

the nation have demonstrated that they do have such rights. And above all others, attorneys should know that the place to resolve disputes is a court of law, not another learned profession's inner sanctum."

The NewsLog article noted that the "fate of the proposal still is unknown. Although thousands of hours have been spent on its development, opposing attorneys leveled charges that it denies due process and is otherwise unconstitutional and unenforceable."

Well, sad to say, we now know the proposal's fate. According to a January 24, 2008 Colorado State Board of Licensure for Architects, Professional Engineers and Professional Land Surveyors memo, the Board decided to drop its proposed guidelines "because the current statutes may limit the Board's authority to adopt the proposed rules.... There is also the possibility, particularly in light of the above concern, that portions of the proposed rules may be viewed as unconstitutional. That would be on the grounds that they would impinge on the right into freedom of speech by restraining individuals' free expression as an expert

witness. And finally, the proposed rules could be viewed as violating the 'separation of powers' provision of the Colorado Constitution by infringing on the prerogative of the courts with regard to the rules of evidence."

As it so happens, the cited reasons for abandoning the initiative were taken almost verbatim from the testimony of a well-known plaintiff's attorney who threatened that, if the Board adopted its proposed rules, he would sue the state, alleging the Board's actions were unconstitutional.

But that's not why the Board cut and ran. Its decision was based on a confidential memorandum issued by the State Attorney General (AG). That memo cautioned the Board against taking action for precisely the reasons cited by the plaintiff's attorney.

According to a confidential source, "The AG apparently based its unilateral decision on a single plaintiff's attorney's arguments, and no other opinions were solicited that might have provided different views of the issue. The AG clearly ignored the opinions, recommendations and testimony of the engineering profession in arriving at his

opinion. The attorney that testified in favor of the rules and provided a significantly differing opinion was never contacted by the AG, and his opinion and hearing testimony was apparently never considered. The AG unilaterally dismissed the work of the Task Force, the recommendations of the Board, and the support of the local and national engineering communities to render an opinion behind closed doors and in secret, favoring a single attorney and his experts. Even more disturbing than the AG's opinions is that this type of decision-making can take place in state government, ignoring the wishes of a government-regulated constituency. As a state-regulated profession, we should have the right to know and understand the governmental decisions that affect us in an open, illuminated manner." We can sit around and fault the lawyers all we want; the lawyer who said he would sue and the AG attorney who evidently preferred to capitulate than defend the Board. But the fact remains that it was the Board that could have said, "We're going to do what's right," but decided against such a novel approach.

Review of Fibre Optic Methods for Structural Health Monitoring

Branko Glišić and Daniele Inaudi

Some readers may remember the two excellent articles about fibre optic sensing that were published in the September 2007 episode of GIN. The two authors have now written a book which expands on the information in the articles.

The book is organized as a step-by-step guide to implementing a monitoring program with fibre optic sensors. It begins with a basic introduction to structural health monitoring, and moves on to describe in detail the various fibre optic sensing techniques—you'll know something about these if you've read the two articles in GIN. The authors present a realistic assessment of the practical situations in which fibre optic sensing may be the

method of choice, together with acknowledgment of the situations for which 'conventional' sensors may be more applicable. For me this is a very appealing aspect of the book, as it doesn't try to convince us that fibre optic sensing is always the way to go.

As a practitioner who has not yet worked with these sensors, the most exciting parts of the book are those that give examples of applications. There are examples of strategies for monitoring piles, buildings, bridges, dams, tunnels, and pipelines, and these strategies include use of 'conventional' sensors as well as fibre-optic sensors. For each application there are suggestions about which parameters are most commonly monitored.

As an example of the coverage, the section on tunnels describes monitoring of convergence, strain, deformation and tunnel integrity. The section on bridges

takes an even wider look, covering:

- Simple beams
- Continuous girders
- Cantilever girders
- Arch bridges
- Cable-stayed bridges
- Suspension bridges
- Bridge integrity

As can be seen from the above list, the value of the book goes far beyond our geotechnical monitoring community, and I recommend that you tell your structural engineering colleagues about it.

In summary, I'm delighted with the book as a source of well balanced practical information about an exciting technology.

The book is published by Wiley (www.wiley.com) ISBN 978-0470-06142-8. The price is US\$ 140.

John Dunnycliff