
BOARD MEMBERS

Scott McClure, P.E., Chair, Twin Falls
James H. Milligan, P.E., Vice Chair, Moscow
Clyde Porter, P.L.S., Secretary, Boise
Leslie M. Walker, P.E., Member, Pocatello
Gary L. Young, P.E./L.S., Member, Twin Falls

Board Home Page www.state.id.us/ipels/index.htm

BOARD STAFF

David L. Curtis, P.E., Executive Director
Email dcurtis@ipels.state.id.us
Linda A. Bowcutt, Admin. Secretary
Email lbowcutt@ipels.state.id.us
Kathleen M. Lee, Clerical Specialist

December 2001 NEWS BULLETIN Thirty-second Edition

INTRODUCTION

This News Bulletin is being distributed by the Idaho State Board of Registration of Professional Engineers and Professional Land Surveyors to inform the public and the State's Professional Engineers and Professional Land

Surveyors of those events which significantly affect the professions. Future News Bulletins will be printed and distributed as the Board deems advisable.

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR - SCOTT McCLURE, P.E.

The purpose of the Idaho State Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors is to protect the public by regulation of engineering and land surveying within the State of Idaho. To better accomplish this purpose, the board is addressing issues that affect the day-to-day decisions made by engineers and surveyors in the performance of their duties. While our obligation is to the public, the Board needs and welcomes input from the engineering community. Members of the Board are Scott McClure, P.E., Chairman, Twin Falls; Les Walker, P.E., Pocatello; Jim Milligan, P.E., Moscow; Clyde Porter, P.L.S., Boise; and Gary Young, P.E./L.S. Twin Falls. They welcome your questions and comments.

One of the topics being addressed by the Idaho Board as well as the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying is the mobility of engineering licenses. Each state retains the authority to regulate the engineering and surveying professions within their jurisdiction. This has led to charges of unnecessary restriction of trade due to the difficulty for engineers qualified in one jurisdiction to obtain licensure in another jurisdiction. While there may be special requirements in some jurisdictions, a common standard generally exists throughout the country on what are necessary qualifications for licensure. A committee of NCEES, chaired by Dave Curtis, P.E., Executive Director of the Idaho Board was charged with examining ways of expediting the obtaining of a license in a new jurisdiction for an individual who is currently licensed in another jurisdiction. This process, known as comity, has been streamlined to the point that an engineer licensed in one state can often obtain licensure in another state in less than seven days. This process is made even easier if the engineer has a file on record with the NCEES, which provides a repository of references, academic records, etc. as often required by applications for each state.

A topic recently addressed by the Board is the design of alarm and fire suppression systems. It is the Board's position that proper design and installation of the systems is a critical element of public safety. As such, design criteria should be established by a professional engineer, and construction documents must be reviewed and approved by a licensed engineer. While certified technicians can lay out systems based upon proprietary materials and processes, this is not a substitute for proper engineering design and review. It must be mentioned however that this places an obligation upon the engineer to be knowledgeable in the application of codes and standards in this area of design. The National Fire Protection Association, as well as national code organizations and reference manuals provide information on the proper application and design of fire protection systems. If the engineer is to provide services related to these systems, it is required that he become knowledgeable regarding all aspects of systems for which he is taking responsibility.

Another area of concern for the Board is that of the review of the work of a professional engineer or land surveyor by another professional engineer or land surveyor. The Board believes that the performance of such work, often called peer review or value engineering, is often a valuable tool available to the client. At the same time if done improperly, it is fraught with ethical obstacles that must be overcome if the client is to receive the full benefit of the review and the reviewed and reviewing engineer are to avoid charges of ethical misconduct. A summary of the position of the board is being developed and should be available to the engineering community in the near future. I urge you to carefully review the information provided within that opinion and conduct yourself at all times in a manner which holds paramount the public interest and the free and reasonable dissemination of information.

