

Q5 Any comments related to answer to Question 4

Answered: 472 Skipped: 200

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	DATE
1	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.	2/13/2020 10:37 AM
2	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.	2/13/2020 9:43 AM
3	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	2/13/2020 9:28 AM
4	3 hrs biennially probably is not be enough to meet the intent	2/13/2020 9:21 AM
5	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.	2/13/2020 8:04 AM
6	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.	2/13/2020 7:38 AM
7	No	2/13/2020 7:35 AM
8	There are a lot of incompetent engineers out there, you need to keep them educated.	2/13/2020 6:57 AM
9	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.	2/13/2020 6:29 AM
10	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.	2/12/2020 9:01 PM
11	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	2/12/2020 7:32 PM
12	I believe the 30 hours of education require Nevada Engineers to spend necessary time outside of project related work to think about their profession.	2/12/2020 4:36 PM
13	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.	2/12/2020 3:24 PM
14	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 bellow the level of catalogues.	2/12/2020 3:22 PM

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

15	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.	2/12/2020 2:51 PM
16	I feel like 30 credits is sufficient and allows professionals to improve their technical competencies through a variety of opportunities.	2/12/2020 2:50 PM
17	Seems like many professionals go to a convention or seminar for their CE hours, then immediately forget everything afterwards	2/12/2020 2:08 PM
18	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.	2/12/2020 1:48 PM
19	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.	2/12/2020 1:30 PM
20	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.	2/12/2020 1:22 PM
21	30 pdh's are relatively easy to obtain in two years.	2/12/2020 11:40 AM
22	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!	2/12/2020 10:27 AM
23	Most technical competency comes from working experience.	2/12/2020 10:15 AM
24	Responsible engineers will do what is necessary to maintain appropriate technical competence in their area of practice.	2/12/2020 10:10 AM
25	I would just add, that 1 - 2 hours per year should be on ethics. That would be within the 15 hours per year.	2/12/2020 9:43 AM
26	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.	2/12/2020 9:38 AM
27	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.	2/12/2020 9:05 AM
28	It would be likely helpful to add a requirement that a certain number of PDH need to be focused on ethics, laws and regulations.	2/12/2020 9:03 AM
29	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.	2/12/2020 8:38 AM
30	With the advances in the engineering practice, it is very important to have continued education be a part of maintain a licence.	2/12/2020 7:57 AM
31	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.	2/12/2020 7:19 AM
32	No	2/12/2020 7:08 AM
33	I learn everyday on the job.	2/12/2020 7:02 AM
34	30 hours per biennium should be considered the minimum; the course structure and Board approval of the subject matter should be discussed.	2/12/2020 6:51 AM

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

35	none	2/12/2020 6:42 AM
36	just seems like a lot of time spent for pretty minimal gain.	2/12/2020 6:25 AM
37	I do feel that professional ethics has given way to greed in the last 13 years.	2/12/2020 3:15 AM
38	Let's require that 3 of the 30 hours be about ethics and laws.	2/11/2020 11:22 PM
39	I think the current the PDH requiement helps maintains technical competents in the profession.	2/11/2020 10:13 PM
40	I believe a portion of the required hours should be related to ethics.	2/11/2020 8:51 PM
41	Not really.	2/11/2020 7:59 PM
42	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.	2/11/2020 7:58 PM
43	This directly addresses the original intent. I recommend that we keep it!	2/11/2020 7:40 PM
44	no	2/11/2020 7:25 PM
45	This is comparable with other states as well as requirements for other related professions and easily achievable.	2/11/2020 7:11 PM
46	Many of the seminars that we get credit for have nothing to do with protecting the public.	2/11/2020 7:09 PM
47	CE should be limited to laws and ethics.	2/11/2020 6:44 PM
48	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).	2/11/2020 6:24 PM
49	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.	2/11/2020 6:22 PM
50	To many things qualify. The requirement has been watered down	2/11/2020 5:52 PM
51	None.	2/11/2020 5:46 PM
52	Keeping current technically especially with code related changes is important as well.	2/11/2020 5:35 PM
53	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.	2/11/2020 5:17 PM
54	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.	2/11/2020 5:06 PM
55	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.	2/11/2020 4:59 PM
56	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.	2/11/2020 4:39 PM
57	I have heard of reducing the number of hours and making the training specific to the intent of ethics and public safety.	2/11/2020 4:04 PM
58	Many of my hours are spent watching presentations about engineering efforts and advancements. Ethics and law are not included	2/11/2020 3:44 PM
59	I do feel that the current professional development paradigm is (somewhat) effective in	2/11/2020 2:40 PM

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

promoting technical competency. It could always be improved.

