Registration Pros and Cons

The contributions by Merin, Nolte, Slayback and Spellman inside this issue show divergent views on registration from very competent geologists in separate fields of practice. Is there a way AIPG can resolve these extremes and serve its intended purposes to all geologists? The 1988 Executive Committee believes that there is. Next month, the address of President Sam Evans will focus on this difficult issue and possible solutions to it.

BLM Leasing Rules Proposed

Guerry Newton, AIPG’s Washington representative phoned this editor on March 25 to announce that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has issued proposed onshore oil and gas and geothermal leasing rules (43 - CFR parts 3000 et al. - see Federal Register v. 53 #54, p. 9214). Comments on these proposed rules are due April 21. Comments are available for public review in Room 555 of the Main Interior Building on 1800 C St. NW, Washington, D.C. during regular business hours (7:45 a.m. through 4:15 p.m. M-F). Comments may be sent to the Director at 140 BLM, Room 555, Main Interior Building, 1800 C St. NW, Washington, D.C. 22040. For further information phone Judith I. Reed (202) 653-2194 or Ted Hudson (202) 343-8735.

Thanks, Members!

Sam R. Evans, AIPG President

All of us in AIPG wish to thank the following members who so graciously responded to my request for volunteers to man the AIPG booth at the Annual Meeting of American Association of Petroleum Geologists. These were MATT DAURA, MICHAEL FEIN, GEORGE GORE, RON GRUBBS, ERIC JORGENSEN, STEPHANIE HRABAR, JIM MARTIN, PENELPO NELSON and JEANNE FISHER (AIPG Member Applicant). The presence of geologists at the booth produced an even better quality of representation than was formerly possible. This response is exemplary of the type of membership contribution that will keep AIPG dynamic and increase its effectiveness.

Investment Scams Grow As Stocks Drop in Appeal

The Minnesota Commerce Department is investigating a sharply rising number of out-of-state mineral investment schemes that could bilk Minnesota investors out of millions of dollars. In one scam being investigated in New Mexico, at least seven Minnesotans are part of a group of investors who lost as much as $6 million.

A deal’s promoters, who often make misleading and exaggerated claims, sometimes disappear once they have an investor’s money. A typical investment is $10,000 to $15,000. Although not all aggregate ore programs are fraudulent, Commerce Commissioner Michael Hatch says that, historically, many of them have been.

The number of investment cases under investigation by the department rose 28.5 percent in 1987, to 473. While those cases also include conventional investments like stocks and bonds, officials attribute most of the increase to nontraditional or exotic schemes including land and mineral investments.

While these deals have turned investors of every description, the elderly seem to be frequent targets, according to Scott P. Borchert, department attorney/investigator in the enforcement division.

The department isn’t sure how many people have been enticed by these high-risk schemes. “Because a lot of these things are unreported, we don’t have a lot of hard figures,” says Borchert. “Our concern right now is that a lot of people are being approached.”

Besides aggregate ore programs, investors also are looking into oil and gas drilling projects and precious metals future contracts not sold on commodities exchanges.

The first thing the Commerce Department looks for is whether the promoter is registered to sell securities in the state of Minnesota. Many of the fraudulent promoters are not, which is a felony under state law.

Next, officials check to see if the promoter’s claims are truthful. In the fraudulent deals, potential gains are often exaggerated and risk underestimated.

In some cases, promoters have simply pocketed the investor’s funds and vanished.

Nearly all the companies under investigation by the Commerce Department are “boiler-room” operations that employ a sales force and a set of phones to barrage consumers in a na-
tional telemarketing blitz. "They just pull five or more guys off the street and give them phones," Borchert says.

The promoters, operating mostly from Las Vegas and Tucson, tout investments located throughout the West and Southwest. The telemarketing is done out of southern California and southern Florida. None of the companies under investigation is now based in Minnesota.

Borchert believes promoters are preying on fears of inflation and worries that stocks are not the high-performing investment they were before the October 19th crash.

He also notes that many people have pulled their money out of stocks and may be looking for other investment avenues. "There is a disillusionment on the part of the public with the stock market. The stock market may seem as risky as going out and investing in oil and gas limited partnerships, or they may think there is something tangible about land, diamonds, and gold that you won't find in stocks." That perception is often wrong, he says.

Hatch says commodity-selling may be attracting stockbrokers put out of work by the market crash. "There has been a tremendous number of layoffs in the securities industry," he says. "Some of these people may well work for these other types of investment companies."

The problem is not exclusive to Minnesota. Officials in New Mexico, working on a federal probe funded by the National Association of Security Administrators Association (NASAA), say the incidence of fraudulent gold investments is reaching epidemic proportions nationwide. According to one estimate, investors lose anywhere from $150 million to $400 million every year in bogus commodity investments.

The Minnesota Commerce Department and similar state agencies around the country are coordinating their work with the New Mexico project. Begun July 1, Project Goldbrick started with an investigation of 10 to 15 cases. "Now we're up to 40," reports John B. Hiatt, director of the New Mexico Securities Division in Santa Fe.

Mike Chapel, a securities division special agent who works full-time on Project Goldbrick, called it the first NASAA effort to employ traditional police methods to attack gold mine fraud. Investigators are using search warrants to seize office records and are conducting undercover investigations.

In the project's first major case, expected to bring arrests within a few months, seven Minnesota investors joined about 500 others in losing $6 million on an aggregate ore deal.

The investors were duped out of an average of $5,000 to $10,000. One lost $170,000.

Project Goldbrick is funded for 12-18 months on just $32,000 of NASAA funds. Officials hope to stretch its impact by using the New Mexico operation as a clearinghouse to identify the major players. They hope to refer for prosecution as many cases as possible and scare the operators out of business, Chapel says.

The trouble is that when the heat's on, the promoters often move to a new town, assume new names, and pick up where they left off. "It's frightening how quickly money is being lost and how ineffective enforcement efforts have been," Chapel says.

Also, there remains a reluctance to prosecute white-collar crimes. "It's been very hard to convince courts that people should do time for this type of activity," says Borchert.

The Minnesota Commerce Department gets involved when it receives an investor's complaint or gets a referral from another agency. The department may issue a cease and desist order, which prevents a company from doing business in the state, or refer cases for criminal prosecution to agencies like the U.S. Attorney's office, the county attorney, or the state attorney general's office.

Three recent cease and desist orders cited these companies for registration violations: DeYork Marketing and Hydromet Inc. of Las Vegas and O.W. Martin Enterprises, Inc., of Tucson.

In one typical case, a firm offered tons of ore for $4 to $7 a ton, guaranteeing a return of $35 a ton after it was refined. Buyers were asked to put $1,400 down to cover commissions and expenses, then pay $14,000 under a contract payment plan.

Borchert says that under a typical aggregate ore investment scheme, promoters call hundreds of potential investors, whose name are obtained by buying phone lists or investment newsletter lists.

"They'll tell you they're in a position to reap big profits at any time," he says.

A day or two later, an impressive, glossy catalog arrives by mail. It looks legitimate and comes complete with written guarantees, photos of mines and mining equipment, and newspaper articles from reputable publications about the rising price of gold or other precious metals.

And it often contains an assayist's report analyzing the purportedly high mineral content of soil samples.

Promoters usually include a shipper's form for overnight mail service. They say, "You have to get in today; we want you to get in with a minimum of delay," according to Borchert.

The investors may be asked to sign a subscription agreement, promissory note, or a standard contract.

