Some Highlights of the Annual Meeting in Lexington, Kentucky

Edward B. Nuhfer (CPGS 2808)—Editor

The Kentucky Section organized an outstanding national meeting of which they have every reason to be proud. Attendees were treated to a superb array of speakers and activities, all being provided in an excellent setting. If photographs are furnished in time for composition, the focus of the December issue of TPG will be on the AIPG 1987 Annual Meeting held in Lexington. Otherwise, the January 1988 edition will carry this feature.

For the moment, members can benefit from early presentation of a few highlights. Your next year's Executive Committee consists of President Sam R. Evans, Vice President Gary B. Glass, President-elect Richard J. Proctor, Secretary Serge Gonzales, and returning to fill the second year of their two-year terms are Treasurer John T. Galey, Jr. and Editor Edward B. Nuhfer. Delegates who will serve as representatives of the Advisory Board on the Executive Committee are Gerald V. Mendenhall of Texas, Fred N. Murray of Oklahoma, Lawrence A. Cerrillo of Colorado and Wallace W. Stewart of Wyoming.

At the business meeting, 1988 President Sam Evans made special note of the fact that he is in the process of forming committees for the year and that he actively solicits participation from members. Any member with concerns, high energy, and willingness to work for promoting the profession of geology (see purposes of the institute on p. 16) is encouraged to contact Sam immediately (see address on p. 16). Section officers should make special note of our 1988 national president's request for input at upcoming section meetings.

Some very important proposals in amending the Constitution and Bylaws have been made, and the members at the annual business meeting voted to bring these proposals before the entire membership by mail. These proposals have been discussed in the September issue of TPG and are reproduced verbatim inside this issue. See also the letter to the editor from Robert Lamonica which provides further discussion.

Congratulations are in order for Ernest K. Lehmann, recipient of the Ben H. Parker Memorial Medal, Bobby J. Timmons, recipient of the Martin Van Couvering Award, Cliff J. Nolte, recipient of the Public Service Award, and Doris M. Curtis, recipient of the award of Honorary Membership. Recipients of the Presidential Certificate of Merit are William J. Gilliland, Raymond E. Irwin, Stanley S. Johnson, Elisabeth G. Newton, John G. Philley, and Stephen M. Testa. Details and photographs will follow in a later edition of TPG.

American Institute of Professional Geologists

POSSIBLE CONSTITUTION/BYLAWS AMENDMENTS

Possibility 1—Eliminate Associate affiliation: Would eliminate the affiliation with AIPG of Associates.

Possibility 2—Revert designation of members to “Certified Professional Geologists” (CPG); Would change the designation “Certified Professional Geological Scientist” (CPGS) back to “Certified Professional Geologist” (CPG).

Possibility 3—Bylaws amendments provisions: Would change the Bylaws provision regarding amendments.

Possibility 4—Drop “qualifying” society membership requirement to be AIPG Certified or to remain certified: Would delete present requirements.

American Institute of Professional Geologists

POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS TO BE VOTED ON BY THE MEMBERSHIP

(From Annual Meeting, October, 1987, Lexington, KY)

(Key—the present provision appears in regular case, the proposed deletions are shown struck through and proposed additions are in all capital letters)

- Possibility 1—ELIMINATE ASSOCIATE AFFILIATION.

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE IV. MEMBERSHIP

Section 2—Other Affiliations

Other classifications of affiliation with the Institute and the qualifications, designations and limitations thereof, shall be established by the Bylaws of the Institute.

BYLAWS

ARTICLE I. MEMBERSHIP

Section 9—Associate Affiliation

Provision is hereby made for the affiliation with the Institute of a geological scientist who fulfills all the requirements for full membership except the experience requirement and the requirement for full membership in a qualified, society-approved, by the Executive Committee. Such a geological scientist shall be known as an "Associate".

A. Requirements

An Associate shall be a geological scientist: 1) who has, as minimum qualifications, the training described in Article I, Section 3 of the Bylaws; 2) whose application is (Continued on next page)
sponsored by three (3) members of the profession, one (1) of which must be a Member of the Institute; (3) who is affiliated with a qualified society approved by the Executive Committee, the class of affiliation required being that which is granted to said Societies to such geological scientists; and, (4) who, after having been granted Associate status, remains in good standing until the experience requirements described in Article I, Section 3B of the Bylaws have been fulfilled.

B. Admission

Application for Associate status with the Institute shall be submitted to Institute Headquarters on a form authorized by the Executive Committee. The application shall be recorded and, when complete, shall be transmitted to three (3) Members of the Executive Committee for review and recommendations. If the application is approved by three (3) Members of the Executive Committee, the applicant shall be granted Associate status and so informed by the Executive Director. If any of these three (3) reviewers object to the application, the application shall be transmitted to the entire Executive Committee for final decision, and must receive an approval vote of three-fourths (3/4) of the Executive Committee before the applicant is granted Associate status.

C. Rights and Reservations

Associates shall have the right to vote and hold office in the Sections, to serve on Institute committees that are not responsible for the screening or processing of any application or the review of confidential information regarding any Member, and to receive all official publications of the Institute. No Associate shall have the right to vote or hold office in the Institute, to use the Seal of Certification or to use the title "Certified Professional Geological Scientist".

D. Suspension or Termination

The conditions and processes for suspension or termination from Associate status shall be the same as those described for Members in Article I, Section 7 of the Bylaws, except for the addition of the following:

1) An Associate shall be automatically expelled from the Institute if the Associate uses the title "Certified Professional Geological Scientist".

2) An Associate who has fulfilled the experience requirement for membership in the Institute as provided in Article I, Section 3B, shall have six (6) months after fulfilling the experience requirement in which to apply for membership in the Institute or his or her affiliation with the Institute shall be automatically terminated.

Possibility 2—REVERT DESIGNATION OF MEMBERS TO "CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL GEOLOGIST" (CPG).

(Key—the present provision appears in regular case, the proposed deletions are shown struck through and proposed additions are in all capital letters)

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE IV. MEMBERSHIP

Section 1—Members Defined

The Membership of the Institute shall consist of geological scientists who qualify by standards of education, experience and integrity, as each is defined in the Bylaws, and who subscribe to the Constitution and the Code of Ethics of the Institute. Members of the Institute shall be known as Certified Professional Geological Scientists, GEOLOGISTS (CPG).

BYLAWS

ARTICLE I. MEMBERSHIP

Section 1—Classification

The Membership of the Institute shall consist of one class, to be known as "Member", each of whom shall hold the title of "Certified Professional Geological Scientist", GEOLOGIST (CPG).

Section 2—Requirements

Members of the Institute shall be geological scientists PROFESSIONAL GEOLOGISTS who have the qualifications described in Article I, Section 3 of these Bylaws, whose applications for membership have been submitted to a Screening Board and approved as hereinafter provided by Article I, Section 4, and who, after admission to the Institute, remain in good standing therein.

Section 4—Admission to Membership

A. Procedure

Application for membership shall be submitted in writing. Names of applicants shall be distributed to all Members of the Institute. An objection to any applicant should then be submitted in writing to the Executive Director within sixty (60) days of the official mailing date of the circularization of the name of the applicant to the Membership, with a full statement giving factual reasons for the objection. When an application is complete with all supporting material, the file shall be sent to the appropriate Section Screening Board which, after adequate review, shall return the application file to the Executive Director with its recommendation. The file shall then be transmitted for review and recommendations by the Secretary, Vice President and President-Elect of the Institute. If no objection to the applicant is made by the reviewing Officers, the applicant shall be notified of election to Membership, and the date of notification shall be the official date of certification as a Certified Professional Geological Scientist, GEOLOGIST (CPG). An application which is not approved by all three (3) reviewing Officers, shall be

(Continued on next page)
transmitted to the Executive Committee for action. Approval of such a case shall require a three-fourths (3/4) favorable vote of the Executive Committee.