60	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.	2/11/2020 2:38 PM
61	30 credits every two years = 15 credits each year = 1.25 hours each month of continuing education	2/11/2020 2:37 PM
62	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.	2/11/2020 2:36 PM
63	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.	2/11/2020 2:36 PM
64	30 hours is too much time to attend and very costly.	2/11/2020 2:32 PM
65	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.	2/11/2020 1:53 PM
66	Registrants need more direct training on different levels other than rehashing the same training we do every year.	2/11/2020 1:32 PM
67	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.	2/11/2020 1:21 PM
68	The requirement keeps PEs engaged and avoids complacency.	2/11/2020 1:14 PM
69	Have the existing requirement keeps engineers at least somewhat engaged in the profession. Lessening this may result in more 'part time' engineers.	2/11/2020 1:13 PM
70	I believe that a professional development hours requirement is in keeping with the intent of the regulation, but quantity alone cannot ensure it.	2/11/2020 12:36 PM
71	I think the proposed change would more closely meet the original intent.	2/11/2020 12:28 PM
72	My feeling is the CEU's used are not always technical or ethical related.	2/11/2020 11:56 AM
73	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.	2/11/2020 11:33 AM
74	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.	2/11/2020 11:29 AM
75	No	2/11/2020 11:12 AM
76	Competency is achieved through practice not conferences.	2/11/2020 10:47 AM
77	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.	2/11/2020 10:45 AM
78	Some of the courses are repetitive for each renewal	2/11/2020 10:18 AM

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

79	Protecting the public involves keeping current on best practices and new technology.	2/11/2020 10:14 AM
80	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.	2/11/2020 9:39 AM
81	The requirement helps keep engineers up to date on the latest codes and practices to be able to make better engineering decisions and designs.	2/11/2020 9:32 AM
82	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.	2/11/2020 9:21 AM
83	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.	2/11/2020 9:21 AM
84	Excessive continuing education hours is a detriment to small businesses, especially single 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.	2/11/2020 9:16 AM
85	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
86	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 and is able to better protect the public.	2/11/2020 8:47 AM
87	I think some of the PDH's can be very valuable but not all PDHs are created equally.	2/11/2020 8:40 AM
88	This is fair enough	2/11/2020 8:34 AM
89	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
90	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
91	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
92	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
93	None	2/11/2020 8:30 AM
94	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
95	N/A	2/11/2020 8:13 AM
96	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
97	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

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

98	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
99	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
100	none	2/11/2020 7:57 AM
101	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
102	Ethics and State Law applicability are usually not covered in any of the offered conferences and seminars.	2/11/2020 7:39 AM
103	No	2/11/2020 7:15 AM
104	Difficult to find courses/webinars/etc. related to the work requiring my P.E. license.	2/11/2020 7:08 AM
105	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
106	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 networking as people get together at workshops, classes, and conferences for those credits. I think it "dumbs down" our profession to remove those requirements.	2/11/2020 7:06 AM
107	The continuing education requirement is too broad. It can be satisfied by taking almost any type of class, most of which contibute little to public safety.	2/11/2020 7:06 AM
108	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
109	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
110	The requirement is too broad.	2/11/2020 6:33 AM
111	No	2/11/2020 6:17 AM
112	Current Subject matter too flexible!	2/11/2020 5:19 AM
113	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
114	IT IS WASTE OF TIME AND \$	2/11/2020 3:43 AM
115	I don't think that such requirement is necessary.	2/11/2020 1:21 AM
116	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
117	No comments	2/10/2020 10:41 PM
118	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
119	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	2/10/2020 9:59 PM

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

continuing education requirements are of little importance or value

120	Continuing Edccation introducs the Licensee to updated methods, systems, safety, and ethics. It is an absolute requirement for engineering capabilities.	2/10/2020 9:28 PM
121	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
122	Conferences are easy and affordable	2/10/2020 9:21 PM
123	too lenient	2/10/2020 9:06 PM
124	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
125	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
126	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
127	No	2/10/2020 8:50 PM
128	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
129	Do not change.	2/10/2020 8:25 PM
130	It's more of a burden to fulfill the hours, not benefit from specific criteria.	2/10/2020 8:21 PM
131	Just a money maker for certain organizations.	2/10/2020 8:18 PM
132	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
133	Reduce to 20 hours every 2 years	2/10/2020 8:01 PM
134	not at this time	2/10/2020 7:51 PM
135	none	2/10/2020 7:34 PM
136	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
137	30 hours per biennial period is too many	2/10/2020 6:59 PM
138	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
139	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
140	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
141	No	2/10/2020 5:59 PM
142	Continuing education requirements do not not necessarily encompass ethics and statutes.	2/10/2020 5:50 PM
143	The current PDH requirement is working, but could be done more efficiently.	2/10/2020 5:41 PM

