LEST WE FORGET

About 20 years ago when the stage was being set for the formation of AIPG, there were some ominous currents that were undercutting the image of geologists and the whole profession of geology. It was in the wake of several mass firings of geologists that enrollment in some of our well-established geology departments girded wildly. There were probably more unemployed geologists than at any other time in the history of the country. Many half-educated promoters were pushing themselves on the investing public as geologists.

And if this was not bad enough, the very managers who were so boldly firing fairly new geologists then turned to an even bolder hiring spree of new young talent who were willing to work eighteen hours each day to gloat about a salary that might sound high to young graduates working banking hours. The havoc that this operation played with geology departments was well documented, but the hardships imposed on the lives and families of individual geologists will never be fully known. A much more detailed and well documented story could be told of the situation before AIPG was formed, but the above will suffice for now. The purpose in looking back is obviously to determine "whence came ye" and to be sure that we learn well from the past what our priorities should be.

Now after that retrospective introduction, the real reason for this article is "WHAT SHOULD OUR PRIORITIES BE?" We cannot do everything that every geologist in this group wants done. So within our limitations we must decide what should we do first, second, and when-we-can.

In my opinion, CERTIFICATION and all that it entails is our primary function. Without this function we would have little purpose and the rest could be handled by other organizations simply by changing their tax status. I also believe that the end result should be a better service to the public or to mankind. I say this in spite of the several comments on the recent questionnaire like: "What's all this "about mankind" and "Who gives a ______ about the public?" If we are to only promote geology and geologists, it will soon be apparent to those we seek to impress. Anyone who knows anything about public relations will tell you that the self-serving approach will not work. We must look at the concept that a well-trained, experienced and self-disciplined group of professional geologists is good for the public and mankind, if you will. When this is accomplished, the image will follow. The fact that a well-trained, experienced and self-disciplined group of professional geologists is good for geology and geologists is just the icing on the cake.

Almost half of the active AIPG committees are doing work and studying programs that supplement the operation of certification. The man hours that individual members have expended on these committees are enormous. The donation of this time is the reason that we are the most viable and visible group of professional geologists in the country today in spite of our small monetary budget.

The next two most important priorities are (1) SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC and (2) SERVICE TO GEOLOGY AND GEOLOGISTS. Here again, the certification process is a lot of the service performed for the public and for geologists. There are, however, other distinct areas that command our attention.

In the area of PUBLIC SERVICE, we owe it to ourselves to have proper geological input into the lawmaking processes that effect the public, geology, and geologists. Fortunately, this is an area in which we are doing a fine job. I am referring to our Legislative and Regulatory Committee, comprised mostly of members from the East Coast and Washington area with a few from other corners of the country who are able to travel to Washington when the time arrives. The changes we have made in specific acts and particularly in various rules and regulations would have been literally undone if we had not been there. Per dollar spent we have accomplished more and received better recognition than any geological organization three times our size. I am proud to be associated with each and every member of our Legislative and Regulatory Committee.

Other committees are also doing a fine job with Environmental Geology, Public Affairs, Registration, Employment Standards, Professional Guides and others. I would not argue with anyone that we are doing all we should or to some extent all we could. However, as we grow we will accomplish more and more and give our members more and more per dollar spent than any other geological group. The fact that part of our aim is to serve the public makes it feasible that in return the public will support us. As I have said several times before, "You can talk all you want to high governmental officials but if their constituents are not aware of what geologists are and what geology is we don't make much of an impression."

This leads to a priority that is most important to us, PUBLIC RELATIONS. Geologists and scientists in general are notoriously inept at conveying their ideas to the lay public. The Executive Committee has, for the last two years, studied at least four proposals ranging from large companies to free lance individuals. In my opinion, we are going to have to come to grips with some sort of public relations program in order to get our views accepted and respected by the public.

