Dear Jerry:

I am writing you today regarding the proposed Committee on Uniform Procedures and Legislative Guidelines (UPLG) Motion 12, which has been endorsed by the NCEES Board of Directors, and will be offered for a vote at the upcoming NCEES 95th Annual Meeting in Indianapolis. Although the proposed amendments to the Model Law and Model Rules have been described as non-substantive, merely adding “language for structural engineers (that is) parallel to that of professional engineers and professional surveyors,” their impact would be profound and, in our view, damaging to the PE license. Passage of UPLG Motion 12 would place NCEES’ endorsement, as a recommended best practice for every jurisdiction to consider, the creation of a separate license for structural engineers and a requirement that those specifically licensed as structural engineers be included as members of every jurisdictional licensing board.

NSPE was disappointed and surprised to see this motion on the agenda. A proposal for a separate structural engineering license was brought to the Council for a vote at last year’s NCEES meeting and was defeated. The Council sent a very clear message that NCEES is a member-driven organization. NSPE strongly urges NCEES to honor the Council’s decision in last August’s vote and not proceed again with an action that fractures our profession.

NCEES and NSPE have a strong relationship and a shared commitment to promote and protect the licensed PE. We have a common cause in increasing public awareness of the critical role of the PE in protecting the public health, safety and welfare. Recognizing a separate structural engineering license as proposed and rejected by NCEES last year, and as proposed again in these revisions, would splinter the profession, confuse the public, and weaken a strong licensure regulatory system.

NSPE would like to make clear that it does not object to PEs individually identifying the fact that they practice in a particular field of engineering, like structural engineering, or use specialty designations in combination with the “PE” designation so long as such communications are in accordance with local practice regulations.

Given that the practical effect of the proposed amendments would be to redefine the fundamental nature of the PE license, Motion 12 goes well beyond the UPLG’s charge to address inconsistencies and conflicts in the existing language of the
Model Law and Rules. Accordingly, NSPE urges the NCEES Council to defeat this motion.

Given the very compressed timeline before the NCEES Annual Meeting, please contact NSPE Deputy Executive Director Art Schwartz at aschwartz@nspe.org or NSPE Senior Manager of Government Relations Arielle Eiser at aeiser@nspe.org at your earliest convenience if you have any questions or need additional information. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Kodi Jean Verhalen, P.E., Esq., F.NSPE
President 2016-2017
National Society of Professional Engineers

cc: Michael Conzett, P.E., President, NCEES
    Daniel Turner, Ph.D., P.E., P.L.S., President-Elect, NCEES
    NCEES Delegates