The President's Message

by Richard J. Proctor

State Registration of Geologists

This is a subject that could fill several presidents' messages, and indeed has in the past. Our membership's beliefs run the gamut of extremes from "never" to "now." Both sides have valid reasons. However, there is a ray of resolve on the horizon.

On the con side are many exploration petroleum and mining geologists who must travel across state lines to perform their work. Having to be registered and pay annual fees in several states is a pain. Also, many of us do not like the idea of still another governmental regulation with which we must abide. Furthermore, this group of geologists does not deal with public health, safety, and welfare.

On the other hand, state licensing or registration for geologists is happening rapidly even as you read this. Twenty states now have some form of registration for geologists and about six more have laws in preparation. This is an increase of ten states in the past seven years. Many of the newer state registration laws have been written and sponsored by AIPG members. Their motives and needs are clear: they must compete with registered engineers. Many geologists must be registered to perform work. We all know what certain engineers in Kentucky think of geologists; many truly believe that geologists are professionally subordinate to them and want to keep it that way. There, the geologist does the work and writes the report but the engineer signs it, simply because he has a state-recognized number after his name. The fact is that geologists have no legal status in most states, even though they may be certified through this Institute, and even though our certification requirements are more stringent than some states' registration requirements.

What to do? One approach is to encourage more states to recognize that certification in AIPG is sufficient for legal status. Alaska and Indiana have such statutes. Perhaps a continuing education requirement for continued AIPG membership would add more credence. We are looking into this.

Another solution: I'm happy to inform you (unless you heard it first at our Annual Meeting in Tulsa) that past-president Sam Evans and I have met with the top officers of AAPG's DPA, SIPES, and AEG to discuss the preparation of a model state registration law that would address these concerns. The discussions now seem to go toward exclusion of petroleum and mining geologists from any future state registration, plus exclusion of any geologist that does not deal with public health, safety, and welfare. (A proposed law in Texas is worded in this manner.)

However, there is a pitfall in excluding one group of geologists: As in California in the 1960s, the petroleum geologists initially were against the proposed state registration of all geologists until Hank Neel, CPG 528 and others convinced the petroleum geologists that they would, in effect, be second class professionals by being the only group of geologists not legally recognized by the state.

Most petroleum geologists who became state registered still don't deal with public health, safety and welfare. Nonetheless, legal state recognition is useful to those who (1) testify as experts in court, and (2) those who change their specialty to the growing field of ground-water geology related to hazardous waste.

Many unemployed petroleum geologists are seeking new employment in ground-water geology because the oil patch remains economically depressed while hydrogeology is booming. However, because ground-water geology deals with public health, these unemployed geologists are faced with seeking state registration if they wish to work in those states that require registration. It is infinitely easier to grandfather into state registration than to study for the required exam after so many years since college and so many years of working in a different specialty. Therefore, a suggestion: An initial cost to
The New York State mining industry is approaching a crisis in the foreseeable future. A review of some facts, figures and history will make this clear.

The statistics on the New York mining industry can be summarized: approximately 1,200 sand and gravel operations, 200 rock quarries, and 6 underground or solution mines supply approximately 35,000,000 tons of mineral products (exclusive of oil and gas) with a value of some $650,000,000 per year. The mineral products include construction aggregates, cement, gypsum, garnet, clay, zinc, salt, lead, wollastonite, and talc.

Statistics such as these suggest a strong industry with a bright future. But statistics deal in the past. The fact is that New York's mining industry is in trouble, reflecting industry problems common throughout the Northeast. What evidence is there of an impending crisis, you ask? Here are some of the signs.

Metropolitan New York is about out of sand and gravel even with its fabled Long Island glacial deposits. Half of New York City's sand comes from maintenance dredging of the Ambrose Channel. Serious consideration is being given to deep ocean dredging by federal and state agencies with considerable foreign interest in such ventures. Crushed stone is also a problem for the city. An initial shipment of about 35,000 tons of crushed stone was sent to the city from Nova Scotia last year. Each night, stone is trucked from central New Jersey to Long Island. Westchester and Putnam counties rely on sand and stone sources up to 50 miles or more to the north. Throughout the state, it can, and frequently does, take years to obtain the permits needed to open a mine, assuming that the application is approved. Courts are increasingly involved with mine approval decisions. A thorough knowledge of recent court decisions is becoming as necessary as knowledge of zoning laws or mining regulations in obtaining permits.

The aggregate industry is not alone in its problems. The reserves of a major cement producer in the Hudson Valley are being threatened, in part, by the inability of the miner to renew his mine permit. Over the last 15 years, numerous mines have closed including Bensen Mines (J & L Steel), Mineville (Republic Steel), Edwards & Balmat #3 Mines (St. Joe Zinc), and NYCO (Willsboro Operation).

