MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 8, 1969

The fourth quarterly meeting of the 1969 Executive Committee was held on October 8 at the Stouffer Riverfront Inn, St. Louis, Missouri, two days before the Annual Meeting of the Institute. All members of the committee were present, as were the new officers for 1970.

The first action of the Executive Committee was formal adoption of a resolution for the establishment of the Ben H. Parker Memorial Medal, to be awarded to an AIPG member for outstanding service to the Institute and to the profession. The Executive Committee named Martin Van Couvering the first recipient of the medal, and provided for presentation to take place at the Annual Meeting on October 10.

A report was received from E. C. Eckel, chairman of the Committee on Committees. This group has just completed a thorough review of the committee structure of the Institute. Their recommendations call for a reduction in the number of standing committees, and a reduction in committee membership to three persons per committee. They further recommended that the standing committees operate through subcommittees where such action is desirable. Such organization will give the Institute greater flexibility and more efficient operation of committee work. The Executive Committee unanimously accepted this report. Bylaw amendment for instituting the changes will be presented to the membership by mail ballot.

As a further aid to organization of the Institute, the Executive Committee approved the compilation and printing of a handbook on "Duties and Responsibilities of Institute Officers and Committees" which has been prepared during the past year. The handbook will be distributed widely among working members of the Institute, and it should provide substantial aid to the organization.

The Executive Committee accepted interim and formal reports from numerous committees, which were later presented at the Annual Meeting of the Institute. The Executive Committee took action on those committee recommendations which are required for smoother functioning of the Institute. Certain other recommendations were referred to the 1970 Executive Committee for appropriate action.

As most of the committee reports gave penetrating reviews of Institute problems, and made recommendations for their solution, the Executive Committee directed that a summary of these reports be published in The Professional Geologist.

The Executive Committee meeting was reconvened on October 11, in order to consider business raised at the meeting of the Advisory Board on October 9 and at the Annual Meeting on October 10. Among matters discussed was the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Screening Review, which was presented at a general session of the Annual Meeting on October 10 by Chairman Nielsen Rudd. This report summarized succinctly the various problems faced by local screening boards in their review of membership applications, and suggested guidelines that will be helpful to local boards. It was decided that copies of this report should be printed and distributed to all State Sections.

Robert R. Berg, Secretary-Treasurer

ADVISORY BOARDS MEET

The 1969 Advisory Board, with an attendance of 28 delegates representing 19 states, met on October 9. Two main items of business came before the meeting: should the Institute (a) consider lowering experience requirements for membership, and (b) reconsider the creation of another class of membership. After extended debate and discussion, two motions were made. The first, recommending that the Executive Committee not consider lowering the experience requirements, was passed by a vote of 14 to 11. The second, recommending that the Executive Committee reconsider the proposal for another class of membership, was defeated on a roll-call vote of State Sections, 17-8, with three abstentions. A motion to poll the full membership on this question was then passed, 19-7.

The 1970 Advisory Board convened briefly to elect four members to the 1970 Executive Committee. Those elected were Andrew G. Alpha, Emmett A. Finley, Wallace B. Howe, and Philip E. LaMoreaux.

PART OF INITIAL COST OF PARKER MEDAL REMAINS TO BE MET (See Page 2)

The company in New York that makes the Penrose Medal for GSA quoted an initial, nonrecurring cost of $1,960; yearly charges thereafter will be minimal. To date, only members of present and past Executive Committees have been approached; they have donated $1,370. Other members wishing to contribute to this cause are invited to send a check to headquarters made out to "AIPG - Ben H. Parker Memorial Fund."
"Therefore: In grateful recognition of outstanding and distinguished service to the Profession of Geology and to the Institute, and in recognition of contributions through example of the finest qualities of professional integrity, the American Institute of Professional Geologists does hereby, on this 10th day of October, nineteen hundred and sixty-nine, award the Ben H. Parker Memorial Medal to Martin Van Couvering."

Martin’s response was not recorded, but according to Art he was taken quite by surprise and was tremendously pleased.

The State of the Institute

Presidential Address - St. Louis, October 10, 1969

At the Geological Society of America’s annual meeting in Mexico City last November, our good friend and charter member of AIPG, Ian Campbell, CPG #19, examined the current status of geology and of the Society in the context of the biblical story of the handwriting on the wall at Belshazzar’s feast: “Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin.” The translation, “They have numbered, and numbered, and weighed, and still they divide,” served as text for Ian’s theme that the Society has grown greatly but has also become more and more divided. In the 80 years since GSA was founded, the number of GSA members has increased 60-fold, while the total population of the United States has increased only three and one-third times. But there are now 16 member societies of AGI, and more to come, and GSA, once a single homogeneous community of Fellows, now has seven Associated Societies, six Sections and four Divisions -- and probably more of each to come. Ian went on to examine some of the implications, to GSA and to our culture, of this growth and division.

In Dallas last April, Frank Conselman, CPG #4, one of our founders and our first editor, also examined the state of geology, he in relation to the American Association of Petroleum Geologists. In his presidential address to the Association, Frank also noted the increase in number of geologists, but pointed out that the fields and areas of geologic application are increasing much more rapidly, so that a “geologist gap” is developing. He then went on to draw some rather sweeping conclusions regarding the future role of the Association in consolidating some of these geologic functions.

GSA has a long tradition of scholarly treatises from its presidents at annual meetings, so Ian Campbell felt constrained to at least use a scholarly title if he was to speak on a mundane subject. Both he and Frank Conselman also felt impelled to discuss the relationships of the science of geology to society. I feel no such constraints; on the contrary, our Institute is exclusively concerned with a mundane subject -- the professional aspects of geology -- and I am specifically instructed by Article IV, Section IV-A of our Bylaws to “present a report on the state of the Institute at the Annual Meeting.” I intend to do just that -- to speak on the internal state of our organization. It is not that we are uninterested in the scientific aspects or technical functions of geology, we definitely are; but they are not our responsibility as a professional organization. We leave them in the capable hands of our sister organizations, whom we prefer to complement, not compete with. So here
we are to discuss the state of the Institute, and I will try to "tell it like it is." Actually, as you will discover, I can only tell it as I see it; what it actually is, no single one of us precisely knows.

Let's start by looking at a few statistics. This is only our 6th Annual Meeting, whereas it was GSA's 80th, so our base is slightly shorter; nevertheless, we may find these simple graphs instructive. And if we're going to take a critical look we'd better wear these dark glasses so we're not blinded by our own optimism.

Figure 1 is a cumulative curve of our membership at the time of each annual meeting. To an old sedimentologist it looks suspiciously like a cumulative size-analysis curve approaching its asymptotic limit of 100 percent, which appears to be between 2100 and 2200. Is that as big as we're going to get? Those of our members who view the function of AIG as primarily protectionist -- a geologist's "union" -- are not disturbed by this thought; their philosophy seems to be "Let me in and then close the gates!" But I'm disturbed by the implications of this curve; we cannot legitimately claim to represent the professional concerns of all geologists if only about 5 percent of the total, or less than 10 percent of those eligible by training and experience, are members of the Institute. We need a little more weight to wield a big stick.