Edward E. Rue, President
BUSINESS AFFAIRS OF THE INSTITUTE

APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

USBURN, Ronald G.; Camillus, NY
BAUGH, Ronald A.; Casper, WY
BUSH, Dan E.; New Concord, OH
DOWNING, Kenneth G.; Englewood, CO
DREHER, Alan L.; Aurora, CO
EDWARDS, Jimmy Reid; Lakeland, FL
EVANS, Sam L.; Houston, TX
GOEBEL, Joseph E.; Minneapolis, MN
GULDENZOPF, E. Charles; Houston, TX
HADDAD, Richard Y.; Washington, PA
HART, Allen L.; Bellevue, WA
KEFFLER, Joseph W.; Midland, TX
KOSTER, Wallace C.; Chambersburg, PA
KROPSCOT, Robert E.; Lafayette, CA
PAGE, Norman J.; Houston, TX
SIMPSON, Carl Leon; Conneaut Lake, PA
WHITE, John F.; Lafayette, LA
WERSUM, Keith Allen; Midland, TX

If any Member has any recommendations, positive or negative regarding the application of any of the above applicants, please mail your comments to General Headquarters within 30 days. Your comments will be held confidential within the Executive Committee and Screening Board of the local section.

NEW MEMBERS

BOHMAN, Robert P. #4514; Detroit, MI
DERBY, James R. #4515; Tulsa, OK
FORSYTHE, James T. #4516; New Orleans, LA
HOUSE, Richard D. #4517; Lafayette, LA
MILLING, Marcus E., Sr. #4518; Kingsville, TX
PETTY, Robert S. #4519; Houston, TX
RAJARAM, Vasudevan #4520; Brooklyn Center, MN
RIESE, Walter C. #4521; Bosque Farms, NM
WEBER, Jeffrey L. #4522; Houston, TX
WIGAL, James M. #4523; Pittsburgh, PA

Please take a moment and welcome these new members. If they are in your area, give them a call - if not, drop them a note. This can go a long way in helping to strengthen our organization.

SCREENING

At the March 31, 1979 meeting of the Executive Committee, the Committee reaffirmed the requirement that three of sponsors on an application for membership must be members of AIPG. In addition, it was noted that all sponsors must be geological scientists. The strict adherence to the "3-AIPG" members as sponsors will be effective as of May 1, 1979.

It was also noted that members asked to sponsor an applicant can do so by careful checking of qualifications, training, and performance. Long-term, direct personal contact can to a degree be replaced by careful investigation with regard to the applicant's overall professional capabilities. If you have any questions regarding sponsorship of an applicant, please contact Mrs. Dare at Headquarters.
SECTION NEWS

Illinois-Indiana Section

The Indiana Legislature has passed an act requiring certification of geologists. The Governor signed the Act on April 6, 1979, and its provisions are effective after June 30, 1980. We are reproducing the entire act here as there has been a great deal of interest generated. Read it carefully -- it's very interesting!!

INDIANA ACT
Senate Enrolled Act No. 35

AN ACT to amend IC 25 by adding a new article concerning geologists.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana:

SECTION 1. IC 25 is amended by adding a NEW article 17.5 to read as follows:

ARTICLE 17.5 GEOLOGISTS
Chapter 1. Certified Professional Geologists.
Sec. 1. As used in this chapter:
"Department" means the department of natural resources.
"Certified professional geologist" means a geologist certified under this chapter.
"Geology" refers to that science which is based on investigation of the earth's crust and the rocks and other materials which compose it and which utilizes knowledge of the earth and its constituent rocks, minerals, liquids, gases and other materials for the benefit of mankind.
"Qualified geologist" means a person who possesses all the qualifications to be a certified professional geologist under this chapter except he is not certified.
"Responsible position" means a position requiring the exercise of independent control and direction and the use of initiative, skill, and independent judgment when performing geological work or when supervising such work.

Sec. 2. After June 30, 1980, no person other than a certified professional geologist may stamp or seal any plans, specifications, plats, reports or other documents with the seal or stamp of a certified professional geologist, or use in any manner the title "professional geologist", "registered geologist" or "certified geologist" unless he is certified under this chapter.