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

144	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
145	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
146	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
147	None.	2/10/2020 4:55 PM
148	no	2/10/2020 4:47 PM
149	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
150	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
151	No.	2/10/2020 4:39 PM
152	This allows one to stay up with the new technologies and code changes which affect desins.	2/10/2020 4:28 PM
153	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
154	none	2/10/2020 4:23 PM
155	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
156	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
157	No	2/10/2020 4:12 PM
158	The required amount is too much.	2/10/2020 4:09 PM
159	We can reduce the number of hours required a little bit	2/10/2020 4:05 PM
160	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
161	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
162	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
163	I think that technical competency is important especially in the ever changing technology development and its implications.	2/10/2020 3:50 PM
164	I feel what we have is sufficient to entice continuing education.	2/10/2020 3:45 PM
165	In regard to the intent of the survey, 30 pdhs may be a little excessive and expensive.	2/10/2020 3:45 PM
166	Seminars make up the majority of CE Hrs. I support the 3 hrs of ethics and NV law.	2/10/2020 3:41 PM
167	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 orignations such as ASCE & NALS. These are all positive things.	2/10/2020 3:39 PM
168	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	2/10/2020 3:38 PM

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

mandatory to perform as an engineer where public health and safety are involved. Please do not reduce this requirement.

169	It may be a bit much, but should be no lower than 20 hrs.	2/10/2020 3:31 PM
170	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
171	It could be less	2/10/2020 3:15 PM
172	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
173	Works for me.	2/10/2020 3:10 PM
174	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
175	No one pays attention to PDH activities as it is.	2/10/2020 3:08 PM
176	None	2/10/2020 2:53 PM
177	This is more important than a legal review.	2/10/2020 2:53 PM
178	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
179	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
180	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
181	It has been effective in keeping practicing professionals current in their respective fields.	2/10/2020 2:40 PM
182	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
183	I don't think the requirements are specific to enhancing competency in the specific fields.	2/10/2020 2:33 PM
184	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
185	PDH can be given/earned for items that are not related to public protection.	2/10/2020 2:30 PM
186	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
187	With changing technology I think technical courses are important, not just ethics and regulations.	2/10/2020 2:26 PM
188	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
189	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	2/10/2020 2:18 PM

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

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.

190	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
191	no	2/10/2020 2:17 PM
192	Seems like 20 hours every 2 years is adequate. Also these hours are usually expensive.	2/10/2020 2:14 PM
193	The courses are worthless and costly	2/10/2020 2:07 PM
194	30 is good	2/10/2020 2:03 PM
195	30 hours is relatively low. Especially when compared to other jurisdictions, such as Canadian provinces.	2/10/2020 2:03 PM
196	I think some technical hours is important. But maybe not 30. Laws and ethics would also be important.	2/10/2020 2:03 PM
197	the focus should be moved towards Nevada laws & regulations and ethics to provide better protection to the public	2/10/2020 2:02 PM
198	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
199	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
200	I THINK THAT 20 HOURS, INCLUDING TECHNICAL COMPETENCY, NEVADA LAWS AND ETHICS WOULD BE A MORE REASONABLE APPROACH.	2/10/2020 1:58 PM
201	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
202	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
203	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
204	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
205	none	2/10/2020 1:47 PM
206	N/A	2/10/2020 1:44 PM
207	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
208	No	2/10/2020 1:33 PM
209	No comment	2/10/2020 1:24 PM
210	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	2/10/2020 1:19 PM

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

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.

211	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
212	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
213	I think most people just take classes to check the box on this requirement.	2/10/2020 1:18 PM
214	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
215	no	2/10/2020 1:16 PM
216	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
217	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
218	Often I sign up for courses that are available, not usable just to satisfy the requirements.	2/10/2020 1:14 PM
219	No	2/10/2020 1:08 PM
220	This should be less hours with more of a focus on what is important.	2/10/2020 1:00 PM
221	Quantity does not replace targeted quality courses.	2/10/2020 1:00 PM
222	The PDH are necessary to keep the engineer more up to speed with technology, practices, etc.	2/10/2020 12:59 PM
223	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
224	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
225	I am in favor for a reduction in hours but not an elimination.	2/10/2020 12:57 PM
226	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
227	No Comment	2/10/2020 12:55 PM
228	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
229	Professional engineers stay current in their field of expertise without having an arbitrary mandate from a licensing board.	2/10/2020 12:51 PM
230	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
231	No	2/10/2020 12:44 PM
232	No	2/10/2020 12:43 PM
233	30 credits are enough as long as the verification system works and the credits are actually furthering knowledge.	2/10/2020 12:43 PM
234	NA	2/10/2020 12:42 PM

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

235	It'd be helpful to provide more training opportunities in continuing education.	2/10/2020 12:41 PM
236	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
237	No	2/10/2020 12:37 PM
238	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
239	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
240	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
241	Raise the number of hours to 60.	2/10/2020 12:33 PM
242	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
243	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
244	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
245	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
246	30 hours is insufficient - Should be increased, say doubled.	2/10/2020 12:16 PM
247	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
248	Current requirement is sufficient	2/10/2020 12:12 PM
249	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
250	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
251	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
252	Ethics is more inline with public protection than conferences and workshops.	2/10/2020 12:09 PM
253	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

