



Oregon

**State Board of Examiners for
Engineering & Land Surveying**

670 Hawthorne Ave. SE, Suite 220

Salem, OR 97301

(503) 362-2666

Fax (503) 362-5454

E-mail: osbeels@osbeels.org

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of Meeting

December 15, 2012

Members present:

Sue Newstetter, Chair

Steven Burger

Jim Doane

Sue Frey

Staff present:

Mari Lopez

Jenn Gilbert

Allen McCartt

Joy Pariente

James R. (JR) Wilkinson

Others present:

Katharine Lozano, Assistant Attorney General

Bob Neathamer

Brent Johnston, Tetra Tech

Jason Magalen, Sea Engineering

Mike Stecher, Solmar Hydro Inc.

The meeting of the Professional Practices Committee (PPC) was called to order at 1:15 p.m. in the conference room of the Oregon State Board of Examiners for Engineering and Land Surveying (OSBEELS) office at 670 Hawthorne Avenue SE, Suite 220, Salem, OR 97301.

Guest Discussion

Hydrographic Surveying

Mr. Johnston, Mr. Magalen, and Mr. Stecher attended the PPC Committee meeting to give an overview of the practice of hydrographic surveying. The Office of Minority, Women, and Emerging Small Business (OMWESB) had denied a numeric classification to Mr. Stecher's business because he didn't have the appropriate surveying licensure. Mr. Stecher has communicated with Mr. McCartt regarding whether or not what he is doing is considered land surveying in Oregon. Following an extensive overview of hydrographic surveying, the Committee determined that the professional examination for land surveying does not cover any of these topics and there are no professional engineering examinations that address hydrographic surveying either. AAG Lozano suggested OSBEELS staff contact OMWESB and discuss this

situation as there are a number of land surveying and surveying-related categories covered under one numeric classification at OMWESB. Not all of these categories, such as hydrographic surveying, require Oregon licensure.

Mr. Stecher also stated an interest in getting licensure for hydrographic surveyors to protect the integrity of the practice and the safety of the public. AAG Lozano advised that Mr. Stecher contact organizations which have currently been granted professional licensure in Oregon, including sleep technicians. For OSBEELS to oversee licensing of hydrographic surveyors, AAG Lozano said, there would have to be a demonstrated need for licensure and statutory changes made.

New Business –

Flood Elevation Work – Email from Dan Linscheid dated November 6, 2012

An individual asked Board President Dan Linscheid if calculating a flood elevation would fall under engineering or if it could be completed by a land surveyor instead. Mr. Neathamer said the question seems to be worded in a way that would make the Committee determine the above actions are considered engineering. Ms. Newstetter said she wasn't ready to make comment on this issue, as she feels she needs more information and more time to consider the situation. The Committee determined to move this issue to the February PPC Committee meeting and to ask the questioner to rephrase the question in a way that doesn't lend itself to a "yes" or "no" answer.

Sealing Software Output – Email from Robert Taylor, SE, dated November 27, 2012

Mr. Taylor's email explained that his engineered wood products company has developed software for sizing the company's joists and beams. The software is available for public use and is used by other companies. If Mr. Taylor gives copies of the output from the software to clients, does he need to sign and seal these outputs as he would any other engineering product?

On the topic of relying on software for engineering purposes, Mr. Doane said that without manual calculations and matching answers, he would personally never rely on software outputs alone and would never sign or seal them. Ms. Frey agreed there are many potential glitches in software and the outputs are only reliable if double-checked manually.

However, the Committee did agree that the software printout is considered a final engineering product, and, therefore, must be signed and sealed. AAG Lozano asked if engineers can sign and seal work they didn't personally generate. Ms. Frey said they can, but they need to verify that it's correct and engineers need to be willing to put their license on the line when they sign and seal documents of this nature. Ms. Frey likened the software to a calculator, protractor, or any other engineering tool.

Ultimately, AAG Lozano advised the Committee to ask for an example of the work to view and discuss before coming to a conclusion because the question is currently very broad and the Committee should make the determination based on a more specific question and example. Staff was directed to obtain additional information for the February PPC meeting.

Building Department Summary of Important Facts for OSBEELS Consideration

Ms. Lopez informed the Committee that Mr. Tappert had comments relating to the proposed language of OAR 820-010-0622 – Modifying Designs and Documents, during the Rules and Regulations meeting earlier. As a result, the Committee determined to send the Building Department’s information to Rules and Regulations Committee for discussion during the February meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.