



---

## Category 1: Proposed Repeal or Amendments of Regulations Relating to Licensure and Examinations

---

Small Business Impact Statement

## **Small Business Impact Statement for proposed repeals and amendments to regulations relating to:**

Applications – NAC 625.210; 625.230;

Licensing – NAC 625.240

Examinations – NAC 625.310; NAC 625.330

### **Summary**

The State Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors has determined that the proposed repeals and amendments will have no negative financial impact on a small business and in some circumstances will likely have a beneficial impact. The proposed regulations have no negative impact on the formation, operation, or expansion of a small business in Nevada.

A small business is defined in Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 233B as a “business conducted for profit which employs fewer than 150 full-time or part-time employees.”

This small business impact statement was created pursuant to NRS 233B.0608(3) and complies with the requirements of NRS 233B.0609. As required by NRS 233B.0608(3), this statement identifies the methods used by the agency in determining the impact of the proposed regulations on a small business and provides the reasons for the conclusions of the agency followed by certification by the agency’s responsible person.

### **Background**

The proposed repeals and amendments reduce regulations, speed the licensing process, and reduce costs for professionals seeking a license as a professional engineer or land surveyor in Nevada. The rationale for each of the proposed repeals and amendments is described in the following:

#### **Applications**

##### **NAC 625.210**

→ Recommending the addition of application fee waiver for active military members and active military spouses, military veterans and military veteran spouses in support of Nevada’s initiative to become the most military friendly state in the US.

##### **NAC 625.230**

→ Recommending repeal of this regulation, because requiring a separate application/NCEES Record is redundant and not necessary for seeking a license in a secondary discipline.

## Licensing

### NAC 625.240

→ Recommending the addition of application fee waiver for active military members and active military spouses, military veterans and military veteran spouses in support of Nevada's initiative to become the most military friendly state in the US.

→ Recommending the removal of requirement to pass a written examination on Chapters 625 of NRS and NAC and replace it with an attestation pertaining to review of Chapters 625 of NRS and NAC in the application for licensure to speed the licensing process for endorsement/comity license applicants.

## Examinations

### 625.310

→ Recommending adding clarifying language regarding the structural exam requirements. Prior to taking the structural exam, applicants must take the national fundamentals of engineering exam. The language is proposed to be updated to provide clarity and allow for the upcoming changes to the exam length/format.

→ Recommending removing the requirement for a Nevada specific exam. Eliminates an unnecessary requirement and speeds the licensing process, resulting in new workers getting licensed sooner and being able to offer and provide services in Nevada much quicker.

### 625.330

→ Recommending repeal of this regulation as it is unnecessary. If an applicant chooses not to appear for an examination scheduled by the Board, the only harm is to the applicant.

## **Manner in which comments were solicited, response summary, and explanation of how interested parties may obtain a copy of summary**

Referencing the requirements of NRS 233B.0608, the Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors requested input via a survey link sent to all Nevada licensed engineers and land surveyors, and those signed up to receive news and information from the board. The emailed survey link was sent to 18,500 individuals.

The survey asked for input on adverse/beneficial economic effects on small businesses, and indirect adverse/beneficial effects – with space to elaborate on responses.

A summary of the survey results is available for viewing on the Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors website (see link below) and are included as an attachment.

<https://nvbpels.org/business-impact-survey-results-2023/>

## **Manner in which the analysis was conducted**

Survey results were initially reviewed for general comments to gauge if the intent of the proposed regulation changes was adequately conveyed.

Survey analysis then focused on “YES” responses relating the direct and indirect adverse economic effects, and the associated comments and explanations to determine the individual concerns. The same was done with survey results for the direct and indirect beneficial impacts.

### **1. Estimated economic effects of the proposed regulation on small businesses**

Based on the survey results, there are no adverse economic impacts related to the proposed repeal and amendment of regulations relating licensure and examinations.

### **2. Considerations were made to reduce impact of proposed regulation**

The proposed repeal and amendment of regulations relating to licensure and examinations was put forward to lessen the regulatory burden on those applying for professional licensure in the state. No adverse impacts were identified that warranted additional consideration.

