STATUTORY REGULATION

The resolution below was requested by the Advisory Board at its October, 1968 meeting in San Francisco. The 1969 Executive Committee determined its general content at its January 11-12, 1969 meeting. President Russell and Executive Director Brunton then drafted a preliminary statement and circulated it to members of the Statutory Regulation and Legislation Committee. Russell revised the Statement in the light of the comments received, and revised it further in consultation with Warren Beebe, Ben Parker and Brunton. This third draft was then circulated to the Executive Committee and the Committee on Statutory Regulation and Legislation for final review and approval.

The statement printed below thus represents a consensus of the most knowledgeable people in the Institute of this important matter.

RESOLUTION

RESOLVED, That the official policy of the Executive Committee of the American Institute of Professional Geologists regarding statutory regulation of geologists is as follows:

1. Because many geologists practice, or may practice, in many states, and because adequate reciprocity is difficult or impossible to achieve, the Executive Committee recommends that conventional statutory registration and/or licensing be avoided wherever and whenever possible. The only exception should be in states where the majority of those geological scientists responding to a specific question on this matter vote in favor of registration and/or licensing in recognition of a public need. (The Institute recognizes the peculiar problem of engineering geologists working with registered or licensed engineers, but believes that a minority does not have the right to impose restrictive regulations on the majority. There are other ways of achieving legal, and/or statutory, recognition.)

2. The Executive Committee recommends that members of AIPG first attempt to obtain legal and/or statutory recognition of certification as proof of professional and ethical competence. This may be done in several ways:
   a) Through recognition by courts, and other legally constituted bodies, in the course of establishing competence through testimony. (Though not generally known, this is a perfectly feasible method of achieving legal recognition. For example, one of the well-known charter members of AIPG has had his AIPG certification accepted by the Federal Power Commission, Federal and State Courts, and state regulatory bodies, simply by introducing his CPG number and explaining what it means. This constitutes legal recognition. This practice is highly recommended and will ultimately lead to complete acceptance of AIPG certification.)
   b) Through recognition by a state or federal officer, such as the Attorney General or Secretary of State. (This has been done in Illinois.)
   c) Through legislative recognition of certification.

3. In the event that members of the Institute are unable to effect recognition of certification by state legislatures or administrative officials, and statutory action appears probable, the Executive Committee recommends that a chartering bill be proposed and supported. 1

4. In the event that statutory registration or licensing appears likely, the Executive Committee recommends that members of the Institute be prepared to submit proper legislation for the registration or licensing of geologists under a Board of Geologists with control of finances, and providing for the greatest degree of reciprocity possible. 1

TOWARD A MINE-MAP LIBRARY

The West Virginia Section is supporting legislation that would establish a central catalog and library of maps of abandoned coal mines in the state. Two serious floods have resulted when large amounts of stored water in abandoned mines were accidentally released.

1 Copies of a model chartering bill and of a model registration bill may be obtained from AIPG Headquarters.
EDITORIAL

Recently we heard a fellow member of AIPG growling about the proliferation of geological societies and how inefficient it all is. He cited the GSA and the AAPG, of course, and then went on to name half a dozen others, winding up with the state academy of science, the AAAS, and the AIPG. Unnecessary fractionation of scientists and multiplication of dues, he grumbled; damn shame. He felt quite strongly on the subject.

Whatever our friend may think about the array of scientific societies to which geologists may pledge their allegiance and cash, he should know better than to include AIPG on the list. In its very reason for existence, AIPG is fundamentally different from the other organizations that he named.

Not long ago, an AIPG member of many accomplishments and professionwide reputation asked the organization to step in and render an opinion on the geological evidence at a controversial construction site. The request was politely declined, with a reminder that AIPG is not in the business of making geological studies or judging geological interpretations.

It is an easy error to make. Nearly everyone society that a geologist is likely to join or to be concerned with --- from GSA to the state academy, from AAPG to the local association --- has the advancement of the science of geology as a basic, if not indeed the only, purpose of its existence. A new society of this type seems to spring up about every 30 days. AIPG is young. No wonder people take it for just one more of the same.

