It is imperative that this nation have a comprehensive mineral and energy resource policy, and that the Party consider the development of such a policy as basic and paramount in the preparation of a progressive and meaningful party platform for 1976. The continued vitality, security, stability, and welfare of the nation is dependent on the intelligent, orderly, and continued development of our natural resources. Though this nation will never again be mineral and energy self-sufficient, we can decrease our dependence on foreign sources. The inconveniences we experienced during the oil embargo imposed by the OPEC countries in 1973 and 1974 will be multiplied into privations if our dependence on the whims of foreign governments continues to grow.

We, the geological scientists, represent the scientific and technical basis for all mineral and energy resource exploration and development. We are, therefore, more acutely aware of the difficulties of finding economic and adequate supplies, and of the increasingly great lead times required between discovery and production. As the difficulties of finding the less obvious mineral deposits have increased, so have our regulatory difficulties increased. We find ourselves beset by a growing mass of conflicting Federal, State, and local regulations and areas available for exploration are being withdrawn at an alarming rate.

Public Lands

The Mining Law of 1872 was enacted not only as an instrument for the regulation of exploration and production of resources from public lands, but it was also intended as an incentive measure to encourage the development of our natural resources. Regrettably, the states were given the right to promulgate rules and regulations for the location and development of public lands over and above the rules and regulations set out in the Mining Law. In recent years, some states have taken advantage of this right by establishing rules, regulations and taxes on public lands that seriously hamper and, in some instances, have the effect of prohibiting exploration. It is an interesting fact that the 14 states having over 90 percent of the total public lands are those states with the largest portion of undeveloped natural resources. Obviously, these states must have some voice in the future development of these mineral assets, but not to the detriment of the interests of the remaining 36 states.

Environmental Considerations

Early in the 1960's, the public became increasingly aware of our growing environmental problems. A major part of the publicity was given to those who greatly exaggerated the problem, and the public reverted from its excesses of waste and pollution to excessive zeal for preservation. In many instances, it is obvious that little thought has been given to the economic consequences of these preservationist measures. Since 1968, the percentage of public lands withdrawn from mineral exploration and development under the

Mining Law increased from 17 percent to 67 percent, and the percentage of public lands withdrawn from mineral exploration and development under the leasing laws increased from 24 percent to 73 percent. Most of these withdrawals, particularly the wilderness and primitive area withdrawals, were made after little more than cursory investigations of their mineral potential. In addition to these actual and de facto withdrawals, much of the remaining public lands are now subject to so many conflicting rules and regulations as to make exploration extremely difficult, if not impossible. Management of the public lands is the responsibility of two Departments of the Federal Government, and eight separate agencies within those Departments. It is evident that there has been little communication between these agencies relative to the promulgation of rules and regulations.

A Single Agency

We sincerely urge that the party consider a policy for the establishment of a single, apolitical agency, with departmental status, and staffed with the best people available with sole responsibility for all mineral and energy resource exploration and development of public lands and the outer continental shelf. We also urge that this department be charged with developing a uniform interpretation of the mining and leasing laws at all levels of government. Mineral and energy resources on public lands can be developed in a manner compatible with the environment, and a single set of rules and regulations must be established that will not only allow such development, but will encourage and promote such development. During our many years of overabundance, we seem to have forgotten the one basic economic principle that made this country strong and free. A stable, healthy economy is absolutely dependent on the production of new raw materials. Every dollar that is printed and put into circulation must represent an equal value of new material produced, whether it be farm produce, lumber, oil, gas, or the many minerals with which we are so richly endowed. This has not been the case in recent years.

Exploration Funding

It is the responsibility of the geological scientist to find new deposits of mineral and energy resources, and to develop methods of exploration and exploitation that minimize environmental degradation. No other profession is as aware of the increasing odds against making a successful discovery, or of the resulting increased costs of production. Every successful oil or gas discovery must pay for 17 unsuccessful attempts, and every successful mineral discovery must pay the exploration costs of five to seven marginal or unproductive prospects. It is interesting to note that, while the price of oil and gas are regulated, no one has even suggested that the prices of material and services required by the industry be regulated. As a consequence, since 1972, oil drilling and completion costs have increased four-fold, while the price of oil has only tripled.
It is important to fully realize that the vast sums required for exploration today cannot be supplied by small independent corporations involved in only one phase of the business. The large mineral and energy corporations must remain integrated so that a small profit in each step of producing, refining, and marketing adds up to the billions of dollars required for continued exploration. While costs increase, we find our industry best not only by continued price regulation and increased taxes, but with the new threat of forced divestiture. If each corporation is limited to only one phase of the process, its margin of profit for that operation will have to be increased many times to provide the funds necessary for future exploration. The resulting increases for all phases of an industry's services can only result in prohibitive costs for the consumer.

International Policies

While the geological scientist has not been educated in international politics and economics, so many hundreds of our professionals work in foreign countries that we naturally gain some experience and knowledge relative to the international situation. Our professionals returning from tours of duty in foreign countries seem to be more aware of the political instability of some foreign governments than are our public officials. We find our diplomats concentrating their efforts in highly unstable areas such as the Middle East, and apparently unconcerned with regard to maintaining friendly relations with the relatively stable countries in this hemisphere plus Nigeria and Indonesia. Most, if not all, of our import requirements of strategic mineral and energy resources would be guaranteed through a revised approach to these stable countries. We urge you that you consider a policy of integration of our national and international energy policies. We have urged the establishment of a single departmental agency to oversee our domestic mineral and energy resource development. We further urge that this department be allowed to contribute to the formulation of our international mineral and energy policies.

Nuclear Energy

An intelligent mineral and energy resource policy must recognize that nuclear power is an integral part of our future energy budget. Great progress is being made in the development of "fail-safe" nuclear power plants and in the safe storage of nuclear wastes. Public acceptance of these power plants will occur in the near future. At that time, we must have supplies of uranium available for use. It is prudent, therefore, that the Federal government restructure its domestic uranium purchasing program. Foreign governments have placed high priorities on the production of uranium for internal use, and this commodity will not be available for import at any price.