### **3. Cost estimate for agency enforcement**

At this time there would be no additional cost to the regulatory board to enforce the proposed amendments. Any issues relating to compliance would be absorbed into the existing workload of the current staffing levels.

### **4. New fees or increases in existing fees**

The proposed amendments do not involve an increase to existing fees or create any new fees.

### **5. Are any duplicative or more stringent provisions involved**

There are no federal regulations associated with professional engineers and land surveyors. However, every state and US territory regulates the professions of engineering and land surveying.

### **6. Summary of conclusions**

The proposed repeal and amendment of regulations relating to licensure and examinations will have no adverse impacts on small businesses.

**Certification by Person Responsible for the Agency**

I, Patty Mamola, Executive Director of the Nevada Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors certify to the best of my knowledge or belief, a concerted effort was made to determine the impact of the proposed amendments to regulation on small business, and the information contained in this statement was prepared properly and is accurate.



March 9, 2023

DRAFT




## Category 1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments or repeal of regulations related licensure and examinations.

### Small Business Impact Survey Results

# Q1 Type of Business (primary service offered)


Answered: 252 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Engineering	86.90%	219
Land Surveying	11.11%	28
Architectural	0.00%	0
Contractor	1.98%	5
TOTAL		252

## Q2 Number of Full-Time Employees

Answered: 252 Skipped: 1




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
>150	35.32%	89
<150	64.68%	163
TOTAL		252



### Q3 Business Managing Office Location


Answered: 251 Skipped: 2



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
in Nevada	37.05%	93
other US State	62.55%	157
outside US	0.40%	1
TOTAL		251

### Q4 Will a specific proposed change or repeal of the regulations relating to licensure and examinations have a direct adverse economic effect on your business?

Answered: 163 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	5.52%	9
No	94.48%	154
TOTAL		163

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

Answered: 84 Skipped: 79

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Eliminating the application fee for military/veteran persons and spouses should not adversely impact the company where I am employed	2/22/2023 4:26 PM
2	None	2/22/2023 2:18 PM
3	No comments.	2/20/2023 5:01 PM
4	Requiring passing the SE for all types of structural engineering is excessive. We support requiring passing the SE exam for structural engineering of Risk Category III and IV structures and structures 4 stories or more. Requiring the higher SE exam standard for lower risk, low rise buildings adds a barrier for those licensed by comity as approximately 45 states do not require passing the SE exam for performing structural engineering (and only one state requires passing the SE exam for doing all structural engineering - the others only require the SE for doing cat III/IV and tall structures).	2/19/2023 7:50 AM
5	I would not anticipate any impact on our business.	2/17/2023 10:07 AM
6	I'm a veteran.	2/16/2023 8:32 PM
7	There may also be a direct adverse effect to life safety	2/15/2023 5:06 PM
8	None	2/15/2023 2:31 PM
9	No effect.	2/15/2023 12:59 PM
10	none	2/15/2023 10:42 AM
11	Removing barriers to licensure will incrementally benefit our business.	2/15/2023 7:18 AM
12	Proposed changes seem appropriate.	2/15/2023 7:17 AM
13	None	2/14/2023 9:09 PM
14	waiving fees to military isn't a bad thing. The bad part is when everyone else has to pay more to subsidize the special group. Too much of this nowadays. Everyone pays more to give some other special group something for free.	2/14/2023 5:32 PM
15	No	2/14/2023 12:49 PM
16	The path to licensure should be simplified as we believe there is a shortage of licensed professionals due to some of the regulations that would qualify you for licensure.	2/14/2023 12:15 PM
17	no	2/14/2023 11:24 AM
18	I think the examination on Nevada law is still a good idea. I can only assume removing that requirement is due to making reviewing the law a requirement for PDHs.	2/14/2023 8:30 AM
19	One group or another should not be waived for paying fees for licensure. This could have a long term effect of raising rates for all other applicants to compensate for the loss of fees.	2/14/2023 7:38 AM
20	No	2/13/2023 4:07 PM
21	By removing the requirement for examination we are not protecting the profession or the public by testing for minimum competency of the laws and practices pertaining to the profession. By allowing for individuals who are not well vetted by a fair and consistent examination process (which an oral review by itself is not)IMO we are opening the door for less than competent persons to mascaraed as professionals and undermine the strength and integrity of the profession.	2/13/2023 1:54 PM
22	no	2/13/2023 1:26 PM

Category 1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments or repeal of regulations related licensure and examinations.