Apparently it cannot be stated too often that the business of AIPG is, broadly, the relation between the geological profession and society. Who shall be certified as a professional geologist? What should be the standards of employment? How, if at all, should geologists be formally or legally recognized by the state? How can the public be protected against geological quacks? It is solely with such professional, repeat professional, matters that AIPG is concerned. Surely we must have this central purpose clear in our own minds before we can expect others to understand it.

RESULTS OF STANFORD VISIT

Dr. Kenneth S. Pitzer, President
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Dear President Pitzer:

The Executive Committee of the American Institute of Professional Geologists, at its meeting January 11-12, 1969, approved the recommendation of the AIPG Cooperative Evaluation Committee which visited Stanford University June 13, 1968. This Committee, and its parent Professional and Scientific Standards Committee, reported that the School of Earth Sciences at Stanford is accomplishing the objectives which it has set for education in the Earth Sciences and is presently qualified to offer programs of education that lead to the following degrees:


The cooperation and courtesies extended to the AIPG Cooperative Evaluation Committee by members of the faculty and administration at Stanford University are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

R. Dana Russell
President

January 16, 1969

OHIO SECTION MEETS

Thirty-five were in attendance at the winter meeting of the Ohio Section on February 11 at Findlay, Ohio. R. L. Bates reported briefly on the San Francisco meeting of the Advisory Board, and Glenn Frank discussed the survey of attrition among geologists now being carried on by the Professional Employment Standards Committee. Featured speaker was past-president John T. Galey, whose subject was "Role of the Geologist in Environmental Planning."

Officers of the Ohio Section are as follows:

Ralph J. Bernhagen .................. President
Glenn W. Frank .................... Vice-President
Ted DeBrose ...................... Secretary-Treasurer
Fred Klaer, Jr. ...................... Past-President

Members of the Executive Committee are Richard J. Anderson, Guy Sitler, and Robert C. Stephenson.
MORE ABOUT COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS --
AN OPEN LETTER TO TWO DISTINGUISHED GEOLOGISTS

Gentlemen:

A mutual friend told me of a luncheon conversation with you two in which AIGP was a major subject of conversation -- largely critical. Since you are both AIGP members, I'm sure you intend to bring your criticisms to the Executive Committee so that we can do something about them, but this letter provides an opportunity to try to clarify some points in advance.

I understand that the discussion centered on three topics: (1) The proposal for a second class of membership; (2) the proposal for an Environmental Geology Center, and (3) a presumed trend away from the purely professional orientation of AIGP toward a technical or scientific one.

Regarding the first point, my personal opinion is that the younger geologists should become aware of and involved in professional problems at an early stage -- preferably during their academic training -- and I thought the second class of membership helped accomplish this with adequate safeguards. But this question is a very controversial one. It was presumably discussed in the State Sections and then at length by the Advisory Board. The latter voted to recommend a second class of membership to the Executive Committee, but the vote was so close (14 in favor, 9 opposed) that the Executive Committee decided to refer the question to a vote of the membership. As you know, the proposal was defeated by a nearly two-to-one vote, so I am definitely in the minority on this question. Further discussion seems pointless -- the issue has been decided, at least for the time being.

The second subject -- the proposal for an Environmental Geology Center -- bids fair to become a classic example of a communication problem. To understand what has become a controversial subject, a little historical review is necessary.

Last year our president, John Galey (like our first president, Martin Van Couvering), became deeply concerned about geologic hazards and environmental geology in general -- particularly with the slow progress being made in acquainting engineers, planners, and legislators with the contributions geology could and should make. He saw the problem as primarily one in communications. If an organization could be set up whose sole responsibility was to disseminate information about environmental geology -- to geologists on the one hand and to planners and legislators on the other -- and which could bring the two groups together, much more rapid progress could be made. He visualized a very small staff -- one man plus secretarial help the first year with another man added the second year; scarcely a threat to any existing geologic group. Further, the Center would not itself undertake any work. Instead of stealing jobs from engineering and environmental geologists, it would create more jobs for them.

