


Q1 Type of Business (primary service offered)


Answered: 484 Skipped: 2



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES |
|----------------|------------|
| Engineering | 89.88% 435 |
| Land Surveying | 7.64% 37 |
| Architectural | 0.41% 2 |
| Contractor | 2.07% 10 |
| TOTAL | 484 |

Q2 Number of Full-Time Employees


Answered: 481 Skipped: 5



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|-----|
| >150 | 26.82% | 129 |
| <150 | 73.18% | 352 |
| TOTAL | | 481 |

Q3 Business Managing Office Location


Answered: 351 Skipped: 1



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|-----|
| in Nevada | 35.33% | 124 |
| other US State | 63.53% | 223 |
| outside US | 1.14% | 4 |
| TOTAL | | 351 |

Q4 Will a specific proposed regulatory provision in NAC 625.630 have an adverse economic effect upon your business?

Answered: 348 Skipped: 4



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|-----|
| Yes | 10.63% | 37 |
| No | 89.37% | 311 |
| TOTAL | | 348 |

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

Answered: 158 Skipped: 194

| # | RESPONSES | DATE |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 1 | It would be helpful | 3/5/2018 2:50 PM |
| 2 | No | 3/2/2018 11:37 AM |
| 3 | Possibly. It may allow more out of state competition to open shop here but it will also make it easier for us to open a satellite office elsewhere in the state. | 3/1/2018 3:46 PM |
| 4 | None | 3/1/2018 12:25 PM |
| 5 | I currently work for a public agency in another state. I am not currently using my license. | 3/1/2018 11:48 AM |
| 6 | NONE | 3/1/2018 11:20 AM |
| 7 | I have always been a proponent of remote working, and engineering has always been a challenge to do so even when the scope of work does not require site observation. I think this is a great revision! | 3/1/2018 10:09 AM |
| 8 | This business does not offer structural engineering. | 2/28/2018 5:46 PM |
| 9 | telecommuting is real | 2/28/2018 4:01 PM |
| 10 | None | 2/28/2018 10:17 AM |
| 11 | The requirement of the responsible in charge agent being removed would be a positive impact on business | 2/28/2018 4:59 AM |
| 12 | This is long overdue. | 2/27/2018 5:46 PM |
| 13 | We regularly work from home while taking care of children but are able to communicate with other office staff electronically. | 2/27/2018 9:53 AM |
| 14 | No | 2/27/2018 8:17 AM |
| 15 | No | 2/27/2018 7:08 AM |
| 16 | I agree that it is time to look at this rule and update it accordingly. | 2/27/2018 5:18 AM |
| 17 | I am a sole proprietor with no employees. No effect. | 2/26/2018 9:47 PM |
| 18 | It is a good change. | 2/26/2018 9:25 PM |
| 19 | We have engineers at the office regularly and during operating hours already, and don't plan to change it. | 2/26/2018 4:47 PM |
| 20 | None | 2/26/2018 3:56 PM |
| 21 | it is outdated and other jurisdictions have successfully implemented similar language. | 2/26/2018 3:23 PM |
| 22 | The licensed professional should always be in the office. | 2/26/2018 1:43 PM |
| 23 | I fear it will be abused and supervision, which is already poor at best, will become worse. | 2/26/2018 1:09 PM |
| 24 | none | 2/26/2018 12:06 PM |
| 25 | If a design issue arises during construction the PE related to that design needs to be available locally. Remote supervision may work for some elements but nothing compares to being able to visit the site in the event of a problem. | 2/26/2018 11:15 AM |
| 26 | NO | 2/26/2018 10:51 AM |
| 27 | No comment. | 2/26/2018 10:44 AM |
| 28 | I agree that this change is warranted based on modern business practices. | 2/26/2018 10:12 AM |
| 29 | no | 2/26/2018 10:10 AM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630

| | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 30 | While the changes may seem to be a logical progression; the adverse reality is that licensees who are out-of-state may now compete with in-state professionals who have investments in brick and mortar. This change will also facilitate a push to test the limits of "adequate" responsible charge oversight. | 2/26/2018 10:08 AM |
| 31 | None. | 2/26/2018 9:56 AM |
| 32 | we employ professional engineers on site. I do not believe the modification is good for our profession. | 2/26/2018 9:51 AM |
| 33 | We are a larger firm and already comply with the proposed changes. | 2/26/2018 9:33 AM |
| 34 | Good revisions | 2/26/2018 8:55 AM |
| 35 | none | 2/26/2018 8:49 AM |
| 36 | telecommuting is a big part of our business and this will help | 2/26/2018 8:44 AM |
| 37 | It is not anticipated that any of the proposed changes will adversely affect my business. I believe that the proposed changes will positively affect the cost of doing business which can be passed on to the client. | 2/26/2018 8:44 AM |
| 38 | To encourage in-state location of engineers is beneficial to the State economy. The removal of this provision will provide business opportunities to out of state engineers, who will be able to staff the office with non-registered engineers or interns creating a potential for unqualified expertise in the day to day management of the office. | 2/26/2018 8:40 AM |
| 39 | No | 2/26/2018 8:39 AM |
| 40 | As a single location business, it is of no impact | 2/26/2018 8:34 AM |
| 41 | Having PLS and PE in office doing work | 2/26/2018 8:32 AM |
| 42 | Striking out the particular requirement makes sense nowadays. | 2/26/2018 8:31 AM |
| 43 | Good idea. | 2/26/2018 8:30 AM |
| 44 | N/A | 2/26/2018 8:09 AM |
| 45 | I believe there is great benefit from working in the same local office as a supervisor. Remote is not the same thing and usually involves much less frequent interaction, guidance, and oversight. This is especially true if those candidates for licensing are out of state and don't get to know the local codes and standards in Nevada. | 2/26/2018 7:41 AM |
| 46 | All Engineers are licensed for the disciplines we offer. | 2/26/2018 7:40 AM |
| 47 | Do not feel that physical presence should be required | 2/26/2018 7:39 AM |
| 48 | this modified provision makes sense. | 2/26/2018 7:37 AM |
| 49 | I don't agree with removing this text. Although our company is licensed in Nevada, our offices are in California and in Oregon. There is more to having a licensed PE in the office than just the supervision of design. The PE also is the licensed professional who understands the rules for a given state which includes ethics of practice and business conduct. This is more difficult to establish without a licensed PE in the office. | 2/26/2018 7:31 AM |
| 50 | None. | 2/26/2018 7:28 AM |
| 51 | na | 2/26/2018 7:25 AM |
| 52 | None | 2/26/2018 6:40 AM |
| 53 | It's about time this requirement went away. | 2/26/2018 6:35 AM |
| 54 | nothing | 2/26/2018 6:35 AM |
| 55 | no | 2/26/2018 6:20 AM |
| 56 | As a regional firm this will provide greater flexibility. | 2/26/2018 6:13 AM |
| 57 | proposed NAC 625.630 is acceptable | 2/26/2018 6:02 AM |
| 58 | None | 2/26/2018 5:16 AM |
| 59 | No | 2/26/2018 5:02 AM |
| 60 | no | 2/26/2018 4:58 AM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630

| | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 61 | I am opposed to removing the requirement for a licensed professional to be physically present (based) in the office. It is very difficult to adequately supervise and direct employees, and oversee and take professional responsibility of plans produced at a distance. | 2/25/2018 9:00 PM |
| 62 | no effect on our office work. | 2/25/2018 8:28 PM |
| 63 | Seems like an "employee" should be in the same physical place as the responsible engineer. An independent subcontractor (NOT an employee) could be somewhere else. | 2/25/2018 5:23 PM |
| 64 | I'm a one man firm and the bulk of my business is from local clients. Field problems account for about 10% of my time, where on-site presence is reqd. Big companies out of state should be reqd to hire a local engineer to act as their representative, expediting submission of sealed documents to bldg depts. | 2/25/2018 4:27 PM |
| 65 | I'm not a current business owner but have been in the past for 20 years. I believe the change needs to be made with today's technology. | 2/25/2018 4:22 PM |
| 66 | No Comments. | 2/25/2018 3:10 PM |
| 67 | We often limit our liability to the client, but not to others or for injuries, based on a number of issues. Would the change prevent us from making such an agreement? | 2/25/2018 2:59 PM |
| 68 | We already naturally comply with the proposed Code. | 2/25/2018 2:34 PM |
| 69 | I have no problem with the bill, but it has no impact on my business. | 2/25/2018 1:45 PM |
| 70 | In favor of the change. | 2/25/2018 1:33 PM |
| 71 | This change opens opportunities for much abuse, which in turn would result in unfair competition that is not in the best interest of public safety. | 2/25/2018 12:39 PM |
| 72 | There are companies who already pretend to have an engineer on staff in the geotechnical field that can do this even easier. If they were not allowed to be owned by a non-engineer this would eliminate this issue but as long as that is allowed, changing this rule will allow these "low baller" technician based companies to destroy our business. | 2/25/2018 10:11 AM |
| 73 | Our engineering work is performed in the location of and under the direct supervision of the licensed structural engineer | 2/25/2018 9:45 AM |
| 74 | None. | 2/25/2018 9:14 AM |
| 75 | I agree with the change. | 2/25/2018 8:57 AM |
| 76 | I am a Sole Proprietor Nevada PE doing business at my office in New York | 2/25/2018 8:45 AM |
| 77 | none | 2/25/2018 8:00 AM |
| 78 | It is possible this would open the door to remote engineers setting up firms. I believe this could take work away from small local firms. I have done work remotely for other engineering firms and in my opinion the level of service is compromised. | 2/25/2018 7:28 AM |
| 79 | This is the electronic age. It makes no difference whether an engineer is in the next cubicle or a thousand miles away. | 2/24/2018 10:43 PM |
| 80 | Why should someone in Tasmania be allowed to sign plans for Nevada just because they are in charge of a bunch of apes here? | 2/24/2018 6:51 PM |
| 81 | No | 2/24/2018 6:00 PM |
| 82 | No | 2/24/2018 5:38 PM |
| 83 | There are a lot of engineers in their 80s who make spare money by stamping other people's work after cursory (or no) review. This change will just make that easier - they won't even have to come into the office. | 2/24/2018 3:19 PM |
| 84 | It allows non license individual to compete with me a license individual because they have the oversight of P.E. in another location. | 2/24/2018 3:06 PM |
| 85 | No | 2/24/2018 3:04 PM |
| 86 | No | 2/24/2018 2:33 PM |
| 87 | I think the language should remain. It helps avoid "purchasing a stamp" | 2/24/2018 1:37 PM |
| 88 | No comment. | 2/24/2018 1:34 PM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630

| | | |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| 89 | As a licensed civil engineer and land surveyor I support the proposed change. | 2/24/2018 1:25 PM |
| 90 | I am present in the office in Nevada, but I do supervise engineers in other offices and believe the change is necessary. | 2/24/2018 1:22 PM |
| 91 | We have E&O insurance, but the limits of that insurance should only be disclosed if requested by a client. Otherwise we may be disadvantaged by having a smaller limit than a larger firm. | 2/24/2018 1:01 PM |
| 92 | I only have one business location. | 2/24/2018 12:54 PM |
| 93 | Good idea in light of current technology | 2/24/2018 12:46 PM |
| 94 | Most professionals are not locked into working out of a given office location. Showing up an given office everyday is meaningless... | 2/24/2018 12:41 PM |
| 95 | No impact | 2/24/2018 12:08 PM |
| 96 | I agree that the previously written is outdated. | 2/24/2018 10:38 AM |
| 97 | none | 2/24/2018 10:37 AM |
| 98 | The proposed amendment is encouraged. | 2/24/2018 10:12 AM |
| 99 | None | 2/24/2018 10:07 AM |
| 100 | This would allow out of state firms to potentially set up shop with simply administrative people to say they have an office locally. That's not a benefit to resident licensed engineers or surveyors. I don't think it's a benefit to the public either. | 2/24/2018 10:04 AM |
| 101 | As a single person specialty service firm, I am unable to have presence in Nevada. | 2/24/2018 9:53 AM |
| 102 | My business prepares drainage reports, to accompany plans of another engineer / firm. Our reports must be wet-sealed. | 2/24/2018 9:51 AM |
| 103 | I think this question tends to take a Nevada Licensed Engineer completely out of getting work locally on many projects and can compromise emergency life safety issues in this locale. We are a less populated state compared to other states like California and many other Midwest and Eastern States. I feel that every out of state engineer may practice engineering for Nevada projects but must have a locally licensed engineer or engineering company sponsor them on large projects of one million dollars or more. What this means is that these qualifying licensed engineers/companies maintain and promote a tie in the professional community in case any type of problem may exist. Nevada local engineers can readily handle on the spot project coordination for important life safety matters easily with local authorities as well. I would not delete the requirement as stated in NAC 625.630 item #3 (b)! | 2/24/2018 9:51 AM |
| 104 | No | 2/24/2018 9:48 AM |
| 105 | Competing out of state firms may open an office to get "local" status without having engineering professionals at that office. They can basically have an admin or even executive suite and state they have a local engineering office. | 2/24/2018 9:39 AM |
| 106 | No | 2/24/2018 9:00 AM |
| 107 | Good idea | 2/24/2018 8:31 AM |
| 108 | Better to keep as | 2/24/2018 8:19 AM |
| 109 | none | 2/24/2018 8:15 AM |
| 110 | All work that we do is from remote locations. | 2/24/2018 8:14 AM |
| 111 | None | 2/24/2018 8:04 AM |
| 112 | None | 2/24/2018 7:51 AM |
| 113 | Proposal sounds reasonable. | 2/24/2018 7:50 AM |
| 114 | I am a sole proprietor LLC, and work in many locations and also work remotely in many cases, both in conjunction with other engineers and alone. | 2/24/2018 7:50 AM |
| 115 | The only problem that we have as a firm specializing in structural engineering, is competing with other engineers who do marginal work. The problem lies in the plan check process, the plan checkers are non-engineers who have no idea what they are looking at. | 2/24/2018 7:50 AM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630