ALL BUSINESS ENTITIES MUST NOW HAVE CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORIZATION

Effective July 1, 2001, every business entity, except sole proprietorships, that is offering professional land surveying or professional engineering services to the public in Idaho must obtain a Certificate of Authorization (COA) from the Board. The Board asked the Legislature to amend the Idaho Code to require a COA of all businesses to assure that businesses were held to the same Rules of Professional Responsibility as the individual practitioners. Application forms are available from the Board Office or over the internet through a link from the Board's Home Page which is at <http://www.state.id.us/ipels/index.htm>.

HIGHWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY PLATS AND PLANS - A CLARIFICATION

In a clarification of information previously printed in the Board NEWS BULLETIN, Board representatives met with representatives of the Idaho Transportation Department regarding the preparation of Highway Right-of-Way Plans. The preparation of those plans appears to fall into two separate categories. The first is when a consultant is retained to perform a field survey and prepare legal descriptions for property to be acquired. In this instance, the consultant is required to employ a PLS to be in responsible charge of the field survey and the PLS must seal, sign and date the legal descriptions prepared. The legal descriptions are then taken by the Design Section of ITD and used to prepare right-of-way plans which are used in the property acquisition process. The consultant PLS is not in responsible charge of the preparation of those right-of-way plans, and so does not seal, sign and date them. Under some circumstances the consultant PLS is also retained to prepare the actual right-of-way plans, in which case the consultant PLS seals, signs and dates the right-of-way plans. The second category is when the project is done by ITD employees. In that situation, a PLS employed by ITD is in responsible charge of the field survey and preparation of the legal descriptions for property to be acquired. The legal descriptions are sealed, signed and dated by the PLS in responsible charge. The legal descriptions are then taken by the Design Section and used to prepare right-of-way plans which are used in the property acquisition process. The PLS is not in responsible charge of the preparation of those plans, and so does not seal, sign and date them.

PLATS AND RECORDS OF SURVEY MUST MEET CODE REQUIREMENTS

At its meeting on June 29 & 30, 2001 the Idaho Board of Registration of Professional Engineers and Professional Land Surveyors reviewed information regarding compliance with portions of Idaho Code Title 50, Chapter 13, Plats and Vacations. The Board reviewed examples of plat submittals which clearly did not meet the requirement of Idaho Code §50-1304 which states, in pertinent part,

“The drafting film and image thereon shall be waterproof, tear resistant, flexible, and capable of withstanding repeated handling, as well as providing archival permanence. If ink is used on drafting film, the ink surface shall be coated with a suitable substance to assure permanent legibility.”

The examples viewed by the Board were not waterproof as evidenced by the application of water and very light abrasion with a paper towel. It was reported to the Board that as many as five or six coats of a surface coating substance may be required in order to truly waterproof a plat produced by an inkjet plotter on mylar.

As an alternative to filing an “ink-on-film” original plat, Idaho Code §50-1304 allows the filing of the plat using “. . . a photographic process using a silver image emulsion . . .” In addition to the filing of either an “ink-on-film” original or a silver image emulsion copy of the original, Idaho Code §50-1310 requires the filing of a copy of the original plat and in regard to the copy, requires that “The image thereon shall be by a photographic process using a silver image emulsion.” No alternatives to the photographic process using a silver image emulsion are given in regard to this copy.

Idaho Code §55-1905 also requires that “ink-on-film” Records of Survey be waterproof and the ink surface coated with a suitable substance to assure permanent legibility. As with plats, the professional land surveyor has the option of filing a silver image emulsion copy of the original.

The Board wants all license and certificate holders to be aware of the requirements of Idaho Code in regard to these

matters and urges compliance. Failure to comply could result in disciplinary action following an Administrative Hearing.