23	All Licensed Professional should be required to pass a written exam pertaining to State Law's and Ethics to be licensed in Nevada!!	2/13/2023 12:38 PM
24	None.	2/13/2023 12:00 PM
25	no	2/13/2023 9:27 AM
26	Granting fee waivers to any class of applicants or licensee ultimately raises the costs for others. While I applaud the contributions of members of the military, they took the job voluntarily, and there needs to be a limit on the secondary benefits extended. Let the Federal Government determine the full compensation and benefits to be extended to the military.	2/13/2023 8:54 AM
27	No	2/13/2023 7:39 AM
28	none	2/12/2023 4:41 PM
29	None	2/12/2023 3:26 PM
30	The changes are minimal. The State can require Ethics for State Regulations as part of continuing education, as many other states do.	2/11/2023 9:33 AM
31	no	2/10/2023 3:46 PM
32	I think it is important that the applicant/professional be acquainted with local regulations and practices. this exam makes it that the candidate at least has to review regulation prior to being licensed and start practicing in the state.	2/10/2023 2:12 PM
33	none	2/10/2023 1:51 PM
34	no	2/10/2023 1:45 PM
35	No	2/10/2023 12:59 PM
36	None	2/10/2023 12:42 PM
37	Requiring examination for PEs from another state will make it more difficult for engineers from other states to get licensed.	2/10/2023 11:19 AM
38	none	2/10/2023 11:04 AM
39	As a veteran I could have benefited from the changes but since I am already licensed it doesn't make any difference.	2/10/2023 10:54 AM
40	No	2/10/2023 10:31 AM
41	NA	2/10/2023 10:14 AM
42	none	2/10/2023 10:05 AM
43	The military should be supported.	2/10/2023 9:45 AM
44	I have retired, and have closed my structural engineering office.	2/10/2023 9:27 AM
45	No	2/10/2023 9:27 AM
46	No proposed changes in this section would effect our current business practices	2/10/2023 9:24 AM
47	No	2/10/2023 9:19 AM
48	N/a	2/10/2023 9:09 AM
49	no	2/10/2023 9:06 AM
50	I think it is important that the take-home exam on the licensing laws in NV be continued. From my experience there are subtle differences in the laws from state to state, e.g., NV allows LLCs, CA does not. NV uses qualifications based selection with no fees/costs. Not true in many states.	2/10/2023 9:04 AM
51	no	2/10/2023 9:01 AM
52	N/A	2/10/2023 8:52 AM
53	I work for the Nevada State Engineer.	2/10/2023 8:20 AM

Category 1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments or repeal of regulations related licensure and examinations.