All this is evident from a reading of our brochure about the Environmental Geology Center. But unfortunately the brochure also gives the impression that the Center would be an exclusively AIGP undertaking; not as an integral part of AIGP, but as a separate organization sponsored and supported by AIGP and with a preponderance of AIGP members on its Board of Trustees. It is this aspect of the proposal that has been responsible for most of the misunderstanding.

The 1968 AIGP Executive Committee was faced by a difficult decision. If they solicited the cooperation of other geological organizations in starting the Center, a delay of months or years might result. But if funds could be obtained immediately and the Center started, other groups could then be invited to participate in the organization and direction of a going entity whose funding was assured for a trial period, say of five years. Galey thought he could obtain the funds from foundations with whom he had contacts, so the decision was made to take the second course. The proposal was therefore written in as specific a form as possible (you are both aware of the need for detailed and specific statements of responsibility when applying for funds). Some organization had to be responsible; since one of AIGP's missions is to protect the public welfare, it seemed as logical an organization as any (at least any outside the government). The American Geological Institute might be equally appropriate -- if its member societies would permit it to act. The point is, someone had to start the ball rolling. The AIGP Executive Committee decided to try.

Following announcement of this decision at the AIGP Annual Meeting in October, President Galey presented the proposal to the Association of Engineering Geologists at their annual meeting that same month and invited their cooperation in starting the Center. Environmental geology is certainly not synonymous with engineering geology -- it is far broader. But of all the technically oriented geological organizations, the Association of Engineering Geologists is most concerned with problems of our environment. Also, since the American Geological Institute represents all geological organizations, Galey made the same presentation to the AGI House of Society Representatives meeting in November. So, despite the impression that some people have gained from the specific wording in the brochure, AIGP is not trying to play dog-in-the-manger; we welcome participation by all geological organizations interested in, and concerned about, problems of environmental geology. We solicit comments and suggestions from all such groups, and will be glad to work with them in developing a mutually agreed upon organization to meet the crucial need for more effective dissemination of information about environmental geology problems. The Association of Engineering Geologists is now in the process of formulating recommendations on our proposal; we hope these will be constructive ideas furthering our mutual aims. If AIGP proves to have served as a catalyst to bring various geological groups together in this undertaking, we will be pleased and satisfied.
I am at a loss in trying to answer your third topic without specific examples of what you had in mind. I am not personally aware of any AIPG member, much less any member of our past or present Executive Committees, who would change the fundamental responsibility of AIPG as the geological organization dealing with professional problems. There are already far too many geological organizations concerned with scientific and technical matters; we have no desire to become another. We wish to complement, not compete.

There are, of course, and probably always will be, differences of interpretation on what constitutes "professionalism," especially on matters dealing with the public. And our dedicated and hard-working committees may, in some instances, encroach upon what other organizations consider their private preserves. But we are only trying to get the job done, and these problems can always be resolved by men of good will if they keep their communication lines open. We need continuing discussion and criticism to bring about understanding and a consensus on each problem. And let's all try to keep such discussions broadminded and objective, and avoid the organizational partisanship that has been far too prevalent among geologists in the past.

Cordially,
R. DANA RUSSELL

BEEBE ON REGISTRATION

Both the writer and the recipient of the following letter have given permission for its publication.

R. Dana Russell, President
AIPG
Littleton, Colorado

Dear Dana:

I have your letter of December 17 relative to the proposed geologists-registration bill in Washington. As you know, after almost 10 years as chairman of the AGI Professional Standards Committee, several years as chairman of the AIPG Legislative Coordinating Committee, and two model registration laws, I know more about registration than I really care to know. The incongruity is that, although any kind of statutory registration is completely abhorrent, I was the author of the two model laws which repose in AIPG's office.

My worst fear is now being realized. Once this sort of business starts, there is no stopping point. I am preparing to write to California for applications to qualify under the "grandfather clause." As a consultant in natural gas and energy I work in many states, and the reciprocity written into the typical bill simply is not adequate.