A few days later, the account executive calls back to close the deal. Over the next few months or years, the investor may receive updates by mail or phone.

At some point, the investor may get suspicious, but by then, the firm may already be out of business or have moved to another area.

Aggregate ore promotions seem to vary in popularity from time to time. Hatch says the last surge came in 1983 and 1984. "It's a cyclical thing with these exotic investments," says Borchert. "We've seen them in the past, and we'll see them again."

From City Business, (Minneapolis), January 25, 1988 Recommended for TPG by Ernest Lehmann, CPG 583
Colorado Radon Survey Resumes

Colorado Geological Survey Director John Rold announced the resumption of the EPA sponsored statewide radon-in-home screening survey. The half-completed survey was halted last June 30 because of Colorado budget problems.

"Completion of the screening survey is needed to better understand the distribution of radon in Colorado's diverse geologic environments," Rold said. "That data, which should be obtained during the heating season, will also provide basic information for the research that is needed in order for us to carry out our statutory charges in subdivision reviews and to determine areas of natural geologic hazards that could affect the safety of or cause economic loss to the citizens of Colorado."

The American Association of Radon Scientists and Technologists, a professional and trade association devoted to a better public understanding of radon and greater professionalism of scientists and technologists working on radon problems, will provide part of the funding needed to complete the survey.

The Environmental Protection Agency sponsored the survey in 10 states last winter and an additional seven states this winter. The survey is designed to statistically determine the distribution of radon concentrations in homes throughout the U.S. EPA furnishes the charcoal canisters used in the testing and analyzes the data they collect, but does not fund the screening survey. On-the-ground support is provided by local health departments and local government personnel.

In last winter's project no tests were made in seven Colorado counties. Surveys were partially completed in 38 counties and 18 counties were completed.

Results from the screening tests conducted to date indicate that of the 10 states surveyed, Colorado, with 42 percent, had the greatest percentage of readings above 4 picocuries per liter. EPA recommends that homeowners whose dwellings receive a reading above 4 picocuries per liter take action to reduce the level.

The approximately 1,000 results from last year's sampling in Colorado showed 56 percent between 0 and 4 picocuries per liter, 32 percent between 4 and 10, 8 percent between 10 and 20 and 2 percent above 20 picocuries per liter. The highest level recorded to date in this Colorado survey was 81 picocuries per liter, but private testing firms have reported levels as high as 785 picocuries per liter.

APRIL 1988

Consult an Expert

Your article about mining scams is very timely (City Business, 1/25/88). We have reported several such probable scams to the Minnesota attorney general, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and officials in other states in recent years. It is unfortunate that investors and brokers do not seek the advice of competent mining and geologic professionals, such as members of the American Institute of Professional Geologists, when considering an investment in such a highly technical field.

Ernest K. Lehmann
Certified Professional Geologist

Summary of American Institute of Professional Geologists Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

January 16, 1988, The Westin Oaks Hotel, Houston, Texas

I. Meeting Called to Order: Roll Call and Approval of Agenda.

Executive Committee Members present were: Sam R. Evans, President; Richard J. Proctor, President-Elect; Gary B. Glass, Vice-President; John T. Galey, Treasurer; Serge Gonzales, Secretary; Edward B. Nuhfer, Editor, and Advisory Board Representatives: Lawrence A. Cerrillo, Gerald V. Mendenhall, Frederick N. Murray and Wallace W. Stewart.

The results of the membership's vote of the four Constitution/Bylaws amendments were given. All proposals were accepted, so that: (1) the membership category "Associate" was eliminated; (2) the designation Certified Professional Geologist (CPG) was reinstated; (3) the voting majority for the annual business meeting was amended; and, (4) the qualifying society requirement was dropped.

Executive Director Victor C. Tannhill has submitted his resignation, effective at the end of January 1988. Various change-over developments have already been instituted at headquarters.

The Legislative Forum to be held in conjunction with the mid-April, 1988, Executive Committee meeting, will focus on strategic minerals. Ms. Elisabeth (Guerry) Newton is coordinating this effort.

By mutual agreement, Mr. Russell Wayland will end his tenure as AIPG's Washington Representative, effective at the end of January, 1988. His successor will be Ms. Elisabeth Newton. Ms. Newton’s charge was discussed.

Developments for the Annual Meeting in Tulsa during late September, 1988, include technical sessions, a continuing education activity, a field trip to the Ouachita belt, and a keynote speaker. Candidates for the latter are currently being considered. Oklahoma Governor Bellmon will make a welcoming speech.

II. Secretary’s Report

The Secretary's Report for the period October 1-December 31, 1987, and for the annual (1987) summary, as prepared by previous Secretary Stanley S. Johnson, was distributed by the current Secretary Serge Gonzales. Some contents of that report and related topics of interest are as follows: As of 12/31/87 we have a a total membership of 4,593, 144 applications on hand and 195 new members in 1987.

The Executive Committee approved the following institute policy: (1) a copy of the previous Bylaws relative to the Associate category would be retained for any needed future reference; (2) the current Associates will continue to function as before with all attendant privileges and be encouraged to apply for full member status once the appropriate level of experience is individually attained; (3) those Associate applicants whose applications were received prior to December 30, 1987, will undergo the normal membership screening process, and (4) Associate applicants whose ap-
Applications are received after that date will have their applications returned together with an appropriate letter of explanation (this last policy measure has already been implemented, according to information received from Headquarters).

Eight "problem applicant" cases were considered. A separate motion was made and seconded in seven of the cases that each applicant be accepted. Two were accepted, three rejected and three deferred for further study.

The change of Corporate Domicile to Delaware is presently under further study.

A request by the Northeast Section for a change in their Bylaws whereby the previously combined office of Secretary-Treasurer will be divided into two separate offices was approved by the Executive Committee.

The Secretary was instructed to advise the Carolinas Section that their amended Bylaws, as described in their January 7, 1988, Newsletter, were apparently not previously approved by the Executive Committee. If such approval is shown to be lacking, the matter will be considered at the next regularly scheduled Executive Committee meeting, provided a request from the section is received in time.

The question was raised about the several amendment proposals organically presented by Donald Hook at the October 14, 1987, Executive Committee meeting and intended for consideration at this meeting. The secretary was advised that Mr. Hook is currently revising his Bylaws amendments and will submit them in written fashion shortly. The secretary agreed to contact Mr. Hook about this matter.

Two Bylaws amendments were submitted in written form by Editor Edward Nuhfer (see Item E under New Business).

III. Treasurer's Report

A. A detailed and section-written report was distributed. The sections were: (1) the 1988 proposed budget; (2) explanation of accounting terms used throughout the report; (3) month-by-month budget worksheet; (4) balance sheet and statement of income and expense, as of 12-31-87; and (5) financial reports for the 3rd and 4th quarters of 1987.

B. The matter of check authorization was considered. The Executive Committee accepted the resolution entitled "Authorizing Signing of Checks and Notes" as presented by the treasurer. The enacted resolution stipulates that the following parties are so authorized: (1) President Sam Evans; (2) Vice-President Gary Glass; (3) Treasurer John Galey; and (4) Administrative Manager Carol Beckett. It further stipulates that for checks of $3,000 or less, only one signature is required; for checks above that sum, two signatures are required.

C. Other topics presented by the treasurer include signature cards for the officers, centralized AIPG telephone credit cards, salary raises for Headquarters staff, establishment of a petty cash account at Headquarters, transfer of institute assets to the treasurer from the executive director and bonding for check signatories.