Sec. 3. An application for certification as a professional geologist shall be made to the department on a form prescribed by the department and shall be accompanied by the application fee fixed by the rules of the department.

Sec. 4. To be certified as a professional geologist, a person must be certified by the American Institute of Professional Geologists, or have the following qualifications:

1. Be of good moral character.
2. Meet one (1) of the following educational requirements fulfilled at a school or university whose geological curricula is accredited and meets the criteria established by rules of the department.
   (A) graduation with a major in geology; or
   (B) completion of thirty (30) semester hours in geological sciences courses leading to a major in geology, of which at least twenty-four (24) hours are in the third or fourth year, or graduate courses.

3. Meet one of the following work experience requirements:
   (A) three (3) years of professional geological work under the supervision of a certified professional geologist, except that prior to July 1, 1979, professional geological work qualifies under this subdivision if it was under the supervision of a qualified geologist; or
   (B) five (5) years experience in a responsible position.

4. Have at least seven (7) years of professional geological work. Professional geological work does not include routine sampling, laboratory work, or geological drafting.

5. Each year of undergraduate study in the geological sciences counts as one-half (½) year of professional geology work up to a maximum of two (2) years, and each year of graduate study or research counts as a year of professional geology work.

6. Teaching in the geological sciences at college level counts as one (1) year professional geology work, provided that the total teaching experience includes six (6) semester hours per semester, or equivalent if under another system, or third or fourth year or graduate courses.

7. Credit for undergraduate study, graduate study, and teaching, separately, or in combination, may not exceed a total of four (4) years towards meeting the requirement of at least seven (7) years of professional geological work.

8. The ability of the applicant must be demonstrated by his having performed his professional geological work in a responsible position. The adequacy of the required supervision and experience shall be determined by the department in accordance with standards set forth in rules adopted by it.

Sec. 5. An applicant who meets the qualifications for certification under this chapter, upon payment of the certification fee, shall be issued a certificate as a professional geologist.

Sec. 6. An applicant who is denied certification shall be notified in writing and informed of the reason for the denial. Within thirty (30) days after receipt of notice, the applicant may make written request to the department for a hearing which, if granted, shall be conducted as specified in IC 4-22-1.

Sec. 7. The department shall investigate applicants and violations of this chapter.

Sec. 8. A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere made to a charge of a felony or a crime involving moral turpitude is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this chapter. The department may order a certificate suspended or revoked or may decline to issue a certificate when the time for an appeal has elapsed, when the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal, or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence.

Sec. 9. After June 30, 1980, any person who signs, stamps, or seals any plans, specifications, plats reports, or other documents as a certified professional geologists, "registered geologist" or "certified geologist" without being certified under this chapter, or after his certificate has expired or has been suspended or revoked, commits a Class A infraction.

**********
PROFESSIONAL PARAGRAPHS

Frederic B. Mullin (CPGS 1716) has been promoted from Zone Minerals Engineer in the South Idaho Zone of the Forest Service to Chief of the Minerals Branch in the Denver Regional Office. His promotion is effective on May 7, 1979. Congratulations, Fred!

***********

MEMBER ACTIVITIES

Approximately two years ago James W. Skehan, SJ (CPGS 1505) gave the following testimony on HR 35 before the House Subcommittee on Scientific Research and Technology.

"Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Scientific Research and Technology. I am Professor James W. Skehan, S.J., representing the Association of Professional Geological Scientists (APGS) nationwide. APGS, on behalf of whom this testimony is given, is an organization of over three thousand (3,000) geologists whose professional activity encompasses many fields of geology. I am Director of Boston College's Weston Observatory, a research institute in geophysics and geology. With me is Professor Edward Chibbirs, who heads up our seismology program at Weston Observatory. It is relevant to the present topic to indicate that Weston Observatory has the longest record of monitoring earthquake activity of any currently active institution in northeastern U. S., our observing facilities dating to 1930.