National Security

In conclusion, we cannot stress too strongly the importance of an integrated mineral and energy policy to our national security. The increasing chaos of laws, rules and regulations besetting the mineral and energy industries is forcing us into great dependency on foreign sources. As we have seen, these sources are subject not only to periodic interruption, but to absolute termination. At the onset of World War II, this nation was producing its known mineral and energy resources at a rate far below capacity, so it was relatively easy to bring ourselves to a war production status simply by producing at maximum capacity. Should another such crisis arise, we will not have the unused production capacity of the 1930's, and the normal lead time from discovery to production of most of our metallic minerals is 15 years. A crash program could not possibly reduce this lead time to under eight years--an eternity in an emergency. As scientists, we are confident that our energy and mineral problems can be solved, or at least alleviated, but not under the chaotic and uncoordinated myriad of Federal and State regulations facing the energy and mineral industries today. The Party must face up to this challenge and act immediately--or bear the responsibility for inaction in the eyes of the American voter.

SOUTH TEXAS GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY FIELD TRIP
October 30-31, 1976

The South Texas Geological Society fall field trip will be "Economic Geology, San Antonio and Austin, Texas, Area," excluding petroleum and uranium. Sites to be visited will include quarries of limestone, gypsum, granite, serpentine, vermiculite and lignite strip mining.

Dr. Donald E. McGannon, Jr., Chairman of the Geological Department, Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas, will be the leader of the fall field trip, October 30-31, 1976. For additional information, please contact Dr. McGannon.

Minutes
ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
May 22, 1976

A meeting of the Advisory Board of the Association of Professional Geological Scientists was held on May 22, 1976 in Meeting Room 9, Braniff Place Hotel, New Orleans, Louisiana, in accordance with notice given in writing by John A. Taylor, Chairman.

Chairman Taylor called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. The following Delegates or Alternates were present:

- Michael R. Rector - California
- Andrew G. Alpha - Colorado
- Wilson G. Harris - Illinois/Indiana
- Steven H. Harris - Dakotas
- J. W. Eggers - Louisiana
- Roger C. Rice - Montana
- John W. Showalter - New Mexico
- Ralph H. Espach, Jr. - Oklahoma
- Jack O. Colle - Texas
- Frank A. Jacobsen, Jr. - Virginia
- Larry D. Woodfork - West Virginia

Guests present were:

- Allen F. Agnew
- John M. Ewing
- President John D. Haun
- Ross L. Shihman
- J. Dan Skelton

Chairman Taylor gave a brief review of actions taken by this Advisory Board at their meeting in Tucson, Arizona.
Legislative Testimony

W. Harris noted that some members of his Section wanted to know the process being used to select persons to testify before government agencies and committees. President Haun explained that the lead time for testimony is often so short that the President must call upon a person familiar to him who is knowledgeable on the subject matter and who is available. He also noted that there is seldom time for a review of the testimony to be given. Since the person presenting testimony is a "professional," it is assumed that the testimony will be for the benefit of the majority of the profession. Rector suggested that all Sections be directed to appoint Legislative Committees, and that direct communication be established between them and the national Legislative Committee.

It was the consensus of the Board that all Sections appoint Legislative Committees to assist the APGS Legislative Committee in finding persons to give testimony and for the purpose of contacting individual Senators and Representatives from their respective states.

Colorado H.R. 1574

The Colorado Section suggested that all Sections advocate legislation similar to H.R. 1574, which defines geology and geological work and sets forth the qualifications required for persons preparing geological reports. Skelton noted that the Colorado definitions are too narrow considering the expanded scope of APGS.

It was the consensus that the information regarding H.R. 1574 be printed in the PSS with a recommendation for expanded definitions.

Severance Taxes

The Colorado Section advocates an APGS policy favoring Federal legislation to eliminate or limit severance taxes which States can impose. It was the consensus that APGS should not advocate legislation that abrogates state's rights, but should advise the Sections to oppose onerous tax laws within their respective states.

National Minerals Policy

The Colorado Section advocates the adoption of an APGS National Minerals Policy. It was noted that a statement on minerals policy had been presented to the Democratic Party Platform Committee on May 1, 1976 by Frederick L. Stead (see page 1, PSS). Eggers agreed to write an expanded version of the statement. It was agreed that both statements be published in the PSS.

Coal Leases

The Colorado Section advocates an APGS policy in favor of plans by the Department of the Interior to lease federal lands for coal production. It was the consensus that this matter concerns energy availability more than the professional welfare of geological scientists.

Increasing Membership

It was reported that 490 DPA of AAGP members had become members of APGS since January 1 and that regular applications have increased to over 20 submittals per month. Haun noted that he intends to write an additional letter to all DPA members not now members of APGS.

Jacobo requested suggestions for convincing USGS employees to make applications. There was considerable discussion, but no suggestions were made. W. Harris suggested that APGS discontinue all membership recruitment. A serious concentration of effort on present and future programs of tangible benefit to geological scientists will bring new members into the Association.

State Securities Laws

Chairman Taylor and Espach presented a resume of the recent activity regarding a new securities law in Oklahoma (see letters to Editor). It was noted that professional geological scientists were given an opportunity to contribute substantially in the writing of the new law. It was further noted that the convention of State Securities Commissioners had discussed the problem of unscrupulous promoters and that new, stringent laws could be expected in all states. The Oklahoma Section suggests that all Sections review their respective laws and arrange for input when new laws are advocated. The Section advocates a distribution of a questionnaire, prepared by Oklahoma geologists, to be circulated to all Sections for further distribution to oil and gas operators and independents. The results of the questionnaire will be used to advocate a Federal securities law that will not restrict legitimate oil and gas proposals.