54	No.	2/10/2023 8:17 AM
55	No	2/10/2023 7:46 AM
56	Changes look fine, should not affect our business	2/10/2023 7:35 AM
57	..	2/10/2023 7:05 AM
58	No	2/10/2023 6:51 AM
59	I agree	2/10/2023 6:45 AM
60	No Comment	2/10/2023 6:27 AM
61	Changes proposed seem reasonable and would not impact our business.	2/10/2023 6:13 AM
62	NO	2/10/2023 5:49 AM
63	NONE	2/10/2023 5:47 AM
64	The elimination of 625.310 Paragraphs 4 and 5 is a mistake. To allow anyone that has passed the national exams an automatic path to licensure in this state without an exam reviewing the laws of this state is an open invitation to the excuse of any error in surveys being conducted as this is how I survey back home.	2/10/2023 5:42 AM
65	Eliminating unnecessary steps toward obtaining a similar additional discipline is helpful. Granting fee waivers to military, et al is a great way of saying thanks and helping the transition to civilian life.	2/10/2023 5:26 AM
66	Typical cost of doing business.	2/10/2023 5:22 AM
67	No	2/10/2023 5:21 AM
68	None	2/10/2023 3:52 AM
69	no comment	2/10/2023 3:34 AM
70	Nope	2/10/2023 2:42 AM
71	Glad to see these overdue, common sense revisions!	2/9/2023 11:18 PM
72	Lower wage out of state engineers will drive down rates	2/9/2023 9:32 PM
73	No	2/9/2023 9:01 PM
74	No	2/9/2023 8:26 PM
75	N/a	2/9/2023 7:54 PM
76	None	2/9/2023 7:44 PM
77	None	2/9/2023 7:01 PM
78	N/A	2/9/2023 6:41 PM
79	None	2/9/2023 6:37 PM
80	No	2/9/2023 6:23 PM
81	Half of our employees licensed in Nevada are veterans. This is great.	2/9/2023 5:44 PM
82	None	2/9/2023 5:40 PM
83	No	2/9/2023 5:27 PM
84	No	2/9/2023 3:42 PM

# Q6 Will a specific proposed change or repeal of the regulations relating to licensure and examinations have a direct beneficial effect on your business?

Answered: 163 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	14.72%	24
No	85.28%	139
TOTAL		163

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

Answered: 79 Skipped: 84

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Only the elimination of the application fee for military affiliated engineers. That does not amount to a significant impact to the firm.	2/22/2023 4:26 PM
2	None	2/22/2023 2:18 PM
3	No comments.	2/20/2023 5:01 PM
4	Waiving licensing fees for veterans will save the business in licensing fees for veterans. These fees are negligible to our business at this time.	2/20/2023 12:16 PM
5	We are one of the few out of state firms with engineers who have passed the SE - many of our competitors have just PEs not SEs We also do MEP, which has lots of overlap, removing the specific license for each category makes sense.	2/19/2023 7:50 AM
6	Exam availability.	2/17/2023 5:16 PM
7	I would not anticipate any impact on our business.	2/17/2023 10:07 AM
8	Reduced costs.	2/16/2023 8:32 PM
9	None	2/15/2023 2:31 PM
10	Already licensed. Irrelevant.	2/15/2023 12:59 PM
11	none	2/15/2023 10:42 AM
12	Our veterans eligible for licensure may benefit.	2/15/2023 7:18 AM
13	Will streamline licensing.	2/15/2023 7:17 AM
14	None	2/14/2023 9:09 PM
15	Same comment as before	2/14/2023 5:32 PM
16	None	2/14/2023 12:49 PM
17	We feel we might be able to provide our clients with additional licensed staff and have more leaders in responsible charge of work training the LSIT's	2/14/2023 12:15 PM
18	no	2/14/2023 11:24 AM
19	No	2/13/2023 4:07 PM
20	There is no benefit to promoting less qualified persons to professional status by eliminating the examination.	2/13/2023 1:54 PM
21	no	2/13/2023 1:26 PM
22	I disagree that removing the State Exam for new applicants and reciprocity applicants. Individuals Licensed in our state should be required to know NRS 625 & NAC 625 as well as NRS 328. In addition, the applicants should be tested basic Ethics related to Land Surveying and Engineering. a percentage of our continuing education requirements now require a certain number of courses on ethics. We should be testing applicants about ethics especially if we require it for renewal of licensure.	2/13/2023 12:38 PM
23	None.	2/13/2023 12:00 PM
24	no	2/13/2023 9:27 AM
25	It may enable us to hire ex-military personnel whom otherwise wouldnt bother with the profession due to not meeting licensing requirements.	2/13/2023 7:39 AM

Category 1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments or repeal of regulations related licensure and examinations.