Testimony on HR 35

The Bill appears to be adequate in its overall emphasis and scope. That there is a critical and timely need for such legislation is clear as evidenced, among others, the increased construction activity in areas of high and moderate seismic risk, the siting of nuclear power plants throughout the U. S., and unusually high and devastating seismicity during the past several years in various parts of the world. The potential for catastrophe exists in many metropolitan centers in the U. S. should an earthquake of the size of the San Fernando event of 1971 occur in any of them. In this regard, although the eastern U. S. is commonly and erroneously believed to be earthquake free, the population density in the East, the older types of construction in many cities, the relative number of nuclear power plants in operation or planned, and the lack of earthquake awareness on the part of the citizenry, all make the eastern (and particularly the northeastern) U. S. very susceptible to the ill effects of earthquakes. It is for these reasons that sufficient emphasis and support be given in the administration of the Bill to research programs directed toward understanding the seismo-tectonic processes in that section of the country, as well as to the western U. S. where the seismic problem is obvious."

On April 17, 1979, the following headline appeared in the Washington Post:

QUAKE JOLTS MAINE, N.H. AREAS: NO MAJOR DAMAGE IS REPORTED

PORTLAND, Maine, (AP) An earthquake described as the strongest to hit the area in at least a decade shook southern Maine and coastal New Hampshire tonight...

***********
suited for other uses. One should also be aware of the enormous amount of land on which development would be severely restricted owing to proximity to existing or proposed national parks, wilderness areas, wildlife refuges, etc. with their strict standards for minimal air, water, noise and visual impact. Unless these dramatic trends are reversed, the minerals industry will be unable to meet the nation's raw material needs.

The Minerals Exploration Coalition is an affiliation of mineral exploration and mining companies and individuals dedicated to the need to re-establish the right of access to and use of the public domain wherever mineral and/or natural resource potential exists. The coalition is singularly designed to coordinate its members' professional opinions in order to speak out with one voice on the public land issues that will be discussed during the 96th Congress. Our specific objectives are: to eliminate from wilderness or further study classifications those lands embodied in the Forest Service's RARE II study deemed to have mineral resource potential; to provide a unified, scientific, and credible response on the Alaska lands withdrawal issue; and to begin an exchange of information with the Bureau of Land Management during its initial phase of the wilderness review program.

The Minerals Exploration Coalition is also committed to preserving and strengthening the free enterprise system as it relates to the search for and extraction of our nation's mineral resources.

The Mineral Exploration Coalition's basic policy regarding the land withdrawal issues now facing our nation will be the same; wherever mineral potential exists, as shown by existing prospects, mines and/or the presence of a favorable geologic environment, exploration should be permitted. Development of a mineral discovery should be permitted under the existing environmental protection regulations.

For additional information or for membership information, contact: Minerals Exploration Coalition, Inc.; 222 Milwaukee Street, Ste. 201, Denver, CO 80206 (303) 399-2791

************

AIPG LOGO CONTEST

The Executive Committee has authorized at its meeting in Houston that a logo designing contest be held so that we may have member's participation in the designing of a new logo for AIPG for use on our stationary, envelopes, masthead for the newsletter and other publications of the Institute. The following is a list of the rules of the contest. The prize is travel to and lodging at the Annual Meeting in Lafayette or $500 whichever is greater. The Executive Committee welcomes all ideas, so give it a try if you feel so inclined.

1. The logo will not be used for the official insignia (seals and stamps). These will remain as the original AIPG insignia. The new logo would appear on stationary, envelopes and masthead for the newsletter.
2. The logo should be eye-catching, professional, bold and distinctive.
3. The logo should be submitted in its final drafted form.
4. All logo designs must be received at Headquarters by July 1, 1979 to be considered.
5. Contestants must be Institute members.
6. The winner will be announced in the August newsletter.