Section 7—Resignation, Suspension, Expulsion or Termination

C. Expulsion for Misconduct

Any Member who has been found guilty by the Executive Committee of violating the Code of Ethics, the Constitution or Bylaws of the Institute, or whose conduct is unbecoming a Certified Professional Geologist, GEOLOGIST (CPG), shall be subject to expulsion upon a recommendation of the Ethics Committee and the final decision of the Executive Committee. In this connection, any matter, conduct or thing that, in the reasonable judgment of the Executive Committee, is harmful or adverse in a significant way to the best interest of the Institute, shall be held to be conduct unbecoming a Certified Professional Geologist, GEOLOGIST (CPG).

• Possibility 3—CHANGE BYLAWS AMENDMENT PROVISIONS.

(Key—the present provision appears in regular case, the proposed deletions are shown struck through and proposed additions are in all capital letters)

BYLAWS

ARTICLE XI. AMENDMENTS

Section 1—Amendment by Vote at Annual Meeting

These Bylaws may also be amended or altered by a mail vote of the Members, provided the proposed amendments have been previously submitted by the Executive Committee or contained in a written petition signed by at least twenty-five (25) percent of the Members of the Institute. The Secretary of the Institute shall mail each Member a copy of the proposed amendment and an appropriate ballot. An amendment submitted for mail vote shall be immediately adopted if a majority of the ballots received within sixty (60) days after the mailing are marked in favor of the amendment.

• Possibility 4—DROP “QUALIFYING” SOCIETY MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENT TO BE AIPG CERTIFIED OR TO REMAIN CERTIFIED.

(Key—the present provision appears in regular case, the proposed deletions are shown struck through and proposed additions are in all capital letters)

BYLAWS

ARTICLE I. MEMBERSHIP

D. Continued Society Membership

Continuing (Full) membership in a Qualified Society approved by the Executive Committee. Members in the "Retired" dues paying category are exempt from this requirement.

Letters to the Editor . . .

DEAR EDITOR:

In your article on indoor radon (TPG, July '87), you mentioned the name and address of one company that sells charcoal canister radon detectors. As there are hundreds of firms that provide radon measurement devices to the public in what is now a very competitive business, I was shocked to find the American Institute of Professional Geologists gave an endorsement—or at least free advertising—to just one such company. Their canisters are not significantly better, or worse, than those of many other firms.

In the interest of fairness, please allow me to note that my company, Appalachian Environmental Testing, Inc., 105 S. Union St., Danville, VA 24541, (804) 792-1300, sells not only charcoal canisters but also alpha track detectors, and provides on-site measurement of radon decay products. If AIPG would publicize just one radon testing company, it might have been more appropriate to choose one headed by an AIPG member.

Geologists, particularly those knowledgeable of the formation of uranium deposits and the migration of radionuclides, are especially well qualified to address various aspects of the radon problem. Certainly, greater involvement by the geological profession is needed to identify "high risk" areas.

I direct TPG readers to a very good summary of indoor radon in the July '87 issue of Consumer Reports. The article includes a list of all companies that sell charcoal canisters and alpha track detectors nationwide and that have met EPA measurement proficiency standards.

Very truly yours,

Christopher R. Halladay, CPGS 6422
President, Appalachian Environmental Testing, Inc.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Ouch! Christopher Halladay, your shock is justified. The July article in question came from an article received from headquarters. The article was reproduced as received and unfortunately did include specific reference to a university laboratory, which I should have whacked out of the article before it was typeset for the July issue. The oversight was mine and I apologize for this. Your letter is welcome and will certainly sharpen my editorial pen in the future. Thank you for calling the problem to my attention.

TO THE EDITOR:

I have been watching the passionate discussion of registration/certification that has characterized almost every issue of The Professional Geologist (TPG) and that in fact has been extant throughout my career of almost 20 years. I have been a member of the American Institute of Professional Geologists (AIPG) since 1974, and I have spent my entire career in the consulting sector.

After reading Don Haney's recent letter in TPG, it becomes clear that the divergence of opinion on the issue of registration is related in large measure to the field of practice of the individual. Geologists with consulting firms commonly interface with professional engineers and in many cases covet the visibility and statutory recognition which characterizes the

(Continued on next page)
engineering profession. This situation is further exacerbated when we must have our geological reports co-signed by engineers due to statutory requirements, regardless of whether that requirement is warranted. It follows that many of my colleagues seek equal status for our profession. We have recently enacted registration of professional geologists in Florida in order to assure that those practicing geology are geologists. On the other hand, a large sector of AIPG membership is engaged in oil/gas, economic mineralogy, etc., and may not be concerned with these issues, nor suffer the competition for our professional niche that we experience daily.

I will look forward to comments or response.

Respectfully submitted,
Stephen J. Havrel, CPGS 2712

GENTLEMEN:

Recent letters in TPG decry our lack of readiness to protect/assist our colleagues and indict a lack of boldness in protecting our domain. Such articles cite the failure of AIPG to unite our profession but only “tch tch” without providing solutions.

Since at least 1966, AIPG members have been debating the certification/registration issue. Earlier the lines seemed to be more sharply drawn—we seemed to be trying to follow a constant track. Then the strength-in-numbers champions moved their position. APGS was ill-advised (and ill-fated). The APGS movement further divided our efforts rather than channelled them. Some of us fought the program (and even resigned the institute because of it), because it was wrong. I was one.

AIPG (nationally) still seems to try to be all things to all geologists. Treading lightly in all directions can't work. An example is Donald Haney's offering (July TPG), which asks a number of questions but offers few answers. I will provide some of these answers.

How, indeed, can “we” protect and assist our colleagues and be bold in protecting our domain? Geology is a broad field, and each of us may have to first define the domain, and who our colleagues are. Mine are consultants in the “private sector” (a term I despise). This group has vastly different interests than small divisions of large corporations, state surveys and federal agencies and academe. Private consultants have no protection beyond their own immediate professional sphere. Therefore this is the group that constantly talks about registration as a means of protecting both themselves (and colleagues) and their domain, the group that, among all AIPG groups, stands to benefit the most from registration (or certification, if it works properly). This is also the group that makes up the smallest contingent of AIPG membership.

The AIPG membership won't get behind registration because most members don't need it; few are about to go to the wall for the 7% of the membership who do.

If the truth be known, even private consultants don't make their own case strongly enough. Even when they try to defend their shores, or make a move to advance their cause, they (OK, we) tend to tread too lightly. A perfect example is in the current hydrogeology/hazard harangue in New York between geologists and professional engineers (PE's).

Most environmental (including hazwaste) problems involve ground water, and the (hydro) geologist (assuming he is competent) is the person with the training/expertise to deal with it. Why then is the New York PE making this move to control this work? Not because he's qualified (he's not); not because he can handle the situation better (he can't), and certainly not because he's trying to protect the public from charlatans! It's because ground water provides opportunities and because he's registered and therefore legally recognized! When we protest this situation, we have to speak up! We have to SAY that the PE is not qualified! We have to SAY that the PE is acting UNPROFESSIONALLY (and show just how)! We can't expect to tread lightly and get ahead—we have to be AGGRESSIVE! Remember that if you were dealing with true professionals they'd be quite responsive to rational presentation. Those that aren't responsive probably aren't professionals! So crunch their corns!

How can I suggest that the PE may not be the bastion of professionalism? Allow me. Several years ago planners achieved the hallmark(?) of registration in New Jersey. They had to go through the PEs to do it. One condition was that the PEs could register as planners too! And they DID! Is this professional? I suggest that it may not be. Nor is the attitude of the New Jersey PE Board that engineering geologists cannot call themselves such (“engineering” or its “implications” are reserved for PEs). I and several others refuse to be violated by this clearly unprofessional action. Of course, I have paid the price by being hauled up before the board and accused of practicing engineering without a license. They'd have had my buns too, if AIPG hadn't showed up at the hearing and made it clear we weren't going to cave in. (Yes, contrary to some opinions certification by AIPG does have clout, even in New Jersey where the PE is king.)