IV. Vice President's Report (Membership)

The vice president's report was covered in the secretary's report.

V. President-Elect's Report (Section Relations)

A. The president-elect presented no formal report.

B. A summary statement about Executive Committee policy on section relations was however distributed (see Old Business).

VI. Editor's Report

A. A written report was distributed. Copies of the January 1988 TPG, the first issue of the Silver Anniversary year newsletter, were also distributed.

B. The editor summarized his remarks from those presented on pages 12-13 of the January 1988 TPG in reference to intentions for the 1988 TPG. Changes to the back cover and writeups on Headquarters staff and the Advisory Board were discussed.

C. The Executive Committee approved the editor's recommendations regarding typesetting vendor, cost, and mailing arrangements for the first six months of the 1988 TPG.

D. The Executive Committee also approved the editor's recommendations about the printing contract and mailing arrangements for the Directory. Further discussion on the Directory was held regarding the number of copies, overall distribution, and the future possibility of professional advertising. Sam Evans reported that Jerry Watson will chair a committee to investigate the latter topic and report to the Executive Committee.

E. The editor also reported on plans for the 1988 Awards Booklet and on Issues/Answers Booklet on Geological Hazards being coordinated by Richard Proctor.

VII. Committee and Other Appointments

A. Past Secretary Stanley S. Johnson has agreed to be the institute's representative to the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). Membership and travel expenses will be borne by the institute.

B. President Sam Evans is serving as the institute's representative to the American Geological Institute (AGI). Copies of the AGI Membership Council October 28, 1987, meeting agenda and the minutes of previous meetings were previously distributed to the Executive Committee. The next AGI Membership Council meeting is scheduled for Houston in March, 1988; Sam Evans will attend.

C. The 1989 Annual Meeting is already committed to the Capitol-Virginia sections for the Washington area. Interest in hosting the 1990 Annual Meeting at Reno, Nevada, and the 1991 Annual Meeting in southern California has been extended by the Nevada and California sections respectively.

D. Committees anticipated for 1988 and their chairmen are (Executive Committee liaison shown in parentheses):

1. Annual Meetings - Larry Rhodes (Richard Proctor)
2. Constitution/Bylaws - Dean Grafton (Serge Gonzales)
3. Continuing Education - Ted Clark (Frederick Murray)
4. Ethics - John Dragonetti (Gerald Mendenhall)
5. Governmental Affairs - Roy Guess (Sam Evans)
6. Honors and Awards - TBA (Sam Evans)
7. Membership Services - Membership and Member Services Committees combined - Penelope Nelson (Lawrence Cerrillo)
8. Nominating - Charles Mankin (Sam Evans)
9. Tellers - TBA (Serge Gonzales)

Executive Committee liaisons were requested to contact the respective chairman.

VIII. Old Business

A. It was agreed to coordinate with the headquarters staff to update the Operations Manual in this regard.

B. The summary statement on Executive Committee Policy on Section Relations will be considered at the April, 1988, Executive Committee Meeting.

THE PROFESSIONAL GEOLOGIST
IX. New Business

A. The Executive Committee conferred the title of Administrative Manager - AIPG on Mrs. Carol A. Beckett in light of her expanded duties at Headquarters. Revised financial arrangements were also approved for the Headquarters staff.

B. The Executive Committee voted unanimously to extend an invitation to Mr. and Mrs. Victor C. Tannehill to attend the Tulsa, Oklahoma, meeting in late September, 1988, as guests of the institute.

C. The Executive Committee established a special Headquarters Committee, consisting of John Gale as Chairman, and Gary Glass and Lawrence Cerrillo as members, to coordinate activities of the Headquarters staff and revisions in the operational procedures.

D. The State of Arkansas Board of Registration (Geologists) has contacted the institute and requested that the Institute’s Code of Ethics be utilized by that Board verbatim for its pending registration provisions. Sam Evans will contact Board Chairman (and AIPG member) Don E. Williams with verbal and written acknowledgement that the Executive Committee has approved that request.

E. Two amendments to the Bylaws, dealing respectively with reinstatement and the education requirements, were submitted and distributed by Editor Edward Nuhfer. These will be considered at the Executive Committee meeting in April, 1988.

F. No recommendations were received from the Advisory Board.

G. A special meeting of the Executive Committee has been called for February 20-21, 1988, in Arvada, Colorado for purposes of discussing the Executive Director position, operations at the Headquarters office, and the Colorado corporate dissolution.

Respectfully submitted,
Serge Gonzales
Secretary

Editor’s Note: These minutes have been edited and condensed to allow publication in TPG.

American Institute of Professional Geologists:
Constitutional Purposes and Goals

As adopted by vote of a majority of the membership, according to AIPG’s Constitution Article II, Statement of Purposes (as amended), these are the institute’s goals:

– 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 (so as to) protect the public and the geological sciences from non-professional practices;
– To monitor governmental and other activities affecting the geological sciences; and
– To communicate with the public.

Howard A. Spellman, CPG 3734
President - California State Board of Registration for Geologists and Geophysicists

It bothers me when I read how some individuals promote AIPG certification as an alternative to state licensing of geologists and geophysicists. In fact, when the bill to abolish the Geologists and Geophysicists Board (GGB) was introduced some legislators received letters from several AIPG members suggesting that AIPG could serve as the certifying body for geologists rather than the board. Further, on page 12 of the February 1988 issue of The Professional Geologist, the last sentence in the second paragraph of the California Legislative Update reads:

"Some officers of the Cal Section noted that AIPG is the only national certifying body for all geologists and could be used to take up the slack (if GGB is abolished)."

There is a problem with this type of thinking and advocacy. The problem is clearly illustrated in Items 2 to 4 of the article "Dr. Technician?" on page 3 in the February 1988 of The Professional Geologist. In Item 2, the Kentucky engineers don’t care if the geologists play professional by being members of one or a dozen societies but they don’t want geologists to be statutorily licensed so they can legally perform geological services for the public.

If the California board is abolished without being replaced statutorily by an agency, board or entity which would legally register geologists, the California geologists and geophysicists would be squeezed out of business. That is, geologists would be required to work as employees for registered engineers or registered sanitarians to do much of the same type of work they are doing now as entrepreneurs.

I am also miffed that the Kentucky Section of Professional Engineers and Consulting Engineers Council (KSPE/CEC) is so ill-informed (or nervous about losing business) as to say:

"Geologists do not take as many courses in natural or physical sciences and mathematics as engineers, and thus do not have the broad technical background essential to making adequate technical judgments relating to matters involving the public safety, health, and welfare."

Geologists are better qualified (schooled, trained) than engineers, in many cases, to render judgments on earth materials, groundwater, etc. affecting public safety. College professors see to that by hands-on application of courses in the field. The image portrayed by KSPE/CEC is dark-age...head-in-the-sand...mentality. The public is better served by cooperation, not confrontation, between registered engineers and registered geologists.

Recent toxic waste laws in the California Health and Safety Code permit investigations to be performed and reports signed by a registered geologist or a registered civil engineer. If the Geologists and Geophysicists Board is abolished, only the registered civil engineers would be legally permitted to contract for projects and to sign reports.

Continued Next Page
Now in California, a registered geologist must sign geologic reports and only a registered geologist can practice or offer to practice geology. This is specifically stated in Sections 7832 and 7835 of the California Business and Professions Code which require work to be performed by registered geologists. Many of the tasks reserved for engineers in Kentucky are included in this list.