Motion: Rector Second: Coile

The Advisory Board recommend to the Executive Committee that APGS continue to recognize the need for Sections to be aware of the securities requirements in their respective states, and that Sections furnish APGS with information regarding restrictive laws.

Motion carried.

Salary Survey

President Haun advised the Board that Past-President Spaulding had advocated a salary survey of geological scientists in 1975, and that Peat, Marwick and Mitchell has submitted a proposal for conducting such a survey at a cost of $8,000. Spaulding had approached AGI regarding sharing the costs of the survey, but AGI had not approved the proposal. Agnew noted that Thomas J. Joiner, Delegate from Alabama (absent), reported that AGI now has a proposal for a complete manpower survey. Shipman suggested that J. R. Jackson be contacted for participation because of his previous experience with salary surveys.

Motion: Eggers Second: Jacobeen

The Advisory Board recommend to the Executive Committee that APGS institute a salary survey with the Sections gathering the necessary data.

Motion carried.

Major Petroleum Corporation Divestiture

Agnew reported that the Legislative Committee has investigated the proposed "Divestiture Bill" and had concluded that the "Legislative Committee" does not have sufficient information to determine if S. 2387 will have an adverse effect on the profession, and recommends no action by APGS on S. 2387. There ensued considerable discussion with opinions being expressed both for and against the report of the Legislative Committee. Woodfork noted that the report had not said that there would be no adverse effect, but had said that the Committee does not have sufficient information.
Motion: Espach    Second: W. Harris

The Advisory Board inform the Executive Committee that they disagree with the Legislative Committee report relative to S. 2387, and that the Advisory Board will attempt to obtain information useful in the further consideration of S. 2387 by the Legislative Committee.

Motion carried.

Future Programs

Chairman Taylor noted that the Advisory Board is to review the matter of future Association programs and to have specific proposals at the next Advisory Board meeting.

Chairman Taylor adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m., May 22, 1976.
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Minutes
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
May 22, 1976

Pursuant to notice given by President Haun, a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Association of Professional Geological Scientists was held on May 22, 1976 in Meeting Room 9, Braniff Place Hotel, New Orleans, Louisiana.

President Haun called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. and requested a call of the roll of the Committee. Committee members present were:

John D. Haun, President
Allen F. Agnew, Vice-President
John W. Shomaker, Secretary-Treasurer
Ross L. Shipman, Editor
John A. Taylor, President-Elect
Jack O. Colle, Advisory Board Representative
John W. Eggers, Advisory Board Representative
Wilson G. Harris, Jr., Advisory Board Representative
Michael R. Rector, Advisory Board Representative
J. Dan Skilton, AGI Representative
William A. Oliver, Jr., AGI Representative
Arthur F. Brunton, Executive Director

President Haun declared a quorum of the Committee to be present and the meeting open for official business of the Association.

Motion: Shipman    Second: Shomaker

The minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of January 11, 1976 be approved as circulated.

Motion carried.

Application for membership was given special consideration and approved.

Annual Meeting

President Haun reviewed the Hallinger report on annual meetings (see report in this PGS). No action was taken to change the present policy of holding the annual meeting in conjunction with the GSA convention.

Reciprocity Requirements

Skilton reviewed the opinions expressed in his letter of April 26, 1976 regarding a definition of the "formal application" required of AAPG, SEGS and ASEG members under the reciprocity section of the Bylaws.

Motion: Shipman    Second: Taylor

"Formal application" as used in Article II, Section 30 of the Bylaws is hereby defined as the "Application for Membership in the APOS," without the requirement for "five (5) professional sponsors." Sponsorship shall be considered to be by the participating society, and shall be sufficient for membership in APOS.

Motion carried.

Brunton was instructed to discontinue circulation of "reciprocity" applications to the three officers.

SIPES Letter

President Haun had received a letter from SIPES President Gatlin requesting that APOS discontinue making statements that it speaks for all geological scientists. The request was discussed, but no action was taken.

Colorado Section Request for Financial Support

President Haun reported that the Colorado Section had requested that APOS share the cost of a Section membership drive. It was noted that an approval of the Colorado Section request would result in similar requests from all Sections.

Motion: Taylor    Second: Colle

The Executive Committee deny the request for funds made by the Colorado Section.

Motion carried.

CSSP

Agnew reported on the recent meeting of the Committee on Scientific Society Presidents. Skilton noted that he is advocating AGI membership on CSSP.

Motion: Skilton    Second: Taylor

The Executive Committee approve a "flat fee" payment of dues to CSSP in the amount of $150.

Motion carried.

Membership Cards

Brunton presented a proposal for the preparation and distribution of permanent, plastic membership cards in lieu of the annual cardboard card.

Motion: Shipman    Second: Harris

The Executive Committee approve the policy of discontinuing APOS membership cards.

Motion carried.
Specialty Listings

Brunton presented a list of proposed specialties recommended by an ad hoc Committee on Specialty Listings, chaired by Andrew G. Alpha. It was noted that the committee had recommended the list be used in a separate section of the membership directory and that each member be allowed two principal headings in the listings.

Motion: Shomaker  Second: Skelton
The Executive Committee approve the recommendations of the ad hoc Committee on Specialty Listings, but that the term "specialty" be changed to "field of major practice."
Motion carried.

Associates of Northeast Section

The Northeast Section requested consideration of changing the requirement that Associates be members of an AGI member society, and that present Associates of the Northeast Section be accepted as Associates of APGS without further application of examination.

Motion: Shomaker  Second: Colle
The Executive Committee approve a policy of accepting Section Associates as Associates in APGS without further application or examination, but retain the requirement that the Associate affiliate with an AGI society.
Motion carried.

Securities Laws

Taylor reported that the Advisory Board has recommended that "APGS continue to recognize the need for Sections to be aware of the securities requirements in their respective states, and that Sections furnish APGS with information regarding restrictive laws." Brunton was instructed to inform Sections of the recommendation of the Advisory Board and the concurrence of the Executive Committee. (See letters to Editor.)

