right for the NVBPELS to continue to exclude/restrict/limit sources of references without providing alternate options (or perhaps even coordinating internships) to applicants who have struggled through a four year process to generate references. Many times, licensed professional engineers do not act in the capacity of having responsible charge of work 5/20/2020 3:33 PM
S1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments to update requirements for applications, licensing, contact information, and firm registration

and should not attest to ones experience, but somehow still manage to write professional references for an applicant. If the objective is to provide a minimum standard for licensure while maintaining integrity in the process, the NVBPELS should "require" some level of involvement with professional societies to acquire professional references rather than leaving it up to work-organization relationships.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 3:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>5/20/2020 3:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>General Comments: The first revision: &quot;An applicant shall not give the Executive Director of the Board as a professional reference.&quot; is unclear and needs to be revised. The use of the NCEES organization and testing service is accurate at this date, you may want to add language to allow for flexibility if circumstances change. Added language could be, &quot;NCEES, or another organization approved by the Board,&quot; Otherwise, you would need to amend the NAC anytime a name changes or if another national or international organization provides a testing service that is superior to the current one.</td>
<td>5/20/2020 3:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>I object to the codification of the mandatory use of a single commercial record keeping organization in the law. Having NCEES as the only allowed source of records is a poor choice.</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>nope</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Use of NCEES will allow us to offer more engineers' services within Nevada, and streamline process for engineers based in Nevada to work in other states.</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/20/2020 2:12 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>