| | | |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| 116 | This change would reduce the cost and risk of setting up a satellite office in Nevada by firms from outside of Nevada. This will increase competition and potentially reduce fees. | 2/24/2018 7:42 AM |
| 117 | One employee, sole proprietor will not be affected. | 2/24/2018 7:20 AM |
| 118 | None | 2/24/2018 7:18 AM |
| 119 | good update | 2/24/2018 7:16 AM |
| 120 | I support this change | 2/24/2018 7:15 AM |
| 121 | I think 45' is too tall for other categories, such as residences on hillsides similar to Lake Tahoe. | 2/24/2018 7:06 AM |
| 122 | Would highly support this change and believe it would benefit small firms such as ours. | 2/24/2018 7:01 AM |
| 123 | Good idea since many businesses work remotely. Physical offices are becoming less and less important. | 2/24/2018 6:52 AM |
| 124 | We have those who work from home, utilize servers to share files, Skype to have face-to-face conversations, and Skype to screen share works in progress (AutoCAD). Being in the same physical location is archaic. | 2/24/2018 5:49 AM |
| 125 | no | 2/24/2018 5:43 AM |
| 126 | Will allow us to better service Nevada clients | 2/24/2018 5:03 AM |
| 127 | Good change | 2/24/2018 4:54 AM |
| 128 | All professionals should do an onsite review of all projects that they affix their signature & seal | 2/24/2018 4:12 AM |
| 129 | Not currently providing services in Nevada. | 2/23/2018 10:32 PM |
| 130 | I feel this change is in keeping with current employment trends. | 2/23/2018 10:27 PM |
| 131 | No impact | 2/23/2018 9:33 PM |
| 132 | The Professional Engineer must meticulously guide the sub-professionals he or she directs. It is imperative that such direction be both adequate and timely. The current amendment creates an atmosphere that is ripe for abuse. | 2/23/2018 9:30 PM |
| 133 | I support the proposed change (to delete the requirement to be physically present). Thank you. | 2/23/2018 9:05 PM |
| 134 | no effect | 2/23/2018 8:35 PM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630


| | | |
|-----|---|-------------------|
| 135 | <p>First, I feel the intent of "generally present" needs to be known. (1) Was it intended to provide access to the engineer by a client; or (2) was it intended to ensure that the engineer is present enough to be in responsible charge; or (3) was it intended to ensure that the engineer had knowledge of local practices. I feel the intent of "generally present" could be a combination of all 3 if not more. Taking a closer look at (3) for example, the board should look at adverse conditions experienced in other states such as North Dakota. During an oil boom in Williston, North Dakota, many out-of-state engineers including those from Nevada and California performed professional services without any working knowledge specific to the locality that caused many lawsuits and adverse impact to not only the local economy but many land owners and the local government as well. I feel a lot is simply absorbed by just being present whether it be observations of ecosystems or environments that trigger an awareness of inherent design criteria differences for a septic system that is designed for an arid dry desert of Las Vegas to that of a clayey soil and cold climate of Williston. Even more basic than just engineering is the method of sanitation collection. In Las Vegas, sanitation trucks may drive from residential and commercial developments equipped with mechanical arms lifting sanitation dumpsters at each location to transport the waste; whereas, in Williston, North Dakota, sanitation dumpsters are not only much larger but are towed away to a landfill, disposed of, and returned back to the site in a period of 2 to 4 hours. In one instance, a dumpster can be rolled and lifted by a truck and in the other instance a semi with towing flatbed is required. Of significance is required onsite navigational clearance. Many engineers and contractors went to Williston during an oil boom when the rest of the economy was experiencing record unemployment designing and building sites based on their own local knowledge of origin designing sites that were inadequate in size or did not work for one reason or another often resulting in failure such as waste overflow onto a heavily travelled highway attributed to a failed septic field due to inadequate design. It could be argued that the engineers and contractors have a fiduciary responsibility to their clients but also to the profession. Nonetheless, there is something gained by being "generally present". I like the language of 625.630 but I think "generally present" should be better defined. I do not favor something so narrow but just enough to satisfy conditions presumed intents (1), (2), and (3) above. I do feel removal would have an adverse impact to small business Nevada firms competing against larger firms, which a small business has the advantage of an inherent presence fulfilling (1), (2), and (3) above.</p> | 2/23/2018 8:34 PM |
| 136 | N/A | 2/23/2018 8:34 PM |
| 137 | My business relies on my direct involvement with my clients as such a remote based competitor is not likely to adverse me. | 2/23/2018 7:45 PM |
| 138 | None. | 2/23/2018 7:35 PM |
| 139 | There are many employees located in various offices, inside and outside Nevada | 2/23/2018 7:35 PM |
| 140 | This makes sense in today market where individuals work remotely. | 2/23/2018 7:16 PM |
| 141 | I do mainly power system studies for new equipment installations at government and industrial facilities. Typically I am provided with all the required information without visiting the actual location so the changes would not effect my business. | 2/23/2018 6:55 PM |
| 142 | Proposed language is more consistent with modern practices. | 2/23/2018 6:50 PM |
| 143 | The benefit of having a trained engineer is in the constant interaction with the other employees, subordinates, and clients. This benefit is not present if the licensed trained employee is not present in the office. | 2/23/2018 6:48 PM |
| 144 | Being almost 71 years old I will not be renewing my license when it is due next time. | 2/23/2018 6:46 PM |
| 145 | No reason to rely on "local" presence. The licensed engineer needs to review all product prior to placing a seal on the plans, and is then responsible regardless of where the plans were actually produced | 2/23/2018 6:37 PM |
| 146 | None | 2/23/2018 6:35 PM |
| 147 | none | 2/23/2018 6:30 PM |
| 148 | None | 2/23/2018 6:09 PM |
| 149 | Supervision requires the physical presence of the overseeing engineer | 2/23/2018 6:07 PM |
| 150 | Wait to see impact as difficult to assess. | 2/23/2018 6:02 PM |
| 151 | Not requiring a full time at-the-office engineer will see outside firms setting up "satellite" offices, offering engineering for a lower fee, and ultimately degrading the industry | 2/23/2018 5:55 PM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630