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

254	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
255	Life-long learning is important. Some toil to achieve and maintain licensure is also important.	2/10/2020 12:04 PM
256	None	2/10/2020 12:01 PM
257	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
258	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
259	None	2/10/2020 11:58 AM
260	It matches the requirements of other states	2/10/2020 11:57 AM
261	"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
262	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
263	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
264	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
265	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
266	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. 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.	2/10/2020 11:52 AM
267	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
268	N/A	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
269	Continuing education should remain as-is.	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
270	N/A	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
271	No	2/10/2020 11:50 AM
272	Reduce to 10 hours max per 2 year period	2/10/2020 11:49 AM

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

273	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
274	The 30 hours helps keep design professional up to date on current and relevant design and construction practices.	2/10/2020 11:48 AM
275	About 16 hours for two years would be sufficient	2/10/2020 11:47 AM
276	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
277	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
278	No comment	2/10/2020 11:41 AM
279	The current PDH requirement provides incentive for PEs to continue seeking educational opportunities.	2/10/2020 11:40 AM
280	No	2/10/2020 11:40 AM
281	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.	2/10/2020 11:39 AM
282	The current PDH requirement does not require a focus or minimum number of hours concerning public protection.	2/10/2020 11:38 AM
283	no	2/10/2020 11:37 AM
284	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
285	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
286	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
287	Please don't reduce the hours of continuing education	2/10/2020 11:26 AM
288	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
289	Ineffective and a waste of my time	2/10/2020 11:25 AM
290	Bssed on my experience, PEs proactively stay up to date,	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
291	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
292	Too many hours required.	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
293	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
294	No	2/10/2020 11:23 AM
295	From my experience in meeting the 30 hours of continuing education most pdh's are geared	2/10/2020 11:23 AM

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

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.

296	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
297	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
298	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
299	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
300	No comments	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
301	30 hours is extreme for any practicing professional.	2/10/2020 11:17 AM
302	I think the hours need to be reduced, it is very difficult and costly to get continuing 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
303	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
304	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
305	30 hrs seems a little high, maybe 20	2/10/2020 11:12 AM
306	Continuing education is not necessary for engineers engaged in design and not sufficient for academics or administrators.	2/10/2020 11:11 AM
307	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
308	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
309	The current 30 PDH requirement mainly supports attendance at professional society meetings with little to no educational component.	2/10/2020 11:09 AM
310	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
311	I think keeping current with the industry is an important aspect of our practice of engineering.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
312	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
313	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
314	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
315	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
316	No	2/10/2020 11:05 AM

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

317	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
318	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
319	The continuing education hours should be reduced	2/10/2020 11:04 AM
320	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
321	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
322	It is more of a welfare for educators and people that give course.	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
323	I agree, a lower hourly requirement focused on ethics and law would be an improvement	2/10/2020 11:03 AM
324	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
325	none	2/10/2020 11:02 AM
326	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
327	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
328	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
329	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
330	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
331	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
332	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
333	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
334	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
335	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

336	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
337	I think the continuing education requirement should be dropped completely	2/10/2020 10:53 AM
338	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 should 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
339	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
340	none	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
341	Hi ours should be related to updating/increasing technical knowledge of licensees	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
342	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
343	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 were needed, it could be broken down something like 6 ethics, 6 statute, and 3 miscellaneous.	2/10/2020 10:49 AM
344	None	2/10/2020 10:48 AM
345	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
346	Excessive continuing education	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
347	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
348	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
349	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
350	not practical nore much useful	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
351	I agree with the email that preceded this survey.	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
352	no	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
353	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
354	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
355	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
356	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

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

357	No	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
358	No	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
359	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
360	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
361	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
362	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
363	Most of available classes are best to death. Seems more like a money maker for some review year after year.	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
364	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
365	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
366	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
367	It requires much continuing education hours	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
368	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
369	Waste of time and money.	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
370	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 be more useful.	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
371	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
372	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
373	Many states in the west do not have a pdh requirement	2/10/2020 10:33 AM
374	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
375	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
376	None	2/10/2020 10:33 AM

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

377	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
378	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
379	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 those who no longer actively stamp documents or have jobs that no longer are related to engineering.	2/10/2020 10:31 AM
380	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
381	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
382	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
383	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
384	No	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
385	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
386	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
387	I believe that 20 hours during the biennial period would be sufficient.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
388	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
389	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
390	30 Hours seems to be exorbitant and could be reduced.	2/10/2020 10:28 AM
391	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
392	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

