


Q1 Type of Business (primary service offered)


Answered: 289 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Engineering	90.66%	262
Land Surveying	6.23%	18
Architectural	0.69%	2
Contractor	2.42%	7
TOTAL		289

Q2 Number of Full-Time Employees


Answered: 288 Skipped: 2



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
>150	25.35%	73
<150	74.65%	215
TOTAL		288

Q3 Business Managing Office Location


Answered: 215 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
in Nevada	37.21%	80
other US State	62.33%	134
outside US	0.47%	1
TOTAL		215

Q4 Will a specific proposed regulatory provision in NAC 625.260 have an adverse economic effect upon your business?

Answered: 215 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	5.58%	12
No	94.42%	203
TOTAL		215

Q5 Any comments or explanation relating to your answer to Question 4.

Answered: 85 Skipped: 130

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	We don't do building structural	3/5/2018 2:53 PM
2	Section 1 (c) excludes a single pole antenna or lightning rods from being included. There will be confusion as to the effect of small, but not single pole, antenna etc. above the roof line. My feeling is that you will receive many inquiries regarding typical items that are probably not noticed and are probably ignored. You should expect questions on this sentence on the impact this will have on initially designed or intended to be added later objects such as: A single television antenna that has a horizontal rod or rods and possible additional support rods etc. Multiple television antennae that have horizontal rod or rods and possible additional support rods etc. Size of dish antenna at the upper line of the roof that stick partially or fully above the roof line. Solar panels and parts thereof such as an electrical duct or raceway that sticks partially or fully above the roof line. Be Prepared.	3/5/2018 11:54 AM
3	The addition of item "d" may have a negative impact, however very minimally. I have performed work on small wood framed structures that were risk IV. I believe I am as or more qualified as a civil than most structural engineers in this limited area work.	3/2/2018 11:43 AM
4	We already employ a Nevada Structural Engineer. The projects we can service is unchanged by the proposal.	3/1/2018 5:02 PM
5	We are already licensed SE so won't be affected.	3/1/2018 3:47 PM
6	None	3/1/2018 12:27 PM
7	I am currently employed by a public agency in California and do not work in Nevada.	3/1/2018 11:51 AM
8	NONE	3/1/2018 11:21 AM
9	always a fan of additional clarity	3/1/2018 10:10 AM
10	no	2/28/2018 4:03 PM
11	None	2/28/2018 10:18 AM
12	none	2/28/2018 5:00 AM
13	none	2/27/2018 5:48 PM
14	We do not provide services that would be affected by this revision.	2/27/2018 10:01 AM
15	Does not apply	2/27/2018 8:59 AM
16	It's a great thing. Civil engineers shouldn't be designing significant structures. This further the structural engineering profession and result in structural engineers being able to charge clients more. This puts more value on our profession.	2/26/2018 5:03 PM
17	We have multiple SEs on staff so will not effect the type of work we can do.	2/26/2018 4:50 PM
18	does not apply because we are not structural engineers	2/26/2018 4:21 PM
19	We do not do structural design in Nevada.	2/26/2018 11:16 AM
20	no	2/26/2018 10:13 AM
21	none	2/26/2018 9:34 AM
22	na	2/26/2018 8:42 AM
23	No	2/26/2018 8:39 AM
24	no impact but a good clarification	2/26/2018 8:39 AM
25	The Clarification simplifies the submittal process and eliminates the ambiguity of what is the highest point of the structure (Is it the building itself or elements of the structure resting on the roof)	2/26/2018 8:36 AM