I don’t think that the California Legislature will give any association the legal authority to say who shall and shall not practice geology in California. In 1968 or 1969, the California Professional Engineers tried to establish an independent body to license engineers but the legislature didn’t even consider the bill and it has never been reintroduced although several civil engineers are legislators.

AIPG membership is a worthwhile goal and membership should be promoted, but don’t promote it as an alternative to board registration in California. A lot of your members could be out of work or relegated to second class status if that happened.

Sincerely,
Howard A. Spellman, CPG 3734
President State Board of Registration
For Geologists and Geophysicists

Registration Cons

Statutory Regulation of Geologists, Is It Inevitable?
Cliff J. Nolte, CPG 1604

These are my personal views on the subject of peer certification vs. statutory regulation. They are being made as a 40-year member of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists and certified by the Professional Geologists, the Division of Professional Affairs of the AAPG and the Society of Independent Professional Earth Scientists.

PURPOSES:
1. Review the status of statutory regulation of geologists in the United States.
2. Why its rapid progression,
3. Its impact on the profession, and
4. Is it inevitable?

In 1973 only 2 states had statutes regulating geologists. In 1985 this number grew to 11 and in the past two years 5 others have been added, bringing the total to 16! What first seemed to be a strategy of gradualism employing the domino theory has become a snowballing avalanche of regulation.

In looking at the map, it would seem that those favoring statutory regulation of geologists have a strategy of first the west coast, then the east coast, gradually encroaching upon and surrounding the oil producing states in the middle until the last state “falls like ripe fruit into their hands.” It is not unlike the Soviet strategy towards a one-world Marxist state…surround and conquer.

Why the rapid progression?
1. The geologists in some states are not as adamant about wanting to keep government out of the affairs of geologists as the independent-minded free-spirited petroleum geologists in the mid-section of the country.

2. The profession as a whole has not been able to develop a strong unified certification program that would make “legislation unnecessary”, to quote Martin Van Couvering, and
3. Geologists have not been able to trust their professional affairs to one organization. With this splintering of direction a strong unified lobbying effort promoting peer certification in states not having statutory regulation is impossible.

Let us now compare and contrast statutory regulation to peer certification.

STATUTORY REGULATIONS:

With certain exemptions, statutes regarding the regulation of a profession usually state that: Unless licensed, it is unlawful to practice a profession or hold yourself out to the public as practicing a profession. The purpose is to allow only persons who are minimally competent to practice as professionals. The tools to accomplish this are the initial licensing process and its disciplinary authority. The licensing process generally includes the passing of an exam, submission of character references, academic training and professional experience.

The disciplinary actions provided include letters of admonition, probation, suspension or revocation of license to practice. Practicing a profession without a license in Colorado is considered a misdemeanor.

While public protection may be accomplished, if indeed such protection is necessary, the negative aspects are:
1. The intrusion of government into the profession,
2. Restricting the right and freedom to practice one’s profession,
3. Restricting the freedom to practice across state lines, and
4. Additional economic burdens placed on the professional.

In addition, reciprocity can be considered a myth! State legislators’ concern for the protection of the health, safety or welfare of the public ends where their constituency ends, at the state border. As one Wyoming geologist put it when Colorado was considering a regulatory statute for geologists, “If you pass a law that restricts our ability to do business in Colorado, we will pass a law in Wyoming that will make you wish your law had never been considered!” So much for reciprocity! And score one for the domino effect!
PEER CERTIFICATION:

Except for an entrance examination, the requirements for peer certification for geologists are similar to those of statutory regulation. They include specific academic training, character references to assure the highest ethical and professional conduct, and professional experience.

Disciplinary measures for unethical conduct or malpractice may be expulsion from the institute and certification revocation. While it does not have the force of law behind it, peer certification can assure the public that the practitioner possesses the professional competence and ethical standards to practice his profession in public.

To be effective, peer certification must be unified and supported by the entire profession. A significant portion of the profession must be certified and professional certification must have public recognition.

There are many reasons given for statutory regulation of a profession. But only one is valid: a compelling need to protect the health, welfare or safety of the public where such protection cannot be provided by other means. Seeking statutory regulation of geologists for reasons of securing equal status with other professions, for potential personal gain or for limiting entry into the profession is strictly self-serving. Such groveling before legislative bodies for self-serving reasons is conduct beneath that of a true professional! Seeking statutory regulation for personal reasons while arguing a presumed public need is both unprincipled and unethical.

Certain inequities do exist where the statutes regulating one profession infringe on the territory and rights of another profession. Such is the case between the engineers and the engineering geologists. The problem can be corrected by requesting legislative action to remedy the inequities rather than by trying to pass unnecessary and restrictive laws.

The Executive Committee of the Colorado Section of the AIPG has been concerned with the rapid spread of statutory regulation. It has had questions about the policy of the National Executive Committee of the AIPG toward this problem. It was decided that a questionnaire be sent to each member of the Colorado Section of AIPG asking the reasons for joining AIPG and his or her feelings towards statutory regulation and peer certification. The results of that questionnaire were resoundingly clear:

1. 65% gave peer certification as their primary or only reason for joining AIPG.
2. 75% opposed statutory regulation or registration of geologists.
3. 70% saw peer certification as having your technical competence and professional conduct certified by your peers and as a desirable alternative to registration.
4. 82% felt that the AIPG should be more active in promoting peer certification as being more desirable than statutory registration.

The message being sent by the Colorado Section to the National Executive Committee by the results of this questionnaire is that the policy of the AIPG concerning statutory regulation of geologists should be as follows:

"The AIPG strongly opposes statutory regulation of geologists. In states having no statutory regulation, AIPG should strongly lobby its members to accept peer certifica-

A Few Shots in the Foot - Will They Be Fatal?

Russ Slayback CPG 2305

The relationships of northeast geologists, as well as most geologists east of the Mississippi, to national AIPG have always been tenuous at best. The center of gravity of AIPG has always been in the west. The founders of AIPG were largely oil and gas geologists from California, Texas, Colorado, and Oklahoma, with some support from Illinois, Pennsylvania and Virginia. At times, it has been a struggle to keep the oil and gas types from turning AIPG into a branch office of AAPG. Those of us who practice less lucrative but equally satisfying aspects of geology - mining, aggregates, hydrogeology, environmental geology, engineering geology, economic minerals - generally have different interests, different economics, different competitive situations and even different, generally broader, political viewpoints.

This year, 1987, seem likely to go down in AIPG history, as seen from the east, as a year of setbacks for AIPG geologists who aren't oil patch players. Those of us who are in the trenches investigating and remediating environmental pollution are facing vigorous and increasingly vicious competition from engineers, competition that is largely based on the premise that a P.E. license entitles an engineer to practice geology, no doubt because he/she is a licensed professional who may have been exposed to Geology 101.

Does that premise sound bizarre to you - an AIPG certified geologist with a minimum of 36 credit hours of geology and at least 5 years of experience? Does the fact that many of you, with an early B.S. or a recent M.S. and more than 60 semester hours of formal geologic training, are regarded by regulators as inferiors in matters of Superfund of RCRA or hazardous/toxic or landfill site investigations to a P.E. who has never taken a course in geology?