During the past several years I have represented the major producers as an expert witness in three area rate cases before the Federal Power Commission. Preparation for these hearings required months, in some cases well over a year. My work was done in my own office in Colorado; in the companies' offices, mostly in Oklahoma, Texas, and New York; in Washington, D.C., and in the various states involved in the hearings, which numbered eight. Consequently, I can count well over a dozen states which might have claimed jurisdiction over my work. To be sure, I could obtain registration in every state through the "grandfather clause," but I would also have to pay a yearly fee in every state. One of the members of our AGI Professional Standards Committee was a renowned hydrogeologist. His practice was worldwide and nationwide. He was registered in not less than 30 states to maintain his practice, and his annual fees were nearly $1,000. Now registration is fine for an engineer, a doctor, or a lawyer who maintains his practice in one state and rarely goes out of the state for extended assignments. For us this is utterly ridiculous! Geology knows no state boundaries. It is impossible to work regionally in the Green River Basin without working in Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah. One cannot work in the Anadarko Basin without working in Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, New Mexico, and Colorado. Moreover, what prestige do I secure from registration through a state political body which I cannot obtain through AIPG or through my long years of practice?

Now, after I have that out of my system, let us look at the proposed Washington law. It is a typical registration law.
in which geologists allow themselves to be regulated politically. Article 2 gives jurisdiction to the governor. Second, fees must be high enough for the profession to support its own registration. Few states will subsidize any professional registration. Third, the funds are under the jurisdiction of the state, and the experience of our sister disciplines has been replete with examples of a money-hungry legislature appropriating any surplus which might be built up. Reciprocity is limited to 60 consecutive days for out-of-staters. Although the board may extend this to 120 days, a fee must be paid, a typical closed-shop arrangement. Specialty registration for engineers and others has been outlawed in several states, including Colorado.

In our second model law form submitted to AIPG we used the charter form so popular in Canada, which we advised was perfectly legal in most of our states. Legislators, however, do not like the charter form because it takes the entire business out of politics and any control of the money and reciprocity lies in the incorporated chapter. If we are to have statutory registration, this form is far preferable, although we are advised repeatedly to avoid registration like the plague!

Both model laws are in our Golden office and were drawn after long discussion with competent legal counsel, including the general counsel for the National Society of Professional Engineers. He thought we were out of our minds for even considering any type of statutory registration when our certification procedures were completely legal and acceptable. Mine are on record with the Federal Power Commission and both federal and state courts have yet to be challenged.

This is a real "nitty gritty" situation. May the Lord have mercy on us all!

Best regards.

Sincerely,

January 3, 1969

B. W. Beebe

COLORADO GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENTAL GEOLGY

Urban planners and developers, engineers, architects, and geologists will gather in Denver on April 30-May 2, 1969, to attend a Conference on Environmental Geology. The three-day series of meetings is sponsored by Governor John A. Love of Colorado and is presented under the joint auspices of the Colorado Sections of AIPG and the Association of Engineering Geologists. Seventeen papers are scheduled, on such topics as the geologic approach to problems of urban growth, recognition and control of environmental hazards, prevention of groundwater pollution, and conservation of natural resources. On May 1 there will be a field trip through the Denver area and Rocky Mountain foothills.

For information, write Environmental Geology Conference, P. O. Box 15-124, Denver, Colorado 80215.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Sir:

As usual, the recent issue of "The Professional Geologist" was very newsworthy and excellent reading, containing much to stimulate our craniums and their contents.

I was particularly interested in the report "Problems in Geological Employment," and the information presented and the conclusions that resulted.

Even more important, from the standpoint of the Annual Meeting, is Item 6 under the "Finance Committee" report. I was party to some of the early discussions three or four years ago, when we were talking about the need for a separate meeting of AIPG rather than one that would be diluted with people who wished to attend the technical sessions of GSA or AAPG. However, because we have so many meetings to attend, and because there are inevitable conflicts, I think that there is likely to be one less conflict and a considerably easier load on the pocketbook if the AIPG Annual Meeting could be combined with one of the annual meetings of the major societies.

I, too, have attended annual meetings of the AIPG and have prepared and presented papers to an audience of 70 people or less. Although some of us may agree with Jay Marks that the attendance of only 90 members can be viewed philosophically, I think more of us would be inclined to agree with Glenn Brown, who was flabbergasted at the lack of attendance at the San Francisco meeting.