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.260


26	None	2/26/2018 8:33 AM
27	We do not provide structural engineering services.	2/26/2018 8:31 AM
28	N/A	2/26/2018 8:12 AM
29	N/A	2/26/2018 8:01 AM
30	Yes it depends what limitation is put on the Civil Engineer to design some structural componets.	2/26/2018 7:45 AM
31	Makes sense and adds clarity	2/26/2018 7:43 AM
32	no	2/26/2018 6:41 AM
33	n/a	2/26/2018 6:36 AM
34	Appears to be just a clarification	2/26/2018 6:15 AM
35	none	2/26/2018 6:03 AM
36	N/A	2/26/2018 5:19 AM
37	No	2/26/2018 5:04 AM
38	no	2/26/2018 5:04 AM
39	no.	2/25/2018 8:29 PM
40	seems like a good change to clarify the limits.	2/25/2018 5:24 PM
41	We do not do structural engineering of this nature.	2/25/2018 2:44 PM
42	As a PE, it would preclude me from designing Category IV buildings. The analysis used in Category IV buildings is no more complex, and requires no additional engineering knowledge, than for the design of other buildings.	2/25/2018 2:17 PM
43	Not a civil or structural engineer	2/25/2018 1:55 PM
44	Noting that you have insurance is an invitation to sue. (FYI - My firm is fully insured.)	2/25/2018 1:34 PM
45	Our licensed engineer is licensed as a Structural Engineer	2/25/2018 9:46 AM
46	none	2/25/2018 8:59 AM
47	none	2/25/2018 8:02 AM
48	I would really like to see a provision for stepped structures on sloped lots to be able to stay below the 45' cutoff. The TRPA recently modified their code to allow stepped structures to calculate max height separately.	2/25/2018 7:31 AM
49	No	2/24/2018 6:01 PM
50	We do not do structural engineering.	2/24/2018 4:20 PM
51	Making the law more vague seems a preposterous concept. Why do we want to increase the wiggle room?	2/24/2018 3:59 PM
52	I don't design structures of any type.	2/24/2018 3:08 PM
53	There is no real difference between a grocery store/warehouse/residence that is 46' tall vs. one that is 36' tall. How about a clarification as to why this provision exists. I understand an essential facility but a store/warehouse?	2/24/2018 2:39 PM
54	No comment.	2/24/2018 1:37 PM
55	We really don't do this type of engineering so the proposed change will have little affect on our company.	2/24/2018 1:24 PM
56	As a licensed civil engineer and land surveyor I support the proposed change.	2/24/2018 1:24 PM
57	none	2/24/2018 10:38 AM
58	We are licensed structural engineers	2/24/2018 10:18 AM
59	N/A	2/24/2018 10:08 AM
60	I do not practice structural engineering.	2/24/2018 9:54 AM
61	No	2/24/2018 9:50 AM

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.260

62	I like new wording	2/24/2018 8:21 AM
63	no	2/24/2018 8:20 AM
64	none	2/24/2018 8:15 AM
65	None	2/24/2018 8:06 AM
66	clarifying definition of terms is always beneficial, unless your are an attorney.	2/24/2018 7:52 AM
67	Determination of lowest point may be difficult if it is below ground	2/24/2018 7:31 AM
68	no	2/24/2018 7:17 AM
69	Restricting RC IV buildings to SE's. I design alum structures sometimes added on to RC IV buildings	2/24/2018 6:58 AM
70	Not providing structural engineering services	2/23/2018 10:34 PM
71	not related to work we do	2/23/2018 8:38 PM
72	No objection.	2/23/2018 8:36 PM
73	N/A	2/23/2018 8:35 PM
74	No effect because I'm an electrical engineer and don't do structural engineering.	2/23/2018 6:56 PM
75	We don't deal with structural or civil engineering	2/23/2018 6:55 PM
76	Language added does not clarify the reference points for the 45 foot limit, in fact the language confuses the issue. " top of the highest structural element or top of the highest point of the roof or parapet." So which is it, the structural element of the parapet?	2/23/2018 6:54 PM
77	Not a structural engineer	2/23/2018 6:39 PM
78	None	2/23/2018 6:36 PM
79	The clarification is a necessary one. Although, from my personal experience, the SE requirement/PE exclusion is not always a good measure of competence, or the best protection of public safety. Many SEs have book knowledge without the practical experience required to really make sound engineering decisions in a world where engineering designs actually need to be constructed.	2/23/2018 6:03 PM
80	The current procedure is for the client to specify insurance requirements and proof of coverage. This new disclosure is unnecessary and could make work responding to inquiries that are trivial.	2/23/2018 5:54 PM
81	Does not effect our type of engineering.	2/23/2018 5:53 PM
82	Good cleanup.	2/23/2018 5:38 PM
83	It could impact my ability to work on some projects that I currently may work on.	2/23/2018 5:37 PM
84	No	2/23/2018 5:35 PM
85	In general, I disagree with only being able to perform structural engineering on any building less than 45 ft. I have done so in other states for years and certainly have the experience.	2/23/2018 5:34 PM