Yet that is the trend of what is happening to geologists as individual states increasingly rule or pass regulations that require that environmental geology work be done by and sealed
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by a registered professional engineer. Many of our colleagues have just given up; they have set up subsidiary engineering companies to provide "turnkey" services and to act as the lead contractor where state regulations require a P.E. stamp. The actions are understandable - nobody ever said that Yankees don't understand economics.

But the real struggle, if geology is to survive as an independent profession, is recognition by law that geology is a learned profession, worthy of licensing as P.G.'s, worthy of legal authority to conduct geologic investigations without being supervised by a licensed engineer (what a crazy idea!). By now, that exalted status has been conferred upon geologists in one legal form or another by at least 13 states. Recent licensing strength has occurred along the South Atlantic seaboard, which now is solidly in the registration camp from Virginia to Florida. In our Northeast Section, only Maine certifies professional geologists. Many of us have fought the struggle, been beaten by the engineers, and wait for a better day to try again.

And so what does National AIPG have for us in 1987? In 1987, AIPG's National Executive Committee saw fit to change the institute's policy on state registration, which now reads:

"AIPG believes that its certification of professionals by their peers as to their competence and ethical behavior is to be preferred. Self-regulation is the most desirable form of professional practice" (October 14).

And:

"This institute shall carry out those Constitutional purposes in such a way as to make AIPG Certification so effective that state geologist registration/licensing laws will be unnecessary for the proper protection of the public" (July 11).

With friends like that, who needs enemies? How did these silly, unrealistic resolutions get passed? Well, I don't really know, but I do know that eastern geologists are underrepresented on the Executive Committee. Maybe it's because we are too busy to attend to professional matters at a time when the oil and gas guys have a lot of time on their hands - the devil makes work for idle hands or something like that. However it happened, it was a real kick in the head for us in the east.

It appears that our 1987 National Executive Committee was oblivious to the challenge from engineers, a challenge that says that geologists cannot be trusted to conduct geologic work! If that isn't an issue that involves protection of the public, I don't know what is.

This policy change would be bad enough by itself but other 1987 Executive Committee actions, subject to membership approval (which tends to be a rubber stamp of Executive Committee recommendations) are also distressing. While eastern geologists have been lobbying for more stringent standards for certification (a return to 8 years of experience versus 5 previously), we will probably no longer be required to demonstrate our participation in the technical aspect of geology by continuing membership in a recognized geologic society to sustain AIPG membership. Why? Come on, guys, let's get serious!

We also see the probable elimination of Associate status in AIPG as the result of proposed Bylaws Amendment 1. We are told that the Associate program has been a failure nationally, that it is costly and a problem for the national office to manage a second class of affiliation, and that it's simply not worth retaining. Well, that may be true in states that never tried to promote Associate status. However, in the Northeast we accepted eight (8) Associates, as compared to 19 full members, so far in 1987. Hardly a failure! Our Associates have been valuable contributors to section activities; witness Bob Lamonica and Rich Barbour, who served on the Executive Committee as Associates and now as full members are section officers.

We hope 1988 will bring more balanced representation of the entire profession by National AIPG.

from Northeast Section Newsletter
Dear Editor:

I said to myself that I was not going to get politically involved in the professional registration issue...wrong!!!! Political involvement is the only way to put a stop to the type of ignorant and arrogant commentary exemplified by the Kentucky Society of Professional Engineers regarding their remarks attempting to stop legislation on the registration of geologists in the State of Kentucky (see TPG, Feb. 1988). More importantly and more pragmatically I couldn’t agree more with Walter Heinrichs’ (February 1988 TPG) comment that “registration is simply an established fact of life for most of the elite professionals”. If we geologists do not act to create a registration movement for each and every state then the engineers will take over a significant segment of our profession. This appears to have already happened in New York State, as pointed out by David Stoner and Robert Lamonica in the TPG February 1988 and November 1987, respectively.

A coordinated effort is required for professional registration to succeed and, whether or not it is endorsed by the AIPG, this organization should take the lead by providing basic information such as the names and addresses of appropriate congressional representatives and other legislators and a list of pertinent issues. Geologists must become politically active by writing to these individuals to encourage their support for registration (phone calls are not as effective because of the lack of a permanent record). The academic community must be made aware of the relevance of this issue so they may get involved. Perhaps mailing copies of the KSPE/CEC opinion plus basic information on the registration issue to university professors would get their attention. If the geologists do not support their profession, then others will carve segments off geology to add to their own professions.

I am grateful that The Professional Geologist published the KSPE viewpoint (February 1988). I am curious, however: did any representative of AIPG write or contact any Kentucky legislators or any of the professors at the University of Kentucky regarding this matter?

Sincerely,
Ira S. Merin, CPG 7298

Editor’s Note: Ira Merin asks several important questions about the nature of response by AIPG. In brief, key legislators in KY have been contacted by both the Kentucky Section and by national AIPG. National AIPG has demanded full retraction by KSPE/CEC of their statements about geologists quoted in the “Dr. Technician?” article in the February TPG. The Kentucky Section has filed a formal complaint with the State of Kentucky on the grounds that KSPE/CEC has violated Kentucky’s own Code of Ethics by publishing false and misleading information. Complimentary copies of TPG are sent to every degree-granting department in the nation and all professors should now be aware of the KSPE/CEC opinion - and hopefully its implications for the future of the geologic profession.

Fred L. Fox, CPG 1273

An issue of major concern is ETHICS, both those of our profession and those of others who impinge on our profession.

The practice of geology is not officially recognized by registration in some states, but engineering is recognized. There are, and always have been, non-geologists treading on our turf, but not often blatantly. When the trespass in blatant, it’s time to get up and act. Consider the following cases.

A reasonably competent soil/foundation engineer (with some exposure to well-executed geological work by virtue of having had some good geologists working under him for a major geotechnical consultancy) is peddling his services as an ENGINEERING GEOLOGIST. This person is NOT a geologist either by education or by training. He IS a professional engineer, or at least is so registered. Is his practice of geology ethical?

Another example is a Ph.D. geographer who claims expertise in ground water. Many of his clients are municipalities, trying to prove their ground water reserves are limited, thereby limiting development. With a certain amount of statistical wizardry he is able to make a case for his clients; however, the results are questionable (to say the least) hydrogeologically.

These people (and others as well) are practicing geology without a license. Of course, so am I and so are others working in New Jersey. This argument has been used in favor of registration laws.

This issue transcends registration debate, however. In the case of the engineer, it is a clear breach of his own ethics, or lack of them. This should be brought up before HIS peers, not just ours. In the case of the geographer, he may be just a college prof trying to pick up some consulting work, but most state codes of ethics specify that an individual should not practice outside his or her field of expertise.

I’m sure there are others out there with similar war stories. LET’S HEAR FROM YOU! I'll be glad to collect and organize our efforts to get the information in front of the proper forum.

American Institute of Professional Geologists: Definitions

(1) "Geology" is the science that includes the study of the earth in general, the history of the earth and its life forms; the rocks, minerals, liquids, gases, and other materials of which the earth is composed; and the study of the component parts of the earth. The knowledge and principles of geology are also applied to extraterrestrial bodies.

(2) "Professional geological work" is application of the principles, theories, laws, and body of knowledge encompassed in the science of geology at an advanced and skillful level requiring education, experience, and the capability of interpretation and evaluation.

