NEVADA STATE BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS
Minutes of the Interim Board Meeting
Held virtually Thursday, April 9, 2026, at 9:15am

Board members participating were Chair Brent Wright, PE/SE; Vice-chair Matt Gingerich, PLS; Thomas Matter, public member; Greg DeSart, PE; Karen Purcell, PE; Jay Dixon, PE; Robert Fyda, PE; and Angelo Spata, PE. Board member Michael Kidd, PLS, was excused.

Also participating were Mark Fakler, Executive Director; Chris MacKenzie, Board Legal Counsel; Murray Blaney, Operations/Compliance; Jasmine Bailey; Licensing; and Derek Vogel, Communications.

1. Meeting conducted by Chair Brent Wright, call to order and roll call of board members to determine presence of quorum—board members Angelo Spata, Karen Purcell, Michael Kidd, Thomas Matter, Jay Dixon, Matt Gingerich, Robert Fyda, Greg DeSart.

Mr Wright called the meeting to order, and a quorum was determined.

2. Public comment.

There was no public comment virtually or via email.

3. Consideration of initial licensure applicant requests to waive certain requirements of Nevada Revised Statutes and Nevada Administrative Code Chapter 625.

Ms Purcell recommended approval of the request to waive NRS 625.183 (4)(b) made by Omar Abdelmoniem Etman applying for mechanical engineering licensure.

26-25 A motion was made by Ms Purcell, seconded by Mr Gingerich to approve the waiver request. The motion passed unanimously. Mr Kidd was not present for the vote.

Ms Purcell recommended approval of the request to waive NRS 625.183 (4)(b) made by Jared Walker applying for mechanical engineering licensure.

26-26 A motion was made by Ms Purcell, seconded by Mr Fyda to approve the waiver request. The motion passed unanimously. Mr Kidd was not present for the vote.

4. Board approval of non-appearance applications for initial licensure. Refer to Addendum A for list of applicants.

The Board reviewed twenty applications in the board packet for initial licensure. Mr DeSart asked that the application for Mr Hickenbottom be pulled from the vote pending further discussion.

26-27 A motion was made by Mr Gingerich, seconded by Ms Purcell to approve the applications for initial licensure contained in the board packet, with the exception of Mr Hickenbottom's application The motion passed unanimously. Mr Kidd was not present for the vote.

Mr DeSart said with Mr Hickenbottom, his record shows two years of experience and it appears that that he is claiming two years of experience for his doctorate in civil and environmental engineering. His undergraduate degree is in wildlife ecology and conservation, and as I understand it, he would need an engineering degree to be able to accrue the full requirement. He added typically applicants would get four years credit for an engineering degree, two years for a master's or doctorate, and then an additional two years of practical engineering experience – but he doesn't have an engineering degree. Mr DeSart said he believed the applicant would need an additional two years of experience before he'd become eligible.

Ms Purcell said she agreed with the assessment of an additional two years' experience.

Mr Gingerich said the content of the natural sciences education could be considered relatable to engineering, and added there is typically a prerequisite of engineering courses to be admitted to a engineering doctorate program.

Mr DeSart agreed that there could be a consideration of those units, but we don't have the full applicant transcript on hand to make that determination, and it is a possible question of whether we want to be looking at the transcripts of non-engineering degrees at a granular level to be assessing equivalency.

Mr Spata said a greater level of detail and more time would be needed to make an assessment, and he made the following motion:

26-28 A motion was made by Mr Spata, seconded by Mr Fyda to nominate Mr DeSart to review and evaluate Mr Hickenbottom's full transcripts and make a recommendation on any additional experience requirements for the Board to consider at the next meeting. The motion passed unanimously. Mr Kidd was not present for the vote.

5. <u>Discuss proposed updates by the Nevada Division of Minerals to the Nevada Administrative Code Chapter 522.210 as shown in LCB File No. R052-25.</u>

Mr Wright asked Mr Fakler to introduce the agenda item.

Mr Fakler said there was a representative of the Nevada Association of Land Surveyors (NALS) on the call that wished to make public comment on the item.

Mr Carrington

My name is Robert Carrington, representing the Nevada Association of Land Surveyors (NALS). Concerning regulation changes to 522 from the Division of Minerals, they are based on the Governor's Executive Order from several years ago. They are now eliminating some additional regulations, and one of them in particular is the need for what's called a "location plat" for oil and gas wells. We believe at NALS that oil and gas wells fall under "fixed works" and, therefore, should be located in accordance with NRS 625.040 which is the practice of land surveying. So, I'd like this Board to review the Commission's regulation changes, and, maybe, make comment to them, if that's possible. I've attended at least one hearing on this issue, and I plan to attend the next hearing to voice our opposition to these regulation changes. Thank you, Board and Chair.

Mr Wright thanked Mr Carrington for his public comment and asked Mr Fakler to give background on the agenda item.

Mr Fakler said the item relates to proposed regulation updates by the Division of Minerals to Nevada Administrative Code Chapter 522, Section 2, as shown in the meeting materials. The revision strikes the requirement of location plat to be prepared by licensed land surveyor as part of the application process. He added that he had contacted the Deputy Administrator for the Division, Garrett Wake, to discuss the proposed changes. Mr Fakler said Mr Wake indicated the change was to reduce barriers by eliminating items that are not reviewed in the application process, and added there was consideration of having the well, once in place, being located by a licensed surveyor, as fixed works. Mr Fakler added that if the language was stricken as proposed, adjustments would be needed to the associated "Form 2" (as shown in meeting materials). As currently written the information prescribed by the form could only be provided by a licensed land surveyor.

Mr Wright asked for input from board members.

Mr Gingerich said with the language as proposed, the associated Form 2 would need to be modified. As already mentioned, that would require a license surveyor. If the form is not modified, then the language in the regulation would need to remain as is.

Mr DeSart said he agreed that Form 2 as written would require a professional land surveyor to accurately provide that information.

The was a brief discussion relating to the locating of water wells by a Water Rights Surveyor (WRS) as a comparison, which is considered fixed works, and does not have the professional land surveyor requirement. It was determined that if the WRS is a civil engineer and is outside of their expertise, there should be consultation with a licensed land surveyor.

Mr Fakler said Mr Kidd intended to participate in the meeting, but due to travel changes he is unable. He added Mr Kidd forward email to be read into the record. It reads as follows:

As far as my thoughts on the proposed changes to NAC 522, I would not be in support as currently shown for the following reasons:

- *The infrastructure involved is high value. The requirement for the proposed well locations to be located relative to the Public Land Survey System (PLSS) section corners or quarter corners is important.*
- *These well permits and leases could be on public or private land, all of which are defined by the PLSS in Nevada.*
- *I would be in support of streamlining the submittal process to something electronic and easy.*
- *Keeping the location of the well within a 40-acre legal subdivision is not overly burdensome*

Thank you, Michael Kidd

Mr Wright asked for a clarification on how best to present a Board position on the agenda item.

Mr Fakler said it would be best if Mr Gingerich could articulate a motion that the Board could consider and vote on, and that can be the basis of the Board position.

Mr Gingerich made the following motion:

26-29

6. <u>Public comment.</u>

There was no public comment virtually or via email.

7. <u>Adjournment.</u>

Mr Wright thanked board members for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 9:47 am.

Respectfully, Mark Fakler
Executive Director