Legislative Activity

The April monthly report of the APGS Legislative Counsel was read. Skelton suggested that a copy of Hamersley's reports be sent to the AGI Editor and to all Section legislative coordinators. President Haun noted that the Advisory Board is to provide the Legislative Committee with additional information regarding the effects of the "Divestiture Bill" on the profession.

National Medal of Science

President Haun reported that he had suggested the nomination of Hollis D. Hedberg for the National Medal of Science.

Motion: Shipman  Second: Colle
The Executive Committee approve endorsement of Hollis D. Hedberg as the National Medal of Science nominee by APGS.
Motion carried.

Salary Survey

Taylor reported that the Advisory Board has recommended the approval of a salary survey to be conducted by the Sections.

Motion: Colle  Second: Rector
The Executive Committee ask the Sections to conduct a Salary Survey.
Motion carried.

Cooperative Evaluations

Rector read the report of the Cooperative Evaluation Committee. At present, the Committee is preparing comments on the preliminary report on the evaluation of Wright State University and has received an inquiry from Portland State University.

Environmental Geology

Rector read the report of the Committee on Geology in the Environment. The Committee has requested that the name be changed to Environmental Geology Committee and it was the consensus that the change be approved. The Environmental Geology Committee reported that they are attempting to devise a technique to provide better communication between the professional and the environmental decision-makers. The Chairman, M.R. McComas, is preparing a short-course for an adult education class in geology for Realtors.

Public Affairs

Eggers read the report of the Public Affairs Committee in which they recommended cosponsorship of a fossil fuel symposium to be sponsored by Boston College. The Public Affairs Committee further recommended the nomination of APGS members to take part in the AISE workshop to be held June 14-16 in Boston. The Public Affairs Committee is discussing the drafting of an instruction booklet concerning public affairs.

Motion: Oliver  Second: Rector
The Executive Committee approve cosponsorship of the Fossil Fuel Symposium.
Motion carried.

President Haun was instructed to inform Elliot Berman, Boston College, of the decision to cosponsor.

It was also suggested that APGS cosponsor a GSA Penrose Conference.

Guides and Practices

Colle read the report of the Professional Guides Committee. James R. Dunn reported that the Professional Guides Committee is working on six new guides and practices.

Motion: Eggers  Second: Harris
The meeting be adjourned.
Motion carried.

President Haun adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m. May 22, 1976.
LETTER TO THE EDITOR

The Writing of a State Securities Law

Geologists are usually not familiar with securities so that in the fall of 1975, when APGS members of the Oklahoma Section were afforded the chance to be involved in writing a securities law, it came as an education for all. Oklahoma is one of the few states, if not the only state, which has excluded the oil and gas lease as a security. All other states, or almost all, consider it a security, and therefore any trading therein should be registered as a security with the State Securities Commission. People who deal in oil and gas leases (landmen, geologists, promoters, operators, etc.) are in violation of the law if they are not registered as securities dealers and don't register their securities, that is, their leases or their projects that offer leases. Because of the vacancy of this item in the Oklahoma law, the State of Oklahoma recently became a haven from which unscrupulous operators could sell such leases or interests therein to unsuspecting investors throughout the United States and did not fall under the purview of the State Securities Commission and therefore control. During the summer of 1975 this is exactly what happened.

Small companies consisting almost entirely of large telephone sales staffs ("boiler room operators") came to Oklahoma, installed telephone connections, with office space, and began to call from Oklahoma City to all over the United States, particularly to the northeast section of the country, seeking investors to purchase interests in oil and gas leases and in drilling wells. Because of the peculiarity in the Oklahoma law, these people didn't have to register their business with the State Securities Commission and, therefore, they went undetected until the Securities Commissions from other states began to call the Oklahoma Commission and inquire why these people were tolerated. They are commonly called "Schedule D Operators" because, surprisingly enough, they take advantage of a peculiarity of the Federal Securities Law that permits them to operate and do so legally insofar as that law is concerned.

Their mode of operation is to sell something that is an illusion to petroleum people that have no way to determine the value of what they are purchasing. The volume of such sales ran into tens of millions of dollars from just a few weeks in Oklahoma. Aside from the fraudulent or grossly overpriced sales, the legitimate industry (and the petroleum geologist with it) receives a black eye. Furthermore, other states have responded by initiating more punitive securities registration legislation which makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for the legitimate oil and gas industry that operates with investment capital to operate under.

Fortunately the Oklahoma State Securities Commission realized they must develop amendments to their Securities Act that would put the unscrupulous operators out of business and yet not damage the legitimate oil and gas industry. So the Commission began meetings with a small committee of people who represented various trade and professional organizations within the oil and gas industry in Oklahoma. These meetings went on for about four months and during that time the language for the amendments to the Oklahoma Securities Act was hammered out between the Securities Commission and those representatives. The language was agreed to by all concerned early in December and by the end of December the bill was prepared for the Oklahoma Legislature. That bill, Senate Bill 608, has passed the Oklahoma Legislature and will be signed by the Governor and will amend the Oklahoma Securities Act in the following fashion:

(1) It will set out that oil and gas leases (mineral leases generally) will henceforth be considered Securities.

(2) Following that declaration, however, are a number of exemptions and definitions which exclude from the requirement to register as securities those oil and gas leases that are traded by and in within the normal day-to-day business practices among and between legitimate oil and gas industry practitioners.

(3) Discrimination is made by saying in effect that...deals or interests that are sold or solicited, and sales that are solicited, to an unknown investor or through publication in newspapers and magazines, telephone calls and radio, general broadside indiscriminate seeking for investors, and constitutes an approach which is not normally used by the legitimate industry, must be registered by the State Securities Commission and therefore controlled. On the other hand, interests in oil and gas leases and in operating agreements in which the buyer and seller know each other or have good reason to believe that they are competent to evaluate the deal and to pay their shares, intramural dealings within the oil industry from one party to another, are specifically exempted from provisions of the Act. These exclusions have the effect of removing from the purview of the Securities Commission, the normal day-to-day business transactions of the legitimate oil and gas industry in the states.