| | | |
|-----|--|-------------------|
| 152 | It will have a very positive effect on this business and many other small engineering firms | 2/23/2018 5:52 PM |
| 153 | all employees are co-located, so at this point, the change in legislation would have little effect on our operation. | 2/23/2018 5:50 PM |
| 154 | We are located outside the US | 2/23/2018 5:47 PM |
| 155 | None | 2/23/2018 5:35 PM |
| 156 | No | 2/23/2018 5:32 PM |
| 157 | Will be beneficial only | 2/23/2018 5:32 PM |
| 158 | I see no reason to have employees sit in my office to do their job. | 2/23/2018 5:31 PM |

Q6 Will a specific proposed regulatory provision in NAC 625.630 have a beneficial effect upon your business?

Answered: 341 Skipped: 11



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|-----|
| Yes | 34.60% | 118 |
| No | 65.40% | 223 |
| TOTAL | | 341 |

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

Answered: 130 Skipped: 222

| # | RESPONSES | DATE |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 1 | It would be helpful | 3/5/2018 2:50 PM |
| 2 | No | 3/2/2018 11:37 AM |
| 3 | Possibly. It may allow more out of state competition to open shop here but it will also make it easier for us to open a satellite office elsewhere in the state. | 3/1/2018 3:46 PM |
| 4 | Free to advertise and have working bodies all over the State of Nevada!!! | 3/1/2018 2:04 PM |
| 5 | None | 3/1/2018 12:25 PM |
| 6 | See comment 5 above. | 3/1/2018 11:48 AM |
| 7 | NONE | 3/1/2018 11:20 AM |
| 8 | see #5 | 2/28/2018 4:01 PM |
| 9 | None | 2/28/2018 10:17 AM |
| 10 | It will allow us to provide our services to more companies | 2/28/2018 4:59 AM |
| 11 | This is long overdue. | 2/27/2018 5:46 PM |
| 12 | If we decide to expand our business it gives us more options in hiring by making a greater population available | 2/27/2018 9:53 AM |
| 13 | No | 2/27/2018 8:17 AM |
| 14 | No | 2/27/2018 7:08 AM |
| 15 | increases flexibility in work locations. | 2/26/2018 9:25 PM |
| 16 | We have engineers at the office regularly and during operating hours already, and don't plan to change it. | 2/26/2018 4:47 PM |
| 17 | No | 2/26/2018 3:56 PM |
| 18 | Job location flexibility OK. | 2/26/2018 2:00 PM |
| 19 | There needs to be a licensed professional in direct charge. | 2/26/2018 1:09 PM |
| 20 | none | 2/26/2018 12:06 PM |
| 21 | I don't know why we would want engineering firms operating in Nevada that don't have at least one resident PE. | 2/26/2018 11:15 AM |
| 22 | Allows licensees in our firm to work in an office not near Nevada. | 2/26/2018 11:14 AM |
| 23 | will benefit those out-of-state to do business in NV | 2/26/2018 11:07 AM |
| 24 | No | 2/26/2018 10:51 AM |
| 25 | No comment. | 2/26/2018 10:44 AM |
| 26 | no | 2/26/2018 10:10 AM |
| 27 | The benefits of multiple offices in rural areas with a licensed professional elsewhere in state, may likely sparsely shadow the detriment of having other out-of-state licensees opening up offices in-state and managing crews here that have diminished oversight. | 2/26/2018 10:08 AM |
| 28 | None. | 2/26/2018 9:56 AM |
| 29 | no | 2/26/2018 9:51 AM |
| 30 | Level the playing field in regard to insurance. | 2/26/2018 9:33 AM |
| 31 | no | 2/26/2018 8:55 AM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630

| | | |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 32 | no change | 2/26/2018 8:49 AM |
| 33 | NO | 2/26/2018 8:47 AM |
| 34 | telecommuting is a big part of our business and this will help | 2/26/2018 8:44 AM |
| 35 | Being able to be in responsible charge of a project without having to be on-site will greatly reduce overhead. | 2/26/2018 8:44 AM |
| 36 | As a single location small business, it is of no impact | 2/26/2018 8:34 AM |
| 37 | N/A | 2/26/2018 8:09 AM |
| 38 | N/A | 2/26/2018 7:59 AM |
| 39 | no | 2/26/2018 7:40 AM |
| 40 | No comment | 2/26/2018 7:39 AM |
| 41 | It makes things clearer. | 2/26/2018 7:37 AM |
| 42 | no | 2/26/2018 7:31 AM |
| 43 | None. | 2/26/2018 7:28 AM |
| 44 | no | 2/26/2018 7:25 AM |
| 45 | No | 2/26/2018 6:40 AM |
| 46 | n/a | 2/26/2018 6:35 AM |
| 47 | none | 2/26/2018 6:35 AM |
| 48 | Makes opening of satellite office more feasible. | 2/26/2018 6:20 AM |
| 49 | See comment on question 5 | 2/26/2018 6:13 AM |
| 50 | none | 2/26/2018 6:02 AM |
| 51 | None | 2/26/2018 5:16 AM |
| 52 | No | 2/26/2018 5:02 AM |
| 53 | Remote work is common. Allowing engineers to work remotely and still act in responsible charge provides flexibility to employers to retain top talent. | 2/26/2018 4:58 AM |
| 54 | In the global market, actual locations of individuals is not important to the production and supervision of employees. | 2/26/2018 4:30 AM |
| 55 | This requirement has no effect on my business, although I believe that the licensed PE should be present. | 2/25/2018 9:00 PM |
| 56 | no effect on our office work. | 2/25/2018 8:28 PM |
| 57 | none | 2/25/2018 5:23 PM |
| 58 | Not currently a business owner. | 2/25/2018 4:22 PM |
| 59 | No. | 2/25/2018 3:10 PM |
| 60 | The relaxation the onsite retirements would allow us to tailor our services to what is necessary for us to perform our normal duties as engineer of record. | 2/25/2018 2:59 PM |
| 61 | We already naturally comply with the proposed Code. | 2/25/2018 2:34 PM |
| 62 | see #5 | 2/25/2018 10:11 AM |
| 63 | This would allow us to work on the projects in a different office than where the licensed structural engineer is located | 2/25/2018 9:45 AM |
| 64 | None. | 2/25/2018 9:14 AM |
| 65 | no | 2/25/2018 8:57 AM |
| 66 | I am a Sole Proprietor Nevada PE doing business at my office in New York | 2/25/2018 8:45 AM |
| 67 | none | 2/25/2018 8:00 AM |
| 68 | no comment | 2/24/2018 10:43 PM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630