Continued on Page 15
Federal Legislative and Regulatory Issues Reviewed

By Guerry Newton, AIPG Washington Representative

Proposed rule on soil handling specifications for surface coal mining and reclamation. The Soil Conservation Service seeks comments on a proposed rule which will establish specifications for soil removal, stockpiling, replacement and reconstruction. A series of public hearings will be held in Washington, D.C.; Champaign, Illinois; Lexington, Kentucky; Bismarck, North Dakota and Columbus, Ohio. Comments on the proposed rule will be accepted until April 18. Contact Gary Margheim, Land Treatment Program Division, Soil Conservation Service, Box 2890, Washington, D.C. 20013 (telephone 202-382-1870).

EPA has announced plans to protect groundwater. EPA has released its long-awaited strategy for groundwater protection from pesticides contamination in a 150 page report released on February 25, 1988. At the same time, Senator Durenburger (R-Minn) has introduced legislation calling for more stringent controls. It is expected to be a contentious debate with congressional interests, environmentalists, agricultural, and pesticide interests all fighting for their positions.

ANWR drilling - gets Senate Committee OK. The Senate Energy Committee approved a bill that would authorize the Interior Department to open 1.5 million acres of the coastal plain portion of ANWR to oil exploration. It has been established that the recoverable resources range from 3.2 billion barrels to 9 billion barrels of oil.

Sulfur sale in OCS. The MMS announced the results of the first sulfur sale in 19 years. The sale realized 15 million dollars.

Marine hard mineral sale anticipated. A gold placer sale in Alaskan OCS waters is anticipated by the end of the year according to William Bettenburg, Director of MMS. This information was provided to the House subcommittee on Mining and Natural Resources on March 1, 1988.

The MMS has also announced the relocation of its office of International and Strategic Minerals from Long Beach, California to Washington, D.C. James Workman, formerly of the Office of Surface Mining will head the program in Washington.

BLM Hazardous materials management program. BLM has asked for increased funding in its 1989 budget request for added emphasis to the hazardous materials management program. The BLM program has been the subject of a study conducted by the environment, energy and natural resources subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee. The subcommittee is chaired by Rep. Mike Synar (D-Okla.)

Governors drafting energy policy. State governors are drafting a rational energy policy to be ready for August presentation. The statement is to be ready for the fall election campaign. Tentative issues of interest to geologists are: increased oil and gas production; strategic oil stockpiling; and state primacy on waste management from oil & mining.

Oil and gas pre-lease planning requirement undecided. The pre-lease planning issue is being kept alive through a difference of opinion between the 9th and 10th judicial circuits where questions on the validity of the issue have been raised. Sen. Bumpers (D-Ark) and Sen. Melcher (D-Mt) have promised that Senate hearings will be held this year. It is anticipated that the Supreme Court ultimately, will decide the issue.

California Desert Legislation. Sen. Pete Wilson (R-Cal.) has decided to develop an independent analysis of the legislation prior to taking a position.

Congress to be pressed by Reagan Administration on several energy issues. Congressional action is being sought this term by the White House on several energy issues it has long promoted: 1) repeal of the Windfall profits tax; 2) natural gas de-control; 3) exploration and development of the Outer Continental Shelf; and 4) exploration and development of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The administration also urged the reform of the nuclear power plant licensing process in order to "ensure the future viability of nuclear power in the United States".

Efforts underway to resolve North Atlantic OCS leasing stalemate. The Minerals Management Service has requested the National Academy of Sciences to study the leasing history of the Georges Bank area and to make recommendations as to the risks and benefits of oil and gas development in the area. Affected states, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York and Rhode Island have agreed to the initial phase of the proposed study. The MMS plans to use the NAS report as a basis for policy discussions aimed at resolving the issues that underlie the current congressional moratorium on leasing in parts of the North Atlantic OCS.

Energy and Interior Secretary's differ on proposal to drain Hetch Hetchy Reservoir, California. Secretary of Interior Hodel's proposal to drain Hetch Hetchy is an "economic and environmental mistake" according to Secretary of Energy Herrington. A DOE report estimates that such action would cause an electrical generating capacity loss of 150 megawatts which would need to be replaced by the year 2000.

OSMRE performance standard rules for coal roads controversial. Several environmental groups want rules withdrawn and minimum standards for design, maintenance and reclamation by OSMRE. The National Coal Association and American Mining Congress are concerned that the rules not be applied retroactively to roads in existing operating areas.

Regulatory Actions:

BLM* - Draft EIS - Aptus industrial & hazardous waste treatment facility, Utah - comments due April 26, 1988 - 53FR 5324
Forest Service - Notice to prepare EIS - Oil drilling in Lewis & Clark NF, Great Falls, MT - 53FR 5290
MMS - Draft EIS-North Atlantic OCS; Lease sale area #96 - comments due April 19, 1988 - 53FR 5471.
Hold It! Have You Checked Your Skeletons Lately? Part II

By Guest Columnist Melba “Jerry” Murray

This article is continued from last month’s issue.
Retrieve ideas buried in modifiers
Consider these (underlined) skeletons:
(3) You must evacuate the area immediately. 6 words
(4) It is recommended [that the process of evacuation be carried out expeditiously]. (12 words)

The skeleton of sentence (3) is a model of plain English; that of (4) is typical of technical writing. Keep the skeleton of (4) intact, substitute technical language of your choice for the rest of the sentence, and you have the unfortunate beginnings of a thousand and more documents written in “technicalesque” or “businessese.”

Why do we write that way? Our subconscious dependence on the skeleton to carry the key idea probably goes back to the beginnings of speech. As a child, Ricky begins communicating in plain (if somewhat ungrammatical) fashion. If he could write, he’d report his need for supper like this:

Ricky want supper now!

Teenager Rick learns to elaborate and complicate the same message (and, unfortunately, to throw the current slang around):

Y’know it sure would be neat if a guy could get a quarter-pounder around here once in a while with like pickles and jalepenos, y’know?

Later, on-the-job Richard cleans up his act and gets dignified -- what he imagines is “professional.”

A fundamental requirement for sustenance exists at this point in time.

“I want a hamburger” is buried in the modifying phrase for sustenance. Dismaying, isn’t it?

Next time you’re writing a letter, memo, or report, identify the subject-verb-complement of your sentences -- especially the lead sentences of each section and paragraph of the text -- to make sure your skeletons in fact deliver the message you want to get across. Your purpose is to inform, not to impress. Let those skeletons help you prepare a message with impact.

Guest columnist Melba “Jerry” Murray of Atlanta has been showing scientists, engineers and business professionals around the world how to improve their writing for over two decades. She founded the technical writing consulting firm Murray Associates International.

“Write It Right” featuring Hugh Hay-Row appears in TPG courtesy of the Texas Section.
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INSTITUTE ALBUM

Edward E. (Bud) Rue, CPG 12

April of 1963 was supposed to be a waiting period for those interested in the professional affairs of geologists. It was in May 1963 that a special AGI committee would make the momentous recommendation as to the course of action that AGI should follow with respect to the certification of geological scientists. For all through April they would be “proceeding with vigor” as instructed by the president to resolve this most difficult (for them) problem. The ploy of additional delay was not swallowed by many geologists.

After six years of discussions, starting with the first AGI Committee for Professional Standards, appointed in 1957 by J. V. Howell, if anything was agreed upon, it was that internal regulation or certification was not only desired but necessary to resolve the problems of the geological profession. It was further agreed by all serious students of the subject that this organization should be either developed through AGI as a spun-off group or be an entirely separate and single group representing all branches of geology and types of geologists. AGI would be the logical choice representing all branches of the science, but almost everyone also knew that some of AGI’s member societies would never stand for this.