OBLIGATION OF LICENSE HOLDERS TO THE PUBLIC OVER OBLIGATION TO CLIENT

The Board reminds all Registrants and Certificate Holders that Rule 005.01 of the Rules of Professional Responsibility states

“All Registrants and Certificate Holders shall at all times recognize their primary obligation is to protect the safety, health and welfare of the public in the performance of their professional duties. (7-1-93)”

These 31 words are the cornerstone of the professions of engineering and land surveying and separate our professions from nearly all other professions for which a license is required. The other professions, including those in accounting, health care, law, and the clergy, find their obligation is to their client, not to the public. Regarding many of those professions, there are even legal safeguards assuring confidential communication between the professional and their client. Confidentiality of medical records, attorney/client communications and clergy/parishioner communications are matters of law, but the primary obligation of registrants and certificate holders of the Board of Professional Engineers and Professional Land Surveyors is to the public.

TEMPORARY RULES GO INTO EFFECT

Effective September 5, 2001 Temporary Administrative Rules went into effect for the Board. Under the rules, candidates who fail to pass an examination will not be allowed to review examination questions if those questions might be repeated on later examinations. Instead of a review of the questions attempted, the candidate will be given a diagnostic report indicating how well they performed on the various subject matters covered by the examination. The rules also more closely align the academic requirements for equivalency with an accredited engineering program for those applicants not holding an engineering degree.

EXAMINATION NEWS

Beginning in the Fall of 2001, the Principles and Practice of Engineering examination in the discipline of mechanical engineering will be in a “breadth and depth” format. Under this format, all questions are multiple choice and all candidates complete the same “breadth” module in the morning session of the exam. The afternoon “depth” module provides an opportunity to demonstrate a depth of knowledge in a more specialized aspect of the discipline. The electrical engineering examination will be converted to the new format beginning in the Spring of 2002. Also beginning in the Fall of 2001, ring binders will be allowed as references during “open-book” examinations, but candidates will not be allowed to open the binders to remove individual sheets. Ring binders have been prohibited in the past due to the noise potential as well as the possibility that individual sheets could more easily be exchanged by candidates. The Board voted to allow them because some references are only available in ring binder format.

UPCOMING LEGISLATION

The Board will ask the upcoming session of the Idaho Legislature to amend Idaho Code §54-1215 regarding signatures. The current law prohibits anything but a handwritten signature on final documents and the Board believes this inhibits commerce in an electronic age. The Board is proposing changes which would allow a digital or electronic signature with safeguards to assure that the professional in responsible charge is the one signing the document. The Board will also ask that Idaho Code §54-1223 be amended to allow the Board to waive the requirement for passage of the Fundamentals of Engineering examination for an exceptional individual with a minimum of twelve (12) years of appropriate experience.

FORMER BOARD MEMBER JAMES L. “JIM” JOHNSTONE DIES

Former Board Member James L. “Jim” Johnstone, 82, of Boise died on October 21, 2001. He was born in Wallace, Idaho, graduated from the University of Idaho and after brief stints in Panama and Oregon, returned to Idaho. Johnstone was appointed to the Board by Governor John V. Evans in 1980 and served for five years, each as Board Secretary. He retired in 1983 after 38 years with Idaho Power Company. The Board extends its condolences to the family.

IN MEMORY OF

In years past, the Board has published information about deceased license and certificate holders in the roster. Since the roster is no longer published in hard copy, the NEWS BULLETIN will be used to memorialize the deceased.

James D. Caufield, CE 1370, Tigard, Oregon
Joseph F. Eyrich, EE 921, Folly Beach, SC
Thomas A. Krumsick, CE 3006, Boise, Idaho

Lewis Seward Prater, MinE 1107, Moscow, Idaho
Franklin H. Sharp, MinE 1112, Salem, Missouri
James L. “Jim” Johnstone, EE 782, Boise, Idaho

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RECEIVES AWARD

Board Executive Director David L. Curtis, P.E. received the Meritorious Service Award from the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES) at its Annual Business Meeting in August in Little Rock, Arkansas. The award is given to Member Board and Council staff persons who have made significant contributions to the advancement of registration. Curtis has chaired NCEES Committees for Member Board Administrators, Finance, and Mobility as well as representing the Idaho Board at numerous presentations annually and being the Board Legislative Liaison.