SEARCH FOR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

A search committee has been formed to seek a replacement for Art Brunton as Executive Director. The committee consists of Charles Mankin, Chairman, Suzanne Takken, Fred Stead and John Fryberger. The responsibilities of the Executive Director have been outlined by the committee. They are as follows:

Institute's Internal Affairs

1. Executive Committee - The Executive Director serves as the principal staff resource for the Executive Committee. Not only should the Executive Director be responsible for implementing policy established by the Executive Committee, but should also take an active role in the development of new policy.
2. State Sections - The strength of the Institute resides to a significant degree within the activities of the State Sections. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the Executive Director to establish and maintain effective communication with the State Sections. Moreover, it is important that the Executive Director vigorously promote communication among the Sections.
3. Standing and Ad Hoc Committees - Since much of the work of the Association is conducted by committees, it is important that the Executive Director maintain a close working relationship with each committee and that the headquarters' staff provide the necessary support services to the committees.
4. Membership Support - the Headquarters of the Institute should be organized and operated to provide services to the membership. These services should include the maintenance of an active member file, processing applications for new members, maintenance of the Institute's fiscal affairs, and coordination of the Annual Meeting.

Institute's External Affairs

1. Communication with Local, State and Federal Legislative and Regulatory Units - A basic charge of the Institute is the promotion of professionalism of earth scientists. An important aspect of this responsibility is communicating the role that earth scientists are capable of playing in the resolution of local, state and national issues.
2. Public Relations - Communicating the activities of the Institute as well as those of individual members is an effective method of increasing public awareness and understanding of the geological profession. The Executive Director should develop and effective program to achieve positive public relations.
3. Inter-Society Communication - The Institute's responsibility of serving as the voice of the geological profession can be discharged in part by developing and maintaining communication with other societies and professional organizations. This is especially true for the member societies of the American Geological Institute for which AIPG serves as the focus for professionalism.

If any members have suggestions or know of anyone interested in the position of Executive Director, the Committee would like to receive applications and resumes by mid-June.
### SENATE AND HOUSE BILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
<th>Hearing Schedule</th>
<th>Committee Status</th>
<th>Final Deposition</th>
<th>AIGP Input</th>
<th>AIGP Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR 2219</td>
<td>Alaska Lands</td>
<td>Huckaby (R-LA) Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sent to House</td>
<td>HOUSE</td>
<td>Previous Testimony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 3636</td>
<td>Alaska Lands</td>
<td>Udall (D-AZ) Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sent to House</td>
<td>VOTES</td>
<td>Previous Testimony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 2199</td>
<td>Alaska Lands</td>
<td>Murphy (D-NY) Completed Breaux (D-LA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sent to House</td>
<td>WEEK</td>
<td>Previous Testimony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8</td>
<td>Alaska Lands</td>
<td>Jackson (D-WA) None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pending House Action</td>
<td>OF MAY 7th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 366</td>
<td>1872 Mine Law Revision</td>
<td>Jackson (D-WA) None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hearings Possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill to RARE II Lands (roadless be intro. area review evaluation)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Senate Hearings 3-6-79 House Hearings 3-8-79</td>
<td></td>
<td>Testimony 2-8-79</td>
<td>Geological evaluation for future potential required before any land withdrawals.</td>
<td>AIGP opposes divestiture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| S. 82    | Petroleum Industry Competition Act (Vertical Divestiture) | Bayh,(D-IN) | None, bills not given chance of passage, hearings in Senate on S. 82 are likely to be held. | Testimony 2-8-79 | Geological evaluation for future potential required before any land withdrawals. | AIGP opposes divestiture |
| S. 600   | Antimerger of petroleum companies                | Kennedy,(D-MA) | Hearing 4-6-79 |                       |                    |                      |                                |
| HR 8     | Prevents oil companies ownership of other energy production | Udall (D-AZ) | None, perhaps fall hearings |                    |                    |                      |                                |
| HR 508   | Prevents oil companies ownership of other energy production | Kastenmeier (D-WI) | None, perhaps fall hearings |                    |                    |                      |                                |