A logical questions was “Why all the hoopla over a group trying to solve its own problems?” Some cried “unionism” and “guildism!” Some said “the technical societies are our professional representatives” while the technical societies did amazingly little to improve the image and working conditions of professional geologists. Others, particularly academic types, said “let the academic degrees certify that a geologist is competent” but not all geologists holding academic degrees were protected by the American Association of University Professors or by good old tenure and economic freedom.

Fortunately there were groups who would sit and study no longer. These were local groups and national committees: to name a few, the Virginia Association of Geologists, the Illinois Geological Society, the Indiana-Kentucky Geological Society, the Geological Society of Iowa, the California Association of Engineering Geologists and others. Hardly anybody sat on the edge of his or her chair for the long awaited decision from AGI. Least of all SIPES. They had already organized, but if you weren’t a consultant or independent, they didn’t need you. The future AIPG and AAPG people may have felt obligated to wait even though they knew what the answer would be.

The president of AAPG admittedly was trying to get the future Division of Professional Affairs off the ground. The future AIPG people were gaining momentum in their plans to organize what the AGI Professional Standards Committee set up as the only alternative to an AGI spin-off. That was an entirely separate group representing all branches and types of geologists.

It was all too apparent that no one really knew who was in charge of the professional affairs of geologists. AGI was controlled by its member societies as it should be, but who controlled those societies? Academia was controlled by its institution but highly influenced by (1) the people and companies who hire their students, (2) the people and corporations who fund...
their research and, (3) the teachers themselves who were well represented by the American Association of University Professors.

It was going to be interesting who, now and in the future, would take charge of representing the professional interests of geologists.

Richard M. “Pete” Foose, CPG 439 had an extremely busy spring and summer in 1987! In March-April he joined with Russ Slayback, CPG 2305 and Ken Weaver, CPG 1064 in evaluating the Department of Geology at West Chester College for the AIPG.

John Jens, CPG 6550 has been reassigned from Mapping and Charting Establishment, Royal Engineers to the Pentagon, Washington, D.C. as U.S. Army Topographic Programs Officer with the HQDA Staff-Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence. Received the Department of Defense Meritorious Service Medal for work in Britain. His new address is 9413 Cloverhill Road, Manassas, VA 22110, (703) 368-0814.

Richard M. Troise, CPG 6794 has been made a VP of G&M and Director of Marketing of Water Information Center, Inc. Mr. Troise is a ground-water geologist and publisher, and has developed and published many textbooks, reference books and periodicals in the water field. He is the author of The Ground-Water Newsletter and co-author of the Water Atlas of the United States. Also to VP, Vincent W. Uhl, Jr., CPG 6519 of G&M Hackensack, New Jersey, office has planned and provided hydrogeologic field supervision during the numerous exploratory test-drilling programs, including design and installation of production wells, deep-injection wells, salt-water monitor wells, pumping tests, and aquifer evaluations.

Robert A. Saar, CPG 6815 was made an Associate of G&M in their Plainview, New York office. Bob has been responsible for the evaluation of chemical data obtained in ground-water investigations relating to industrial compliance and state hazardous waste management programs, compliance orders and RCRA and Superfund investigations.

SECTION NEWS

ALASKA

The March meeting held on March 15 featured Jeff T. Kline, DGGS, who spoke on Radon in Alaska. Potentially hazardous levels of radon have been noted at Alaskan locations. Jeff has been studying radon occurrence in Alaska for several years under the auspices of the state geologic survey. He presented the results of his research and discussed some of the implications for public information and policy.

ARIZONA

The Arizona Section of the American Institute of Professional Geologists held its fall field trip at the new Waddell Dam site. The field trip was expertly led by a representative of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation on Saturday, October 3. Approximately 25 members and guests of AIPG attended.

After our tour, President Eyde called a quarterly meeting of the members. It was agreed upon, by vote, to support an active position against the City of Tucson - Proposition 100. This
proposition would require CAP water, delivered via aqueduct to Tucson from the Colorado River, to be “recharged” into the surrounding alluvial basin. The position of our Arizona Section - AIPG was quoted in newspaper accounts. We urged voters to defeat the proposition because it was poorly developed and, if enacted, would be costly, ineffective, and possibly dangerous. The proposition was defeated.

CONGRATULATIONS! First to our out-going president, Ted Eyde. He did a great job and deserves our highest accolade. Many thanks, Ted.

Second, to our incoming officers: Bill Wellendorf, President; Carole O'Brien, President-Elect; Mike Greeley, Vice President and Charles Miller, Secretary-Treasurer. Let’s all support our officers for 1988 and the activities of the Arizona Section.

COLORADO

Report of the 1987 “Why AIPG?” Examination of AIPG and the Colorado Section

This report reviews and concludes the examination of the purposes and activities of AIPG and the Colorado Section during 1987.

The Colorado Section conducted the examination in order to develop a more effective program for attracting new members. The results identified some benefits of AIPG membership that have not been sufficiently enumerated in the past, and these can be used to effectively recruit new members. In addition, the examination process generated a renewed feeling of excitement and enthusiasm about AIPG and the Colorado Section. This renewal is perhaps the most significant result of the examination.

Maintenance of this renewal requires more work, but we are in the position to proceed with renewed confidence and the expectation of results. The programs for the future discussed by Larry Cerillo in his section of this report are possible because of what the Colorado Section accomplished this year. Other sections and the institute as a whole will benefit from what we have begun.

Review of 1987 Examination of “Why AIPG?” and the Colorado Section

David M. Abbott, Jr.
1987 President, Colorado Section

When the 1987 Board first assembled to set the section’s agenda for the year, the need for increasing membership topped the list of things to do. How could we increase membership among geologists generally, or specifically among oil geologists, geologists employed by large companies, government geologists, younger geologists, etc.? Our interest in increasing membership grew from a recognition that AIPG can be most effective only if most geologists belong. If we can truly speak for the majority of the geologic community, as reflected by both membership numbers and percentages, then we can more effectively carry out the section’s and the institute’s goals and objectives.

In considering how to increase our membership, we quickly got to the question, “Why should a geologist join AIPG?”
In short, “Why AIPG?”

In considering this question, the board quickly realized that a reassessment of AIPG generally, and the Colorado Section in particular, was required, and that the entire section membership should participate in this evaluation. The purpose was not to condemn what had occurred in the past, but to determine what we should do in the future to achieve the institute’s goals and objectives.

We began this evaluation with the February (1987) meeting at which representatives of various segments of the geologic community described why they joined AIPG. We followed in June with a “rap session” which expanded on the February meeting and allowed greater participation from the floor. Rather than having the prepared remarks of a panel, we asked for and got gut-level expressions of feelings and opinions.

These two meetings identified the following benefits of AIPG membership:

- Certification
- Regular publication of The Professional Geologist and The Colorado Professional Geologist.
- Participation in public policy-making in areas affecting geologic practice through lobbying and other efforts.
- Monthly section and annual institute meetings with programs focused on professional issues.
- Special programs such as the Consultant’s Workshop, Geotech, and Haztech.
- Special publications such as Water in the West, the Metals issue of the CPG, Hazardous Wastes, the Professional Practice Guides, etc.
- The opportunity to meet regularly with geologists practicing in different areas and from different perspectives because AIPG members work in all areas of geology and in all types of employment. AIPG is unique in the way in which it brings together the full breadth of the geologic profession. The importance of these contacts is hard to measure, but is very real and very important to many of us.