YOU HAVE TO GO FOR THE THROAT! Some of us haven't “passively abdicated” to the engineer. We have made enough of a mark in New Jersey to have geologic reports (prepared by a qualified geologist, not a PE) required in numerous counties and municipalities. Our work stands on its own, without legal registration, and our EISs probably have generated more respect than those done by engineers.

I've put my money where my mouth is. As a matter of fact, one time long ago I had to compromise just to stay in geology when a lot of us didn't (the mega-hiatus of 1957-59 was just as bad as the current one). I passed an exam and became a soils engineer! Actually that move got me into engineering geology, so I didn't lose a step. Was I really an engineer, just because I read Terzaghi and passed a test? Of course not (but I was employed). First chance (one year) I got back into geology. I actually became quite proficient at soils engineering. I learned that the stuff of the soils engineer is just worn-out rock, and am a better geologist for it.

Neither scientific training, position, title nor professorship a professional make. Professionals are responsible for their own bargaining and security. Professionalism starts with MORALITY and is built on a sound ETHICAL base. This foundation is common to all professions and professionals. Consistent with ethics is the fact that the professional will not operate outside of his area of expertise.

You want registration? I don't, but if you do you're going to have to go through the PE to get it. The truth is that he's in and we're out. In order for us to get in, the PE will have to give ground, and he's not about to do so gracefully. He might want a piece of your action (he might even want grandfathering as a geologist). As a professional you can't concede that, so you will have to fight even harder, but if you want AIPG's help you'll have to settle for certification. I personally think it's the better choice if done right. If it's done right, it will lead naturally into registration if that's your wish. However, witness the program for the national AIPG meeting. Only THREE offerings deal with professional issues, the rest are
technical. I would hope for more emphasis from AIPG on issues that plague our profession.

There’s one root of our problem; AIPG doesn’t offer an effective united front. You cannot compare AIPG to the National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE). NSPE is a very large organization of PEs with a common thread (legal registration). Hairdressers and embalmers enjoy the same distinction, but we don’t!

The answer lies in those who have vital interest in keeping unqualified people from doing professional geological work to organize a united front. Promotion of registration/certification has to be done through the coordination, motivation, and leadership of those with interest in professional practice. It can be done even by a relative few, but keep the disinterested out of it. AIPG has the right stuff, but you’ll have to make it work for you.

GO FOR IT! I’ll help any way I can.

Fred L. Fox, CPG 1273

Letter to the Editor (Open Letter to Northeast Section)

Discussion on Amendments

DEAR MEMBERS:

This fall you will be receiving a ballot from the National Headquarters which will contain four Constitution and/or Bylaws amendment propositions. These propositions are listed below with the perceived rational for each and the consensus opinion of the Executive Committee of the Northeast Section regarding the proposed amendments. We urge all members to vote, regardless of your personal opinions, so that a true consensus is reached.

Proposition 1—Eliminate Associate affiliation: Would eliminate the affiliation with AIPG of Associates.

It is the opinion of some people that the Associate concept has been a failure, demonstrated by the low numbers of Associates in many sections. However, the Northeast Section has been very successful in attracting Associate members, and we have realized excellent section growth partly as a result of the Associates attaining the requirements for full membership. The Northeast Section Executive Committee would like to see the Associate status maintained. We feel that it is not the program which has failed, but individual sections which have failed in their efforts at recruitment of the future professional geologists.

Proposition 2—Revert designation of members to “Certified Professional Geologist” (CPG): Would change the designation “Certified Professional Geological Scientist” (CPGS) back to “Certified Professional Geologist” (CPG).

The CPG vs. CPGS designation has always caused confusion. The Northeast Section Executive Committee supports this proposed amendment.

Proposition 3—Bylaws amendments provisions: Would delete the present Bylaws provisions permitting amendments by voice vote at an Annual Meeting.

While the current process of effecting Bylaws amendments may not be ideal, the Northeast Section Executive Committee would prefer the current process. With a majority mail vote process, there is the concern that the result will be revolving door Bylaws changes. In addition, a majority mail vote will allow one or two large sections to manipulate the Bylaws through well-orchestrated campaigns.

The current process allows the members who are most active and involved in the Institute to effect changes as they see fit. A mail vote may be appropriate, but we would prefer that a more definitive desire for change is registered.

Proposition 4—Drop “qualifying” society membership requirement to be AIPG certified or to remain certified: Would delete present requirements for such other society membership in order to be a Certified Member of the Institute.

This perhaps has been proposed to aid the large numbers of geologists who are currently out of work. While we may sympathize with their plight, the Northeast Section Executive Committee thinks the requirement to maintain membership in a technical organization is very important. AIPG is not a technical organization, yet we attest to the professionalism of our members. Membership in a qualifying organization demonstrates exposure to technical advances in members’ specialties.

Membership in AIPG is more important than ever for geologists in the Northeast Section. It is interesting to note that many of the southeastern states, where environmental concerns took longer to catch on than they did here, already recognize the need to license, certify or register geologists. Meanwhile, in our section, which has an inordinate number of superfund sites, only one state regulates the practice of geology. While membership in AIPG carries no legal weight, it certainly indicates a concern for professionalism. Please use your CPG/CPGS designation and stamp, so that the institute will become more familiar to clients and regulators.

Robert Lamonica, CPGS 5149
President, Northeast Section

Education and Professionalism—An Opinion

Edward B. Nuhfer, CPGS 2808

One of the benefits of being editor for a professional society means that one’s horizons are broadened through being placed on all kinds of mailing lists. One recent receipt was “Industrial Transition: Public Policies for the Labor Force,” which provides seven public policy recommendations relating to pre-college education, engineering education, and continuing education. The document, prepared by the Task Force of the Council on Education of the American Society for Mechanical Engineers, listed seven recommendations. At first glance all sound very laudable.

1) Life-long education should be encouraged for the public good, no less deserving of support than formal education. At a minimum, federal tax incentives for continuing education and retraining should be continued and strengthened.
2) As the nation’s largest employer of engineers and scientists, the federal government should more aggressively promote continuing education.

3) State and local educational authorities should be encouraged to upgrade math and science requirements for high school graduation.

4) Government at all levels should continue efforts to encourage closer ties between academia and industry.

5) The federal government, along with private industry, should actively encourage the entry of more engineering baccalaureates into graduate work through appropriate fellowships, grants, and forgivable loans.

6) The current efforts of the National Science Foundation to encourage interdisciplinary studies and institutes should be enlarged, but not at the cost of other existing engineering research programs.

7) The federal government should place a higher emphasis on support for updating and upgrading teaching and research equipment in American universities."

However, if one reads certain passages of the document carefully, one sees why continuing education has to be emphasized by this profession. Note the following:

"While employers would always like to see more in the background of the graduate, notably increased communication skills...most employers do not want to see this added at the cost of technical preparation." or "Engineering colleges currently suffer from the dilemma of trying to increase engineering science content, design considerations, economics and management planning and improved communication skills in a normal four-year program with nothing left to drop from the curriculum. Attempts to make the basic engineering degree a five-year program are objected to by industry representatives; they would not pay higher starting salaries to five than to four-year graduates."