Not will we have the funds to undertake the many jobs that need doing for the profession. Since, as a professional organization, we must avoid any semblance of conflict of interest, we cannot accept funds from advertisers or from many other sources; almost our only source of finances is the dues of our members. As you can see from the graphs of Figure 2, our income, and expenditures, have gradually increased as our membership has grown. (The apparently excessive expenditure of $42,000 in 1965 resulted from the cash accounting system used; nearly $10,000 of this was for payment of bills incurred in 1964. In 1967 we went to an accrual accounting system and the amount shown from then on is the actual amount obligated each year.) But even with this growth, our budget is ridiculously small for a national organization purporting to speak for all geologists -- just $41,900 this year. And if that asymptotic membership curve is right, it's not going to get much bigger -- maybe up to $45,000 by 1975. How much can we do with that? We don't pay the expenses of any of our officers or committeemen now, and we can't afford to send Art Brunton around to visit the State Sections, as we should. Our headquarters staff, consisting of Art and one young lady putting her husband through the Colorado School of Mines, is periodically overworked -- but we don't have money for hiring temporary help. We have very limited funds for postage and printing and none for public relations or for monitoring legislative actions affecting geologists -- though we should perform these functions. And next year we're going to have to move out of the quarters that have been furnished us so cheaply by Mines, to other space that will certainly be more expensive.

The bottom curve on this illustration presents an even gloomier picture; it shows our Annual Meeting attendance dropping from a high of 158 in 1965 to 88 last year. If this rate of drop continues, no one will attend the Annual Meeting in 1971!

And that ain't all! Despite herculean efforts by John Galey and others, we haven't been able to get financing for the Environmental Geology Center. We've been plugging for more discussion of many difficult and controversial issues of professionalism, and for regular meetings of local groups of members for this purpose. But in visiting 24 local groups of AIG members across the country during this year I find that most State Sections meet only once a year, and only one or two states have any organization below the state level to pull local members together periodically. We can't get much discussion of controversial issues that way! And our other lines of communication aren't working; state committee chairmen complain about lack of information from their national counterparts, while local members of state committees complain that they never hear anything from their state chairmen or the national committee! Some State Section presidents don't answer letters, and few of them send information copies of their letters to Art Brunton -- though he's one person that should be kept
Informed of what's going on in all parts of the organization. Another is your: editor, and the third is your president. Regardless of whom you write to on Institute business, if you'd send information copies to these three it would help a lot. My column in the October issue of The Professional Geologist lists other gripes I've heard in travelling about, but there's no need to repeat them here -- you get the idea. Things are in a hell of a state!

But are they really? Just for contrast suppose we take another look at Figure 1 with the rose-colored glasses of the optimist. These give us quite a different perspective. Why, GSA took 80 years to reach their current membership of 7600, and their membership qualifications are a lot less rigorous than ours! To get up to nearly 2000 in just six years is pretty darned good! Of course, our growth curve has flattened off some in the last few years, but that's normal. No organism grows at a steady rate, but by periodic spurts, followed by periods of rest. And Vito Gotuato's Membership Committee is shooting for an increase of 5 percent each quarter or 20 percent a year; if they come anywhere near that rate we'll be through the recent rest period and into another growth spurt next year. And the curves of Figure 2 look quite different, too, when viewed from the perspective of our short history of six years. How many of you know that at one time we were about $17,500 in debt? One of our founders cancelled a $1000 note, and the rest has been paid off over the last three years -- $4000 in 1967, $5000 in 1968, and the remaining $7643 this year. We are now completely free of debt for the first time, and next year we'll have a tiny bit of meat on our bare-bones budget. Furthermore, we're lucky enough to have an Executive Director who squeezes every buffalo nickel until it bellow, so we get our money's worth and then some. The financial picture doesn't look so very dark after all -- it actually has a slight rosy glow! Even that Annual Meeting curve doesn't look as bad when viewed in the light of membership population density; the lower attendance at San Francisco and here in St. Louis becomes understandable. Besides, the final registration here turned out to be 91, so we're on the upcurve again. But we can never expect the attendance at our Annual Meetings to equal that of the technically-oriented geological organizations, because our meetings are working meetings, and only the workers attend. Last January's issue of The Professional Geologist contains some pertinent comments on this subject, relative to the San Francisco meeting, by new member Glenn Brown, a past president of the Association of Engineering Geologists, and by Jay Marks, president of the California Section. Jay concludes his letter with this "The fact that only 90 (sic) members attended this year was viewed philosophically. Some members expressed sadness that their colleagues have missed such a magnificent show." We can certainly say the same about this year's meeting in St. Louis.

As for the other problems that I mentioned earlier, some are much nearer solution than first appears, and most of the others are to be expected in such a young organization as ours. For example, we really have made great progress on Galey's Environmental Geology Center, even if the money has been slow coming in. John's proposal has been endorsed by the State Geologists, by the American Geological Institute, by the Association of Engineering Geologists, by the American Institute of Planners, and by the American Institute of Architects. AGI has established a Committee Advisory to AIG to assist in promoting the idea of the Center, and the proposal brochure is being revised in the light of their suggestions.

The fact that many of our State Sections have not been as effective as they might be results from two factors; they are young (half of them less than four years old), and our national Headquarters and Executive Committee have been too concerned with more immediate matters to give them the help they've needed. But this situation is now improving, and there are also indications of a growth spurt here; three new State Sections have been added this year and several others are about ready. So I think we can look for a big improvement in all of our operations in the future.

My comments so far have constituted a very simple and naive example of one aspect of the "psychology of perception"; a relatively new field of investigation by psychologists of an old and familiar phenomenon -- the fact that we tend to be blinded by our preconceived ideas. Much more important, however, than the simple pessimist versus optimist viewpoint illustrated by these dark- and rose-colored glasses, is the more sophisticated concept that no two of us see exactly the same thing when we look at a happening, or an idea, in the world around us. What we see is filtered through, and distorted by, our own individual mental "glasses." The corrections ground into these individual mental glasses are based on all of our past experience, and include such things as our individual expectations of how other individuals and groups behave; the ways in which each of us thinks people should behave; our individual sentiments -- our loyalties, prejudices, likes, and dislikes; our self-concepts -- what we believe about ourselves; our obligations, or what we think other people think about us and expect of us; and our objectives -- what we are each trying to achieve.

Whether we are aware of it or not, all of these factors affect what we perceive of the world around us, so it is small wonder that a collection of perceptions that constitute an obvious "fact" to you do not make a "fact" to me at all -- or make a quite different one.

"So what?" you may ask. "This is all pretty obvious when you stop to think about it -- and what does it have to do with our problems?"