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

393	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
394	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
395	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
396	No	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
397	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
398	I think the 30 hour requirement is too much.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
399	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
400	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
401	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
402	No	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
403	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
404	No	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
405	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
406	Needs to be keyed specifically to the area of practice. Not basket weaving	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
407	No	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
408	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
409	Similar protection could be obtained at 20 hours per biennial renewal.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
410	N/A	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
411	NA	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
412	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
413	I like the idea of fewer, but more detailed course structured hours.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
414	Adding a requirement to include 3 development hours focused on ethics and law would be more appropriate.	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
415	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

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

416	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
417	Continuing Education should encourage individuals to broaden their professional horizons and understanding of the field they work in.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
418	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
419	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
420	no	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
421	I am already doing all I can to maintain professional competency in my chosen area of practice	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
422	The number of hours could be reduced.	2/10/2020 10:20 AM
423	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
424	30 is excessive. 4-6 per year would be adequate, equal to one per quarter.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
425	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
426	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 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.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
427	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
428	30 hours each renewal is not a problem to get.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
429	For the most part, I believe 30 is quite a bit and lends to luncheon fatigue.	2/10/2020 10:18 AM
430	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
431	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
432	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
433	No changes are needed to the current law.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
434	I believe the 30 hours is adequate, but would like to see the ethics requirement included within.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
435	I believe the current thirty hour requirement is appropriate.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
436	Most people seem to obtain there pdhs by attending conferences with little public safety protection gained	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
437	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
438	Reducing the requirements will water down the integrity of licensure. If a need for additional	2/10/2020 10:16 AM

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

ethics and integrity is needed, perhaps make some of the 30 hours specific to ethics, but do not reduce the requirements for licensing

439	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
440	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
441	None	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
442	no	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
443	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
444	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
445	Most methods of meeting the requirements are irrelevant to public protection	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
446	N/A	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
447	None	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
448	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
449	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
450	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
451	no	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
452	Engineers find the hours wherever they can.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
453	Most	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
454	n/a	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
455	No	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
456	Continuing education helpful but shouldn't be required.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
457	No comments	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
458	Too many hours, because of that, the actual "learning" is watered down	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
459	There are very few PDH classes that deal with public protection.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
460	None	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
461	no	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
462	Too many items such as the attendance of ASCE lunches are considered under the umbrella of continuing education.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
463	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
464	I believe in some ways it exceeds the intent of the regulation with regard to public protection	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
465	no	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
466	I prefer a focus on ethics, law and regulation.	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
467	Both technical training and ethical/regulation training should be accepted into the 30 hours	2/10/2020 10:11 AM

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

468	Three hours would be fine	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
469	none	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
470	No	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
471	N/A	2/10/2020 10:09 AM
472	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: 428 Skipped: 244

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	It needs to be with mandatory classes for ethics and law AND 30 hours per 2 years.	2/13/2020 8:04 AM
5	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
6	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
7	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
8	Those who have ethic will continue to have ethics those that don't will continue to not to.	2/12/2020 7:32 PM
9	There should be a mix of ethics training and general engineering education required with licensure.	2/12/2020 4:36 PM
10	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
11	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
12	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
13	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
14	3 quality hours are much more effective than 30 uninspired hours	2/12/2020 2:08 PM
15	What would be helpful would be studies of court cases rendered in Nevada which affected land.	2/12/2020 1:48 PM
16	You can memorize the instruction manual, but if you cant implement it by application nothing is gained.	2/12/2020 1:30 PM
17	Mandatory ethics training implies their is an issue with ethics.....is there an issue??	2/12/2020 11:40 AM
18	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
19	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
20	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
21	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	2/12/2020 9:38 AM

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

the 30 CEU already on the books.

22	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
23	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
24	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
25	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
26	No	2/12/2020 7:08 AM
27	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
28	none	2/12/2020 6:42 AM
29	it is worth a trying	2/12/2020 3:15 AM
30	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
31	Engineers should be continually educating themselves as would any other professional.	2/11/2020 8:51 PM
32	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
33	"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
34	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
35	no	2/11/2020 7:25 PM
36	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
37	It will only improve if the participants are serious about protecting the public.	2/11/2020 7:09 PM
38	How much is that going to cost? When implementing material that has to do with law, I would think it will be MORE expensive.	2/11/2020 6:24 PM
39	Focus of continuing education should be to advance knowledge or exposure to new ideas in the	2/11/2020 5:46 PM

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

	profession.	
40	Understanding Law would be more useful.	2/11/2020 5:35 PM
41	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
42	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
43	I suspect many engineers are not aware of all the laws and regulations they work under.	2/11/2020 5:06 PM
44	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
45	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
46	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
47	Rather that 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
48	Many times I think that the 30 hours however legitimate may not be directly related to the area of practice of the engineer. Ethics and Nevada Law is always directly related to the area of practice.	2/11/2020 2:38 PM
49	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
50	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
51	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 course 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
52	Support the Reduction to 3 PDH's. Board should provide free yearly class that covers the public protection.	2/11/2020 2:32 PM
53	Anything to reduce the insanity would be a step in the right direction.	2/11/2020 1:53 PM
54	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
55	I think it is good to focus on our responsibility to the public at this time.	2/11/2020 1:21 PM
56	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
57	Both Cont. Ed. requirements within the practicing engineer's discipline and ethics/regulations are needed.	2/11/2020 12:36 PM
58	See question 5.	2/11/2020 12:28 PM
59	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