You may be wondering, "What has all this to do with the profession of geology?" I was inspired to write this editorial by a combination of all the mail I had received this year with regard to the encroachment on the geological profession by statutes which restrict geologists from the practice of geology, and the following statement in the ASME document: "Of the education of an engineer goes, and must continue to go, beyond (emphasis mine) that of the physical scientists who primarily ask "what and why"; the engineer has to add the important "how." This statement is not restricted to the ASME document. In fact, I have read it in enough documents written by engineers to recognize it as department jargon among the engineering profession in general. Naturally, as a physical scientist, I was curious to find out just how these individuals have gone "beyond" in their educations. One need look no further than the catalogue requirements for civil engineers (the engineering discipline which, in practice, is most closely related to geology). The bulk of the requirements are not governed by individual universities but by the Accreditation Board for Engineering & Technology (ABET). A reply to a letter I wrote to one of the ABET officers several years ago revealed that geology was not a requirement for civil engineers and that, in fact, only half the civil engineering programs required any at all. The remainder required one course, often simply the freshman level course in introductory geology. My own university's program has a "geotechnical emphasis" in civil engineering that requires one three-credit geology course; the "sanitary engineering emphasis" requires none. Other physical science requirements include introductory physics (1 year), and introductory chemistry (1 year). In essence, the "going beyond" aspect with regard to the physical sciences is practiced through acquiring a freshman level education in the sciences before going into the field to practice. Hopefully, the American Medical Association will not institute a parallel in "going beyond" biology by licensing surgery without a prior course in anatomy.

To this geologist, it is small wonder that we have polluted ground water, leaky landfills, and a host of structures built on unsuitable terrain or designed in a manner unsuitable to their geological setting. What else can one expect when freshman-level scientists are sent into the field with licenses to practice? The "going beyond" is frankly a myth; more honestly it would be stated as "science avoidance", not just in geology but in chemistry, physics, and life sciences as well. Practitioners are going to be able to "go beyond" physical science only by learning it before trying to practice it. If the public is to be well-served with design projects in the natural environment, it is imperative that 1) either the designer be knowledgeable about both design and the natural environment or 2) a team approach is used wherein a design expert (engineer) works in conjunction with an expert in the natural sciences.

Qualified geologists, above all others, should perform and sign off on geological investigations. A single course in geology (preferably one focused in engineering geology) provides a civil engineer with sufficient education to appreciate the problems and to communicate with a geologist. One course in geology does not qualify anyone to do geological work.

This is not a diatribe against engineers. The enthusiasm with which I used to advise students to attend graduate school in geology has more recently been balanced by an equal enthusiasm for encouraging students in geology to take courses in civil engineering or to double-major between these disciplines. An addition to the seven points above is my own:

8) The federal government should develop a scholarship program to encourage holders of the baccalaureate in the physical and life sciences to obtain a second degree in the engineering disciplines.

In brief, there are no short cuts to developing practitioners who are competent to practice design work in the natural environment. Four year programs are not sufficient in themselves to convey adequate knowledge of both science and engineering design. The development of retrofitted continuing education programs to make up deficiencies in science and communications that are inherent to an inadequate curriculum dictated by the professional sector is no answer; it is disservice to the public that promulgates mediocrity. If the engineering profession refuses to work with scientists on an equal basis where needed, then their own educational qualifications should be extended. Medical colleges and law schools, recognized that the 4-year BS degree in itself, is simply not a viable means of producing professionals competent to practice in complex disciplines. A parallel requirement that one must obtain an undergraduate degree in the sciences before entering a professional engineering program would be an excellent one that truly would permit the engineer to "go beyond."
Federal Legislative and Regulatory Issues Reviewed

by Russ Wayland
AIPG Washington Representative

How your favorite bureau/agency may be faring. Congressional conference committees now have to reconcile the following, and face possible vetoes unless they consolidate their decisions into a veto-proof omnibus bill and then promptly adjourn:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year 1988 appropriations, million dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/Surface Mining, Reclamation &amp; Enforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals Management Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Bureau of Mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ground water research bills. Five versions of HR 791 have had to be reconciled, partly as a result of combining the original bill (USGS as the lead) with HR 2253 that brings EPA into the picture and emphasizes coordination. The bill is now pending a floor vote.

National Acid Precipitation Assessment Program. The conclusions drawn on acid rain in the four-volume interim report from this 10-year government interagency program have been challenged by environmental groups as “propaganda,” designed to bolster the administration’s position against acid rain control legislation. However, geochemist Laurence Kulp, the now retired research director of the program, says the report is a state-of-the-science report, not a policy document. The report concludes that acid rain at current levels has generally no effect on crops, and no proven effect on forests although a link remains possible. A significant increase in the number of acidic lakes (below pH 5) in the glaciated northeast is said to be unlikely to occur over the next few decades. Emissions of sulfur dioxide in the eleven states adjacent to Canada dropped 20 percent from 1975 to 1985. But environmentalists say a pH of 5 is too acidic to propagate most fish and the smaller organisms that fish feed on. (Science, 9-18-87, p. 1404)

National Sea Grant College Program. HR 3017 was passed by the House and is in the Senate. It would reauthorize and expand the program, which has a core of 30 colleges and universities and participation from over 300 institutions. The Senate passed a similar bill, S 1196, in April.

Uranium industry revival bill. A draft Senate bill jointly written by majority and minority staff would convert the Department of Energy uranium enrichment program into a wholly-owned government corporation, charge nuclear utilities for using too much imported uranium, and establish a fund to clean up or stabilize uranium tailings at 26 western sites.

Federal oil and gas leasing bills. The Senate Energy Committee bill would institute a two-tier system and a $10/acre minimum acceptable bid. The House Interior Committee bill attaches a variety of provisions on land use planning. The administration wants a $20/acre minimum acceptable bid. Even so, an agreed bill is a possibility.

Great Smoky Mountains Wilderness Act. HR 1495 would designate as wilderness about 465,000 acres or 90 percent of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The bill passed the House and is in the Senate. S 695 would designate about 400,000 acres as wilderness. The Interior Department recommended 418,000 acres.

Geology faculty enhancement for undergraduate education. The National Science Foundation aims to strengthen undergraduate sciences by improving the technical capability of experienced faculty members. Proposals for grants must provide for actual extensive work with the substance of the topic and for interaction with experts. The aim is to allow participants to gain experience with recent developments; to work with innovative ideas and technologies, thereby obtaining personal experience with them rather than just hearing about them; and to explore new methods of delivery of information. 52FR35779-35784

Water Resources Research Grant Programs. The USGS invites applications for the year 1988, by 1-22-88. The research subjects include aspects of the hydrologic cycle; demineralization; and depletion and degradation of ground water supplies. 52FR36110

Regulation of oil field wastes. Congress has requested EPA to consider classifying all oil field cuttings, muds and brines as hazardous wastes. At present, EPA seems disinclined to punish the whole industry for the sins of the irresponsible few. EPA now concludes that the vast majority of reserve pits and injection wells will not pose significant health and environmental risks if managed under current state and federal regulatory programs. Stripper operations, with their high rates of produced water, will likely be given special attention in any recommendations, as will misabandoned wells. The test will come next June when Congress receives EPA’s recommendations.