We all agree that the AIPG and its committees are doing yeoman work in terms of state sections and committees, and carry on much of the work by correspondence. However, there is no substitute for face-to-face "chew-the-fat" sessions, and this cannot be accomplished adequately with only five per cent of our membership in attendance! Thus I hope that the Executive Committee will take seriously the matter of arranging the AIPG Annual Meeting back-to-back with the GSA or the AAPG.

Sincerely yours,

February 5, 1969

Allen P. Agnew

PROGRESS REPORT: SACRAMENTO

A bulletin dated February 10 from Roland J. Batz, legislative representative of the California Section, states: "It was learned today that the Attorney General's office has informed the Governor's Appointments Secretary that there are no legal barriers preventing the creation of the Board of Geologists. The Appointments Secretary's office informed this reporter that the board should be announced within 4 to 5 weeks."

If this schedule is followed, the board should come into existence at about the time this issue of TPG reaches its readers.
Environmental Geology is not a science; it is not a sub-science; it is not even an “interdisciplinary complex” — it is really a state of mind. States of mind have occurred in the practice of geology before — petroleum geology is such a state, because it is the application of all that is geology to a particular objective. Environmental Geology, too, is the application of all that is geology to the accommodation of the exponentially increasing human population to the finite resources and terrain of the planet Earth.

Something is required to create a particular state of mind in any professional group. In the case of petroleum geology more than half a century ago, this something is quite obvious — money! In the case of Environmental Geology during the next couple of decades it should be equally obvious — self-preservation!

The term "self-preservation" can be read in two ways, and in my opinion both are equally applicable. First, we may read it as preservation of Homo sapiens, and alternately, we can read it as preservation of geology as a profession. The public has just been awakened to (and awareness is increasing at a fantastic pace) the reliance of our civilization on the maintenance of a compatible environment. You will note that I did not say the preservation of an environment, because that has long since ceased to be possible. Man’s modifications of environmental factors have gone past the point of no return, and this fact needs to be recognized by the “pure” conservationists. What man must do is learn to maintain an environment that will be compatible with his future needs. Unfortunately, as yet we are not even able to write the specifications for such an environment — and this, in itself, gives a clue to some of the needed research.

Geologists should be deeply concerned with this future application, because all the environmental factors are ultimately based on the physical entity of the Earth, its atmosphere, the materials of its crust, and the shape of its surface. This fact is so self-evident that if geologists do not attack the obvious problems vigorously these problems will be dealt with by other disciplines, even though they may have a less adequate background to do so.

If geologists are to become significantly involved in environmental applications, the first lessons they must learn are the basic principles of communication. In mineral exploration, communication developed a long time ago, and, because many individuals trained in the geological sciences have moved into management positions in the mineral industries, it isn’t even recognized as a problem. Unfortunately, in the area of environmental applications we are dealing with planners, administrators, and elected public officials, and to an important degree with the general public. These groups have no intention of learning the specialized terminology of our science, and if we expect them to use geologic data it is up to us to put our information and conclusions in a form they can readily understand. It is also up to us to let them know, in a straightforward way, that we have geologic data that are vital for the future of society.

In discussing some of the applications of Environmental Geology, it is convenient to place them in four general groupings, recognizing that overlap exists and that applications of most geologic specialties are involved in each of them. First is terrain analysis for planning; second, hydrogeology and other water-supply data; third, waste management and disposal evaluation, and fourth, mineral-resource data in the environmental context.

Terrain analysis includes the applications of geology to engineering problems and physical planning. Although engineering geology is a well-established and sophisticated area of applied geology, there has been a strong tendency to limit its scope, and the term itself, to geologic factors in specific construction projects. For planning purposes, however, broad regional evaluations must be made that are applicable to categories rather than to specific undertakings. Furthermore, to be of maximum value for planning, terrain analysis must include a summation of the other three groups to be discussed. In urbanizing regions it is necessary to relate the physical characteristics of the surficial deposits and rocks of the entire region, and to considerable depths, not only to the topography but also to water conditions and the locations of needed mineral resources. It may even be necessary to relate all these data to the physical factors controlling disposal of wastes.