| | | |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| 69 | No | 2/24/2018 6:00 PM |
| 70 | No | 2/24/2018 5:38 PM |
| 71 | Do we really want to reduce the requirements for Engineering? I think not, not at all. | 2/24/2018 3:57 PM |
| 72 | No benefit | 2/24/2018 3:06 PM |
| 73 | No | 2/24/2018 3:04 PM |
| 74 | Possibly opening up additional revenue that was lost prior to this provision | 2/24/2018 2:33 PM |
| 75 | No comment. | 2/24/2018 1:34 PM |
| 76 | It will allow me to effectively use engineers in our other offices to complete work and will allow me to effectively mentor younger engineers in our other offices. | 2/24/2018 1:22 PM |
| 77 | None | 2/24/2018 12:54 PM |
| 78 | No | 2/24/2018 12:46 PM |
| 79 | I mostly work by myself | 2/24/2018 12:41 PM |
| 80 | No impact | 2/24/2018 12:08 PM |
| 81 | With the drastically improved surveying technology in recent years, the change will allow the profession to provide improved services to our clients and be a more profitable assist to our operations. | 2/24/2018 10:38 AM |
| 82 | none | 2/24/2018 10:37 AM |
| 83 | We support the proposed amendment. | 2/24/2018 10:18 AM |
| 84 | I am licensed in multiple jurisdictions and appreciate the clarity of the new wording. | 2/24/2018 10:13 AM |
| 85 | It is not necessary to be on site to perform professional duties. | 2/24/2018 10:12 AM |
| 86 | no | 2/24/2018 10:07 AM |
| 87 | I think this question tends to take a Nevada Licensed Engineer completely out of getting work locally on many projects and can compromise emergency life safety issues in this locale. We are a less populated state compared to other states like California and many other Midwest and Eastern States. I feel that every out of state engineer may practice engineering for Nevada projects but must have a locally licensed engineer or engineering company sponsor them on large projects of one million dollars or more. What this means is that these qualifying licensed engineers/companies maintain and promote a tie in the professional community in case any type of problem may exist. Nevada local engineers can readily handle on the spot project coordination for important life safety matters easily with local authorities as well. I would not delete the requirement as stated in NAC 625.630 item #3 (b)! | 2/24/2018 9:51 AM |
| 88 | No | 2/24/2018 9:48 AM |
| 89 | Work from same office | 2/24/2018 9:00 AM |
| 90 | none | 2/24/2018 8:15 AM |
| 91 | We do not have a physical office in Nevada. | 2/24/2018 8:14 AM |
| 92 | None | 2/24/2018 8:04 AM |
| 93 | Keep undue expenses from projects | 2/24/2018 7:51 AM |
| 94 | See comment 5. | 2/24/2018 7:50 AM |
| 95 | no | 2/24/2018 7:50 AM |
| 96 | We have only one office. | 2/24/2018 7:42 AM |
| 97 | Reduce cost. | 2/24/2018 7:37 AM |
| 98 | All on site personnel to be limited while still maintaining design oversight. Lower cost for engineering firm, as well as client. | 2/24/2018 7:37 AM |
| 99 | None | 2/24/2018 7:18 AM |
| 100 | no | 2/24/2018 7:16 AM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630

| | | |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| 101 | Access to licensed individuals, particularly in remote/rural office locations can prove to be very challenging. Electronic communications makes remote oversight and review very possible. | 2/24/2018 7:01 AM |
| 102 | I think others will benefit, but my business will not at this time. | 2/24/2018 6:52 AM |
| 103 | removal of the item proposed to be deleted. | 2/24/2018 5:49 AM |
| 104 | potential benefits arise if there are licensed employees working from satellite/home offices or travel between offices. | 2/24/2018 5:43 AM |
| 105 | Will allow us to better service our Nevada clients | 2/24/2018 5:03 AM |
| 106 | I believe the proposed revision will allow more quality firms to practice engineering in Nevada | 2/23/2018 10:32 PM |
| 107 | No | 2/23/2018 10:27 PM |
| 108 | No impact | 2/23/2018 9:33 PM |
| 109 | no effect | 2/23/2018 8:35 PM |
| 110 | See comments of (5). | 2/23/2018 8:34 PM |
| 111 | N/A | 2/23/2018 8:34 PM |
| 112 | It would allow the population of remote production offices to perform work under supervision of a licensed professional at a different physical location. | 2/23/2018 7:53 PM |
| 113 | The language is obviously dated. | 2/23/2018 7:35 PM |
| 114 | This will make it easier to work with other professional engineers and EIT's to produce work in the State of Nevada | 2/23/2018 7:16 PM |
| 115 | I typically do all my work from out of state. | 2/23/2018 6:55 PM |
| 116 | None | 2/23/2018 6:50 PM |
| 117 | None | 2/23/2018 6:46 PM |
| 118 | None | 2/23/2018 6:35 PM |
| 119 | none | 2/23/2018 6:30 PM |
| 120 | None | 2/23/2018 6:09 PM |
| 121 | Difficult to tell. | 2/23/2018 6:02 PM |
| 122 | no comments | 2/23/2018 5:55 PM |
| 123 | This will allow smaller firms to provide better service to clients and general public | 2/23/2018 5:52 PM |
| 124 | This will allow my office to still operate while allowing me, as the principal to work on site of construction projects which need more direct oversight. | 2/23/2018 5:50 PM |
| 125 | Not at this time; however it would open the door for possible expansion in the future. | 2/23/2018 5:50 PM |
| 126 | We are located outside the US | 2/23/2018 5:47 PM |
| 127 | None | 2/23/2018 5:35 PM |
| 128 | No | 2/23/2018 5:32 PM |
| 129 | This change will align better to the practice of employees working from remote locations rather than always at a main office. | 2/23/2018 5:32 PM |
| 130 | It will allow me as a professional to review and monitor a project without being at the same physical location. Should be an easy fix. | 2/23/2018 5:26 PM |

Q8 Do anticipate any indirect adverse effects on your business?