OFFICE HOUR CHANGE CONTINUED

The Board has voted to continue the change in office hours initiated this summer. Office hours are now 7:00 AM until 4:00 PM Monday through Friday. The Board office is closed on holidays recognized by the State of Idaho and on weekends. Comments regarding the revised hours should be directed to the Board.

KATHLEEN LEE LEAVES BOARD POSITION

After more than fifteen years as an employee of the Board, Kathleen Lee has decided to pursue other interests and is leaving her job with the Board near the end of this year. Kathy's primary responsibilities over the years have been database management, application processing and the issuance of renewals. She has seen the renewal process change from one in which all licenses and certificates came due in the month of July (effectively preventing her from taking a summer vacation), to one in which renewals were due in the month in which the license or certificate holder was born, to biennial renewals. Kathy has been an effective, efficient and pleasant staff person during her tenure and we all wish her well in the future.

DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

The following actions on complaints have been taken by the Board since publication of NEWS BULLETIN No. 31 in June of 2001. In addition to those listed below, the Board received numerous complaints against individuals or companies who were inappropriately advertising under headings or names that could be interpreted to indicate that they were professional engineers or professional land surveyors, when in fact, they were not. The companies or individuals agreed to discontinue or revise the advertising or title.

DOCKET No. FY 01.06 J. MITCHELL GREER, P.E. and RODNEY T. BURCH, L.S.I.T. Without admitting misconduct, Greer agreed in a STIPULATION AND CONSENT ORDER that there was sufficient factual basis from which the Board may find a violation of Idaho Code §54-1215(3)(b) relating to signing and sealing of a final report previously signed by Burch, and Greer agreed to sign and seal the report. Greer was fined \$500 and admonished.

ANNUAL REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR

The Board submitted the following to Governor Dirk Kempthorne regarding Board Activities:

During the 2001 fiscal year the Board met for five regular meetings and one telephone conference call meeting to conduct Board business, review applications, grant licenses and consider complaints.

The term of Larry H. Hodge, P.E./L.S., who had served on the Board for ten years, expired May 24, 2001. Gary L. Young, P.E./L.S., was appointed to replace Mr. Hodge. Mr. Young's appointment will expire May 24, 2006.

Members of the Board and staff are serving on various committees of the Western Zone as well as committees of the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying.

As of the end of the fiscal year there were 5,317 Professional Engineers, 581 Professional Land Surveyors, 207 combined Professional Engineer/Professional Land Surveyors, 1,233 Engineers-in-Training, 52 Land Surveyors-in-Training, 743 engineering and/or land surveying corporations/business entities and 320 persons who have elected to take retired status.

Licenses were issued to 336 engineers by comity with other states and to 63 who successfully completed the examination process; 19 land surveyors by comity with other states and to 3 who successfully completed the examination process. There were 145 successful examinees in the Fundamentals of Engineering examination and certificates as Land Surveyors-in-Training were issued to 13 successful examinees in the Fundamentals of Land Surveying examination. In

addition, Certificates of Authorization were issued to 216 corporations/business entities to perform professional engineering or professional land surveying in the State of Idaho.

The Board received a total of 21 complaints against engineers, land surveyors, corporations and unlicensed persons in fiscal year 2001 and 12 were carried over from previous years. Of these 33 complaints, 24 were dismissed or terminated without consent agreements or formal hearings and 9 were pending resolution at the end of the year. For the first time in many years, no complaints were dealt with through formal hearings and no Consent Agreements were entered into to resolve any complaints. The Board revoked the license of one professional engineer for failure to comply with a previously issued ORDER of the Board. The Board fined one certificate holder \$2,000 in a previous fiscal year and the money was placed in a Suspense Fund pending the outcome of an appeal of a Board Order. The District Court upheld the Board Order, and the money was removed from the Suspense Fund and deposited in the General Fund.