Hydrogeology, and general geologic data for water supply, also have a wide range of applications. They enter into the development of water supplies, the applications of geology to many types of construction including dams and levees, the capacities and yields of aquifers at all depths, the interrelation of water supply and problems of waste disposal, and the potentially competing uses for permeable rock layers below the surface.

Management and disposal of waste require data from the areas of engineering geology, hydrogeology, and terrain analysis — all fed into the complex of sociological, political, and legal factors that control our multitudinous waste problems. Management of waste is a social problem, a concern of the political and legal machinery that our society has created. If the geologist is to be heard, he must relate to this system, and not sit upon his pompous piety expecting society to come to him for the proper word.

Seemingly, the most difficult aspect of Environmental Geology to communicate, either to the public or to geologists, is the one that should be the easiest, that is, the relationship of mineral-resource availability to continued growth and stability in regions of population concentration. This may be because there is a traditional conflict between the mineral industries and city officials and planners. The mineral industries have considered municipal officials — even though the cities are their major customers — as obstructionists and adversaries, and city officials consider the mineral industries as
obnoxious intruders. It is essential that both sides come to realize that neither can exist without the other. One solution to the conflict is planned multiple sequential use of areas, and here again the geologist must furnish the basic data for long-range planning.

As this is being addressed to professional geologists, there is no attempt to discuss specifics, or to describe particular cases involving Environmental Geology, but rather an attempt to relate this broad area of application to the activity of the professional geologist. Perhaps I am also making a plea for the resurrection of the "generalist" in the profession of geology. We have seen more than a quarter century of progressive development of specialization, in academe as well as in practice. This has gone to the point that the geologist who specializes in building foundations may profess to have no interest at all in a clay pit, a municipal water well, or mineral-resource zoning. Although of course it is true that specialties are necessary, perhaps it is not out of the question for a "specialist" to keep informed on the interrelations of all aspects of geology to environmental applications. This returns to the point made at the beginning, namely, that Environmental Geology is, after all, a state of mind that attunes the thinking of a geologist to the rapidly expanding problems of adapting our exploding human population to a finite Earth.

### STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL CONDITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>December 31, 1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### ASSETS

- **Current Assets:**
  - Petty Cash: $25.00
  - Cash in Bank: 7,041.68
  - Certificates of Deposit: 26,000.00
  - Accounts Receivable: 450.90

- **Total Current Assets:** $35,517.58

- **Fixed Assets:**
  - Office Furniture, at Cost: $1,782.90
  - Less: Accumulated Depreciation: 801.00

- **Total Fixed Assets:** 981.90

- **TOTAL ASSETS:** $36,499.48

#### LIABILITIES AND MEMBERS' EQUITY

- **Current Liabilities:**
  - Notes Payable: $5,000.00
  - Accounts Payable: 3,730.42
  - Accrued Interest: 227.25
  - Accrued Payroll Taxes: 487.24

- **Total Current Liabilities:** $13,961.91

- **Deferred Income:**
  - 1969 Dues Received in Advance: $25,204.00
  - Suspense Dues, Note: 2,005.00

- **Total Deferred Income:** 27,209.00

- **Members' Equity:**
  - Accumulated Deficit, December 31, 1968: (4,671.43)

- **TOTAL LIABILITIES AND MEMBERS' EQUITY:** $36,499.48

### STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSES COMPARED TO BUDGET FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Over/Under</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>$35,988.50</td>
<td>$36,550.00</td>
<td>($564.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>1,565.00</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
<td>265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Fees</td>
<td>925.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>775.00</td>
<td>460.00</td>
<td>315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$39,260.50</td>
<td>$39,200.00</td>
<td>$60.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **EXPENSES:**     |            |            |            |
| Administrative:   |            |            |            |
| Salaries          | $16,400.00 | $17,050.00 | ($650.00)  |
| Outside Serv.     | 100.00     |            | 100.00     |
| Payroll Taxes     | 538.80     | 532.20     | 6.60       |
| Fidelity Bond     | 119.00     | 121.00     | (2.00)     |
| Travel Exp.       | 399.55     | 1,200.00   | (800.45)   |
| Employees Ret. Fund: |            | 1,200.00   | (1,200.00) |

| **Total**         | $18,095.35 | $20,103.20 | ($2,007.85) |

**Operation General**

- Headquarters:
  - Office Rent: $600.00
  - Ofc. Supplies: 1,410.07
  - Microfilming: 83.50
  - Addressograph: 179.41