Q6 Will a specific proposed regulatory provision in NAC 625.260 have a beneficial effect upon your business?

Answered: 213 Skipped: 2



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	8.92%	19
No	91.08%	194
TOTAL		213

Q7 Any comments or explanation relating to your answer to Question 6.

Answered: 62 Skipped: 153


#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	We don't do building structural	3/5/2018 2:53 PM
2	No	3/2/2018 11:43 AM
3	Our workload is unlikely to increase because of the proposed change.	3/1/2018 5:02 PM
4	We are already licensed SE so won't be affected.	3/1/2018 3:47 PM
5	None	3/1/2018 12:27 PM
6	I am currently employed by a public agency in California and do not work in Nevada.	3/1/2018 11:51 AM
7	NONE	3/1/2018 11:21 AM
8	no - it a dumb concern	2/28/2018 4:03 PM
9	None	2/28/2018 10:18 AM
10	none	2/28/2018 5:00 AM
11	none	2/27/2018 5:48 PM
12	We do not provide services that would be affected by this revision	2/27/2018 10:01 AM
13	See previous comments.	2/26/2018 5:03 PM
14	It will make it more clear when certain height driven provisions are required.	2/26/2018 10:24 AM
15	no	2/26/2018 10:13 AM
16	none	2/26/2018 9:34 AM
17	na	2/26/2018 8:42 AM
18	No	2/26/2018 8:39 AM
19	no impact but a good clarification	2/26/2018 8:39 AM
20	None	2/26/2018 8:33 AM
21	Requiring a structural seal on any category IV structure will increase the need for a structural license, which we provide.	2/26/2018 8:13 AM
22	The new language clarifies the criteria, preventing confusion on future projects of this type.	2/26/2018 8:12 AM
23	N/A	2/26/2018 8:01 AM
24	Not Known	2/26/2018 7:45 AM
25	Makes it clear	2/26/2018 7:43 AM
26	no	2/26/2018 6:41 AM
27	n/a	2/26/2018 6:36 AM
28	See answer to question 5	2/26/2018 6:15 AM
29	none	2/26/2018 6:03 AM
30	N/A	2/26/2018 5:19 AM
31	No	2/26/2018 5:04 AM
32	no	2/26/2018 5:04 AM
33	no	2/25/2018 8:29 PM
34	none	2/25/2018 5:24 PM