(4) In short and specifically, the Oklahoma Securities Commission has adopted a "private offering" exemption for the seller of fractional interests in oil and gas leases as follows:

(a) Sells to less than 32 persons in a deal
(b) Does not publically advertise or solicit
(c) Pays no commissions or remunerations for making the offer or sale, other than a referral fee from a participating oil and gas industry member
(d) Require that the investor be economically capable of assuming the risk and posses investment acumen in this area
(e) Purchaser is purchasing for investment intent

It was necessary to make these exceptions to keep the legitimate industry from having to file registration certificates with every deal they make. The accounting and legal costs in making such filings with the State Securities Commission would be so great that many people who deal in these items would simply be forced out of business, and the Securities Commissioner saw this, and it became very plain to him that the industry has for many years done business with each other and with their known investors without needing the safeguards now being written to protect the public. The language of the Oklahoma Securities Act is broad enough to include all mineral interests, not specifically oil and gas. This was included so as to allow similar freedom for dealings among legitimate members of industry and with a sophisticated and financially able investor in such minerals as coal, salt, gypsum, copper and others.

It is largely through this extension to include all other valuable minerals that the Oklahoma APGS Section feels that the impact of this kind of securities legislation will be felt by geologists and operators in other states. From our understanding of the Securities Law in other states, and
June 10, 1976

Dr. John D. Haun
President
Association of Professional
Geological Scientists
Colorado School of Mines
Golden, Colorado 80401

Dear Dr. Haun:

As Foreign Secretary of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America I am privileged to invite to the attention of the officers and members of the Association of Professional Geological Scientists the enclosed resolution taken by the members of the NAS gathered in annual meeting on April 26, 1976. It is our hope that you will make this resolution known to your members and accept our invitation to indicate similar views.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

George S. Hammond
Foreign Secretary
AN AFFIRMATION OF FREEDOM OF INQUIRY AND EXPRESSION

I hereby affirm my dedication to the following principles:

...That the search for knowledge and understanding of the physical universe and of the living things that inhabit it should be conducted under conditions of intellectual freedom, without religious, political or ideological restriction.

...That all discoveries and ideas should be disseminated and may be challenged without such restriction.

...That freedom of inquiry and dissemination of ideas require that those so engaged be free to search where their inquiry leads, free to travel and free to publish their findings without political censorship and without fear of retribution in consequence of unpopularity of their conclusions. Those who challenge existing theory must be protected from retaliatory reactions.

...That freedom of inquiry and expression is fostered by personal freedom of those who inquire and challenge, seek and discover.

...That the preservation and extension of personal freedom are dependent on all of us, individually and collectively, supporting and working for application of the principles enunciated in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and upholding a universal belief in the worth and dignity of each human being.

Date ___________________________  Signed ___________________________

☐ I would prefer, for personal reasons, that my name not be made public as a signer of this document.

Signed statements should be directed to the Commission on International Relations, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418.
REPORT ON ANNUAL MEETING SURVEY

Donald E. Hallinger

Of the 2,321 members polled by questionnaire, only 634 responded. We must assume therefore that this group of members, representing only 27% of our total membership, are those most interested in annual meetings. The questionnaire itself was an attempt to provide the Executive Committee with the attitude of our members toward possible joint meetings with other societies, which societies would be preferable, and when during such a meeting it would be best to hold our own meeting.

Following is a sample of the questionnaire and the numerical and percentile responses to each question.

(1) Have you ever attended an Annual Meeting of AAPG?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) How often?

- 36 every year [14.9%]
- 51 every 2-3 years [21.3%]
- 153 less often [63.8%]

(3) At which national conventions of scientific societies does your employer support attendance?

- AAPG
- SSA
- SEG
- AES
- SEG
- SME
- Other

(4) How often are you able to attend meetings?

- 224 every year [43.3%]
- 165 every 2-3 years [35.7%]
- 109 less often [21%]

(5) Would you be able to extend your attendance at such a meeting in order to attend an AAPG meeting?

- 475 yes [69.1%]
- 104 before a meeting
- 31 after a meeting
- 317 either
- 182 both
- 58 no [10.9%]

Obviously, some comments are in order.

QUESTION NO. 1 The responses to this question should come as no shock to our readers as Art Spaulding pointed out, in a much more descriptive manner. Comparing the attendance figures at past annual meetings (70-75 each year) with the responses to this question leads me to believe that a large number of the members attending our Annual Meetings did not respond to this questionnaire.
Several members (five to be specific) asked why we should hold an Annual Meeting in the first place. Besides the obvious point that our Constitution and Bylaws require such a meeting, it is important to have a meeting at which time the membership has an opportunity to review and ratify the actions of the Executive Committee during the prior year. Annual Meetings also proved an opportunity for discourse among members from various parts of the country concerning professional problems in their respective areas. Such cross-fertilization of possible problem solutions as well as thought-provoking and instructive presentations by speakers should encourage a greater attendance.

QUESTION NOS. 2 and 3. The response to question 2 reflects that the possibility exists of attracting more members to attend APGS Annual Meetings and increases if we hold such meetings jointly with the annual conventions of some scientific societies. Many of those indicating no "company" support were independents and consultants who, for the most part, further indicated they did not have the time to attend such meetings and that such meetings gave no immediate financial justification.

There was no total number of responses to question 3 recorded because of the overlap of members belonging to several of the indicated societies. Comparing these responses with the breakdown of "mode of employment" shown on page six of the 1975 Membership Directory indicates a reasonable fit. According to employment, 56% of our members are involved in petroleum exploration and development, 12% in engineering and 23% in other minerals. Further, government and academia employ 25%.