It has quite a lot to do with our problems for the very reason that we don't stop to think about it. As geologists -- as scientists -- we have been taught to measure things, and to demonstrate principles through reproducible experiments. We accept the results of such tests as "facts" because each of us can get the same answer. But we tend to forget that these same habits of thought do not apply when we are dealing with ideas, with concepts, with people and their behavior. And the problems of professionalism that we must deal with are largely people problems; not the much simpler interpretation of a complexly folded, faulted, and intruded segment of the earth's crust.
Let me illustrate my point further with three specific examples from among my geologist colleagues. My university colleague, Johnny Jones, seems like an intelligent guy — at least I’ve always thought him pretty smart — and well read. Yet the other day he hit into me for favoring depletion allowances on mineral resources. He even called me a “sympathizer for the oil industry!” Wasn’t he familiar with the facts” (It turns out that he had read essentially the same articles that I had.) Or had I misjudged him — was he really stupid? (Further thought didn’t check that idea out either.)

What’s wrong? Quite clearly, what are obvious facts to me are not facts at all to him; he throws out what I consider important, and honors statements that sound like nonsense to me.

A company colleague, Don Benjamin, accused me of being “a traitor to the American Association of Petroleum Geologists” because I’m working to build up AIPG. I’ve been a member of AAGP for over 40 years and have served the Association in several positions — how could he call me a traitor? Through his glasses, AAGP is the only geological organization we need; it’s the largest, and we could eliminate all this duplication, overlap, and excessive number of meetings and publications, if the other geological organizations would just come in under the AAGP umbrella! Through my glasses, AAGP is a technical organization representing only one segment (albeit the largest one) of the geological profession; it cannot possibly represent all of the profession on anything, and in my opinion, should never have become involved in problems of professionalism at all!

My third example is Ralph Baylor, a highly successful consultant who earlier spent many years with one of the major oil companies, first as a petroleum geologist, then on metal- and nonmetallic minerals. I’ve counted Ralph as my friend since he was a graduate student, but when I wrote him to ask why he had not joined AIPG, he brushed me off with “You’re just one more geological organization when we have too many already. I’ve dropped my AAGP membership because AAGP has become an empire builder, and most of the others because they’re too specialized; I’m devoting my time and money just to AGI and GSA.” If he ever gets back from the far corners of the earth so that I can talk to him, I may be able to convince him that AIPG is not empire building, but performing a function for the whole profession that both AGI and GSA support, but believe that they should not do themselves.

So — on these important issues, my colleagues Johnny Jones, Don Benjamin, Ralph Baylor, and I look at the same assemblages of information and come up with markedly different conclusions.

And these are the kinds of issues that divide us — that tend to tear us apart — both in the profession generally and inside AIPG. Our members have sharply differing opinions on a host of controversial issues of this sort, as all of you know. To my mind this is one of the most serious, if not the most serious, problem facing the Institute, along with the problems of adequate communication between our various units and the small size of our membership and budget. What can we do about it?

The psychologists tell us that the first step in solution of this problem, as in most others, is the recognition that it exists. If I realize that my view of the world is distorted by the personal astigmatism resulting from my particular background and history, I can make a conscious attempt to distinguish the real world from my impression of it. My first step is to recognize that my impression is only a “map” of the real “territory,” as the semantics would say — that it is an abstraction, formed by my unconscious selection of certain aspects, and only certain aspects, of the real and complete situation. Having once reached this realization, I can consciously look for the aspects that I have been overlooking. One of the best ways to do this is to try to look through the other fellow’s glasses — I try to find out why Johnny Jones, Don Benjamin, and Ralph Baylor have maps so different from mine. When I do this — consciously trying to understand their point of view instead of trying to sell mine to them, I find that my depth of perception grows, that my map becomes more three dimensional and closer to the real territory, and that our points of view come closer together. Of course this takes time, as do most worthwhile endeavors, and it requires coming together and discussing issues, exchanging and exploring differing views. But it’s very much worthwhile doing.

So what do we conclude about the state of the Institute? That it’s in pretty good condition, considering the state it’s in. We have problems (who doesn’t?), but they are solvable problems, if we just resolve to tackle them with determination and insight. On rereading my January column in The Professional Geologist I find that the goals I suggested for this year and the mechanisms proposed for reaching them have not been essentially changed, but reinforced, by over nine months in office and 24 visits to local groups. Let me conclude by rephrasing them in the light of that experience.

1. Recruitment. I still think that successful recruitment depends upon individual effort. Headquarters, the national Executive Committee, and the national Membership Committee can, of course, assist by furnishing materials and coordination. To help answer the most frequently asked question “What can AIPG do for me?”, headquarters has brought up to date our list of salient accomplishments; it is now an impressive two-page list of 51 items. Also, at our meeting on Wednesday, the Executive Committee adopted Jim Dunn’s proposal to prepare a recruitment brochure on this subject. But no material, and no organization, can do the actual recruiting job; this is still up to the State Sections and to each individual member.

2. Committee Activity. We need, and always will need, willing workers on our committees, at both the national and state levels. However, some of our national committees have become ineffective, and on the recommendation of our Committee on Committees, the Executive Committee has approved, for submission to the membership as an amendment to the by-laws, a considerable reduction in the size, and some reduction in the number, of our national committees. If adopted, this change will streamline our committees, but will make even more necessary the establishment of parallel committee structures (even if only one man to a committee) at the State Section level to provide communication links.
3. Environmental Geology. We have already stimulated other individuals and organizations to take a more active interest in Environmental Geology; we have proved to be an effective catalyst. As a further step in this direction, we hope to establish, in cooperation with other geological organizations and with the planners and architects, a President's Conference on Environmental Geology in 1970. We should continue these efforts, and all of our members should take every opportunity to "sell" John Galey's "preventive geology."

4. Monthly Meetings. I am completely convinced that regular meetings, preferably monthly, are the key to solution of most of our problems. Only two or three members, meeting for lunch, can help to keep communications open and lead to more enlightened decisions on controversial issues. If our present structure is to work effectively, we must reach considered decisions at the local level and transmit these decisions through state delegates to the national Advisory Board and Executive Committee. This means also that Advisory Board delegates must be selected well in advance of the national Annual Meeting, and headquarters informed of their identity.

In my monthly columns in The Professional Geologist, I've suggested several controversial issues needing discussion that could well be subjects at monthly luncheon meetings. I'd now like to add the recommendation that all members participate in a review of the "State of the Institute." Let's re-examine our mission, our specific objectives, and our methods for achieving them. Let's discuss these problems with each other, and then let our Advisory Board delegates, headquarters, our Editor, and our President, know our conclusions. I'll list some specific suggestions for monthly-meeting discussions on this subject in the December issue of The Professional Geologist, but I don't want to dilute my message tonight with a list of discussion items.

I want to leave you with this thought -- we must learn to unite, not divide. We must learn to understand each other's point of view, not decry it. When we do, we will find we are not so far apart, after all. To my mind, such understanding is absolutely essential if we are to represent all of geology on professional problems.

We will achieve this understanding only by openminded and thorough discussion of controversial issues; and when we do achieve understanding we will find that we have reached a consensus on many of them. The official stands of the Institute will then be considered and wise ones, representative of an enlightened and thoughtful membership. We can be sure, then, that the state of the Institute is healthy and growing, and that it is fulfilling the functions planned by its founders.