Answered: 345 Skipped: 7



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|-----|
| Yes | 11.30% | 39 |
| No | 88.70% | 306 |
| TOTAL | | 345 |

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

Answered: 111 Skipped: 241

| # | RESPONSES | DATE |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 1 | It would be helpful | 3/5/2018 2:50 PM |
| 2 | No | 3/2/2018 11:37 AM |
| 3 | None | 3/1/2018 12:25 PM |
| 4 | See comment 5 above. | 3/1/2018 11:48 AM |
| 5 | NONE | 3/1/2018 11:20 AM |
| 6 | no | 2/28/2018 4:01 PM |
| 7 | None | 2/28/2018 10:17 AM |
| 8 | Lack of oversight is dangerous | 2/28/2018 6:19 AM |
| 9 | none | 2/28/2018 4:59 AM |
| 10 | This is long overdue. | 2/27/2018 5:46 PM |
| 11 | We already work this way | 2/27/2018 9:53 AM |
| 12 | I think the Board is trying to do a good thing but not realizing the potential for people/companies to abuse the additional flexibility. I think this may open the door for 'straw' licenses. We all know there are engineers who collect state licenses like baseball cards. What's to prevent a company from hiring, on a part-time basis, an engineer in Pennsylvania or Kentucky who happens to have a NV license just so the company can say they have an licensed engineer on staff? I know this may not have an impact on government projects or large construction bids but it could have an impact on the small, independent engineering business. I work for an oil and gas consulting firm and am also the president of the Nevada Petroleum and Geothermal Society. Although none of the work I do requires a stamp, I was required to obtain a license so that my employer, who's corporation name contains the word "engineering", could get a state business license. The outlook for oil and gas development in Nevada is cautiously optimistic over the next 5-10 years. As activity increases, I think we'll see small consulting firms from Texas, Oklahoma and Colorado do what I have described in the previous paragraph so they can get a business license without truly having engineering capabilities. Because oil and gas work is in somewhat of a gray area with respect to licensing, I'm concerned that much of this activity will fly under the radar. | 2/27/2018 8:17 AM |
| 13 | No | 2/27/2018 7:08 AM |
| 14 | n/a | 2/26/2018 9:25 PM |
| 15 | We have engineers at the office regularly and during operating hours already, and don't plan to change it. | 2/26/2018 4:47 PM |
| 16 | No | 2/26/2018 3:56 PM |
| 17 | none | 2/26/2018 12:06 PM |
| 18 | No | 2/26/2018 10:51 AM |
| 19 | No comment. | 2/26/2018 10:44 AM |
| 20 | no | 2/26/2018 10:10 AM |
| 21 | Already explained; this is going to push the limits of the physical definition of adequate responsible charge and oversight to the detriment of those that can't compete and similarly to the detriment of the public as relates to end products and services. | 2/26/2018 10:08 AM |
| 22 | None. | 2/26/2018 9:56 AM |
| 23 | persons can open shadow firms from out of state and compete at lower prices. removing the cost of PE from equation is immense. | 2/26/2018 9:51 AM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630

| | | |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 24 | Smaller "one man shop" operations can misconstrue themselves into appearing as larger operations. | 2/26/2018 9:33 AM |
| 25 | no | 2/26/2018 8:55 AM |
| 26 | NO | 2/26/2018 8:47 AM |
| 27 | None. | 2/26/2018 8:44 AM |
| 28 | No | 2/26/2018 8:39 AM |
| 29 | no impact | 2/26/2018 8:34 AM |
| 30 | N/A | 2/26/2018 8:09 AM |
| 31 | Businesses without a licensee physically at the office can reduce their overhead and lower prices. I don't feel you can effectively supervise electronically. | 2/26/2018 8:08 AM |
| 32 | N/A | 2/26/2018 7:59 AM |
| 33 | question 8 is grammatically incorrect. where is your proof reader??? | 2/26/2018 7:53 AM |
| 34 | See previous response. | 2/26/2018 7:41 AM |
| 35 | non known | 2/26/2018 7:40 AM |
| 36 | Physical presence would require significant cost to provide this service during normal working hours, with no benefits other than restricting engineering services to only local engineers. Trade restriction | 2/26/2018 7:39 AM |
| 37 | no additional comment necessary. | 2/26/2018 7:37 AM |
| 38 | no | 2/26/2018 7:31 AM |
| 39 | None. | 2/26/2018 7:28 AM |
| 40 | no | 2/26/2018 7:25 AM |
| 41 | None | 2/26/2018 6:40 AM |
| 42 | n/a | 2/26/2018 6:35 AM |
| 43 | none | 2/26/2018 6:35 AM |
| 44 | no | 2/26/2018 6:20 AM |
| 45 | none | 2/26/2018 6:02 AM |
| 46 | If a licensed professional covers multiple offices, how is he or she going to oversee the work he or she will stamp? | 2/26/2018 5:47 AM |
| 47 | None | 2/26/2018 5:16 AM |
| 48 | No | 2/26/2018 5:02 AM |
| 49 | no | 2/26/2018 4:58 AM |
| 50 | None | 2/25/2018 9:00 PM |
| 51 | no. | 2/25/2018 8:28 PM |
| 52 | Other engineering companies might abuse this and have "employees" scattered all over the place. How could they possibly supervise all of them. | 2/25/2018 5:23 PM |
| 53 | No. | 2/25/2018 3:10 PM |
| 54 | We already naturally comply with the proposed Code. | 2/25/2018 2:34 PM |
| 55 | The proposed change will dilute engineering supervision and oversight which in turn will the integrity of the profession and standing in the community. | 2/25/2018 12:39 PM |
| 56 | See #5 - a geotechnical company should not be allowed to be owned by a non-engineer. Then this would not matter. | 2/25/2018 10:11 AM |
| 57 | None. | 2/25/2018 9:14 AM |
| 58 | none | 2/25/2018 8:57 AM |
| 59 | I am a Sole Proprietor Nevada PE doing business at my office in New York | 2/25/2018 8:45 AM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630


| | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 60 | none | 2/25/2018 8:00 AM |
| 61 | no comment | 2/24/2018 10:43 PM |
| 62 | See above. | 2/24/2018 6:51 PM |
| 63 | No | 2/24/2018 6:00 PM |
| 64 | No | 2/24/2018 5:38 PM |
| 65 | This rule could allow an out of town engineer to locate technicians or non licensed individuals near me as my competition. The general public may not understand or respect that who they are doing business with face to face is not licensed. It would allow out of town companies to compete on the same level for public works jobs. | 2/24/2018 3:06 PM |
| 66 | No | 2/24/2018 3:04 PM |
| 67 | No comment. | 2/24/2018 1:34 PM |
| 68 | I see no adverse effects. | 2/24/2018 1:22 PM |
| 69 | Possibly. | 2/24/2018 1:01 PM |
| 70 | None | 2/24/2018 12:54 PM |
| 71 | No | 2/24/2018 12:46 PM |
| 72 | No inpact | 2/24/2018 12:08 PM |
| 73 | No | 2/24/2018 10:38 AM |
| 74 | none | 2/24/2018 10:37 AM |
| 75 | May slightly increase competition from more remote engineers. | 2/24/2018 10:13 AM |
| 76 | no | 2/24/2018 10:07 AM |
| 77 | Many jurisdictions want a local presence when competing for work. Firms from outside the area could establish a "local" presence without a licensed engineer physically here. | 2/24/2018 10:04 AM |
| 78 | I think this question tends to take a Nevada Licensed Engineer completely out of getting work locally on many projects and can compromise emergency life safety issues in this locale. We are a less populated state compared to other states like California and many other Midwest and Eastern States. I feel that every out of state engineer may practice engineering for Nevada projects but must have a locally licensed engineer or engineering company sponsor them on large projects of one million dollars or more. What this means is that these qualifying licensed engineers/companies maintain and promote a tie in the professional community in case any type of problem may exist. Nevada local engineers can readily handle on the spot project coordination for important life safety matters easily with local authorities as well. I would not delete the requirement as stated in NAC 625.630 item #3 (b)! | 2/24/2018 9:51 AM |
| 79 | No | 2/24/2018 9:48 AM |
| 80 | none | 2/24/2018 8:15 AM |
| 81 | None. | 2/24/2018 8:14 AM |
| 82 | None | 2/24/2018 8:04 AM |
| 83 | None | 2/24/2018 7:51 AM |
| 84 | See comment 5. | 2/24/2018 7:50 AM |
| 85 | no | 2/24/2018 7:50 AM |
| 86 | This will allow companies to do work in Nevada, without a physical presence. I still support this amendment to the law. The Board needs to work with the local regulatory agencies and utility companies to work toward electronic signatures for them. Today we will still need to get their signatures by hand. | 2/24/2018 7:37 AM |
| 87 | None | 2/24/2018 7:18 AM |
| 88 | no | 2/24/2018 7:16 AM |
| 89 | None. | 2/24/2018 7:01 AM |
| 90 | none | 2/24/2018 6:52 AM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630

| | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| 91 | no | 2/24/2018 5:49 AM |
| 92 | no | 2/24/2018 5:43 AM |
| 93 | No comment | 2/24/2018 5:03 AM |
| 94 | No | 2/23/2018 10:27 PM |
| 95 | Deleting the requirement to have the professional in responsible charge generally at the location of the business will contribute to sham engineering businesses. The regulation should remain unchanged. | 2/23/2018 10:19 PM |
| 96 | No impact | 2/23/2018 9:33 PM |
| 97 | no adverse effects | 2/23/2018 8:35 PM |
| 98 | See comments of (5). | 2/23/2018 8:34 PM |
| 99 | N/A | 2/23/2018 8:34 PM |
| 100 | None | 2/23/2018 7:35 PM |
| 101 | None | 2/23/2018 6:50 PM |
| 102 | none | 2/23/2018 6:46 PM |
| 103 | None | 2/23/2018 6:35 PM |
| 104 | None | 2/23/2018 6:09 PM |
| 105 | Difficult to tell | 2/23/2018 6:02 PM |
| 106 | same response applies | 2/23/2018 5:55 PM |
| 107 | none expected. | 2/23/2018 5:50 PM |
| 108 | We do not have work in Nevada | 2/23/2018 5:47 PM |
| 109 | NO EFFECTS BUT ITS A BAD IDEA, YOU ARE GETTING PEOPLE SELLING THEIR STAMPS. PROBABLY GETTING WORK DONE IN INDIA AND BUYING A STAMP | 2/23/2018 5:38 PM |
| 110 | None. | 2/23/2018 5:35 PM |
| 111 | No | 2/23/2018 5:32 PM |

Q10 Do you anticipate any indirect beneficial effects on your business?

Answered: 335 Skipped: 17



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|-----|
| Yes | 17.61% | 59 |
| No | 82.39% | 276 |
| TOTAL | | 335 |

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

Answered: 100 Skipped: 252

| # | RESPONSES | DATE |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 1 | Can't think of any | 3/5/2018 2:50 PM |
| 2 | No | 3/2/2018 11:37 AM |
| 3 | None | 3/1/2018 12:25 PM |
| 4 | See comment 5 above. | 3/1/2018 11:48 AM |
| 5 | NONE | 3/1/2018 11:20 AM |
| 6 | None | 2/28/2018 10:17 AM |
| 7 | None | 2/28/2018 4:59 AM |
| 8 | This is long overdue. | 2/27/2018 5:46 PM |
| 9 | None | 2/27/2018 9:53 AM |
| 10 | No | 2/27/2018 8:17 AM |
| 11 | No | 2/27/2018 7:08 AM |
| 12 | n/a | 2/26/2018 9:25 PM |
| 13 | No | 2/26/2018 3:56 PM |
| 14 | Clearer wording. | 2/26/2018 2:00 PM |
| 15 | none | 2/26/2018 12:06 PM |
| 16 | No. | 2/26/2018 10:51 AM |
| 17 | No comment. | 2/26/2018 10:44 AM |
| 18 | no | 2/26/2018 10:10 AM |
| 19 | . | 2/26/2018 10:08 AM |
| 20 | None. | 2/26/2018 9:56 AM |
| 21 | While this change will not have any direct effect on myself or my business, I do feel that an office should have a licensed professional in the office full time. Calls, web conferences and other technologies are great, but they do not replace the ability to knock on a door and ask a question. | 2/26/2018 9:33 AM |
| 22 | no | 2/26/2018 8:55 AM |
| 23 | NO | 2/26/2018 8:47 AM |
| 24 | None. | 2/26/2018 8:44 AM |
| 25 | Providing the expertise in-state would help advance the profession. Having field offices without registered surveyors/engineers could have negative impacts on competing local businesses. | 2/26/2018 8:40 AM |
| 26 | No | 2/26/2018 8:39 AM |
| 27 | no impact | 2/26/2018 8:34 AM |
| 28 | Ability to telecommute. | 2/26/2018 8:30 AM |
| 29 | N/A | 2/26/2018 8:09 AM |
| 30 | N/A | 2/26/2018 7:59 AM |
| 31 | no additional comment necessary | 2/26/2018 7:37 AM |
| 32 | no | 2/26/2018 7:31 AM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630

| | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 33 | None. | 2/26/2018 7:28 AM |
| 34 | no | 2/26/2018 7:25 AM |
| 35 | No | 2/26/2018 6:40 AM |
| 36 | n/a | 2/26/2018 6:35 AM |
| 37 | none | 2/26/2018 6:35 AM |
| 38 | no | 2/26/2018 6:20 AM |
| 39 | none | 2/26/2018 6:02 AM |
| 40 | None | 2/26/2018 5:16 AM |
| 41 | No | 2/26/2018 5:02 AM |
| 42 | no | 2/26/2018 4:58 AM |
| 43 | none | 2/25/2018 9:00 PM |
| 44 | no effect. | 2/25/2018 8:28 PM |
| 45 | none | 2/25/2018 5:23 PM |
| 46 | No Comments. | 2/25/2018 3:10 PM |
| 47 | See 7. | 2/25/2018 2:59 PM |
| 48 | We already naturally comply with the proposed Code. I believe it would be wise to add to the proposed language of NAC 625.630 3(a) Devotes his or her working time in the actual employ of the licensee or firm on a full time basis and not merely as a consultant; | 2/25/2018 2:34 PM |
| 49 | None. | 2/25/2018 9:14 AM |
| 50 | none | 2/25/2018 8:57 AM |
| 51 | I am a Sole Proprietor Nevada PE doing business at my office in New York | 2/25/2018 8:45 AM |
| 52 | none | 2/25/2018 8:00 AM |
| 53 | It simplifies the management of separate local offices. | 2/25/2018 7:56 AM |
| 54 | We would have more flexibility in hiring engineers, no matter where they are. | 2/24/2018 10:43 PM |
| 55 | No | 2/24/2018 6:00 PM |
| 56 | None | 2/24/2018 5:38 PM |
| 57 | I feel the licensed individual needs to be a resident of that office. I agree technology allows us all to work remotely. With this in mind the licensed individual is welcome to enlist help for non licensed individuals who may live else where. | 2/24/2018 3:06 PM |
| 58 | No | 2/24/2018 3:04 PM |
| 59 | No comment. | 2/24/2018 1:34 PM |
| 60 | I do think it will allow engineers to work more collaboratively within our organization. | 2/24/2018 1:22 PM |
| 61 | Yes | 2/24/2018 12:46 PM |
| 62 | No impact | 2/24/2018 12:08 PM |
| 63 | More litigation work when bad design results from this. | 2/24/2018 11:50 AM |
| 64 | Not certain at this time. | 2/24/2018 10:38 AM |
| 65 | none | 2/24/2018 10:37 AM |
| 66 | Competition is good. | 2/24/2018 10:13 AM |
| 67 | no | 2/24/2018 10:07 AM |
| 68 | No | 2/24/2018 9:48 AM |
| 69 | none | 2/24/2018 8:15 AM |
| 70 | None | 2/24/2018 8:14 AM |

Business Impacts related to amendments to NAC 625.630

| | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| 71 | None | 2/24/2018 8:04 AM |
| 72 | None | 2/24/2018 7:51 AM |
| 73 | no | 2/24/2018 7:50 AM |
| 74 | Our company is located in many states across the US and this will allow us to utilize additional resources not physically located in NV to direct work, oversee engineers within the state. | 2/24/2018 7:31 AM |
| 75 | None | 2/24/2018 7:18 AM |
| 76 | makes it easier | 2/24/2018 7:16 AM |
| 77 | Believe this will improve our ability to add staff in our Elko location. | 2/24/2018 7:01 AM |
| 78 | no | 2/24/2018 5:49 AM |
| 79 | possibly, but until now, has not been an issue. | 2/24/2018 5:43 AM |
| 80 | No comment | 2/24/2018 5:03 AM |
| 81 | None | 2/23/2018 10:27 PM |
| 82 | Good | 2/23/2018 9:33 PM |
| 83 | no effects | 2/23/2018 8:35 PM |
| 84 | I feel a better defined "generally present" would be beneficial. With the positive movement of technology, I feel a consultant has the tools and resources to be able to live 6 months in Las Vegas and 6 months in Hawaii or New Zealand or Australia or somewhere in Europe and perform work all year round in Las Vegas. | 2/23/2018 8:34 PM |
| 85 | N/A | 2/23/2018 8:34 PM |
| 86 | It's possible that our costs will be reduced, a benefit for clients. | 2/23/2018 7:35 PM |
| 87 | None | 2/23/2018 6:50 PM |
| 88 | Your survey betrays you pecuniary only interests, while your interests should be in improving the level of skills in Engineering Firms generally. Not the money level. | 2/23/2018 6:48 PM |
| 89 | None | 2/23/2018 6:46 PM |
| 90 | None | 2/23/2018 6:35 PM |
| 91 | None | 2/23/2018 6:09 PM |
| 92 | Difficult to tell | 2/23/2018 6:02 PM |
| 93 | no | 2/23/2018 5:55 PM |
| 94 | Better on site oversight of complicated projects which require engineering review. | 2/23/2018 5:50 PM |
| 95 | none anticipated. | 2/23/2018 5:50 PM |
| 96 | We do not have work in Nevada | 2/23/2018 5:47 PM |
| 97 | None. | 2/23/2018 5:35 PM |
| 98 | No | 2/23/2018 5:32 PM |
| 99 | Easier to higher additional employee. | 2/23/2018 5:32 PM |
| 100 | indirectly, I can have other employees in other states handle the work. | 2/23/2018 5:31 PM |