It would appear that by holding joint meetings with either AAPG or GSA, we would be accommodating most of our members.

QUESTION NO. 4. Almost 50% of the 224 respondents attending these meetings "every year" belonged to both AAPG and GSA, while a total of 60% of these same 224 respondents belonged to either or both AAPG and GSA.

QUESTION NO. 5. The biggest surprise to me was that over 59% of the respondents to this question indicated a willingness to attend a joint meeting with the APGS portion either before or after the convention, and only 11% indicated an unwillingness to extend their attendance for such a joint meeting, either before or after.

SUMMARY. The majority of the respondents implied a willingness to have APGS hold joint Annual Meetings with AAPG or GSA. Based on the responses received, it would appear likely that we could increase the attendance of members at our Annual Meetings if we did hold joint meetings.

Some selected comments by members follow:

No Joint Meeting

Do not believe we should hitch our wagon to one of these horses. If we cannot survive on our own, we don't need APGS. AAPG and GSA are my two favorite meetings for attendance. But GSA has in recent years become so much of a ten-ring circus (including MSA and NAGT and usually SEG) that it is almost too much of a nuisance. And I understand that for next year, at least, GSA is planning on a four-day rather than the usual three-day program of technical sessions. To add another day or day and a half of meetings, even though it involves a different society and a different kind of program is, I think, to much to expect of even the hardest convention goer.

Since a segment of APGS is all that would be interesting in any of the specialty meetings, tying APGS to that meeting would weight attendance heavily to that group. Most AAPG national meeting attendees don't even know AEG exists and vice-versa. The real strength of APGS is drawing on all segments.

Time of the Year

For some reason, all major conventions are in the fall--the busiest time for an exploration geologist. Field reports have to be written, new plans and budgets are formulated, which is obviously more important than a convention. Early spring would be a much better time. It's not the money, it's the time.

Suggestions for Better Meetings

The agenda must be germane to the solution of problems or education within a problem area interfacing jobs to be done by professional geologists. Follow-up on the initial announcement must be skillful and timely.

Recommend APGS Annual Meeting include workshops and/or papers related to (1) expert testimony, (2) liability insurance, (3) contract writing, and (4) discussions of public service areas in which geologists should become more involved, i.e., planning boards, etc.

Reasons for Lack of Attendance

It is difficult to take the time as well as cost. Since APGS is a "side organization" to geological work. APGS deals with important problems, but attendance at APGS is partly dependent on employer support but generally the lack of real issues is the main reason for low attendance.

Problems with APGS

My company still views APGS as a "dog in the manger," a possible precursor to some sort of geology "unification" and is, accordingly, not enthusiastic about supporting us in any way. As a matter of fact, one of our pioneer members, formerly our company's chief geologist, dropped his membership after some questionnaires hinted at such a route.

It is absolutely imperative that APGS organize some kind of official recognition with employers if they expect to increase attendance at meetings.

A complaint that I have heard frequently of late is that APGS is not doing enough for the individual geologist. It is getting too academic. How many geologists who are APGS members are making an income below the poverty level at geology and why? This investigation should possibly be made at the State level personally, not by mail.

And, Some Pats On the Back

Do not be unduly concerned by the small attendance at Annual Meetings of APGS. The lack of attendance is no reflection of the member's opinion of the organization, as evidenced by the increasing membership. APGS is still the only organization concerned about the welfare of the professional geologist, and the only one actively engaged in legislative matters. This is of utmost importance in today's society with our critical energy problems. If it is so essential that more people attend the national meeting, then I suggest that they always be held in an area convenient to the largest segments of the membership (California, Colorado or Texas). Another way to increase membership and hence attendance at Annual Meetings is to establish an associate membership, as has been suggested
many times before, to attract younger members of the profession and also to help eliminate the "old man" image of the organization. ASCE has proven that associate memberships have been very beneficial in increasing membership and maintaining a healthy organization.

I suggest affiliation with GSA. Heretofore, AGPS "management" has tended to discourage attendance more than officers, advisory board members, etc. I think Spaulding's letter is the first real appeal to attendance at an Annual Meeting that has been issued. His letter has changed my mind and I will make every effort to be there. AGPS Annual Meetings are the most stimulating talks I ever attend.

Postscript

I am sure that other members feel just as strongly as some of the comments above. Maybe they will respond to the next questionnaire. The Executive Committee thanks those members who took the time to respond to this questionnaire. Several of the suggestions made are to be tried--associate membership--joint meeting with GSA. See you next fall.

PROFESSIONAL PARAGRAPHS

WILLIAM L. FISHER, CPGS, was recently nominated by President Ford and confirmed by the U.S. Senate as the Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of Economic Geology, State Geologist, and Professor of Geological Sciences at the University of Texas at Austin where he is Director of the Bureau of Economic Geology. He was named Wyoming's "Minerals Industry Man of the Year" by the Casper Area Chamber of Commerce on April 2. DR. MILLER received the award "in recognition of outstanding achievement in the mineral industry and distinguished and meritorious service to the state and community."

He was nominated for the award by the Wyoming Geological Association. The Association noted that Miller helped develop the state's resources while in private industry and since becoming State Geologist and Survey Director, he has "played a vital role in advocating reasonable and progressive development" and that since becoming Survey Director in 1969, he built the organization into a viable entity "serving industry and all citizens of the state."

RUSSELL G. WAYLAND, CPGS, has been named Research Physical Scientist, a new position post established within the USGS. DR. WAYLAND, a career scientist-engineer with the USGS since 1939, has been Chief of the Survey's Conservation Division since 1967. In his new assignment, WAYLAND will serve as a special advisor to the USGS Director and to officials of the Interior Department in all major technical and policy matters related to the evaluation, development and management of energy and mineral resources on Federal lands.