R. Dana Russell

RECRUITMENT ITEMS

James R. Dunn has been appointed chairman of a committee to prepare a new edition of AIPG's recruitment brochure. Already available is an expanded version of "A Few Salient Accomplishments of AIPG." Over 50 specific actions of the Institute and 12 of its Sections are given. This single-sheet item is available from Institute headquarters.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Reports of committees, which made up almost the entire program at the Annual Meeting, resulted in a sheaf of some 68 typewritten pages, far too much material to publish promptly in full. Realizing that this would be the case, the editor obtained authorization to condense the reports for publication in The Professional Geologist. The shortened versions appear in this and the December issues. It is hoped that no violence has been done to the authors' intended meaning; prompt correction will be made if requested. Please note: Readers desiring a full copy of one or more of the committee reports may obtain them on request to the headquarters office. The reports are given in the order in which they were presented.

... Editor

ETHICS COMMITTEE

At the 1968 meeting, the Ethics Committee was given the job of investigating a possible service to members of AIPG who found it necessary to verify the financial responsibility of a client. The committee has solicited opinions on this subject from a number of sources, and recommends that this matter could best be left to the individual initiative of the member involved. The Ethics Committee, and ultimately the Institute, could assist, however, by informing the membership of methods available through which one may satisfy his curiosity and judge his client's ability to pay his bill.

Two methods are readily available. One exists through the services of local branches of retail-credit associations or similar credit-reporting agencies, and the other through contacts with local banks. The conclusion reached was that services offered by the banks appear to be better, more current, and probably more reliable than credit-company ratings.

A recommended procedure is to have clients provide you with basic financial information, for it is easier and less expensive to verify this data than it is to search it out yourself. You may secure a suitable form from your bank or you may prepare your own. The form should provide for personal history, addresses, assets and liabilities, sources of income, etc. and for name of bank and authorization to verify the data. With this form you will find it less difficult to obtain what is normally considered confidential financial information, especially when dealing on a person-to-person basis.

Your banker may then be called on to verify the client's financial responsibility. Banks usually communicate with each other more freely than with outsiders or individuals. They are somewhat limited, however, in the type and amount of information they are able to provide. As a practical business matter, banks are limited in the time and money they will spend collecting data for a customer in proportion to the size of accounts the customer keeps with them. They will usually provide information as to the type of experience they have had in doing business with a customer, such as the years they have serviced the account, the approximate average balance maintained, the number of overdrafts, etc. Bad-credit information is usually not available, nor is an opinion as to a person's ability to pay.
A FEW SALIENT ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF AIPG

INSTITUTE

* Maintaining high professional standards. As of September 30, 1969, 3.4% of all applications for certification received by the Institute had been withdrawn by request or not approved.

* Thwarted an attempt by the National Council of Engineering Examiners to have AIME set up standards for the registration of professional geologists (1964).

* Prepared, in cooperation with AGI, a set of model registration and chartering laws to be made available to geologists who request council on legal registration in their respective states (1966).

* Officially designated by the AGI House of Society Representatives as the Member Society to which all professional matters are to be referred.

* Objected to proposed Bureau of Land Management rules and regulations which could have seriously hampered field surveys by geologists on public lands. AIPG's efforts resulted in favorable revision and clarification (1966).

* Sponsored establishment of an Environmental Geology Center to provide a clearing house of easily-used geological information needed by engineers, architects, and planners concerned with earth-environment problems; obtained endorsement from the Association of Engineering Geologists, the American Geological Institute, the Association of American State Geologists, the American Institute of Planners, and the American Institute of Architects (1966-1968; still in process).

* To assure consideration of geological factors in earth-environment problems, wrote letters to concerned Senators, Representatives, federal Secretaries and other administrative officers, and to President Handler of the National Academy of Sciences, requesting the appointment of geologists to official committees, commissions, councils, and panels concerned with such problems (1969).

* Adopted official position in favor of maintaining mineral depletion allowances; wrote letters to President Nixon and to Senators, Representatives and administrative officials concerned (1969).


* At the request of the universities involved, conducted cooperative evaluations of the geology departments of the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, Northwestern University, Stanford University, and the University of Southern California.

* Established an ad hoc Committee on evaluation of Geology Departments to assist California Board of Registration for Geologists (1969).

* Established an ad hoc committee to study taxation of overriding royalty interests and recommend appropriate action (1969).

CALIFORNIA SECTION

* Directed efforts which resulted in the defeat of determined efforts to register geologists in California under the authority of the Board of Engineers (1963 & 1965).

* Helped to prepare and support legislation for the proper registration of geologists under the authority of a Board of Geologists, but forced to successfully oppose this legislation when an amendment was proposed that would have placed the geologists under the authority of the Department of Professional and Vocational Standards without a proper Board of Geologists (1967).

* Prepared a report on the Geological Environment of the Los Angeles area at the request of the Mayor of Los Angeles. Highly commended for the report as "a distinguished contribution to the City" (1966).

* Prepared a concise and complete "Professional Status Alternatives Report" for the guidance of geologists who may be faced with some form of legal registration in their states (1966).

* Coordinated the efforts of the entire profession in California for the successful passage of a proper registration law for geologists under the authority of a Board of Geologists (1968).

* Successful in obtaining the appointment of five Members of the Section to the seven-man Board of Registration for Geologists (1969).

* Supported legislation that would have required geological studies of lands being developed as subdivisions, then successfully blocked that legislation when it was amended to make the geologist's findings part of a soils engineering report.

* Retains the services of a firm of legislative advocates to provide a bill-reporting and analyzing service and, on the basis of these reports and analyses, supports or combats proposed legislation affecting the practice of geology.

COLORADO SECTION

* At the request of an AIPG Member in the State Legislature, coordinated efforts of all local geological organizations in successfully supporting the reactivation of the State Geological Survey (1967).

* Instituted joint meetings with city and county planning officials to acquaint them with the importance of geology in the initial stages of planning and to receive from them suggestions as to how to establish better communications between geologists and planning commissions (1967).

* A Member of the Section appointed State Geologist (1968).

* Successful in placing a Member on the Committee on Proposed Regulations for Disposal Wells for the Colorado Water Pollution Control Commission (1968).
* In cooperation with the Association of Engineering Geologists, conducted a highly successful Governor's Conference on Environmental Geology, which was attended by approximately 300 geologists, engineers, architects and planners (1969).

* Assisted the Association of Engineering Geologists in successfully obtaining the appointment of a geologist to the Board of Directors of the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District of Denver (1969).

IOWA SECTION

* Successfully preserved the integrity of the Geological Board and the Geological Survey in a general reorganization and consolidation of state departments (1967).

LOUISIANA SECTION


* Assisted the Civil Service Department in updating their testing program for geologists (1968).

* Consulted with the State Tourist Commission regarding a plan to publicize geologic features in the State (1968).

* Established a speakers bureau of Members to be available to give talks when called upon by other organizations (1968).