Following the February and June meetings, we prepared a questionnaire addressing several important issues raised. Cliff Nolte, 1987 Section Vice President, reviews the results of the questionnaire in the April issue of TPG.

In conclusion, I want to make three general observations. First, the excitement and enthusiasm shown by you, the members of the Colorado Section, in pursuing this examination of AIPG, is most gratifying. Clearly, we have been doing something worthwhile. What we have accomplished so far results from your willingness to participate. The board members, individually or as a group, could not have done what we did this year by ourselves. This has been a section-wide program in the truest sense.

Continued on Next Page
Second, the national recognition of what the section has been doing this year has exceeded our expectations. We have gotten national recognition and interest from the beginning through publication in The Professional Geologist.

And third, now that our evaluation of "Why AIPG?" is drawing to a close, we look forward to getting on with our agenda of improving AIPG so that it will serve you better. In particular, our original goal of increasing membership remains to be accomplished. Much work remains to be done, and we still need your help. Larry Cerrillo, the section president for 1988, concludes this report with a discussion of his goals for 1988.

I have enjoyed being a part of this effort. Thank you for your efforts so far. Keep up the good work.

KENTUCKY

Geologists in Kentucky have sought for several years now to persuade the Kentucky General Assembly to enact legislation for the registration of geologists. To date, we have not been successful, and we have not decided at this point if we will press the issue again during the 1988 General Assembly.

The Kentucky Section of AIPG finds it particularly abhorrent that professional engineers state emphatically that the registration of geologists does nothing to protect the public's interest but, on the other hand, they clearly imply that the registration of engineers does.

We also find it distressing that the professional practice of geology seemingly has little application in the areas of "...mining, mine permitting, toxic and hazardous waste disposal, groundwater use and protection, mined land reclamation, sanitary landfill, surface water quality evaluations, and subsurface investigations."

Although the Kentucky Section of AIPG favors the registration of geologists and would like to see the 1988 General Assembly pass legislation to that effect, a more pressing concern now deals with the misrepresentation about geologists that is being promulgated by the KSPS leadership. (Ironically, a number of our members are also registered engineers and obviously do not support the philosophy or condone the actions of KSPS.)

Sincerely,
John C. Philley, President Kentucky Section, AIPG

UTAH

LICENSING OF GEOLOGISTS:

Glenn Maun (December’s program) is submitting a bill on licensing of professional geologists to the legislature. Gerald Parks’ recommendation on this is attached. As of this writing, the bill is still in draft form and has not been assigned a number.

Dear A.I.P.G. Member:
From time to time, geologists have considered the pros and cons of being licensed or registered in the State of Utah. In retrospect, there have been those in favor and those opposed to the concept. At present, geologists have no professional standing in the state and would require an engineer to co-sign any report used in a public works project.

A solution for this problem is being proposed in the 1988 legislature whereby a bill under Title 58, Chapter 53 Utah Code Annotated Chapter 53, Professional Geologists Licensing Act, is being co-sponsored by Joseph Hull and John Arrington. The bill identifies geology and a professional geologist as defined by the American Institute of Professional Geologists. It seeks to prohibit those who fail to meet the qualification supported.
by these definitions from posing as professional geologists. Noted exceptions to the requirements of the licensing act are those who teach at colleges and universities, employees of the federal government who are working in their official capacity, and geologists who have obtained five years of professional experience in the practice of geology.

The bill is a simple and straightforward way to possibly curb some of the abuses of those practicing geology without the qualifications to do so. The bill will provide protection to the state, the public, the geologist, and the geologic profession. It will give the geologic profession some control over the quality of geological work that is performed.

The presidency of the Utah Section of the A.I.P.G. strongly supports this bill. We are enclosing a copy of the Forty-Seventh Legislative Roster to help you in contacting your representative. We urge you to call your representative and support this legislation.

Sincerely,
Gerald M. Park, President

Definitions Continued from page 9

(3) A "geologist" is a graduate of an accredited institution of higher education, with a major in geology or geological engineering, who has successfully completed a minimum of thirty-six (36) semester or fifty-four (54) quarter hours of course work in geology, geophysics, geochemistry, engineering geology or their subdivisions.

(4) A "professional geologist" is a geologist who has accumulated a minimum of five (5) years post-baccalaureate experience in the practice of geology as a vocation and who has a sustained record of adherence to exemplary standards of professional and ethical conduct.

APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

Applicants for certification must meet AIPG’s standards as set forth in its Constitution on education, experience and competence and personal integrity. 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.

ANDERS, Fred J., 4308 Shenandoah Road, Vicksburg, MS 39180. Sponsors: Donald Groff, Dwain Butler, Philip Malone, Stephen Leatherman, Donald Stauble.

BABUSUKUMAR, Sinnadurai, 330 Larch Lane, Apt. #311, Glen Ellyn, IL 60137. Sponsors: David Pyles, Harry M. Ricketts, William Seno, Kelvin S. Rodolfo, Norman D. Smith.


CRAVENS, Daniel L., P.O. Box 398, Tijeras, NM 87059. Sponsors: Glen Hammock, Jim Clary, Rick Renn, Lee Halterman, Chuck Reynolds.


PIERCE, Thomas A., 1045 Cheshire Lane, Houston, TX 77018. Sponsors: Richard Dalton, Brad Morrison, Herb Mayberry, Tom Purcell, Dalton Null.

A Final Note

WHY AIPG? It is an everlasting question. Even if one is not in an official capacity, it recurs every now and then -- particularly when it is time to pay dues. Cliff Nolte of the Colorado Section posed the question to Colorado members and would like to see Texas consider the question. Texas represents about 20 percent of the national membership. That in itself is a good reason to survey the section. There are other reasons to concern ourselves with the “why” such as membership in the association, derived benefit and ever-increasing regulation of profession and industry through registration of geologists, particularly in the public sectors of environment and water.

In looking about me at AIPG members in the oil industry, I see few of the young. There are probably many reasons, but I would like to suggest these ideas: Most of the “oldtimers” were concerned about being geologists when they came out of school. Salaries were such that you did not go into the business for money. Many hoped to work in the field and were disappointed that they did not find a bountiful supply of job opportunities. They have gone through more than one cycle of hiring and firing. There is a ten-year age gap when few were hired during the 1960’s. At the same time a new era hit the national scene of political and domestic relations. Viet Nam, drugs, unisex, women in the profession, father domesticity, high inflation and “equal rights” all have contributed to the idea of “personal time”. This essentially means less devotion to the profession, whether enforced or desired. As a result, the membership has few under 40 years of age except in the new disciplines. I've found little interest in AIPG among those younger than 40 in the petroleum field. There does not seem to be a conscious denial -- just no need. Well, that time may have passed.

I believe that Texas should respond to the survey as Cliff Nolte proposes in the November issue of The Professional Geologist, page 9, and that we each recruit at least one member this year. Even with the statement of position on registration published by AIPG in the December issue of The Professional Geologist there is a growing requirement to be registered, and it is not growing out of demand by the total members. One state recognizes AIPG certification as an expression of a professional geologist. I hope with the spread of regulation that more will accept peer certification. In Texas our notoriety may be summed up by a quote based on my experience as Annual Section Meeting Chairman; when seeking a speaker from the Texas Railroad Commission and mentioning our association, he said, “You sure as hell keep a low profile.”

G. V. Mendenhall, President, Texas Section

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.