CALIFORNIA

AGPS presented a symposium on "Politics-Geology, the Increasing Role of Government in Geology," in San Francisco on April 21, just preceding the annual convention of the Pacific Section of the AAPG-SEPM-SEG. The symposium was organized by Joseph Fusso, Thomas Wright and Robert Paschal. Paschal served as moderator of the five-hour series of talks and question and answer periods. Sixty-four people attended the meeting, and comments made afterward indicated that it was well-received.

Loyd H. Forrest, Jr., Executive Director of the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, launched the program as luncheon speaker. Mr. Forrest recited the complex and powerful role that the year-old commission has in the field of projections of energy supply and demand in California, and in decisions made on power-plant siting. A lively series of questions followed Mr. Forrest's talk, challenging certain actions of the commission. It was evident that the commission has not sought geological advice in areas where it is needed, and an opportunity was afforded to inform the Executive Director of this shortcoming.

Robert A. Matthews, professor of geology at the University of California at Davis, gave an illustrated talk on environmental problems associated with energy development
In the Rocky Mountains. Mr. Matthews has taught courses on Nonrenewable Natural Resources and on Environmental Geology and Land-Use Planning, and also presented a perspective on the problems of developing oil and gas, oil shale, coal, and uranium that industry geologists seldom have the opportunity to contemplate.

Mr. Thomas E. Gay, Jr., Acting State Geologist, told the audience about the many political issues that are involved in administering the Division of Mines and Geology (which, like the Division of Oil and Gas, is in the Conservation Department of the State Resources Agency). Most of the DMS's programs stem from statutes, so its geologists and geophysicists are commonly working in response to legislative intent, and that is about as political as you can get. These programs include the strong-motion instrument project for monitoring active faults, the creation of a map of active fault zones required by the Aquatics-Priro Special Studies Zones Act, and the implementation of 1975's Surface Mining and Reclamation Act. Mr. Gay noted that legislation is so critical to the Division's program that a position of legislative officer on the staff is necessary.

Mr. Harold W. Bertholf, State Supervisor of Oil and Gas, spoke on the current activities of the Division of Oil and Gas. In recent years the DOG has been actively engaged in eliminating unnecessary oil sumps and in promoting public safety and environmental protection relative to their use. A newly formed program is aimed at the abandonment of wells which are not apt to be commercially productive again. The size of this task is indicated by the fact that 20,000 wells now stand idle in California. Also, the DOG now proposes to review and strengthen regulations dealing with the drilling and producing of geothermal wells. It is evident that all of these activities of the DOG have notable environmental impacts, and these days "environmental" is almost synonymous with "political."

Mr. John E. Wolfe, Executive Secretary of the State Board of Registration for Geologists and Geophysicists, concluded the program. Mr. Wolfe noted that there are now about 3,500 registered geologists and geophysicists in the state. As an aside, it is worth remarking that Mr. Wolfe has done an outstanding job at putting the substantial job of registration smoothly into effect. He himself gave high credit to the appointed board, including its two public members, for the policies that it has instituted and for the backing that it has given him in an often difficult job. The audience was interested to hear that several of the board positions will soon terminate, and contemplated the idea of professional action in recommending new prospective members to the Governor.

Mr. Wolfe warned the audience of consistent efforts on the part of politicians to depersonalize the Board of Registration. Past efforts have been made, and undoubtedly similar efforts will also be made in the future to displace geologist Board members with more public members (there are now two), and to take from the Board the power to name the Executive Secretary. The latter action would mean the substitution of a political appointee with no knowledge of, or interest in, the profession. It was evident that professional societies must always stand ready to combat this sort of politicization, which is not only professionally alarming but quite certainly opposed to the public interest. Geologists are prepared at any time to aid and advise lawmakers and other elected officials, but not at the price of losing their professional autonomy.

NEW MEXICO

Registration—Do we want it or not?

Although National AIPG did not, and APG does not, have a stand for or against registration of geologists, the subject is one of concern to us as members of the profession. There are many Certified Professional Geological Scientists in New Mexico who want a registration law, but APG (at this point) represents no more than about 10 percent of all the State's geological scientists and thus could not, even if it chose to, cause such a law to be passed without full support from all of them.

As of September 15, 1975, Jack Simon's committee on registration reported that six states (including neighbors Arizona and Colorado) had laws in effect either registering or certifying geological scientists or regulating the practice of geology. In 20 other states, a bill was being prepared or had been introduced. In spite of Governor Apodaca's distaste for regulatory boards and commissions, it seems that a trend is developing over the country which probably will eventually result in a registration law in New Mexico. If it is true that New Mexicans' geographic mobility as geological scientists will be reduced or that the areas within the profession open to them will be circumscribed by the laws registering other professionals, then a genuine campaign toward registration should be mounted again.

Now that the "off-year" legislative session has ended, the decks are clear for a move to introduce legislation and to build sound support for it in the 1977 term. The purpose of this article is to remind those who favor the idea that the time to start moving is now. The job requires that one, or a few, dedicated proponents step forward and take on the responsibility for communicating with each and every geological scientist—that term, of course, covers geologists and geophysicists in all parts of the field. It is also essential that communication be opened and kept open with the registered engineers so that as much support as possible can come from that quarter.
Trade unions?

It occurs to me that this might be a proper time and place to reiterate some of the profound differences between a professional society and a labor union (which AIGA had been accused of being).

(1) To the extent that a geological scientist, by virtue of his profession, knows something about an issue before our political leaders, he owes it to his fellow men to speak. It's helpful if there is a communication channel already established and open for the geologist to put his "input" into—that's the professional society. My image of a union doesn't involve a mechanism for communication between an individual with novel ideas and political leadership—in fact my image of a union is almost the reverse.

(2) A geological scientist, in common with everyone else, has an economic relationship with the rest of society—generally a relationship with an employer. His professional society will help with statistical "manpower surveys" so he can know where he stands and may offer employment guidelines so that both he and his employer can have a nationwide yardstick to measure employment standards against, but the geological scientist alone is responsible for his economic relationship. He does his own bargaining, his own negotiating. His professional society neither forces his employer to pay more than the geological scientist is worth, nor circumvents the geological scientist's upward mobility.