MISSISSIPPI SECTION

* Publishes an annual report which includes biographies and pictures of Members and distributes these to public agencies.

* Introduced in both houses of the Mississippi Legislature a bill to repeal the anti-evolution "monkey law". The bill died in committee but further efforts will be made (1968).

* Four Members appointed to serve on a Governor’s Geological Advisory Committee.

NEW MEXICO SECTION

* Assisting City of Farmington in preparation of plans for the future expansion and development of that City based on the known geological environment (1967- )

OKLAHOMA SECTION

* Established a program whereby Members give courses for Oklahoma University credit to teachers in the Oklahoma City school system (1967).

* Established liaison with three local societies to investigate and coordinate activities dealing with legal registration of geologists in Oklahoma (1966-1969).

* Gained approval and financing from the State for the erection of informative signs at prominent geologic sites (1968).

* Encouraged the Tulsa Geological Society to adopt "The environmental Geology of the Tulsa Area" as the subject of its Annual Digest, and provided material for the Digest (1969).

TENNESSEE SECTION

* Members testified as expert witnesses at public hearings regarding industrial waste disposal wells.

TEXAS SECTION

* Successfully defeated efforts by engineers to assume legal authority over geological work in Texas (1964).

* Arranged for closer cooperation between Soil Conservation Service and geological agencies in the study of Urban Environmental Problems (1965).

* Appeared before the Railroad Commission of Texas to advocate a proposal to increase the number of oil and gas wells benefiting from the Discovery classification from 5 to 10 - a measure designed to aid exploration and thereby increase the demand for geologists (1966).

* Investigated Water Well Driller’s Licensing Act of 1965 and determined that the requirement of licensing for those supervising water well drilling does not apply to geologists engaged in ground water investigations (1966).

* Intervened in a controversial matter of evaluation of State mineral rights in the proposed Guadalupe National Park and was instrumental in obtaining passage of the bill approving establishment of the Park (1967).

WASHINGTON SECTION

* Instrumental in defeating proposed legislation to register geologists under the authority of the engineers (1966).

WEST VIRGINIA SECTION

* Maintained contact with, and influenced, State officials engaged in the drafting of new legislation for the preservation of mine maps and related information in a central catalog of the State.

UTAH SECTION

* Prepared a complete census of all geologists in the State (1968-1969).

* Instrumental in conducting a Governor’s Conference on Environmental Geology (1968).

* Organized an advisory group for the Department of Natural Resources which has now been included within the State Government by executive order of the Governor. Two Members have been appointed to this Committee (1968-1969).
National credit bureaus provide information on the paying habits of individuals, based on facts obtained from banks, department stores, courthouse records, and other sources that they can definitely verify. In general, credit bureaus provide data only to member subscribers. They require a statement which certifies that the information is to be used only for the purpose of granting credit, and to become a subscriber you must apply, be approved, and agree to exchange similar information on your accounts. The membership fee is $60 per year. The cost of each report requested is nominal. Credit bureaus maintain files only on individuals, not on companies.

Because of the availability and reliability of financial reports through banks and credit bureaus, AIPG members should have no difficulty in this regard once they are aware of what is available.

Arthur H. Trowbridge, Chairman

Membership Committee

The major goals that have been set for this year are to (1) complete the International, national, regional, state and area organization of the committee; (2) charge committee members with specific duties and responsibilities; (3) design a reporting and monitoring system that can be used at all levels of committee management; (4) assemble a Membership Committee Handbook that will contain all procedures; (5) increase Institute membership by 20 percent per year, and (6) do all that is possible to retain present members.

Organizational structure of the committee is on three levels: international-national, regional, and State Section. Each level is responsible for supplying the national chairman with the names of all persons working within their organization. This process will be greatly simplified if the president of the Institute will approve the chairman's recommendations as to who should be appointed regional co-chairmen when vacancies occur, and if the bylaws can be amended to give the vice-president of each State Section the responsibility of being membership chairman for his Section.

All co-chairmen at the upper levels have been charged with their specific duties and responsibilities. One of these is that they give similar charges to the State and area chairmen under their jurisdiction. To date, roughly one-half of the committee's members are trying to do what was requested. The others will have to respond shortly or be replaced.

A form has been designed to be used by all levels of management in reporting quarterly results. Each level will report to the next higher one; the national chairman will composite all results and forward them to the Institute's Executive Committee. The compositing data can be compared with data received from the Executive Director on applications requested and those filled in and returned. Since January 1968, requests for applications have been averaging 24.1 per month; applications filled in and ready for processing, 16.9 per month, and those approved, 16.2 per month. To achieve an increase in membership of 20 percent per year, we need to approve 32 members per month, or twice the present rate.

A handbook has been prepared and sent to all committee members, the Executive Committee, and the Executive Director.

Vito A. Gotautas, Chairman

Committee On State Section Organization And Affairs

The functions of this committee are, first, to promote the formation of State Sections, working in close cooperation with State Coordinators and assisting in the appointment of new State Coordinators upon request of the Executive Committee. Second, to review the proposed bylaws of each applicant Section and advise the Executive Committee on its eligibility. Similarly, we are asked to review proposed changes in the bylaws of existing Sections and to advise the Executive Committee on their acceptability. Third, to provide liaison between Sections and between the Institute and the Sections. This responsibility has not been actively exercised in the past, possibly because of the committee's immediate concern with the business of getting Sections organized. As the number of possibilities for State Sections begins to decline, more of the committee's efforts can be directed toward intersectional activities and affairs.

The first function, that of helping to form State Sections, is normally accomplished through the State Coordinator, who is responsible for bringing individual members together for the purpose of forming a Section. This function is our most important one. Briefly, the procedure for forming a State Section is as follows. After drafting a set of bylaws, the applicant Section petitions the Institute for formal recognition as a State Section, and the petition and bylaws are sent to our committee for examination. The bylaws are checked for completeness and compatibility with those of the Institute. If they are satisfactory, our committee returns the application to the Executive Committee with the recommendation that formation of the State Section be approved. The Institute has made available a set of "Model Bylaws" which is of great help to a new Section when drafting its own bylaws. It also makes the job of our committee much easier when the "Model Bylaws" are closely followed.

During the past year we have been engaged in processing applicant sections and in stimulating activity in eligible states through local Coordinators. In April, the Institute admitted the Washington Section, which had been organized through the cooperative efforts of E. H. Gilmour and G. W. Thorsen, serving together as Coordinators. Karl R. Newman was elected president. The able work of M. F. Pryor as Coordinator led to the admission of the Kansas Section in July. Also admitted in July was the Alabama Section under the leadership of Philip LaMoreaux as Coordinator and Thomas A. Simpson as first president. The addition of these three State Sections brings the total to twenty-seven.

Five more states are eligible for Section status. In Maryland, Carl Supp is actively seeking a combined Maryland, Delaware, District of Columbia section. State Coordinators have also been appointed for Arizona, Indiana, Massachusetts,
and North Carolina. Coordinators for these states report varying amounts of activity and we hope to add Sections from one or two of these states to the roll before the end of the year.