26	none	2/12/2023 4:41 PM
27	None	2/12/2023 3:26 PM
28	The changes are minimal	2/11/2023 9:33 AM
29	no	2/10/2023 3:46 PM
30	No impact at this time. It will have a beneficial impact the next time one of our employees submits a PE comity application.	2/10/2023 3:10 PM
31	none	2/10/2023 1:51 PM
32	no	2/10/2023 1:45 PM
33	No	2/10/2023 12:59 PM
34	None	2/10/2023 12:42 PM
35	More trained engineers will be available for temporary or permanent employment.	2/10/2023 12:07 PM
36	none	2/10/2023 11:04 AM
37	No impact.	2/10/2023 10:54 AM
38	No	2/10/2023 10:31 AM
39	NA	2/10/2023 10:14 AM
40	none	2/10/2023 10:05 AM
41	Any support we can give to the military is good.	2/10/2023 9:45 AM
42	No	2/10/2023 9:27 AM
43	Allowing the structural exam to be in four parts is beneficial.	2/10/2023 9:25 AM
44	More standardized approach and exam focused approach will make it easier for future applications	2/10/2023 9:24 AM
45	We do have Veteran employees.	2/10/2023 9:19 AM
46	N/A	2/10/2023 9:09 AM
47	no	2/10/2023 9:06 AM
48	no	2/10/2023 9:01 AM
49	No	2/10/2023 8:52 AM
50	No.	2/10/2023 8:17 AM
51	None	2/10/2023 7:35 AM
52	.	2/10/2023 7:05 AM
53	No	2/10/2023 6:51 AM
54	No Comment	2/10/2023 6:27 AM
55	No impact change	2/10/2023 6:13 AM
56	NA	2/10/2023 5:49 AM
57	NONE	2/10/2023 5:47 AM
58	none	2/10/2023 5:42 AM
59	Any reduction in regulations is a good step.	2/10/2023 5:26 AM
60	Typical cost of doing business.	2/10/2023 5:22 AM
61	No	2/10/2023 5:21 AM
62	None	2/10/2023 3:52 AM




Category 1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments or repeal of regulations related licensure and examinations.

63	no comment	2/10/2023 3:34 AM
64	Nope	2/10/2023 2:42 AM
65	As a military retiree, I appreciate this initiative	2/9/2023 11:18 PM
66	No	2/9/2023 9:01 PM
67	No	2/9/2023 8:26 PM
68	N/a	2/9/2023 7:54 PM
69	none	2/9/2023 7:44 PM
70	None	2/9/2023 7:01 PM
71	Not having to notify the board of employment or contact information changes beyond license renewal makes things easier.	2/9/2023 6:41 PM
72	Easier to get reciprocity	2/9/2023 6:41 PM
73	None	2/9/2023 6:37 PM
74	No	2/9/2023 6:23 PM
75	We would support recognition of the discipline of building architectural engineering which has been recognized with a NCESS exam for 20 years now	2/9/2023 5:47 PM
76	We did not note whether or not this change would include all licensure.	2/9/2023 5:44 PM
77	Veterans like myself would benefit	2/9/2023 5:40 PM
78	No.	2/9/2023 5:27 PM
79	No	2/9/2023 3:42 PM

### Q8 Do you anticipate any indirect adverse effects from the proposed changes or repeal on your business?

Answered: 163 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	7.36%	12
No	92.64%	151
TOTAL		163