Exploratory drilling in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas, AK. EPA has a draft NPDES General Permit II available for comment by 11-9-87. It establishes effluent limitations, standards and prohibitions for stratigraphic tests and exploration wells, but not production wells. It authorizes discharges of drilling muds, cuttings, wash water, deck drainage, and a number of other specified discharges. 52FR36617-36625. Separately, EPA is modifying its General Permit for Operations in the same OCS area with respect to discharges of drilling muds containing diesel oil. 52FR36461-36467

Standards for cleanup at 24 inactive uranium processing sites. EPA proposes changes in its 1983 regulations to require stabilizing tailings in order to permanently eliminate or minimize ground water contamination. A draft document supporting the proposed regulations is available. Comments are due 10-26-87, to be followed by a public hearing 10-29-87 in Durango, CO. 52FR3600-36008

Mixed low-level radioactive and hazardous waste. The EPA and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) have jointly prepared and released a guidance document which provides a conceptual design approach for disposal facilities. The document is intended to assist existing commercial low-level radioactive waste disposal site operators as they expand facilities to accommodate hazardous wastes. It is also intended to assist states and compact regions. Copies are free from the NRC, Mail Stop 623 SS, Washington DC20555, telephone (Continued on next page)
Radioactive tracer surveys in underground injection control. EPA is proposing to authorize such surveys to demonstrate that there is no significant leak, in the casing, tubing or packer, and to demonstrate that there is no significant fluid movement into an underground source of drinking water through vertical channels adjacent to the injection well bore. If no significant written comments are received by 10-19-87, this proposal will become final on 11-17-87. 52FR35324

Ocean dumping site. EPA has proposed to designate a site for dumping dredged material off Port Aranson, TX. A draft EIS is expected to be available for comment this November. 52FR35321

Deep seabed mining and exploration rules. The National Oceanic an Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has modified part of its July 1986 proposed regulations and is seeking public comment by 10-29-87 on the changes. The changes pertain to definitions, environmental effects and requirements, monitoring, best available technologies, and mitigation. 52FR34748-34754

NOAA vs the California Coastal Commission. NOAA has threatened to withhold $1.9 million per year grant money, 80 percent of the CCC's funding, unless the CCC ceases substantially deviating from the federally approved coastal zone management plan. Interior Secretary Hodel has complained to NOAA that the CCC has attempted to regulate matters over which it has neither state nor federal authority. But Senator Wilson (R-CA) is backing the CCC. The new Commerce Secretary, Verity, is attempting to settle the dispute.

Californian's self-imposed starvation? Proposition 65 added the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 to its public protection laws, but also to growing public anxiety. The new California law provides that, as of 3-1-88, "no person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual..." Virtually all food naturally contains detectable arsenic and other trace elements known to be carcinogenic. Anyone can sue alleged violators of this law and share 25 percent of any fines. The burden of showing that the exposure poses no significant risk over a lifetime is on the defendant. So, will grocery manufacturers, bottlers, the chemical industry, retailers and restaurants elect to accept this risk? (Philip H. Abelson, Science, 9-25-87)

National Strategic Materials and Minerals Program Advisory Committee. At its open meeting in Washington DC 9-29-87, the committee recommended opposition to S 1174 which would manage the national stockpile on a dollar rather than a need basis. The committee also views with alarm the fact that U.S. buyers of strategic minerals are switching to Soviet bloc sources because of the embargo or sanctions on South Africa. Concern was also voiced over the Cranston bill on wilderness in the California desert area because of the very major source of U.S. rare earth mineral elements there. The committee favors new legislation for EEZ/OCS hard rock minerals rather than the skimpy authorization already in the OCS Lands Act with its front-end load and its bidding requirements.

More germanium for the National Defense Stockpile. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has raised the stockpile goal for germanium from 30,000 kilograms to 146,000 kilograms. 52FR33993

National Public Lands Advisory Council. Open council meetings are to be held in Denver 10-15-87. 52FR3500 The Colorado Section has been alerted.

A threat from Greenpeace. Offshore drilling has been added to the Greenpeace causes. While it plans to use legal means such as turning out crowds for hearings and staging demonstrations, its marine habitat policy coordinator, Lynn Davidson, is quoted in the press as saying "We must always be prepared to take direct action against the administration and the oil drillers if all these other efforts fail."

OCS Advisory Board. The Policy Committee of the board will hand an open meeting 11-4-5-87 in Corpus Christi, TX. The agenda includes the impact of the EPA/Congressional proposal to consider drilling muds, cuttings and produced water as toxic waste. Other agenda items concern access of coastal states to proprietary geological and geophysical data, and the effects of seismic activity on fish and fishing. Requests to comment at the meeting due 10-16-87. 52FR37027 The scientific committee of the board will meet at the same place and time to consider environmental studies.

OCS geological and geophysical exploration. The Minerals Management Service (MMS) proposes to revise the time frame for protection of proprietary information to assure that the party that incurred the cost would have a reasonable opportunity for exclusive use of the data during subsequent lease sales. Comments are required by 10-29-87 on two approaches to a final rule. 52FR36435-36439

Proposed OCS sulphur and salt lease sale. MMS has identified 51 areas in the Gulf of Mexico that have potential for the discovery of sulphur in commercial quantities. A proposed notice of sale at 52FR34346 indicates the terms and conditions if a sale is actually held. Comments on the proposal are requested by 10-26-87.

Regional Coal Team open meeting. The federal/state team for the San Juan River Area, New Mexico, will meet in Santa Fe on 11-3-87. Public comments are invited, particularly on the long-range market analysis and the need for leasing. 52FR35000

Environmental Impact Statements (EISs):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Comments due</th>
<th>52FR page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trans-Alaska Gas System pipeline, AK</td>
<td>11-20-87</td>
<td>34424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozark NF, AR, 12 scenic rivers</td>
<td>10-30-87</td>
<td>36811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safford District RMP, AZ</td>
<td>12-7-87</td>
<td>35591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Panhandle NF, ID, WA, &amp; MT</td>
<td>10-26-87</td>
<td>36096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawtooth NF, ID, &amp;UT</td>
<td>11-9-87</td>
<td>36096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenai NF, MT &amp; ID</td>
<td>10-26-87</td>
<td>36096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerlodge NF, MT</td>
<td>11-2-87</td>
<td>37006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont NF, OR, gold mine</td>
<td>11-20-87</td>
<td>36447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colville NF, WA</td>
<td>12-18-87</td>
<td>35320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifford Pinchot NF, WA</td>
<td>12-31-87</td>
<td>36095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridger-Teton NF, WY, Sohare Creek oil drilling</td>
<td>10-27-87*</td>
<td>37006-35148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BLM District Advisory Council meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>52FR page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Alaska, AK, on 11-5-87, at Fairbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma, AZ, on 11-5-87, at Lake Havasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Desert, CA, on 10-29/30-87, at Ridgecrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukiah, CA, on 10-26-87, in Arcata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrose, CO, on 10-29-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoshone, ID, on 10-20-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Mountain, NV, on 10-27-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, NV, on 10-21-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernal, UT, on 11-5-87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDITOR’S NOTE: Russ Wayland is taking a well earned vacation abroad this month. His regular column will return in the January, 1988 issue of TPG.
ARIZONA

The summer meeting of the Arizona Section of the American Institute of Professional Geologists was held on Saturday, July 18. The meeting was co-sponsored by the Arizona Conference-AIME. There was a large attendance of over 100 men and women.

Paul Lindberg, an AIPG member, provided an excellent, provocative description of the United Verde massive sulfide deposit at Jerome. He also led us through a tour of the old mine pit. AIPG member, Don White, gave an outstanding talk on the Little Daisy (United Verde Extension) mine and the current exploration program there. We were shown some very interesting drill core produced during the recent exploration project.

After our geologic tour, President Eyle called a short meeting of the AIPG members. Discussion centered on the encouragement of members to become registered in Arizona. Suggestions were also made to provide some general guidelines for taking the registration exam.

It was announced that the treasury contained a balance of $2,087.37. This amount included a deposit of $500 received from the Arizona Board of Technical Registration for the April 1987 exam.

Michael N. Greeley, CPGS 2922

COLORADO

From the Colorado Section Newsletter
WHY AIPG—a Continuation

The June 15th evening AIPG “Rap” Session was a smashing success! For two hours the group shared their “gut” feelings about AIPG and participated in a spirited brain-storming session. There were many excellent ideas offered that will certainly revitalize the Colorado Section.

Opening Statement—Cliff Nolte, CPGS 1604

How many of you read the editorial “WHY AIPG?” in the CPG?

(The surprise of the board most of the attendees raised their hands!) The question is often asked: “What can a professional organization do for me?”

The best answer I can give is that: “a professional organization can offer the opportunity for you to advance your profession and enhance your professional stature.”