The Legislature amended the statutes to (1) clarify that engineering on projects physically located in Idaho must be under the responsible charge of a person licensed in Idaho, (2) require all business entities to obtain a Certificate of Authorization to offer professional services to the public through its employees, and (3) require that non-final documents be clearly marked as such.

LEGISLATIVE AUDIT COMPLETED

The Legislative Audits Division of the Legislative Services Office has completed auditing the effectiveness of the Board's internal control design and operation for Fiscal Years 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001. The Audit Report to the Joint Finance Appropriations Committee noted no matters involving the internal control over financial reporting and its operation that were considered to be material weaknesses. There were no findings and recommendations in either the current report or prior audit reports.

BOARD POSITION PAPER ON REVIEW OF WORK BY OTHERS

The following has been adopted by the Board as a Position Paper on the issue of review of work done by others.

On numerous occasions the Board has been asked to express their opinion regarding specific situations in which a professional engineer or a professional land surveyor has been asked to review the work of another license holder. The Board believes that a general discussion of the issue might serve the public and the license holders to better understand the ethical and legal circumstances which come to bear in such situations.

It is the Board opinion that the review of the design documents by another professional is a reasonable and prudent option open to the client. While not always warranted, the review of the documents as to concept, content, completeness and reasonableness by another professional provides the engineer and the client with a degree of assurance that design documents comply with industry standards. This type of review can be performed under various titles such as "Value Engineering" or "Peer Review". While the Board considers such reviews as legitimate undertakings of a design professional, the manner in which such a review is performed raises several legal and ethical considerations of which both the reviewing and reviewed professional must be aware.

Comments, particularly critical comments, regarding to the initial design generally fall into two categories. Those categories are those areas in which there is a difference of opinion between the original design and the review engineer regarding best engineering practice, and those areas where, in the opinion of the reviewing engineer there is a material discrepancy or inaccuracy which must be corrected by the design professional. Addressing first the condition where the design documents are not in violation of currently accepted codes or standard practices, but in which the reviewing engineer believes an alternative approach is superior, the reviewing engineer must make clear that he is presenting opinions regarding what is the best engineering solution for the client and that he is not claiming that the original design documents are in error or unsatisfactory according to current practice. In a review conducted under this circumstance, the reviewing engineer should clearly state recommended modifications to the documents, his reason for recommending that such changes are warranted, as well as mitigating circumstances which he feels may have been considered by the original design engineer in establishing the system presented in the original documents.

Following this initial comment, the reviewing engineer should make available to the design engineer all comments and correspondence regarding his recommendations to the client along with supporting charts, documents and computations that he utilized to establish his recommendations. Following this presentation of information to the client and to the design engineer, the reviewing engineer should give the design engineer the opportunity to respond to all comments

presented in his report. Upon receipt of the design engineer's response, the reviewing engineer should provide a summary outlining, to the best of his knowledge, arguments presented by both parties, with comments regarding the perceived relative merits of each argument. The original design engineer should be invited to do likewise.

The purpose of this process is to provide the client with clear and concise information regarding differences of opinion between the design professionals.

In those instances where the reviewing engineer discovers a material discrepancy or inaccuracies, the Rules of Professional Responsibility apply. The Rules of Professional Responsibility (IDAPA 10, Title 1, Chapter 2) contain several sections which relate to the issue. The first of these is Rule 005.04, **Obligation To Communicate Discovery Of Discrepancy**. This rule states