### RULES AND REGULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment Deadline</th>
<th>AIGP Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Interior</td>
<td>STRIP MINING Office of Surface Mining Reclamation &amp; Enforcement (Dept. of Interior) has adopted final regulations to implement a nationwide permanent program for the regulation of coal exploration and surface coal mining and reclamation operations and the surface effects of underground coal mining by the States and the Federal Government.</td>
<td>April 12, 1979</td>
<td>Testimony, 3-18-79 to maintain law to assure geologists participation. Future testimony, June.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Register</td>
<td>Feb. 9, 1979 U.S.G.S. (Dept. of Interior) is proposing a rule in response to a policy decision by the Secr. of the Dept. of Interior to encourage companies to engage in pre-sale on-structure, as well as off-structure drilling on OCS lands.</td>
<td>May 8, 1979</td>
<td>AIGP will testify and comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEGISLATIVE REPORT
By James U. Hamersley
AIPG Legislative Counsel

Although Congress has just returned from a two-week recess, President Carter’s oil decontrol and energy message has finally stimulated some activity in Congress. As well, the normal legislative process has finally produced some activity of interest to geologists -- The Alaska Lands Bill!! By the time you read this, the House (hopefully) will have reached a decision.

President Carter had alluded to the windfall profits tax in his energy speech of April 5; actual details of the plan were not revealed until April 26, 1979.

Various facts emerge from the proposals:

a. Scenario and Synopsis. The President had previously announced his phased decontrol program which is to begin on June 1, 1979 and extend through September 30, 1981. The proposed windfall profits tax is an excise tax imposed on domestic production of crude oil effective January 1, 1980. The tax would apply to windfall revenues from sales of lower and upper tier oil which are attributable to any inflation. Since the windfall profits tax is an excise tax, it is deductible for income tax purposes.

The energy security trust fund will receive the revenues from the windfall profits tax, and the additional corporate income taxes paid in 1980-1982 which result from decontrol. The revenues from the fund will be used for: (i) assistance to low-income households; (ii) to increase funding for energy efficient mass transit; and (iii) to undertake a major program of new energy initiatives and investments.

The House Commerce Subcommittee on Energy (Dingell, D-MI) has begun hearings on the President's crude oil pricing program. Secretary of Energy Schlesinger defended the phased decontrol of crude oil and urged adoption of the windfall profits tax. House Ways and Means will begin hearings on the tax May 9. Senate Finance Subcommittee on Energy (Gravel, D-AK) began hearings on April 30.

b. Opposition and Support. Now that the proposal has been introduced, it appears that principal opposition will be not from oil companies, but liberal Senators who feel that the windfall profits tax is not stringent enough. The net effect of the tax, the liberals say, is of minimum effect in reducing oil company profits, and of limited duration (to 1982). Thus, ironically, the battle lines are drawn between Carter, and those who want a more stringent tax. The oil companies while opposing the tax are in an unusual position, and await the outcome. Early votes have shown surprising strength for a more stringent tax, which may place Carter in a difficult position.

**********

REPORT OF REGISTRATION ALERT COMMITTEE
By William E. Cutcliffe, Chairman

The Present Status of Registration and Certification

State registration or certification now exists in eight states. They are Arizona, California, Idaho, Indiana, Delaware, Maine, Georgia, and Oregon. The state of Indiana and Maine certify geologists; all of the others listed register and license them. The act of certification develops minimum qualifications which certain professionals have obtained but does not necessarily limit the practice to those geologists. Agencies may require or recommend that certain activities, such as siteing reports be signed by a state certified geologist, while other fields of geologic practice remain unaffected.

Registration and licensure limit the practice of geology to those professionals who have obtained such. A geologist is registered in a specific state to practice geology and obtains an initial license to practice same. In some states (California for one) he may subsequently allow his license to lapse and still be maintained on the registration roster. A new license, reportedly, will be issued upon request and submittal of fee.