- Printing, Genl.: 3,294.86
- Postage: 2,185.49
- Telephone: 556.95
- Auditing: 740.00
- Legal: 493.00
- AAPG Card: 65.00
- Depreciation: 267.00

**Total Expenses:**

- $9,925.38
- $7,144.00
- $2,781.38

**Member Services:**

- Ptg. Newslr.: $2,588.60
- Dues (AGI): 1,380.00

**Interest Exp.:**

- 375.99
- 605.00
- 229.01

**Annual Mtg. (Net):**

- 49.10
- 49.10

**Stamps & Seals (Net):**

- (30.04)
- (30.04)

**Decals (Net):**

- 54.75
- 54.75

**Lapel Buttons:**

- (23.26)
- (23.26)

**Total Expenses:**

- 32,457.12
- 32,972.20
- (405.08)

**Excess of Income over Exp.:**

- $6,693.38
- 6,227.80
- 465.58

**Payment of Principal of Notes - Paid and Included in Budget:**

- 5,000.00

**Budget Indicated Surplus for 1968:**

- $1,227.80
CALL FOR LETTERS

In November, NBC-TV announced the formation of a new department to develop major programs in science and adventure. The Public Relations and Publicity Committee immediately wrote NBC, explaining why geology should be included in the new programs. As of late January the committee had no reply.

Edith McKee, chairman of the PR&P committee, urges that we write our own letters to the TV people, to let them know that geology has an important role in "science and adventure." If you have films of wild parts of the earth, or are working on projects that can be publicly reported, let the broadcasters know. Specific suggestions are better than a generalized statement. Write to Mr. Al Morgan, Chief, Department of Non-fiction Science & Adventure Programming, NBC-TV News, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10020.

COLORADO SECTION OFFICERS

Members of the Colorado Section have elected the following officers for 1969:

John H. Dolloff ................. President
William D. Chawner .......... Vice-President
Clifford L. Mohr .............. Secretary-Treasurer
Fred S. Jensen is past-president and John D. Haun, Richard W. Lemke, and Robert D. Brace are members of the Executive Committee.

OBITUARY NOTE

W. D. WILKINSON, AIPG, longtime head of the Department of Geology at Oregon State University, Corvallis, died on January 8, 1969. He was an early and enthusiastic member of AIPG and in 1965-67 served as president of the Oregon Section.

PROFESSIONAL PARAGRAPHS

Petroleum Exploration Inc. has been formed in Denver to originate computerized multiple-well exploratory programs. ROGER M. MATSON, AIPG, is president, and WILLIS J. MAGATHAN, AIPG, heads the firm's Calgary office.

C. W. SANDERS, AIPG, has been named general manager of the new McKnight Petroleum Trust (MACPET) of Houston. The trust consolidates the exploration and development programs previously carried on by four separate companies.

BENTON WILMOTH, AIPG, past-president of the West Virginia Section, was guest speaker at the January meeting of the Appalachian Geological Society, Charleston, West Virginia. He reported on the work of the Section's committee on geologic hazards.

Governor Ronald Reagan of California has appointed G. RAY ARNETT, AIPG, state director of the Department of Fish and Game, effective February 1.

L. F. McCOLLUM, AIPG, chairman of the board of Continental Oil Company, was the guest of honor at a dinner in Houston on December 11, 1968. He was honored for leadership in business, education, and civic affairs, and for his service as National Chairman, UN Day.

RICHARD M. FOOSE, AIPG, professor and chairman of the Department of Geology, Amherst College, will be a National Academy of Science Exchange Fellow to the Soviet Union for three months starting April 1. Earlier this year he was a visiting professor at the University of Vienna and the American University of Beirut, Lebanon.