THAT’S WHY WE ARE HERE! THAT’S WHAT AIPG IS ALL ABOUT!

The attributes of a profession and professionalism were masterfully presented in Ben Parker’s Presidential address to the AAPG in 1964. The salient points were excerpted in the CPG editorial. (See June 1987 issue of the Colorado Professional Geologist.)

He concluded his remarks by saying:

“The attributes of our profession are not self-natured. They require the concerted efforts of every member of our profession to assure their continual development. This can best be brought about by a strong aggressive professional organization which can represent all geologists in professional affairs. Our organization (the AAPG) is a scientific and technical structure which was not organized to function as a professional group.”

Let us examine the differences that Ben Parker was addressing by comparing the goals of a scientific organization to that of a professional organization:

The purposes of a scientific and technical organization are to gather, develop and disseminate technical information. The benefits to its members are obvious and tangible: concepts, ideas, data presented in the form of publications, lectures, seminars, etc.

The purposes of a professional organization are to:
1. Establish and certify qualifications.
2. Establish ethical standards.
3. Monitor and influence governmental activity and public opinion.

The benefits, by comparison, are less obvious. The professional organization offers the geologist the opportunity to nurture his profession and enhance his professional stature.

A brief statement concerning the three PROFESSIONAL organizations involved with geologists:

DPA (the Division of Professional Affairs of the AAPG) speaks for and certifies the petroleum geologists—it is a specialty group.

SIPES (Society of Independent Professional Earth Scientists) addresses a specialty within a specialty—primarily the independent petroleum geologist.

AIPG is structured to speak for all geologists in professional affairs and is the only professional organization that provides a unified certification program that, hopefully, “will make legislation for statutory regulation of geologists unnecessary”, to quote Martin Van Couvering.

BUT with less than 7% of all geologists and less than 5% of all petroleum geologists as members—are we able to do that which we were structured to do?

To accomplish the goals envisioned by the founders of the AIPG in Golden in 1964, we must have a greater representation of geologists—especially from among petroleum geologists.

WE NEED MORE MEMBERS! HOW?
By making the AIPG an attractive option for geologists to choose to represent them in professional affairs!

HOW IS THAT TO BE ACCOMPLISHED?
• By finding out why our members joined AIPG,
• By finding out why some members have resigned,
• By finding out why some have failed to pay their dues,
• By finding out why apathy exists among some of our members, and
• By finding out why other geologists have not been attracted in greater numbers.

We must know how you feel at a gut level (or from the heart) about the AIPG without having to defend or justify those feelings.

(Continued on next page)
I am convinced that emotions control our actions—not logic: feelings—not reasoning!
For an example, let me share with you some of my feelings that affect the way I view the AIPG.

The present policy toward registration of geologists—being neither for nor against—strickes me as being the height of absurdity. It is like being half pregnant—you either are or your are not—either you are for statutory registration or against it! My anger toward this policy is a feeling! I do not defend it or justify it. It just is! And it reflects negatively on how I regard the AIPG!

Now on the positive side: Looking back at the some 40 years of involvement in geology, I can see the benefits I have enjoyed—the pleasure I have had by being in this profession. Geology has made great strides during that time—both scientifically and professionally. I have been the beneficiary. And it was no accident!

Leaders of our profession, men like Ben Parker and Martin Van Couvering, and there were so many others, helped make this profession what it is today both technically and professionally. I feel deeply indebted. I would feel guilty if I did nothing to advance this profession for those who follow me. It is a feeling I have. It is real. And in this instance it reflects positively on my relationship with the AIPG!

These are some of my feelings. We need your comments, your feelings about AIPG! What we gather here will determine the kind of questionnaire that will be sent to all members of the Colorado Section.

If this is successful, and I know it will be, we expect other sections to follow suit, particularly in the states with large populations of geologists, such as Texas, California, Oklahoma, and Nevada.

When these data are gathered, summarized and evaluated, only then can the Colorado Section, the other sections, and the institute formulate and administer the kinds of policies that will make the AIPG an attractive option for all geologists to choose to represent them in professional affairs!

We need your input! We need to know how you feel without justifying or defending your feelings.

WE NEED YOU

Following Cliff's opening remarks Dave Abbot moderated a lively session that brought out a heartfelt response from the attendees, some who had not been at an AIPG meeting for some time. Many of the thoughtful comments were made from notes by the attendees indicating a high degree of preparation and anticipation.

An abbreviated summary of the feelings and concerns shared are separated into several categories and are listed below:

Certification, Registration, and Standards
- Peer certification of technical competence and professional conduct was the prime reason for joining AIPG with the hope that it would forestall statutory registration.
- AIPG needs higher standards for certification.
- AIPG should take a definite stand either for or against registration.

- The certification program has “lost its reason for being” by low percentage of geologists seeking certification and the onslaught of statutory registration.
- In states that require registration, AIPG should offer to prepare and administer any required examination.
- Unethical practice among geologists is a problem that deserves more attention.
- Re-establish cross certification with DPA and SIPES.

Inaction on the part of AIPG in the area of monitoring and influencing governmental activity and public opinion
- The Colorado Section has lost its espirt de corps.
- Loss of visibility to the geologic profession and to the public at large.
- Need more interaction with the technical societies.
- Need more issue-oriented publications such as the metals, oil & gas, and water papers.
- Need more involvement in schools—should consider campus representatives, and an organized relationship with students majoring in geology.
- We are not getting enough exposure, public does not know we exist.
- Need a “spokesman” to “beat our drum”.
- The director should be the spokesman.
- Action on the part of AIPG should be initiated at the grass roots (section) level.

Lack of Representation
- The National AIPG does not represent my views.
- The AIPG is supposed to represent all geologists but fails on an age basis. Need better representation from among young geologists.
- The Colorado Section needs more representation on the national Executive Committee.
- The Colorado Section should encourage its members to run for national offices.

This is a general summation of the feelings, concerns, and comments that were made at the June rap session. The comments were heartfelt, thoughtful and enthusiastically presented. They seem to center around the weakness of the certification program, the inaction of the Colorado Section, and the sense of nonrepresentation, particularly at the national level.

The rap session was the second step on the Executive Committee’s agenda. The third step is to get the same thoughtful, heartfelt response from those members not attending the meeting.

The Executive Committee is committed to a singular goal, and that is to:
Make AIPG an attractive option for all geologists to choose to represent them in professional affairs!

To meet that goal we must have your input. Please complete and return the questionnaire on the following page.

EDITOR’S NOTE: The following questionnaire accompanied the Colorado Section’s newsletter. I have condensed this by omitting the spaces for answers.

(Continued on next page)
QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: ____________________________

1. Why did you join the AIPG? (use additional sheets for response to any question)

2. How do you view AIPG Certification?
   □ To have your technical competence and professional conduct certified by your peers?
   □ As a desirable alternative to statutory registration?
   □ Both.

3. How do you feel about registration of geologists?
   Pro ______ Con ______ Why? ________________________________

4. Do you feel the AIPG should be more active promoting certification as being more desirable than registration? Yes ______ No ______ How? ________________________________

5. How would you strengthen the certification program? ______

6. To advance the profession of geology in the eyes of the public and to influence legislation where geology and geologists are concerned, members of the Colorado Section have:
   (a) Monitored proposed legislation in the Colorado legislature;
   (b) Given testimony in legislative hearings; and
   (c) Made and circulated comprehensive studies of oil and gas exploration; of metals, minerals and mining; of water in the west; and of ground water.

Do you feel that such activity on the part of the members of our section advances the profession of geology in the eyes of the public? Yes ______ No ______

Do you feel that such activity can affect legislation? Yes ______ No ______

Do you feel that such activity will ultimately enhance your professional stature? Yes ______ No ______

Do you feel that such activity should be continued? Yes ______ No ______

In what areas could such activity be increased?
In what capacity would you be willing to assist in such activities?