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

60	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
61	see comments related to question 4	2/11/2020 11:29 AM
62	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
63	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
64	I read the laws and further explanation would be helpful.	2/11/2020 10:18 AM
65	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
66	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
67	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
68	As noted in Question 4. When I took the ethics test to become a professional engineer I was provided with a license based on my performance and understanding of the Nevada State Law.	2/11/2020 9:21 AM
69	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
70	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
71	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
72	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
73	No Comment	2/11/2020 8:34 AM
74	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
75	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 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.	2/11/2020 8:33 AM

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

76	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
77	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
78	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
79	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
80	N/A	2/11/2020 8:13 AM
81	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
82	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
83	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
84	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
85	none	2/11/2020 7:57 AM
86	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
87	In my experience, most violations are related to practitioners violating laws and ignoring ethical obligations and requirements.	2/11/2020 7:39 AM
88	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
89	No	2/11/2020 7:15 AM
90	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
91	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

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

92	Same as above comment	2/11/2020 7:06 AM
93	I believe that learning about ethics contributes very little to whether 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
94	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
95	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 accepted training and what is not.	2/11/2020 7:03 AM
96	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
97	As long as there are courses provided by some resource I think this is a major improvement.	2/11/2020 6:33 AM
98	No	2/11/2020 6:17 AM
99	None	2/11/2020 5:19 AM
100	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
101	Seems obvious	2/10/2020 11:30 PM
102	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
103	See Answer 5 above.	2/10/2020 10:28 PM
104	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 based on knowledge and professional character and ethical behavior	2/10/2020 9:59 PM
105	Ethics in the engineering profession creates a level playing field in competition and private and public practice.	2/10/2020 9:28 PM
106	Removing requirements for technical knowledge will reduce the capacity for engineers to further their professional development.	2/10/2020 9:23 PM
107	Shouldn't focus continuing education on the 1% that are a problem.	2/10/2020 9:21 PM
108	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
109	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
110	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
111	While a change to ethics and statute only PDH would likely make a change for some; is there 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
112	Do not change.	2/10/2020 8:25 PM
113	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

114	A good replacement that is concentrated on what is important for the profession.	2/10/2020 8:18 PM
115	We have seen the Lawyers try to make criminal activity acceptable, but engineers are a different breed.	2/10/2020 8:05 PM
116	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
117	NO	2/10/2020 7:51 PM
118	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
119	The requirements should focus on codes	2/10/2020 7:34 PM
120	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
121	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
122	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
123	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
124	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
125	No	2/10/2020 5:59 PM
126	None.	2/10/2020 5:50 PM
127	No comment.	2/10/2020 5:41 PM
128	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
129	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
130	no	2/10/2020 4:47 PM
131	I am all for continuing education and staying current.	2/10/2020 4:47 PM
132	A broad approach to skill refreshers and new engineering knowledge would be better for the public good.	2/10/2020 4:39 PM
133	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
134	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
135	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
136	Not sure where I could find training specific to the Nevada statutes.	2/10/2020 4:16 PM
137	Highlighting the need for professional ethics could reduce the number of litigations	2/10/2020 4:05 PM
138	I think if you reduce the hours then it would need to be mandatory to focus in professional	2/10/2020 4:01 PM

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

	ethics and Nevada law	
139	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 loose 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
140	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
141	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
142	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
143	No	2/10/2020 3:41 PM
144	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
145	see comment from questions 4.	2/10/2020 3:38 PM
146	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
147	No	2/10/2020 3:15 PM
148	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
149	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
150	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
151	It will keep a licensee informed to not violate regulations.	2/10/2020 3:08 PM
152	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
153	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
154	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
155	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
156	Eliminating professional discipline specific education will defeat the purpose of continuing education requirements	2/10/2020 2:40 PM

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

157	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
158	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
159	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
160	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
161	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
162	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
163	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
164	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
165	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 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.	2/10/2020 2:18 PM
166	Ethics hours should be a part of each renewal.	2/10/2020 2:17 PM
167	no	2/10/2020 2:17 PM
168	Seems very narrow. The current system allows a wide array of choices to learn or refresh about	2/10/2020 2:14 PM
169	Pursuing continuing education to maintain technical proficiency is just as important as ethics and NV laws.	2/10/2020 2:13 PM
170	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
171	keep the 30 and focus the requirement to 3 of the 30 for ethics	2/10/2020 2:03 PM
172	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
173	I think the technical hours are important	2/10/2020 2:03 PM