Several months ago the proposal was made that a section be formed in Alberta. Discussion within the Executive Committee suggested that a "Provincial" Section would be acceptable to the Institute, and initial steps toward selection of a Coordinator have been taken. Such a Section would provide a forum on professional matters to those American geologists in Alberta.

The Louisiana Section has set up groups, called Chapters, for the purpose of meeting regularly to discuss matters of mutual interest. Chapter officers parallel those of the State Section. The Chapter maintains close communication with the state organization and implements its program by holding regular meetings and engaging in organized professional activity. The national Executive Committee has endorsed this plan, but it is up to the State Sections to see it through. We hope that the Section presidents and executive committees will take this means of increasing the strength and effectiveness of AIPG. Of course, our committee offers its support and assistance in this endeavor.

Frank A. Exum, Chairman

Ad Hoc Committee On Screening Review

The report of this committee, prepared by Neilson Rudd, chairman, is a full discussion of the screening philosophy and procedure, and is intended to serve as a "handbook" for screening boards. Because of the critical importance of this subject to the Institute, we expect to publish the report in full in the December issue.

..., Editor

Committee on Professional and Scientific Standards

I strongly believe that in the near future evaluation or accreditation of departments of geology will become one of the important functions of AIPG, and I would like to comment briefly on this subject before reviewing the activities of our committee.

In the United States, higher educational institutions have considerable autonomy. To insure quality and minimal standards, a complex system known as accreditation has been developed. Accreditation has been defined as the process whereby an organization or agency recognizes a college or university, or a program of study, as having met certain predetermined qualifications and standards. Regional accreditation is usually based on evaluation of the institution as a whole, and is an expression of confidence in the institution's purpose, resources, and performance. Professional accreditation is usually concerned with a particular program or field of study within a college or university, and may be granted by a national organization representing the profession, primarily to insure that the purposes and accomplishments of the professional program meet the needs of society and of the profession.

Closely related to accreditation is evaluation, a process of appraisal of an institution to determine whether it has the necessary resources to meet its objectives and goals, and whether or not it is achieving its stated objectives.

Opponents of accreditation usually object to its standardizing effects, and to the interference with independence and autonomy which they claim to see. Proponents emphasize the importance of maintaining minimum standards among higher educational institutions and within the profession, and believe that the institution, the profession, and the public are served by accreditation.

An extensive program in evaluation or accreditation is a time-consuming and expensive operation. Also, there are so many different approaches to geological education that it might be difficult for an AIPG committee to fully understand all segments of the geological profession. Thus, it might be well for AIPG to invite participation from other national geological societies. Those that come to mind include AAPG, AAGS, AEG, AGI, AIME, GSA, MSA, NAGT, SEPM, SECG, SEG.

Evaluation of departments of geology by the Institute has been started, but involvement by institute members and by departments has been minimal. The committee has considered in a cursory manner additional steps that should be taken, namely development and continued updating of accreditation criteria, and developing and maintaining a list of personnel for ad hoc visiting committees.

Since the San Francisco meeting, committee activities have related to the evaluation of geology departments. (1) An evaluation committee visited and reported favorably on the School of Earth Sciences, Stanford University. A statement appeared in the March issue of The Professional Geologist. (2) An AIPG team visited the Department of Geological Sciences, University of Southern California, and submitted its report. The report has been circulated to members of the Professional and Scientific Standards Committee. After committee action, an appropriate report was submitted to the AIPG Executive Committee. (3) A committee has visited Northwestern University, but has not submitted a report. (4) Committees have been, or are being, organized to visit the Colorado School of Mines, Old Dominion College, and Wayne State University.

At a meeting held on Thursday of this week, the committee considered an information questionnaire to be filled out by the department being visited; uniform evaluation criteria to be used by visiting teams; and AIPG members on ad hoc visiting teams.

Truman H. Kuhn, Chairman

Committee On Relations With Governmental Agencies

Early in the year, one of our committee members pointed out in a letter to me a problem that we have found occurs in many states, and about which we felt we should be concerned. This has to do with the geological sections of planning reports
prepared under the local Assistance Program authorized by Section 701 of the Federal Housing Act of 1954. (See TPG, May-June, page 7. - Ed.) In almost all cases where the authorship was known, the very necessary section of these reports dealing with geology was written by a nongeologist.

President Russell, on April 25 of this year, wrote George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, concerning this matter. Secretary Romney answered on May 12 that there was little he could do, since "planning is a state and local responsibility." He felt that it is up to individual geologists and/or State Sections to cultivate a working relationship with state planning agencies and inform them of the assistance available, both from state geological surveys and from consultants.

On April 25, President Russell sent a letter to all State Section presidents enclosing a copy of the original letter to me and a copy of his letter to Secretary Romney. He requested that each Section investigate the situation locally and advise me of their findings.

I regret to say that I heard from but two states. The Mississippi Section indicated that they would investigate the local situation, but nothing further was heard. The Montana Section submitted a report, not only pointing out this problem but making recommendations in other areas. They stated, "Most of the planning in Montana involves geology, and almost all of the planning is administered by nongeologists." They reiterated that the best means of advising governmental agencies of the value and availability of geologists is by involvement, either individually or organizationally.

The Water Resources Board of Montana is responsible for the formulation of a statewide comprehensive water plan, which is at present directed to a large extent by a consulting hydrogeologist. It was noted that a geologist while serving in the Montana legislature was responsible for the act which made this plan possible.

I also received from Andrew Mozola of Detroit a planning report in which he had marked certain pages dealing with geology. It was most evident that the report was not prepared by a geologist, or if it was, the geologist should certainly be ashamed of himself.

It is reasonable to assume that these problems exist in all states which take advantage of funds available under Section 701 of the Federal Housing Act.

I know very little of the geologist's relationship with state agencies, but I can give you an example of one that is not good, which occurs in my own state -- the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The Kentucky Water Pollution Control Committee requires that when any industry proposes to dispose of industrial wastes underground, the plans must include a detailed report indicating the formation in which these wastes are to be disposed of, the area of influence, etc. On inquiry, I found that they had no criteria with respect to the background or professionalism of the geologist preparing that report. In fact, I was advised that anyone who could make the report sound good would be acceptable to them. I argued, but to no avail.

This brings me to a few comments that are mine alone, and may or may not be supported by the members of my committee. Until we have a registration law on the books in the various states, and laws requiring that geologist's reports paid for by public monies, or submitted to regulatory agencies, be certified by a registered geologist, we can expect to make little headway. This is an argument for registration, and I know that many oppose it. It does work out, however, that if you want protection, you must be willing to accept some of the bad to get the good.

Frank H. Walker, Chairman

Committee On Statutory Regulation
And Legislation

One of the first considerations was of the resolution proposed last spring for an AIPG policy on statutory regulation. After considerable discussion with the Executive Committee, particularly as to the practicality of proposing certification or chartering as a preferred course to registration and regulation, all these possible courses finally were included in the priority sequence of the resolution of the Executive Committee which appeared in the March issue of The Professional Geologist.