I wish to make the following additional comments: ________________________________

NEVADA

The section’s meeting was held September 18th at John Ascuaga’s Nugget.

   No Host Cocktails  6:00 - 7:00
   Dinner           7:00 - 8:00
   Business Meeting  8:00 - 8:30
   Speaker          8:30 - 9:15

A dinner and business meeting was followed by the speaker for the evening, Mr. Vel S. Clanton, manager of Site Characterization Plans at the Nevada Test Site. His talk, “Plans for a High Level Waste Repository”, included a 35 mm slide presentation as well as a film.

NORTHEAST

An old Story—Redux

Through Bill Cutcliffe, the Northeast Section learned that there was movement within State Education Department to declare hazardous waste investigations in New York the purview of firms licensed to practice engineering in the state. The issue arose upon the complaint of a licensed New York professional engineer. Bill Cutcliffe, George Banino, Ted Clark, Bob Lamonica and Ellis Koch met with Norman Nosenchuck of the DEC Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste and other representatives of the DEC to express the viewpoint of geologic firms—essentially that geologic work should be done by geologists and geologic firms. The DEC position seems to be that geologists can work as subordinates to engineers or as subcontractors but that licensed engineers should be responsible for the work. Mr. Nosenchuck indicated that the department would confirm to the determination of the Office of Professional Discipline of the State Education Department (who regulate licensing). Accordingly, Bob Lamonica wrote the following letter on behalf of the Northeast Section to the reviewing officer for this matter.

Mr. John J. Hegarty
Senior Investigator
Office of Professional Discipline
State Education Department
350 Daniel Street
Lyndhurst, NY 11757

RE: Environmental Investigations
Performed for the Department of Environmental Conservation

Dear Mr. Hegarty:

It has come to the attention of the Northeast Section of the American Institute of Professional Geologists that you are collecting information relative to a complaint which alleges that New York State Superfund Phase I and Phase II investigations (and by extension remedial investigations and feasibility studies) performed for the Department of Environmental Conservation constitute “engineering” and as such can only be performed by a firm duly licensed to perform engineering in the State of New York. The Executive Committee of the Northeast Section has authorized me to express our opinion on the matter.

We in the geologic community have long recognized the need to regulate the engineering profession to insure the safety of the public. Similarly, we have felt that the profession of geology should be regulated for the same reason, as it is in many states. However, the State of New York has never allowed registration of geologists, leaving us to determine for ourselves where geology leaves off and engineering begins. The process which you are currently investigating is in need of a definition of such an interface.

Many initial environmental investigations, including those at hazardous waste sites, involve ground water contamination as the major focus. This involves subsurface exploration through drilling and soil sampling, evaluating ground water

(Continued on next page)
flow patterns, determining the permeability by methods suited to the individual case, and, most importantly, by the control of ground water through the use of wells, drains or barriers. These are tasks which are well suited to hydrogeologists, but for which engineers are generally not trained. Conversely, there are aspects of these investigations which need training and judgement of an engineer.

Our opinion on this subject is that remedial investigations involve many scientific disciplines, and that the services rendered should fall under a category of technical services, professional services, or some other category besides engineering services. This would allow the agency involved to determine, on a case-by-case basis, the type of services and professional personnel they believe would be best suited for a given project.

The case in question has implications far beyond New York State contracts. Mr. Nosanchuk of the NYSDEC has stated that, if it is determined that all services relative to hazardous waste site investigations are the purview of firms licensed to practice engineering in New York State, he will extend that ruling to submissions to the NYSDEC by private sector corporations, municipalities and other state agencies. Many of these entities utilize the services of non-engineering firms for site investigations because they realize that their interests are best served by professionals trained to interpret data pertaining to ground water problems.

We ask you to please consider our opinion when judging the merits of the complaint in question and consider the implications your ruling may have on firms and individuals who have for many years provided high quality professional services in New York State.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Very truly yours,
Robert Lamonica, CPGS
President, Northeast AIPG

Section Editor's Notebook

Russell G. Slayback, CPGS 2305

The letter from Northeast Section President, Bob Lamonica, to the New York State Education Department reprinted in this issue represents a "shoe we have been waiting to hear dropped." The professional engineers nationwide have discovered hydrogeology in a big way and are determined to capture that profession and make it theirs. Hydrogeologists, in their view, are handy technicians to have around but they should be subservient to P.E. employers or prime contractors.

The indifference of geologists in the northeast to professional issues and state registration is now coming home to roost. When the next shoes drop, you will see chunks of geologic business taken away from geologists by law and by binding regulations. As you go about playing geologist, you may even be sued for practicing engineering without a license. A New Jersey colleague who shall remain nameless (but goes under CPGS-1273) has gone through all of this before and warned us of our failures to gain registration and recognition a dozen or more years ago. The equation is simple:

REGISTRATION = RECOGNITION = POWER

An excellent letter on this same general theme appeared in the July 1987 TPG by Donald C. Haney (CPGS-4053) of Kentucky. Give it your time—he has a lot to say.

In the Beginning God Created the Heaven and the Earth . . .

He was then faced with a class action lawsuit for failing to file an environmental impact statement with HEPA (Heavenly Environmental Protection Agency). HEPA is an angelically staffed, high-level lead agency, dedicated to keeping the universe pollution free and responsible to SEQRA (Sacred Environmental Quorum of Reviewing Angels).

HEPA granted God a temporary permit for the heavenly portion of the project, but he was issued a cease and desist order on the earthly part, pending further investigation by HEPA.

Upon completion of his construction permit application and draft environmental impact statement (DEIS), God appeared before the HEPA Council to answer questions.

When asked why he had begun these projects in the first place, he simply replied that he liked to be creative.

This was not considered adequate reasoning and the council said that he would be required to provide further substantiation.

HEPA was unable to see any practical use for earth since "the earth was void and empty and darkness was upon the face of the deep."

Then God said, "Let there be light."

He should have never brought up this point since one member of the council was active in the Sierrangel Club and immediately protested, asking "How was the light to be made? Would there be strip mining? What about thermal pollution? Air pollution? God explained the light would come from a huge ball of fire.

Nobody on the council really understood this, but it was provisionally accepted assuming (1) there would be no smog or smoke resulting from the ball of fire; (2) a separate burning permit would be required; and (3) since continuous light would be a waste of energy, it should be dark at least one-half the time.

So God agreed to divide light from the darkness and said he would call the light "Day" and the darkness "Night." (The council expressed no interest in in-house semantics.)

When asked how the earth would be covered, God said, "Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters."

One ecologically radical council member accused him of double talk, but the council tabled the action since God would be required first to file for a permit from the ACAC (Angelic Conservation Advisory Council) and further would be required to obtain water and wetlands permits from appropriate involved agencies.

The council asked if there would be only water and firmament and God said, "Let the earth bring forth the grass, the

(Continued on next page)
herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind, which may have seen itself upon the earth.”

The council agreed, as long as native seed would be used.

About future development God also said, “Let the waters bring forth the creeping creature having life, and the fowl that may fly over the earth.”

Here again, the council took no formal action since this would require approval of the Heavenly Fish and Game Commission in accordance with the Heavenly Wildlife Federation and Audobongical Society.

It appeared everything was in order until God stated he wanted to complete the project in six days.

At this time he was advised by the council that his proposed schedule was completely out of the question . . . HEPA would require a minimum of 180 days to review the application and draft environmental impact statement; then there would be public hearings and reviews by all involved heavenly agencies and the necessary angelic findings statements would have to be prepared. In addition, as a mitigation measure, alternative means of heavenly access would have to be explored.

The council stated that it would take at least 10 to 12 months before a permit could be granted. In the meantime, God was ordered to cease and desist the practice of creation without a universal engineering certificate.