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

174	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
175	Already have professional ethics classes provided as annual conference.	2/10/2020 1:58 PM
176	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
177	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
178	N/A	2/10/2020 1:44 PM
179	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
180	Continuing education must include technical and engineering subjects.	2/10/2020 1:33 PM
181	No comment	2/10/2020 1:24 PM
182	people are going to justify what they are doing. it may help if the specific issue is covered.	2/10/2020 1:19 PM
183	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
184	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
185	None	2/10/2020 1:17 PM
186	no	2/10/2020 1:16 PM
187	See above comment.	2/10/2020 1:16 PM
188	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
189	Are there documented courses on Nevada State Law that can be offered to the professionals?	2/10/2020 1:14 PM
190	No	2/10/2020 1:08 PM
191	There should still be some requirement for technical in addition to the 3 hours proposed.	2/10/2020 1:00 PM
192	No comment	2/10/2020 1:00 PM
193	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
194	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
195	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
196	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
197	Too many of the design professionals in Nevada have no idea of ethics or the law is simply ignored. If a person breaks the 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	2/10/2020 12:56 PM

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

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.

198	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
199	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
200	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
201	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
202	No	2/10/2020 12:44 PM
203	I am in favor of the revision/reduction	2/10/2020 12:43 PM
204	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
205	Offer open forum lectures at universities to better understand ethical issues within our industry	2/10/2020 12:42 PM
206	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
207	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
208	No	2/10/2020 12:37 PM
209	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
210	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
211	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
212	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
213	In my experience, most problems occur in the areas of ethics and Nevada Law.	2/10/2020 12:19 PM
214	Reminders of the law are always helpful especially due to the fact that the laws change periodically.	2/10/2020 12:18 PM
215	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
216	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
217	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
218	Having a few hours focus on professional ethics and laws/regulations is fine but I think that the	2/10/2020 12:12 PM

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

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.

219	I believe current CEU and adding ethics and NV laws will enhance safety.	2/10/2020 12:12 PM
220	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
221	Sometimes it is nice to reiterate the importance of ethics.	2/10/2020 12:09 PM
222	Need to have online or distance learning opportunities for non-NV residents.	2/10/2020 12:07 PM
223	More in-line with why you would license individuals...	2/10/2020 12:04 PM
224	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
225	None	2/10/2020 12:01 PM
226	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
227	Please reduce the 30 hr requirement.	2/10/2020 12:00 PM
228	Agree	2/10/2020 11:58 AM
229	It would need to be reciprocal with other states to meet their requirements	2/10/2020 11:57 AM
230	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
231	None	2/10/2020 11:56 AM
232	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
233	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
234	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
235	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
236	none	2/10/2020 11:51 AM
237	No	2/10/2020 11:50 AM
238	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
239	no	2/10/2020 11:47 AM

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

240	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
241	Laws do change. Keeping up with these changes is very necessary.	2/10/2020 11:47 AM
242	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
243	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
244	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
245	Staying professionally competent is accomplished by existing CE requirements as well as public protection.	2/10/2020 11:40 AM
246	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
247	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
248	that change may not adequately address changes in materials, technology, design methodology, construction methodology, and federal regulations.	2/10/2020 11:37 AM
249	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
250	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
251	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
252	Keep the continuing education program strong	2/10/2020 11:26 AM
253	Same old Same old	2/10/2020 11:25 AM
254	No	2/10/2020 11:24 AM
255	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
256	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
257	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
258	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	2/10/2020 11:23 AM

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

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.

259	Keeping up with changes and improvements in the industry also protects the public	2/10/2020 11:22 AM
260	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
261	Yes, changing rules and regulations coupled with taking courses that provide case studies of ethical behavior would benefit 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.	2/10/2020 11:20 AM
262	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
263	No comment	2/10/2020 11:18 AM
264	Need to make classes more affordable and have classes closer to rural ares as to minimize travel.	2/10/2020 11:16 AM
265	I think it would help for sure in this area	2/10/2020 11:13 AM
266	The board laws are written poorly and are vague. Education on ambiguous laws will not help technical competency.	2/10/2020 11:13 AM
267	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
268	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
269	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
270	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
271	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
272	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
273	The technical continuing education pdhs are important and valuable.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
274	Knowledge of laws and regulations don't necessarily improve professional competency.	2/10/2020 11:08 AM
275	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
276	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

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

277	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
278	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
279	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
280	See above comments regarding CE.	2/10/2020 11:04 AM
281	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
282	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
283	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
284	none	2/10/2020 11:02 AM
285	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
286	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
287	Please verify the availability of classes in the areas of ethics and NV Law.	2/10/2020 11:00 AM
288	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
289	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
290	I think focusing on Nevada ethics and regulations is more beneficial for public protection than the current requirements	2/10/2020 10:55 AM
291	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
292	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
293	I do not feel the continuing education requirement benefits practicing engineers	2/10/2020 10:53 AM
294	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
295	See my previous comments # 5	2/10/2020 10:51 AM
296	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	2/10/2020 10:50 AM

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

is ethical.