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.260

35	We do not do structural engineering of this nature.	2/25/2018 2:44 PM
36	none	2/25/2018 8:59 AM
37	none	2/25/2018 8:02 AM
38	We do not perform structural design.	2/25/2018 7:58 AM
39	No	2/24/2018 6:01 PM
40	We do not do structural engineering.	2/24/2018 4:20 PM
41	No comment.	2/24/2018 1:37 PM
42	Not our type of work.	2/24/2018 1:24 PM
43	none	2/24/2018 10:38 AM
44	We are licensed structural engineers	2/24/2018 10:18 AM
45	Clarification.	2/24/2018 10:14 AM
46	N/A	2/24/2018 10:08 AM
47	No	2/24/2018 9:50 AM
48	no	2/24/2018 8:20 AM
49	none	2/24/2018 8:15 AM
50	None	2/24/2018 8:06 AM
51	I do not provide structural engineering services	2/24/2018 7:52 AM
52	change generally not related to what I do	2/24/2018 7:17 AM
53	Not providing structural engineering services	2/23/2018 10:34 PM
54	not related to work we do	2/23/2018 8:38 PM
55	No objection.	2/23/2018 8:36 PM
56	N/A	2/23/2018 8:35 PM
57	Not a structural engineer	2/23/2018 6:39 PM
58	None	2/23/2018 6:36 PM
59	I am the licensed NV principle in charge for our firm, and as a PE, have abided by the old and proposed language since licensure.	2/23/2018 6:03 PM
60	Does not have an effect on our type of engineering.	2/23/2018 5:53 PM
61	Maybe with the requirement of Risk Category IV buildings.	2/23/2018 5:38 PM
62	No	2/23/2018 5:35 PM

Q8 Do anticipate any indirect adverse effects on your business?

Answered: 210 Skipped: 5



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	4.76%	10
No	95.24%	200
TOTAL		210

Q9 Any comments or explanation relating to your answer to Question 8.

Answered: 58 Skipped: 157


#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	We don't do building structural	3/5/2018 2:53 PM
2	No	3/2/2018 11:43 AM
3	None	3/1/2018 12:27 PM
4	I am currently employed by a public agency in California and do not work in Nevada.	3/1/2018 11:51 AM
5	NONE	3/1/2018 11:21 AM
6	no	2/28/2018 4:03 PM
7	None	2/28/2018 10:18 AM
8	none	2/28/2018 5:00 AM
9	none	2/27/2018 5:48 PM
10	We do not provide services that would be affected by this revision	2/27/2018 10:01 AM
11	no	2/26/2018 5:03 PM
12	no	2/26/2018 10:13 AM
13	none	2/26/2018 9:34 AM
14	na	2/26/2018 8:42 AM
15	No	2/26/2018 8:39 AM
16	no impact but a good clarification	2/26/2018 8:39 AM
17	None	2/26/2018 8:33 AM
18	N/A	2/26/2018 8:12 AM
19	N/A	2/26/2018 8:01 AM
20	no	2/26/2018 6:41 AM
21	n/a	2/26/2018 6:36 AM
22	none	2/26/2018 6:03 AM
23	N/A	2/26/2018 5:19 AM
24	NO	2/26/2018 5:04 AM
25	no	2/26/2018 5:04 AM
26	no	2/25/2018 8:29 PM
27	none	2/25/2018 5:24 PM
28	We do not do structural engineering of this nature.	2/25/2018 2:44 PM
29	See the response to Question #5	2/25/2018 2:17 PM
30	Noting that you have insurance is an invitation to sue. (FYI - My firm is fully insured.)	2/25/2018 1:34 PM
31	none	2/25/2018 8:59 AM
32	none	2/25/2018 8:02 AM
33	No	2/24/2018 6:01 PM
34	We do not do structural engineering.	2/24/2018 4:20 PM
35	No comment.	2/24/2018 1:37 PM

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.260

36	Not our type of work.	2/24/2018 1:24 PM
37	none	2/24/2018 10:38 AM
38	No	2/24/2018 10:18 AM
39	N/A	2/24/2018 10:08 AM
40	No	2/24/2018 9:50 AM
41	no	2/24/2018 8:20 AM
42	none	2/24/2018 8:15 AM
43	None	2/24/2018 8:06 AM
44	See comment 5	2/24/2018 7:52 AM
45	no	2/24/2018 7:17 AM
46	I would have to not design the alum cover for the RC IV building or have someone review my design. Very few SE's are not trained w/ light gauge aluminum.	2/24/2018 6:58 AM
47	Loss of particular business	2/24/2018 5:06 AM
48	Not providing structural engineering services	2/23/2018 10:34 PM
49	not related to work we do	2/23/2018 8:38 PM
50	No objection.	2/23/2018 8:36 PM
51	N/A	2/23/2018 8:35 PM
52	Not a structural engineer	2/23/2018 6:39 PM
53	None	2/23/2018 6:36 PM
54	none anticipated.	2/23/2018 6:03 PM
55	Does not have an effect on our type of engineering.	2/23/2018 5:53 PM
56	None.	2/23/2018 5:38 PM
57	May increase confusion with some jurisdictions on what constitutes the top reference point for establishing building height	2/23/2018 5:37 PM
58	No	2/23/2018 5:35 PM