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

Answered: 66 Skipped: 97

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	The proposed change could increase the number of Professionally licensed engineers in the state by eliminating the application fee for those affiliated with the military.	2/22/2023 4:26 PM
2	None	2/22/2023 2:18 PM
3	No comments.	2/20/2023 5:01 PM
4	no comment.	2/16/2023 8:32 PM
5	With the removal of fees for veterans and active duty military the costs of administration, which will not be similarly reduced, will be borne by fewer licensees so the fees to the remaining licensees will increase. I would expect fees to rise.	2/15/2023 5:07 PM
6	None	2/15/2023 2:31 PM
7	No effect.	2/15/2023 12:59 PM
8	none	2/15/2023 10:42 AM
9	No comment.	2/15/2023 7:17 AM
10	None	2/14/2023 9:09 PM
11	I wish I was special somehow. I'm just a normal guy, paying extra on everything so other people don't have to carry their own weight.	2/14/2023 5:32 PM
12	None	2/14/2023 12:49 PM
13	no	2/14/2023 11:24 AM
14	No	2/13/2023 4:07 PM
15	More time and money will be spent by cleaning up after persons that do not understand the laws and practices. Also undermining the public confidence in the work of the professional. In Nevada we passed the 4 year degree before licensure and then you are proposing to eliminate the exam that would identify any holes in the training that a person should have in order to become a professional. This does not make sense.	2/13/2023 1:54 PM
16	no	2/13/2023 1:26 PM
17	None.	2/13/2023 12:00 PM
18	no	2/13/2023 9:27 AM
19	Increased costs.	2/13/2023 8:54 AM
20	No	2/13/2023 7:39 AM
21	NCEES does not catch applicants 'double-dipping' on experience. This is not a serious problem on related disciplines, it is however a problem with PE/LS applicants.	2/13/2023 6:57 AM
22	I am licensed in many states and while I hate taking exams related to the state statutes, I think they are necessary for someone to feel like they have the knowledge necessary to work in the state.	2/12/2023 3:26 PM
23	no	2/10/2023 3:46 PM
24	There should be no adverse effect as the revisions are common sense, military benefits, and practicing PE are required to review the laws and rules as part of renewal requirements.	2/10/2023 3:10 PM
25	none	2/10/2023 1:51 PM

Category 1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments or repeal of regulations related licensure and examinations.


26	no	2/10/2023 1:45 PM
27	No	2/10/2023 12:59 PM
28	None	2/10/2023 12:42 PM
29	none	2/10/2023 11:04 AM
30	The changes to the exam requirements for structural engineers: NAC 625.310 2. leaves out existing structural engineers that passed Western States exam or other non NCEES exams prior to NCEES creating the structural exams. Need to allow for the alternative exams.	2/10/2023 10:54 AM
31	No	2/10/2023 10:31 AM
32	NA	2/10/2023 10:14 AM
33	none	2/10/2023 10:05 AM
34	No	2/10/2023 9:27 AM
35	No changes seem like they would negatively impact our business	2/10/2023 9:24 AM
36	NO	2/10/2023 9:19 AM
37	None	2/10/2023 9:09 AM
38	no	2/10/2023 9:06 AM
39	no	2/10/2023 9:01 AM
40	No	2/10/2023 8:52 AM
41	No.	2/10/2023 8:17 AM
42	No	2/10/2023 7:35 AM
43	.	2/10/2023 7:05 AM
44	No	2/10/2023 6:51 AM
45	No Comment	2/10/2023 6:27 AM
46	no comment	2/10/2023 6:13 AM
47	NA	2/10/2023 5:49 AM
48	NONE	2/10/2023 5:47 AM
49	Opening licensure to anyone that passed the NCEES exam will allow more PLS in the state.	2/10/2023 5:42 AM
50	already licensed.	2/10/2023 5:26 AM
51	No	2/10/2023 5:21 AM
52	None	2/10/2023 3:52 AM
53	no comment	2/10/2023 3:34 AM
54	Nope	2/10/2023 2:42 AM
55	None	2/9/2023 11:18 PM
56	No	2/9/2023 9:01 PM
57	No	2/9/2023 8:26 PM
58	N/a	2/9/2023 7:54 PM
59	None	2/9/2023 7:01 PM
60	N/A	2/9/2023 6:41 PM
61	None	2/9/2023 6:37 PM
62	No	2/9/2023 6:23 PM

Category 1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments or repeal of regulations related  
licensure and examinations.

