

2019 DRAFTING REQUEST

Senate Amendment (SA-SB(LRBx2146/1))

For: Dale Kooyenga (608) 266-2512 Drafter: mduchek
By: Sandy Secondary Drafters:
Date: 4/1/2019 May Contact:

Same as LRB:

Submit via email: YES
Requester's email: Sen.Kooyenga@legis.wisconsin.gov
Carbon copy (CC) to:

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Status of certain retired professionals

Instructions:

See attached

Drafting History:

Table with 6 columns: Vers., Drafted, Reviewed, Submitted, Jacketed, Required. It lists three rows of drafting activity with names and dates.

FE Sent For: <END>

Duchek, Michael

From: Lonergan, Sandy
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2019 2:34 PM
To: Duchek, Michael
Subject: RE: amendment please for LRB 2146 and 2328 re: emeritus architect

Yes, that's my understanding. Thanks for clarifying.
Sandy

From: Duchek, Michael <Michael.Duchek@legis.wisconsin.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2019 2:26 PM
To: Lonergan, Sandy <Sandy.Lonergan@legis.wisconsin.gov>
Subject: RE: amendment please for LRB 2146 and 2328 re: emeritus architect

It sounds like you want the amendment to a) say that they can't require that a statement attesting to retirement be **notarized** and b) allow anyone who previously held a credential but let his or her credential "lapse" and who satisfies the 65+ or 30-year requirement to be able to get the credential back with retired status. Is that your understanding of what he's asking for? If so, yes, I think I can draft that.

-Mike

From: Lonergan, Sandy <Sandy.Lonergan@legis.wisconsin.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2019 1:26 PM
To: Duchek, Michael <Michael.Duchek@legis.wisconsin.gov>
Cc: Riske, Laura <Laura.Riske@legis.wisconsin.gov>
Subject: amendment please for LRB 2146 and 2328 re: emeritus architect

Hi Mike,
Would you please draft an amendment for both the senate and assembly LRBs that reflect the issues raised in the email below from Mr. Schwalbach? Please let me or Laura know if you have any questions or need anything else. Thank you!
Sandy

From: glenschwalbach@netzero.net <glenschwalbach@netzero.net> **On Behalf Of** Glen R. Schwalbach
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2019 9:03 PM
To: Riske, Laura <Laura.Riske@legis.wisconsin.gov>
Cc: Riske, Laura <Laura.Riske@legis.wisconsin.gov>; Lonergan, Sandy <Sandy.Lonergan@legis.wisconsin.gov>
Subject: Re: FW: DEADLINE EXTENSION: co-sponsor LRB 2146 and 2328 re: emeritus architect

Hi, Laura. Thanks for the heads-up. I'm sure the Wisconsin Society of Professional Engineers will support the bill. I'll contact our Executive Committee and ask members to contact their legislators to support.

One provision to add that would be helpful is to make it clear that the retired P.E. would be given that status with just a signature promise to no longer practice. At one point when continuing education was introduced the DSPS allowed for a waiver to retired P.E.'s. I had asked for that to help the number of retired P.E.'s who were

renewing their registration even though they were not practicing. They were devoted to their profession and were staying evolved in our society with our scholarship programs, mentoring activities, etc.

But the DSPTS required an notarized affidavits from the retired P.E.'s to attest that they were done practicing. This hurdle along with a user-unfriendly process on their website caused a number of retired P.E.'s to not renew. Some also assumed they could be a member of WSPE any longer. So, we lost members and DSPTS lost revenue.

I believe some of these retirees would renew under this bill but the bill should also make it clear that retired P.E.'s who have expired registrations can renew anytime to reestablish the retired P.E. status.

Thanks for the efforts of everyone involved.