297	I believe this focused approach will be much more effective and will improve the system.	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
298	none	2/10/2020 10:50 AM
299	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
300	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
301	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
302	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
303	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
304	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
305	It's useful to protect public and professionals	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
306	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
307	While ethics are critical, they are also notoriously hard to test in any standardized format.	2/10/2020 10:47 AM
308	I think you should always continue learning from a technical perspective.	2/10/2020 10:46 AM
309	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
310	may be interview engineer once a year in lieu of continue education init	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
311	Theses are good topics that should be part of the current 30 hour requirement	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
312	None	2/10/2020 10:44 AM
313	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
314	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
315	No	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
316	No	2/10/2020 10:40 AM
317	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
318	Technical skills are still important and must be maintained. The current requirement triggers	2/10/2020 10:40 AM

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

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.

319	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
320	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
321	Review current changes that are applicable.	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
322	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
323	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 stay up-to-date.	2/10/2020 10:37 AM
324	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
325	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
326	It's a great idea	2/10/2020 10:36 AM
327	No	2/10/2020 10:35 AM
328	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
329	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
330	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
331	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
332	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
333	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
334	It appears to me that continued knowledge of current methods to increase technical competency takes care of itself in a 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.	2/10/2020 10:32 AM
335	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	2/10/2020 10:31 AM

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

move our industry forward because a lot of their membership is based of professionals trying to receive their PDHs.

336	See comment in Item 5	2/10/2020 10:31 AM
337	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
338	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 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.	2/10/2020 10:30 AM
339	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
340	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
341	It will improve because ethics is not currently an area that most engineers acquire their PDHs.	2/10/2020 10:29 AM
342	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
343	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
344	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
345	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
346	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
347	It would free up my time to focus on more important things.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
348	None	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
349	Need a combination of both ethics and updates on codes and new engineering practices.	2/10/2020 10:27 AM
350	Our responsibility and accountability to the regenral public will be more emphasis.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
351	No	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
352	By this requirement it will keep everyone updated with Nevada laws and regulations as well as ethics.	2/10/2020 10:26 AM
353	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
354	See answer at #5	2/10/2020 10:24 AM
355	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
356	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
357	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
358	I feel the county employees, especially inspectors, need this as well.	2/10/2020 10:23 AM

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

359	No	2/10/2020 10:23 AM
360	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
361	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
362	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
363	See previous comment	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
364	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
365	Ethics is important but Nevada's laws are not all that complicated to require repeated education requirements.	2/10/2020 10:22 AM
366	N/A	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
367	None	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
368	none	2/10/2020 10:21 AM
369	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
370	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
371	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
372	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
373	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
374	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
375	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
376	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
377	Either you are ethical or you are not. Training doesn't change someones disposition from unethical to ethical.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
378	See previous comment.	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
379	3 hours of ethics and regulations in 2 years may or may not stick with engineers. Title 30 has a	2/10/2020 10:19 AM

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

wealth of information that could and should be covered.

380	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
381	Three units is not enough keep up with trends and regulations	2/10/2020 10:19 AM
382	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
383	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
384	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
385	No.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
386	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
387	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
388	I believe a reduction in the requirements would diminish the level of professionalism.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
389	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
390	Many private firms already have similar requirements.	2/10/2020 10:17 AM
391	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
392	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
393	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
394	One benefit would be just refreshing everyone's mind on the legal aspects of being a PE.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
395	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
396	None	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
397	30 hours should include ethics every 2 years.	2/10/2020 10:16 AM
398	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

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

399	None	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
400	Refreshing those knowledge areas could keep some engineers out of trouble	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
401	N/A	2/10/2020 10:15 AM
402	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
403	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
404	technical competence is the keystone of public protection for engineering practice.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
405	It's a good idea worth pursuing.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
406	A more educated professional can better serve public protection, not just a more ethical one.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
407	I guess it would be ok to require 3 of the 30 to be as suggested, but do not dorp the others. It's easy to fall behind and use the same old methods, but not good.	2/10/2020 10:14 AM
408	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
409	N/A	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
410	No	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
411	More important to keep up with technological advancements	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
412	No	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
413	How will technical competency be addressed if the only subjects are ethics and knowledge of the law?	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
414	No comments	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
415	Per my previous comment, I believe that the hours will be vastly improved	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
416	this would be a good change.	2/10/2020 10:13 AM
417	None	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
418	no	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
419	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
420	If these classes are mandatory, who will teach them and who's going to pay for it?	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
421	I applaud the board's efforts in regard to the possible thoughtful reform of the continuing education requirement.	2/10/2020 10:12 AM
422	no	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
423	Improve	2/10/2020 10:11 AM
424	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
425	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
426	No	2/10/2020 10:10 AM
427	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