Q10 Do anticipate any indirect beneficial effects on your business?

Answered: 208 Skipped: 7



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	7.69%	16
No	92.31%	192
TOTAL		208

Q11 Any comments or explanation relating to your answer to Question 10.

Answered: 53 Skipped: 162

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	We don't do building structural	3/5/2018 2:53 PM
2	No	3/2/2018 11:43 AM
3	None	3/1/2018 12:27 PM
4	I am currently employed by a public agency in California and do not work in Nevada.	3/1/2018 11:51 AM
5	NONE	3/1/2018 11:21 AM
6	no	2/28/2018 4:03 PM
7	None	2/28/2018 10:18 AM
8	none	2/28/2018 5:00 AM
9	none	2/27/2018 5:48 PM
10	We do not provide services that would be affected by this revision	2/27/2018 10:01 AM
11	We will be able to increase fees.	2/26/2018 5:03 PM
12	no	2/26/2018 10:13 AM
13	na	2/26/2018 8:42 AM
14	No	2/26/2018 8:39 AM
15	no impact but a good clarification	2/26/2018 8:39 AM
16	None	2/26/2018 8:33 AM
17	N/A	2/26/2018 8:12 AM
18	N/A	2/26/2018 8:01 AM
19	no	2/26/2018 6:41 AM
20	n/a	2/26/2018 6:36 AM
21	none	2/26/2018 6:03 AM
22	N/A	2/26/2018 5:19 AM
23	No	2/26/2018 5:04 AM
24	my company has licensed structural engineers in the state of Nevada. Risk category IV structures will no longer be able to be designed by Civil engineers, thus our business may benefit.	2/26/2018 5:04 AM
25	no	2/25/2018 8:29 PM
26	none	2/25/2018 5:24 PM
27	We do not do structural engineering of this nature.	2/25/2018 2:44 PM
28	none	2/25/2018 8:59 AM
29	none	2/25/2018 8:02 AM
30	No	2/24/2018 6:01 PM
31	We do not do structural engineering.	2/24/2018 4:20 PM
32	No comment.	2/24/2018 1:37 PM
33	Not our type of work.	2/24/2018 1:24 PM

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.260

34	none	2/24/2018 10:38 AM
35	We are licensed structural engineers	2/24/2018 10:18 AM
36	N/A	2/24/2018 10:08 AM
37	No Comment	2/24/2018 9:52 AM
38	No	2/24/2018 9:50 AM
39	no, but this requirement should be further revised to exclude structures that are NOT buildings, such as scaffolding.	2/24/2018 8:20 AM
40	none	2/24/2018 8:15 AM
41	None	2/24/2018 8:06 AM
42	See comment 7	2/24/2018 7:52 AM
43	no	2/24/2018 7:17 AM
44	Not providing structural engineering services	2/23/2018 10:34 PM
45	not related to work we do	2/23/2018 8:38 PM
46	No objection.	2/23/2018 8:36 PM
47	N/A	2/23/2018 8:35 PM
48	Not a structural engineer	2/23/2018 6:39 PM
49	None	2/23/2018 6:36 PM
50	none anticipated.	2/23/2018 6:03 PM
51	Does not have an effect on our type of engineering.	2/23/2018 5:53 PM
52	None.	2/23/2018 5:38 PM
53	No	2/23/2018 5:35 PM