63	None	2/9/2023 5:44 PM
64	None	2/9/2023 5:40 PM
65	No.	2/9/2023 5:27 PM
66	No	2/9/2023 3:42 PM

### Q10 Do you anticipate any indirect beneficial effects on your business from the proposed changes or repeal?

Answered: 162 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	11.11%	18
No	88.89%	144
TOTAL		162

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

Answered: 58 Skipped: 105

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	None	2/22/2023 2:18 PM
2	No comments.	2/20/2023 5:01 PM
3	Since I'm a veteran, it will reduce my expenses.	2/16/2023 8:32 PM
4	None	2/15/2023 2:31 PM
5	No effect.	2/15/2023 12:59 PM
6	none	2/15/2023 10:42 AM
7	The shortage of licensed engineers and surveyors in Nevada is real and becoming more significant with time; particularly, PLS licensure should be encouraged in every way possible for qualified candidates.	2/15/2023 7:18 AM
8	No comment.	2/15/2023 7:17 AM
9	None	2/14/2023 9:09 PM
10	Regulations don't benefit my business.	2/14/2023 5:32 PM
11	None	2/14/2023 12:49 PM
12	no	2/14/2023 11:24 AM
13	No	2/13/2023 4:07 PM
14	There cannot be any benefits to not vetting fairly and consistently persons desiring to be professionals in a field.	2/13/2023 1:54 PM
15	no	2/13/2023 1:26 PM
16	None.	2/13/2023 12:00 PM
17	no	2/13/2023 9:27 AM
18	No	2/13/2023 7:39 AM
19	It may make finding new engineers easier	2/13/2023 7:27 AM
20	simplifying redundant language and requirements is always good	2/12/2023 4:41 PM
21	This change will make it as simple as put in an application and get a survey license. That is not protecting the public.	2/12/2023 3:26 PM
22	no	2/10/2023 3:46 PM
23	none	2/10/2023 1:51 PM
24	no	2/10/2023 1:45 PM
25	No	2/10/2023 12:59 PM
26	None	2/10/2023 12:42 PM
27	More engineers available for temporary or permanent employment. Also note COE will have engineers involved in Nevada projects, and they will be able to be certified here.	2/10/2023 12:07 PM
28	none	2/10/2023 11:04 AM
29	No	2/10/2023 10:54 AM
30	nA	2/10/2023 10:14 AM

Category 1 - Business impacts related to proposed amendments or repeal of regulations related licensure and examinations.

31	none	2/10/2023 10:05 AM
32	If the military is helped, everyone in America is helped.	2/10/2023 9:45 AM
33	No	2/10/2023 9:27 AM
34	None	2/10/2023 9:19 AM
35	Clearer process to receive licensure as an engineer.	2/10/2023 9:09 AM
36	no	2/10/2023 9:06 AM
37	I oppose ALL of the proposed changes to the NAC as outlined in the preview. State specific licensure is important as all applicants need to demonstrate knowledge of NAC as well as follow the provisions of the blue book. I dont believe the application fees would be of any particular burden to any member of the military seeking application to become an engineer. I believe short-cutting of any of the application requirements/provisions in Nevada may lead to licensure of less-qualified individuals than the profession requires and think it is a bad idea. I do not support Governor Lombardo's order. Hugh Ezzell, CE	2/10/2023 9:01 AM
38	No	2/10/2023 8:52 AM
39	None	2/10/2023 7:35 AM
40	.	2/10/2023 7:05 AM
41	No	2/10/2023 6:51 AM
42	No comment	2/10/2023 6:27 AM
43	NA	2/10/2023 5:49 AM
44	NONE	2/10/2023 5:47 AM
45	none	2/10/2023 5:42 AM
46	A simpler methodology for obtaining a similar discipline.	2/10/2023 5:26 AM
47	None	2/10/2023 3:52 AM
48	Nope	2/10/2023 2:42 AM
49	Easier to convince military veterans to seek NV registration	2/9/2023 11:18 PM
50	No	2/9/2023 9:01 PM
51	N/a	2/9/2023 7:54 PM
52	None	2/9/2023 7:01 PM
53	N/A	2/9/2023 6:41 PM
54	None	2/9/2023 6:37 PM
55	This might encourage more applicants but I doubt it.	2/9/2023 5:44 PM
56	A veteran friendly state is always a benefit.	2/9/2023 5:40 PM
57	No.	2/9/2023 5:27 PM
58	No	2/9/2023 3:42 PM