God said, “To Hell with it!”

The anonymous author is stating his personal views and these have not been endorsed by the editor, Executive Committee or God.

VIRGINIA

The Virginia Section held its annual meeting on September 19, 1987, at the Powhatan Mining Company in Amelia County. There were 41 in attendance and this was considered to be one of the section’s most successful meetings. During the business meeting, the results of the officer-elections were announced. Elected to serve the section of 1988 were Bill Murray, president; Donald W. Foss, vice president; and Kenneth J. Kormendy, secretary/treasurer.

After the business meeting, a presentation on pegmatite mining was given by William Baltzley. Mr. Baltzley, owner of Powhatan Mining Company which operates the Morefield Mine, has spent most of his life mining pegmatites in South America, North Carolina, and Virginia. A dinner of Brunswick Stew and pork barbecue was provided at the mine site in the evening.

In addition to the “official activities” of the section, meeting attendees collected mineral specimens from the old and current mine dumps. The Morefield pegmatite is best known for its amazonite. In addition, many excellent specimens of topaz, beryl, muscovite, and columbite were collected. An underground tour of the mine was provided by Mr. Baltzley for those desiring to view the interior of a pegmatite.

WYOMING

The Wyoming Section held its last two monthly meetings on July 8th and August 12th at the Casper Petroleum Club.

On July 8th the featured speaker was Mr. Howard Shrinar, state commissioner of Public Lands. Mr. Shrinar discussed his role as overseer of the Wyoming Public Lands.

Dr. Charles Mankin, national president of the AIPG, was the featured speaker at the August 12th meeting. His discussion included an overview of the AIPG organization as well as a summary of current federal legislation that will have an impact on the AIPG membership.

Our September 9th meeting has been postponed due to a scheduling conflict with the WGA Field Conference. The next regularly scheduled meeting is on October 14th and will feature Mr. Tim Monroe, district manager of the BLM. His discussion will be on the Powder River Basin KGS study.

The meeting for September 9th has been cancelled because of the two other geological meetings scheduled in September: the WGA Overthrust Revisited Symposium at Jackson Lake Lodge, September 8–11; and the AAPG Rocky Mountain Section in Boise, September 13–16.

Our September speaker, Tim Monroe of the BLM, has been moved to our meeting date on October 14th. Tim will discuss the KGS system, and he also will briefly review the Powder River Basin resurvey project. The November 11th speaker will be Don Basko. He will discuss the EPA interim report on wastes for oil and gas development and production. The speakers for the December 9th meeting will be Larry Sanek and Mark Chase with P1, Denver, in reference to their information retrieval system.
ANOTHER GOVERNMENTAL ATTACK

Roy H. Guess, CPGS 2894

The proverbial last straw is about to be dropped on our backs. When the Environmental Protection Agency was established by Congress, oil field wastes were exempted from the EPA's Hazardous Wastes control. Now, the EPA is attempting to get Congress to remove that exemption. This decision is now a 100% political decision. If the EPA follows its previous pattern of extreme environmental regulations (using parts per million and parts per billion to determine hazardous wastes), it is entirely possible that half of the oil wells in Wyoming will have to be abandoned. We don't even have one hazardous waste disposal site in the entire state. People have lived in the middle of oil fields in Wyoming for over 75 years without experiencing problems from the environment.

Only one thing can stop this EPA attempt to destroy the oil business. That is a massive letter writing campaign to members of Congress by every AIPG member and all our friends in other states. Every out-of-state phone call should include this message. Every letter and every contact of any kind should carry the message. This effort can be successful.

Edmund Burke said, "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

(From Wyoming Section Newsletter)

Bureau of Mines Study Yields $196,000 Award by Interior Appeals Board

The Department of the Interior Contract Appeals Board has awarded over $196,000 to a geological consulting firm for a study which it performed for the Bureau of Mines in the Kantishna Hills/Dunkle Mine area of Alaska. The board issued its order in response to the refusal of the Bureau of Mines to reimburse the contractor for $162,954 in costs incurred during the course of the $1.5 million contract.

Subsequent studies by the Bureau of Mines valued the minerals identified by Salisbury & Dietz, Inc., as between $375 million and $2.04 billion, at 95 percent and 5 percent confidence levels. The cost of acquiring mining claims in the two areas studied by Salisbury & Dietz, Inc., could be as much as $157 million.

On completion of its report, Salisbury & Dietz, Inc., sought, as final payment for incurred costs, an amount in excess of $162,000. An audit performed by the Department of Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) concluded that those costs had been incurred in accordance with federal regulations. The refusal of the Bureau of Mines to pay the amount verified by the DCAA was appealed to the Department of the Interior's Board of Contract Appeals.

The Board's Order, dated August 31, 1987, required the Department of the Interior to pay the amount sought by Salisbury & Dietz, Inc., plus interest.

(From Comiskey & Hunt Law Firm, Fairfax, Virginia)

Members in the News

John E. Voytek, Jr., CPGS 4777, has joined Environmental Resources Management (ERM) as a Senior Geologist. Prior to joining ERM, Mr. Voytek was Administrator and Principal Hydrogeologist for the Ohio Department of Natural Resources. Mr. Voytek is a Certified Professional Geologist and a charter member of NWWA's Certified Ground Water Professionals.

Mr. Voytek will head ERM's hydrogeological efforts in Michigan including activities such as hydrogeological assessments, property transfer site assessments, aquifer characterization and remediation, and superfund investigations for private clients. ERM's offices in Ann Arbor are located at: 2000 Hogback Rd., Suite 2; Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103, Phone: 313-971-0551.

Dr. F. Beach Leighton, CPGS 1544, chairman and chief executive officer of Leighton & Associates, Inc., headquartered in Irvine, California, has been elected to the board of trustees of the Geological Society of America Foundation.

In 1961 Dr. Leighton founded Leighton & Associates. The firm now employs over 300 people in nine regional offices and offers services in soil engineering, rock mechanics, engineering geology, geophysics, materials and construction inspection services, ground water, and hazardous materials assessment.

Flannery Rules Environmentalists Have Standing

On August 10, 1987, Judge Flannery of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia Circuit, granted several environmental groups the right to proceed with their challenge to certain regulations promulgated in 1981 and 1982 by OSM in the In Re: Permanent Surface Mining Regulation Litigation cases. Some issues were appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit for additional judicial consideration. The Court of Appeals remanded the issue of whether the environmentalists have standing to challenge the regulations back to Judge Flannery for further consideration.

Judge Flannery held that the environmentalists do not have to actually be injured by the regulations in order to have standing to challenge them. Rather, the environmentalists need only show that the occurrence of future harm is "reasonably likely" as a result of the challenged regulations.

(From The Compact, September 1987)
APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

Applicants for certification must meet AIPG's standards as set forth in its Constitution on education, experience and competence and personal integrity, and for associate status, the same except for experience. If any member has any factual information as to any applicant's qualifications in regard to these standards, whether that information might be positive or negative, please mail that information to Headquarters within thirty (30) days. This information will be circulated only so far as necessary to process and make decisions on the applications.
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MEMBERS—IMPORTANT NOTE!!!

You have received your 1988 dues statement. Be sure to check all information on that statement card, your address, the spelling for your town and the zip code. Be sure to include primary, secondary and tertiary skill codes (see 1987 directory for code numbers). Otherwise your personal information will be incomplete or incorrect in the 1988 Directory. The information you provide here is the basis for your directory listing. Contact AIPG Headquarters if you note an error or have a question.

The purpose of AIPG is to strengthen the geological sciences as a profession with all reasonable actions, to establish professional qualifications, to certify those qualifications to the public, and to evaluate continuously the ethical conduct of its members. Further, the institute establishes ethical standards to protect the public and geological sciences from nonprofessional practices, monitors governmental and other activities affecting the geological sciences, and communicates with the public.