



House Executive Departments & Administration Committee
New Hampshire House of Representatives
107 North Main Street
GP Room 231
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Chair Layon and Members of the Committee,

The New Hampshire Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE-NH) respectfully submits this letter in opposition to HB 1060, relative to the requirements for licensure as a Professional Engineer.

NSPE-NH is concerned that HB 1060 materially alters standards for initial Professional Engineer licensure by eliminating the requirement for supervised engineering experience and by limiting the licensing board's ability to meaningfully evaluate whether an applicant's experience demonstrates readiness for professional practice. These safeguards exist to protect public health, safety, and welfare and are foundational to professional engineering licensure.

HB 1060 is not a reciprocity or mobility bill. Nationally, flexibility around experience requirements is most commonly applied after licensure, through comity, once an individual has already been evaluated and licensed by another jurisdiction. Applying that same flexibility to first-time licensure removes an important front-end quality control mechanism at the point where licensure standards matter most.

Supervised experience is a core component of professional engineering licensure. It is how engineers develop professional judgment, ethical responsibility, and an understanding of responsible charge. While the PE examination evaluates technical knowledge, it does not assess professional judgment, ethics, or preparedness to assume responsibility for work that directly affects public safety.

In jurisdictions cited in support of HB 1060, licensing boards typically retain strong discretion to evaluate experience quality. For example, while Texas allows broader interpretation of qualifying experience, the licensing board continues to review and

determine whether that experience demonstrates acceptable engineering judgment. Board discretion remains central. In New Hampshire, supervised experience and board judgment currently function together; removing both mechanisms increases risk by eliminating meaningful oversight.

NSPE-NH is not aware of evidence that supervised experience requirements are acting as a barrier to licensure. Supervision does not require physical proximity, and engineers routinely gain supervised experience remotely and across jurisdictions. Workforce challenges should be addressed through mentoring, education, and pipeline development, and not by lowering licensure standards that protect the public.

We understand that an amendment may be proposed to restore board review of experience. While board discretion is essential, restoring review alone does not address the removal of supervised experience, which is the mechanism that allows boards to meaningfully assess readiness for licensure in the first place.

For these reasons, NSPE-NH respectfully urges the Committee to oppose HB 1060.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Chuck Gregory". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the right.

Chuck Gregory, PE

President

New Hampshire Society of Professional Engineers