Glen R. Schwalbach, P.E., NSPE Fellow
Wis. Society of Professional Engineers,
VP-Government Affairs
PROBITY Consulting, LLC
1090 Moonriver Dr., De Pere, WI 54115
Cell: 920-680-2436, Office/Home: 920-532-6330



State of Wisconsin
2019 - 2020 LEGISLATURE

LRBa0113/P1
MED:cdc

In 4-1-19
Out 4-2-19 if poss

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION
SENATE AMENDMENT ,
TO SENATE BILL (LRB-2146/1)

1 At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

2 1. Page 2, line 2: delete lines 2 to 10 and substitute:

3 "443.015(1m)(a) 1. Each section of the examining board shall promulgate rules to do all of
4 the following:

5 a. Allow the holder of a credential under this chapter who is at least 65 years
6 of age or has actively maintained that credential for at least 30 consecutive years and
7 who certifies that he or she has retired from and no longer engages in the practice
8 for which he or she holds the credential to apply to the board to classify that
9 credential as retired status.

10 b. Allow an individual who previously held a credential under this chapter, and
11 failed to renew that credential prior to the renewal date, to apply to the board to renew
12 the credential with retired status if the individual is at least 65 years of age or had

1 actively maintained that credential for at least 30 consecutive years, certifies that
2 he or she has retired from and no longer engages in the practice for which he or she
3 previously held the credential, and pays the fee under par. (d). Section 440.08 (3) (a)
4 and (b) does not apply to the renewal of such a credential.

****NOTE: This is the language I came up with for people who had let their
credentials "lapse." Normally, under s. 440.08 (3), I think they could do what is called a
"late renewal," but certain additional requirements would apply. This says that those
additional requirements would not apply, and instead they would just have to pay the
one-half fee and make the certification that they are retired. Let me know if works. *that*

5 c. Allow the holder of a credential classified as retired status as described under
6 subd. 1. a. or b. to apply to the appropriate section of the examining board to remove
7 the retired status classification if he or she satisfies reinstatement requirements
8 established by the appropriate section of the examining board by rule.

9 2. Rules promulgated under subd. 1. may not require a certification to be
10 notarized.

11

(END)

Duchek, Michael

From: Lonergan, Sandy
Sent: Wednesday, April 03, 2019 9:38 AM
To: Duchek, Michael
Cc: Riske, Laura
Subject: FW: Draft review: LRB a0113/P1
Attachments: 19a0113/P1.pdf

Hi Mike,
The amendment looks great! Please send us the stripes. Thank you!
Sandy

From: LRB.Legal <lrblegal@legis.wisconsin.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2019 11:17 AM
To: Sen.Kooyenga <Sen.Kooyenga@legis.wisconsin.gov>
Subject: Draft review: LRB a0113/P1

Following is the PDF version of draft LRB a0113/P1.



PRELIMINARY DRAFT - NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION
SENATE AMENDMENT ,
TO SENATE BILL (LRB-2146/1)

1 At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

2 **1.** Page 2, line 2: delete lines 2 to 10 and substitute:

3 "443.015 (**1m**) (a) 1. Each section of the examining board shall promulgate
4 rules to do all of the following:

5 a. Allow the holder of a credential under this chapter who is at least 65 years
6 of age or has actively maintained that credential for at least 30 consecutive years and
7 who certifies that he or she has retired from and no longer engages in the practice
8 for which he or she holds the credential to apply to the board to classify that
9 credential as retired status.

10 b. Allow an individual who previously held a credential under this chapter, and
11 failed to renew that credential prior to the renewal date, to apply to the board to
12 renew the credential with retired status if the individual is at least 65 years of age

1 or had actively maintained that credential for at least 30 consecutive years, certifies
2 that he or she has retired from and no longer engages in the practice for which he or
3 she previously held the credential, and pays the fee under par. (d). Section 440.08
4 (3) (a) and (b) does not apply to the renewal of such a credential.

****NOTE: This is the language I came up with for people who had let their
credentials "lapse." Normally, under s. 440.08 (3), I think they could do what is called a
"late renewal," but certain additional requirements would apply. This says that those
additional requirements would not apply, and instead they would just have to pay the
one-half fee and make the certification that they are retired. Let me know if that works.

5 c. Allow the holder of a credential classified as retired status as described under
6 subd. 1. a. or b. to apply to the appropriate section of the examining board to remove
7 the retired status classification if he or she satisfies reinstatement requirements
8 established by the appropriate section of the examining board by rule.

9 2. Rules promulgated under subd. 1. may not require a certification to be
10 notarized.".

11 (END)