“If a Registrant or Certificate Holder, during the course of his work, discovers a material discrepancy, error, or omission in the work of another Registrant or Certificate Holder, which may impact the health, property and welfare of the public, the discoverer shall make a reasonable effort to inform, in writing, the Registrant or Certificate Holder whose work is believed to contain the discrepancy, error or omission. Such communication shall reference specific codes, standards or physical laws which are believed to be violated and identification of documents which are believed to contain the discrepancies. The Registrant or Certificate Holder whose work is believed to contain the discrepancy shall respond in writing within sixty (60) calendar days to any question about his work raised by another Registrant or Certificate Holder. Failure to respond on the part of the Registrant or Certificate Holder whose work is believed to contain the discrepancy shall be considered a violation of these rules and may subject the Registrant or Certificate Holder to disciplinary action by the Board. The discoverer shall notify the Board in the event a response satisfactory to the discoverer is not obtained within sixty (60) days. (3-30-01)”

While the determination of what constitutes a “material discrepancy, error, or omission in the work of another Registrant or Certificate Holder, which may impact the health, property and welfare of the public” is left to the judgment of the discoverer, this section is relatively unambiguous, and quite clearly identifies the responsibilities of the discoverer and the alleged maker of a discrepancy. Communication between the involved professionals may lead one or the other or both to the conclusion that no material discrepancy, error or omission exists, but rather a professional difference of opinion. Such situations arise, and should not require Board involvement to resolve. The Board has issued Orders regarding this rule following Administrative Hearings and clearly believes that this is a serious obligation of its license holders.

The second section of the Rules of Professional Responsibility which relates to the review of work by others is found at Rule 007.04, **Actions In Regard To Other Registrants Or Certificate Holders**. This rule states

“A Registrant or Certificate Holder shall not attempt to injure, maliciously or falsely, directly or indirectly, the professional reputation, prospects, practice or employment of another Registrant or Certificate Holder, nor shall he indiscriminately criticize another Registrant's or Certificate Holder's work in public. If he believes that another Registrant or Certificate Holder is guilty of fraud, deceit, negligence, incompetence, misconduct or violation of these rules he should present such information to the Board for action. (7-1-93)”

Following Administrative Hearings, the Board has issued Orders in the past which found the failure on the part of a license holder to discuss alleged errors on the part of another license holder constituted indiscriminate criticism. This rule is not intended to infringe on the right to free speech of license holders. It does not prohibit criticism, it just makes indiscriminate public criticism a violation of the Rules of Professional Responsibility. It provides license holders the opportunity to make the Board aware of possible wrongdoing by a license holder of the Board.

The third section of the Rules of Professional Responsibility which deal with review of work by others involves Rule 009.03, **Assignment On Which Others Are Employed**. It states

“A Registrant or Certificate Holder shall not knowingly seek or accept employment for professional services for an assignment which another Registrant or Certificate Holder is employed, or contracted to perform without the currently employed or contracted entity being informed in writing. (7-1-98)”

Licensees often believe that when they are hired to review the work of another license holder they may be in violation of this rule. The Board is of the opinion that it is not a violation of this rule to review the work of another to provide a “second opinion”. However, the obligation to notify the alleged maker of a discrepancy becomes paramount, as does the

obligation to refrain from indiscriminate public criticism.

Nothing in the Rules of Professional Responsibility or the statutes are intended to prohibit or inhibit the legitimate review of the work of a professional by employees of regulatory agencies or persons employed to conduct a “peer review” or perform “Value Engineering”.

An issue was brought to the attention of the Board in which “Engineer B” was hired to review the work of “Engineer A”. Engineer A expressed a concern that Engineer B could only provide an unbiased review of the work if Engineer B made it clear from the beginning that Engineer B would not be eligible to perform any work on the project, should Engineer B’s review result in the owner of the project seeking professional services from another engineer on work previously done by Engineer A. The Board concurs with Engineer A in this scenario, since Engineer B would be suspected of being critical of Engineer A in order to secure work on the project unless Engineer B removes himself from the potential of being hired for subsequent work on that project. Without such removal, the perception, if not the reality of a conflict of interest would arise.