(3) It's central to the professional society relationship that the society's leadership does not "speak for" the membership in the sense of determining what's best for the common good and using the sheer weight of numbers to force that to happen. Rather, the society furnishes a platform from which an individual's ideas can be expounded.

John Shomaker
President

WEST VIRGINIA

Status of the Registration Bill

As of the date of this newsletter (May 1976), the West Virginia Professional Geologists' Registration Bill (H.B. 1719) remains firmly lodged in the House Judiciary Committee. The legislature voted to extend the session and reconvene after the May 11 primary; so depending on how the extended session develops, it may still be possible to get some action on the bill this year. However, if the attendance at our last meeting at the Army and Navy Club in Charleston is an indication of the general level of interest of our membership in supporting the bill, it will probably never get out of committee this year or any other year!

Assuming there is more actual interest in actively supporting the bill than has been evident so far, Bill Bennett has been appointed chairman of an ad hoc committee whose purpose is to "lobby" on behalf of H.B. 1719 and work towards its passage at the earliest possible data. Bill's committee is to consist of our entire membership. What can do you?

(1) Contact your local legislators and senators personally and make them aware of your support of H.B. 1719 and your interest in their affirmative action concerning it.

(2) Write to the Honorable Albert J. Sommerville, Jr., Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, inform him of your support of the bill and urge him to act promptly to bring the bill out of committee. Send copies of your letters to the leadership of both the House and Senate and a blind copy to Bill Bennett.

(3) Contact Bill (office phone: 345-0216; home phone: 344-1983) if you are going to be in Charleston while the Legislature is in session and if you are willing to go down to the Capitol and talk to legislators concerning the bill. Bill has now developed some experience in that activity from which you can profit and he will be coordinating all of our efforts in the Legislature.

Gentlemen, we've got the ball now and all we have to do is run with it.

This is your opportunity to participate in the legislative process.

PENNSYLVANIA

The Executive Committee's efforts during the first quarter of 1976 were concentrated toward obtaining a sponsor for the proposed "geology bill" and its introduction into the House of Representatives.

There have been obstacles but these obstacles clearly demonstrate the need for geologic registration and should be viewed by all geologists as a challenge. You, as individual geologists, can participate by promoting geology and geologists as a positive factor in Pennsylvania. The format for promotion can be by writing to your legislators, participating in civic groups and informing the public of the critical role geologists and geology play in their lives. You can also inform other geologists of your opinions by writing to our Editor, Bill Adams, for inclusion in the newsletter under the heading "Open Forum."

The Executive Committee's commitment is to you, but without your support and efforts the proposed "geology bill" will not move. The Executive Committee has done an excellent job of getting the "bill" to the "bill"—it's your job to get it moving.

Don Senovitch
President
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STATEMENT OF JAMES W. SKEHAN S. J.

TO THE

U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SUBCOMMITTEE ON

SCIENCE RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

July 14, 1976

Members of the Committee, I am Professor James W. Skehan S.J., Professor, Department of Geology and Geophysics, Boston College, and Director of Boston College's Weston Observatory, Weston, Massachusetts. My appearance is on behalf of the Association of Professional Geological Scientists, a chartered organization of 3,000 professional geological scientists, headquartered in Golden, Colorado. It is the policy of the Association to express its views and draw from its expertise to aid the public in matters that face our nation and involve geology. I am a member of the Association and enclose my professional biography as part of this statement.

I should like to address myself to three points regarding the Earthquake Hazard Reduction Act. Any legislation on this matter should contain three points in order to
provide necessary protection against the effects of earthquakes for the citizens of America.

(1) There is a need for a dense network of seismic stations in the eastern United States, as well as the more obvious need in the western United States. An examination of proposed nuclear power plant sites would show that there is a high density of these plants in the eastern United States. It is important for the safety and well-being of the population in these areas to have the best understanding possible of the seismic risk factors. Except for several isolated major earthquakes, the eastern United States area is characterized by earthquakes of smaller magnitude than the western United States.

The record of earthquakes in China over a long time span indicates that the more important, as well as less important, earthquakes occur repetitively. This is probably true to a greater or lesser extent for all other parts of the world, including North America. Because the length of the record of observation is far more restricted in North America, we should have a far greater number of stations as part of a regional network joined in a coordinated effort in order to monitor the pattern of distribution and magnitude of earthquakes in the eastern states.

(2) A greater density of stations is necessary to monitor the nation effectively, and this is particularly true in the eastern United States for reasons mentioned above. With the present wide spacing of seismic stations, it is not yet possible to assign earthquakes to specific faults or other geological structures with any degree of certainty, except in certain isolated instances. Thus, more stations are required. Additionally, it is highly desirable for funds to be allocated for rapid mobilization of teams to study after-shocks of local earthquakes. There is portable seismic equipment available; however, for the most part, there are no funds for this particular critical activity.

(3) Funds should be allocated for geological mapping of geological structures, and especially for seismic-tectonic analysis for the purpose of correlating seismic activity with the specific structural features.

This would be most important for areas that are planned for nuclear power plants.

Thank you for the opportunity that you have given the Association of Professional Geological Scientists to present their views.
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PROFESSIONAL PARAGRAPH

RUDOLPH K. HOGBERG, CPES, has joined the geological consulting firm of Ernest K. Lehmann & Associates, Inc. of Minneapolis. For the past 12 years Hoberg has been a geologist for the Minnesota Geological Survey, University of Minnesota, carrying out projects on industrial minerals and environmental geology. Prior to his tenure at the Survey, he was employed by the Northern Pacific Railway Company as a geologist and was responsible for geologic mapping projects, negotiation and administration of contracts and promotion of mineral commodity freight traffic.
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