Then at midyear a committee discussion culminated in an exchange of letters between Bob Pashall (California) and Ed Mayhew (Colorado), both of whom commented on the political competence of professional geologists (TPG, July-August). While expressing different points of view, these men agreed on two counts: (1) embark on a statutory course now, and (2) involve practical political attitudes and competence in these actions.

In June, President Russell requested our committee to review and to rewrite as necessary the model registration laws, credited to Warren Beebe, thought by some to be too lengthy. Note was made of a 1966 "model law" prepared by Wes Bruer, based on Beebe's and others, including the Alberta, Quebec, and Puerto Rico chartering acts for engineers and related individuals. It was thought we could put these together as 'one' to recommend to the Executive Committee.

After much discussion in our committee, it was decided not to undertake revision. A great deal of time had been involved in developing these models. Also, any state contemplating chartering or registration would require substantial local counsel to adapt to their legislative requirements. We are therefore recommending the acceptance of the Beebe model law as a base and making the Bruer law available as a reference. This means that there are available from headquarters these basic materials: model chartering law, model registration law, Bruer's draft as reference, and California Registration Act, AB 600.

The example of California in obtaining a Geologist Registration Law is so well known that additional detail is unnecessary. You will be interested in knowing that as of October 17 approximately 1025 applications and over 4000 inquiries had been received. Reciprocity, emphasized repeatedly by our committee, is included in the California bill. The California AIPG retains a "Legislative Service and Public Relations" firm alert to legislation.
Leroy Gatlin reported that Oklahoma feels considerable education is necessary before geologists should try to legislate for certification or registration. Meanwhile, they will probably try to get the Corporation Commission to recognize AIPG certification.

Our committee urges prompt action in whatever statutory direction is chosen by the State Section. Finally, on the influencing of political action, associate with an element of the politician’s constituency in order to improve what is known as “clout” (power, communication, effectiveness).

Richard E. Faggioli, Chairman

Ad Hoc Committee On Professional Fees

In 1968, the committee conducted a survey to determine existing practice in regard to professional fees. Of the 315 AIPG members responding, about one-third devoted at least 75 percent of their time to consulting and had been doing so for a median time of nine years. Fifty-one percent reported petroleum as their major specialty, 18 percent mining, 14 percent engineering, and 11 percent groundwater.

Median fee for petroleum geologists, whether engaged in office or field work or in court testimony, was $125 per day, with a range from $50 to $200 per day. The median fee for all classes of work by mining and groundwater geologists was $150 per day, and the range from $100 to $650 per day. Engineering geologists reported median fees of $150 per day for office or field work and $200 per day for court testimony, and a range from $75 to $250 per day. Fees varied by area, with median fees in the east and west coast areas of $150 per day, or $25 higher than in the Gulf Coast and interior areas.

Those devoting more than 75 percent of their time to consulting reported a median income of $12,000 to $16,000 per year from consulting, correlating closely with data reported by the NSF for self-employed earth scientists for 1966. For the group that devoted more than 50 percent of their time to consulting, those engaged in mining or water geology reported a median annual net income of $15,000 to $20,000 from consulting, while those engaged in petroleum or engineering geology reported a median annual net income of $12,000 to $16,000.

In 1969, the committee reviewed the practices of other professions with regard to fees, both as to gathering information and in establishing guidelines or minimums. In the states surveyed, in the Gulf Coast and north-central regions, it was found that doctors, dentists, and certified accountants do not establish fee guidelines. Only the Florida accountants survey their members. Accounting fees, depending on the skill of the practitioner, range from $8 to $50 per hour. Engineers, architects, planners, and landscape architects all suggest guidelines and lean toward basing fees on a percentage of construction cost, ranging from 4 to 19 percent depending on job size. Where hourly or daily fees are indicated, commonly quoted figures are $12.50 per hour, or $100 to $150 per day and up to $300 per day. The use of a multiplier is frequent, particularly among engineers, and commonly suggested multipliers are from 2.0 to 3.0 times the payroll costs (base pay plus taxes, fringe benefits, vacations, etc.). Lawyers establish “minimum” fees, in many cases by the type of work. Where hourly fees are suggested, they range upward from a minimum of $25 per hour. One bar association stated, “A minimum fee is never a reasonable fee. It is the point where all fee calculation begins.”

Based on its findings and the indicated widespread interest in fee matters within AIPG, the committee in 1969 recommended that the Executive Committee consider (1) initiation of a periodic survey of fee practices; (2) preparation of a “guide to fees” which members could use for guidance and for discussion with clients; and (3) transfer of the committee functions to one of the permanent standing committees.

Ernest K. Lehmann, Chairman

Committee On Interprofessional Relations

On October 11, 1968, Jack Graham, past chairman of this committee, gave a comprehensive report setting the stage for future activities. Several recommendations were made: (1) strengthen liaison with other societies, (2) assume increasing responsibilities in publicizing geology, (3) assume a larger role in urban planning, (4) seek membership in other existing professional societies, and (5) act on the State Section level through an individual. Some progress has been noted in each of the categories mentioned above, but the major work lies ahead of us.

In mid-August, all twelve members of the committee were asked to furnish reports of progress. Data are now available on activities of our widely scattered committee members. Jerry Vineyard reported on the following progress in the Missouri Section. (1) A “Mini” symposium on engineering geology in karst terrain was held, with 75 persons, mainly engineers, in attendance. Although the symposium was not sponsored by AIPG, two section members were on the program. (2) An active committee, chaired by James H. Williams, was formed by the Section to draft an appropriate bill regulating dam construction; this committee included consulting and public engineers as well as geologists. (3) Two AIPG members, Hayes and Vineyard, have written a publication, “Environmental Geology in Town and Country,” which is directed to “engineers, builders, planners, and other professionals engaged in environmental change.” This has been published by the Missouri Geological Survey. (4) Vineyard has been invited to address the Central Association of Science and Mathematics Teachers in Milwaukee in November, 1969. (5) Vineyard has an opportunity to comment editorially on the geologist and his relations to the public in the Missouri Mineral Industry News. (6) A Section member (Hayes) is on the Water and Sewage Facilities Committee of the East-West Gateway Coordinating Council.

From New York, Jack Graham reported that a member of the American Institute of Planners spoke at the annual meeting of the Section in October, 1969. Graham is active on the Admissions Committee of the Society of Mining Engineers of AIME. Efforts are being made to hold a joint meeting with the Association of Engineering Geologists, New York-Philadelphia section.

In Colorado, the Governor’s Conference on Environmental Geology was sponsored by the Colorado Section of AIPG and the
Denver section of AEG and was directed to planners, engineers,
constructors, and others involved in the environmental aspects
of geology. Preliminary contacts were made with a number of
ecological organizations at the “Seminar on Environmental Arts
and Sciences” in Aspen during late June and early July. AIPG
supported a successful AEG movement to get an engineering
geologist on the governing board of the newly created Urban
Drainage and Flood Control District.