The final situation dealing with this situation is one in which the professional reviews the work of an unlicensed person. Idaho Code §54-1215(3)(d) states

“The seal and signature shall be used by registrants only when the work being stamped was under the registrant’s responsible charge.”

Idaho Code §54-1202(h) defines “responsible charge” as

“ . . . the control and direction of the investigation, studies, design, construction or operation of engineering work, or the control and direction of record research, field retracement, office calculations, boundary determination and mapping of land surveying work, requiring initiative, professional skill and independent judgment.”

The Rules of Professional Responsibility compliment the Idaho Code through Rule 006.03, **Use Of Seal On Documents**, which states

“A Registrant shall affix his signature and seal only to plans or documents prepared under his responsible charge.”

The Board has made it clear in past articles in News Bulletins, and in Orders resulting from Administrative Hearings, that simple review of the work done previously by an unlicensed person is a violation of Idaho Code and Administrative Rule, because simple review does not constitute responsible charge as defined in Idaho Code.

There are, however, circumstances in which a professional might review the work of an unlicensed person legitimately. One instance is when a professional engineer prepares performance specifications for an end product in order to avoid proprietary specifications. In this circumstance, typically, the successful bidder, who may or may not be licensed, prepares “shop drawings” for review by the professional engineer who prepared the performance specifications. The review by the professional engineer is performed in order to determine whether or not the intent of the performance specifications has been met.

The Board has been asked whether a professional engineer can review the work of an unlicensed person on a project in which the professional engineer has not been in responsible charge of the work, and then sign, seal and date a letter attesting to the accuracy or acceptability of the work. This letter is then intended to accompany the work of the unlicensed person. Idaho Code §54-1215(3) states, in pertinent part,

“It shall be unlawful for any person to affix or to permit his seal and signature to be affixed to any documents . . . for the purpose of aiding or abetting any other person to evade or attempt to evade any portion of this chapter.”

Further, Rule 006.02, **Aiding And Abetting An Unregistered Person** of the Rules of Professional Responsibility states

“A Registrant or Certificate Holder shall avoid actions and procedures which, in effect, amount to aiding and abetting an unregistered person to practice engineering or land surveying.

(7-1-93)”

Unless there were unusual circumstances surrounding this situation, the Board would likely consider this a violation of

both Idaho Code and Administrative Rule.

GARY L. YOUNG. P.E./L.S. APPOINTED TO BOARD

The Idaho Society of Professional Engineers nominated and Governor Dirk Kempthorne appointed Gary L. Young, P.E./L.S. to a five year term on the Idaho Board of Registration of Professional Engineers and Professional Land Surveyors. Mr. Young moved to Twin Falls in November of 1975, having previously graduated with a bachelor degree in civil engineering from Chico State College and working for the California Department of Transportation. He is currently the City Engineer and Director of Public Works for the City of Twin Falls. He is licensed as a professional engineer in Idaho and California and as a professional land surveyor in Idaho. The Board welcomes Gary Young and looks forward to his service on the Board.

Calendar of Upcoming Events

January 10, 2002 Application Deadline for Spring Examinations
February 22 & 23, 2002 Board Meeting, Boise, Idaho
April 5 & 6, 2002 Board Meeting, Elko, Nevada
April 19, 2002 PE and PLS Examinations, Boise, Idaho
April 20, 2002 FLS (aka LSIT) Examination, Boise, Idaho
April 20, 2002 FE (aka EIT) Examinations, Boise, Pocatello, Moscow
May 2-4, 2002 Western Zone NCEES Meeting hosted by Idaho Board, Sun Valley, Idaho
June 14 & 15, 2002 Board Meeting, Boise, Idaho
August 1, 2002 Application Deadline for Fall Examinations

**IDAHO BOARD OF REGISTRATION OF
PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYORS
600 SOUTH ORCHARD, SUITE A
BOISE, IDAHO 83705-1242**

**PRESORTED
STANDARD
U.S. POSTAGE P A I D
PERMIT NO. 1
BOISE, ID**