Several states have specialty certification. California and Oregon certify engineering geologists. Georgia's act requires, in addition to registration, certification in the individual fields of engineering, hydrology, and mining. To date, the Georgia board has been unable to discern a satisfactory method for administering certification and has refunded application fees.

Numerous additional states, in excess of 15 to 20, are in some stage of consideration of registration. Several of them have had bills before their legislature for two to four years.

SPECIFIC STATE UPDATE AVAILABLE

Arizona: The Arizona AIPG Registration Committee met with representatives of the Arizona Board of Technical Registration and proposed to: (1) inform the Board of Registration laws in other states, (2) advise the Board on matters dealing with geology, (3) interview geologist in training applicants, (4) recommend examination type, (5) aid in preparation, administration, and grading of examination, and (6) give the professional geologist exam.

The Board has not given a formal response, but committee members expect it to be favorable on most points.

The committee hopes to suggest names of some AIPG members to the Governor for the next scheduled Board opening (1980). At this time there is not a geologist on the Board.

California: The sunset law has become popular in California politics. They, reportedly, have been confined to regulatory boards only. Such boards function in relation to licensing and registration for certain professionals and businesses in which a relatively small number of voters are directly involved.

There are currently four bills before the California legislature that would sunset the registration of geologists and geophysicists. (Assembly AB 46, AB 51, SB 43, Senate AB 51, Senate SB 751, Priolo)

Assembly Bill 46 is essentially the same as AB 3145 of last year's session which received approval of both houses but failed passage through last day mech-
The Governor and certain advisors are now advocating the transfer of the registration of Engineering Geologists to the Board of Professional Engineers and the cancellation of registration of all other geologists. Present codes and ordinances call for the service of "registered geologist" approval in several functions other than strictly engineering concern, such as proposals of site rehabilitation, abandonment of wells, etc. If the Governor's proposal were enacted, the geologists most experienced at rendering such services would be excluded.

"It is rather obvious that the economy of abolishing the State Board is not real. There is the additional possibility of erratic standards of qualification." Howard Anderson, Past President of the California Section urges all concerned registered professionals to directly contact their respective Assemblyman and Senator to explain the implication of these several bills. He further states "There is an immediate necessity of ALERT here in California."

Indiana: Senator Harris, a former geologist, introduced Senate Bill 55 to satisfy the Office of Surface Mining (OSM) requirements defining "professional geologist". Please note information under Illinois-Indiana Section News.

Massachusetts: An Association of Engineering Geologists Committee developed a registration bill last year. Due to some considerable dissent within the Section, the Committee independently eventually appeared before a hearing a submitted the bill to the legislature. The bill was revised this year and will be resubmitted.

New York: New York has had a bill before the legislature for some four years. A new biannual submittal must be completed this year. To add to the effort, Senior Senator Smith, Chairman of the Environmental Committee and principal sponsor, did not run for re-election, therefore, a new sponsor(s) must be sought. A long uphill road lies ahead in New York.

Tennessee: The Tennessee registration bill was not introduced in the current session of the legislature, reportedly primarily to the mining industry geologist's opposition. The latter, interestingly, are exempt from registration requirements. Efforts will be made again next year.

Virginia: The Virginia Section is currently working on a bill which should be introduced in the 1980 Virginia General Assembly.

Existing and proposed registration requirements fortunately have some uniformity. Most states have followed or propose to follow California's experience, education and examination requirements. Delaware is a notable exception in that they require more demanding applied experience. In most states, one can obtain registration after "seven" years of experience, which is generally nine years after they have completed their secondary education. The four years of undergraduate education can be submitted as two years experience, and their graduate school education can be submitted as an additional year of experience for each year of graduate school. However, educational experience may not exceed the equivalent of four years, since three of the seven years generally are required to be applied experience. Delaware requires an additional three years' experience.