In California, Elmo Adams established contact with the
Interprofessional Commission on Environmental Design (ICED).
Continued contact with this group on the State Section level
will be maintained and should be productive.

Before we become deeply involved with other professions,
AIPG must demonstrate an ability for its own members to work
together for the common good of geologists, and must be in-
volved in mutually beneficial relations with other geological
associations. Our efforts should be directed first at improving
relations with those groups from which we draw our member-
ship. After all, AIPG seeks to provide a base of professionalism
for organizations that are older than itself, and our organization
will have to continually demonstrate in practical ways the ad-
vantages of membership. At the same time we should continue
to lay the groundwork for interprofessional cooperation, repre-
senting geology as a profession which makes a viable contribu-
tion toward satisfying man’s desire for a high-quality environ-
ment.

An operational plan has been formulated as an extension
of recommendations which were submitted last year. (1) Coun-
terpart committees, such as the Colorado Intersociety Liaison
Committee and the Pennsylvania Interprofessional Relations
Committee, should be formed in each State Section. They
would encourage joint meetings and other cooperative efforts
to further good relations between AIPG and other geological
societies. Each committee would establish contact with local
sections of nongeological professional organizations. Where
membership in these organizations is feasible and desirable,
committee members could apply or encourage other qualified
members of their Section to do so.

(2) The number of members on the national Interprofes-
sional Relations Committee should be reduced to three or four.
The present number and distribution of committee members
does not promote efficient operation. (3) The national com-
mittee would furnish local Sections with lists of societies with
which contact should be made and liaison maintained. The
Section committees would also feed back to national the results
of their efforts, making it possible to meet broad nationwide
objectives.

John B. Ivey, Chairman

Committee On Man’s Geological Environment

During 1969 four communications were sent out to the
members of this committee. The first dealt with the history of
the old Geologic Hazards Committee, and its transition into the
Committee on Man’s Geological Environment. It requested
committee members to send to the chairman and vice-chairman
any information available on what district and State Sections
are doing and the methods of operation they have developed to
combat problems of environmental geology. Committee mem-
bers were also asked to send in a list of all geologic hazards or
problems of environmental geology with which they were even
remotely familiar, in order to complete a “catalog” of geologic
hazards started by the earlier committee.

The second general communication, in April, solicited
information and ideas concerning establishment of the Environ-
mental Geology Center.

By July, enough items to include on a catalog of problems
in environmental geology had been received that such a ten-
reative catalog was compiled. This was sent to the members
along with a third communication, which detailed some of the
conferences on environmental geology which had been held in
the United States.

About the time I was thinking about writing another general
communication to the committee membership, I received a
letter from Jim Dunn. This letter was so comprehensive in
summarizing some of the ways in which geology is used in New
York state in the broad area of environmental geology that I
took the liberty of sending it to the entire committee as a gen-
eral communication. Only his final paragraph is quoted here.

"In summary, becoming active in the environmental ge-
ology field requires, I think, an evangelistic approach which
requires that we do research and supply valuable compilations
and evaluations of geologic data; that we communicate out-
wardly; and, lastly, that we 'get our hands dirty' (meet and
work with the people with problems; learn their needs)." Jim’s
comments should be adopted as a creed for all geologists who
wish to have their influence felt and see recognition of the
geologic profession expand.

Henry H. Neel, Chairman

Oceans Committee

With regard to Federal regulation of the outer continental
shelf, rules published by the Department of the Interior on
August 22 contain two items of potential interest to professional
geologists. First, there is specific provision for analysis of the
over-all use or potential of an area before special-use rights
are granted. Second, there are new requirements for the sub-
mission of geologic data, including structural interpretations,
prior to commencing an exploratory program as well as during
the course of drilling and development.

Of the many issues being debated in the United States on
jurisdiction of the ocean floor, the "narrow versus wide" issue
relating to the continental shelf is the most noteworthy. A re-
cent and much-quoted publication is the report of the Stratton
Commission, "Our Nation and the Sea"; it supports a narrow-
shelf position (to the 200-meter isobath or 50 miles, whichever
includes more area). The National Petroleum Council’s report,
"Petroleum Resources under the Ocean Floor," takes a wide-shelf
position, maintaining that current international law, based on
the Geneva Convention of 1968, provides for jurisdiction over
the entire continental mass pertaining to the adjacent coastal
nation.
Current exploratory activities, the results of which may be important to geologists, include the voyage of the Glomar Challenger, under the sponsorship of JOIDES; a private-industry group continuing exploration off the East coast, including Georges Bank; and the Humble Oil & Refining Company's Manhattan voyage through the Northwest passage.

A publication that may be of particular interest is "World Subsea Mineral Resources," by Vincent E. McKelvey and Frank F. H. Wang of the Geological Survey. It includes impressive new maps showing the occurrence of subsea minerals.

Consideration of national jurisdiction over our continental margins brings to mind two questions which we should answer relative to certification and/or licensing. Since our activities in this professional area relate to states, what is the implication regarding a geologist practicing in the adjacent areas of national or international jurisdiction? Will the subject of Federal certification, or licensing, become a problem to which we should address ourselves? In any event I urge the inclusion of the principle of reciprocity in any proposed certification or licensing legislation.

Richard E. Faggioli, Chairman

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Sir:

As a professor in a fairly large university, I have to contend with too many colleagues who are all too ready to yield to the tantrums of the instant-gratification set. But I didn't expect to meet with this phenomenon on the editorial page of The Professional Geologist (Sept. 1969).

No other membership is more valued by me. I had to be a professional geologist for over eight years before I could gain membership. Several years are needed for the geology profession to find out if a man is incompetent, a four-flusher, or both.

My membership in AIPG is a realistic assurance to all that I have passed muster. That is damned important to me and I don't want it eroded.

The "disgusted (young) geologist" who poured that he didn't need us now must have been given his bicycle, his pony, and his Honda instantly upon request, and he will brook no frustration now.

I will concede that it might be shown that a six- or seven-year stretch of professional activity might serve the purpose as well as eight. But, if this is changed, let it be because our own experience and that of comparable professional groups showed that it was right, and not because of some negotiable demand from the Pepsi generation.

It is not "unrealistic" to desire that AIPG continue to project an "image" of rigorous professional reliability.

September 25, 1969

Walter H. Wheeler, AIPG

Sir:

The pessimistic view of Ellis Krinitzky (TPG Sept. 1969) is unjustified. First, the salary differential between engineers and geologists of the lower GS grades is warranted, since the B.S. engineer degree has become mostly a five-year curriculum instead of our four. Second, the apparent overcrowding is due to the fact we do not have a professionally accredited degree; instead, we have yielded to the hedonistic philosophies of professional educationists so that geology could even survive in a watered-down academia. I would favor professional certification of degrees after completion of one year above the normal degree requirement in intensive geologic courses or in an approved industry training program. If we are going to stump for higher wages we should be agreed the product is worthy of them.

October 4, 1969

Bahngrell W. Brown, AIPG