This litany raises the obvious question of why. There are two basic sets of reasons. The first has to do with economics, ore grade, and new sources, three problems shared by the country's entire mining industry. New York's iron mining industry, for example, is over; the victim of high operating costs, high transportation costs, and foreign competition. These are problems that cannot be solved within the bounds of New York.

The second set of reasons is political. It has to do with regulations and land use. In my opinion, part of the problem lies with the New York State Department of Conservation's (DEC) Mining Land Reclamation Law and the regulatory outlook of the Department. In 1974, the state passed the Mining Land Reclamation Law (MLRL) that has as one of its primary purposes the fostering and encouraging of a stable mining industry and adds, rightly so, that mining should be done in an environmentally sound manner. The language and intent of the law are clearly to pre-empt any local regulation of mining to avoid a patchwork of local regulations for a regionally important resource. Yet, DEC's regulatory outlook has at times overshadowed the primary purpose of the MLRL. Its increasingly stringent requirements, occasional hostility to the industry (expressed by a few individuals with DEC), frequent refusal to supersede local regulations (in spite of numerous court decisions to the contrary), and increasing threats of "enforcement actions" against alleged "violations" are affecting the mining industry. Uneven application of the MLRL is leading to difficulties in some areas and minimal problems in others, while the program managers claim an inability to control the people responsible for implementing the law.

The DEC, however, is not the only source of the problem. Land use and public perception are the other culprits. When land sells for tens of thousands of dollars per acre or when a proposed mine site is surrounded by high density residential developments or office parks, mining is not a rational use of the land. However, when a suitable piece of land is found, the citizen committees form, petitions flow and emotions reach fever pitch. Mines are now only one step away from landfills as an unacceptable land use, and it is often uncertain if that step is above or below landfills.

For the mining industry to remain economically healthy in New York, these problems must be resolved. California has established designated mineral resource districts to assure future supplies of aggregates, particularly for its metropolitan area. New York could do the same. The industry can improve its image by cleaning up its properties and ardently following good environmental practices. This has been done by many but the bad actors continue to stand out. Public relations and education campaigns can be initiated by industry, but these are often perceived as being self-serving.
One of the best solutions is for the State of New York to take a strong leadership role in assuring the future availability of minerals, one of its most basic natural resources which should be placed alongside air and water in importance. If DEC can't fill this role, another agency should become the leader. The state can develop a "nedible" public education campaign, taking its cues from the Province of Ontario, which has an excellent program. It can step forward to take the lead intended by the legislature in controlling the entire permitting process, thereby rising above local political pressures that too often control this regional resource. It can develop an attitude and set of regulations for the mining industry that are "user-friendly."

Lastly, and surprisingly, there is no local, regional, or statewide agency that has responsibility to plan for the future availability of mineral resources. The only planning done now is by individual companies looking down the road 20 years or so to provide for their own interests. What an opportunity to lead the mineral industry into the future. Can the state assume this positive role? There are no signs of it now. What will it take to resolve the problems? A crisis in supply, I suppose. Which brings me back to my original statement: the mining industry in New York is approaching a crisis in the foreseeable future.

From the Northeast Section Newsletter, Winter 1988.

Science Versus Pseudoscience

Early in the spring of 1988 we were exposed to various media treatments of a circumstance of pseudoscience. There were television, radio, and newspaper accounts about the conclusions credulously reached by the Orson Welles film The Man Who Saw Tomorrow, a portrayal of the poetic prognostications of Nostradamus, a 16th-century astrologer. Over 2,000 Californians ordered the videotape of the film to see for themselves the conclusion that an earthquake would strike "New City," supposedly a California city, in April. Geophysicists and geologists are confident that earthquakes will occur in California, but all of the best science they perform will not allow prediction of exact dates. Only seers, astrologers, and other paranormals are willing to predict such events.

While California may have its share of residents willing to set aside rational acceptance of the limitations and ambiguities of geology, we, too, in Pennsylvania have our believers in the occult-in the secret of water smelling. A substantial portion of our population will accept the induced bending of hand-held twigs as indicating the location of waters hidden beneath the twig-holder's feet. No connection is made with the perversive rain that they see fall on the earth's surface and the porous nature of the soil into which it percolates. Rather there is a preferred belief that hidden streams are rushing beneath our feet.

If we geologists are to reduce the popular acceptance of pseudoscience we must insist people in learning to understand the connection between natural events, such as the falling of rain with its disappearance into the soil, and its reappearance as water in a spring or well. Pseudoscience and the occult will flourish unless we translate the complexities of geology into understandable knowledge for all, not for just a few.

Donald M. Hoskins
State Geologist


Acid Rain

Editor's Note: A letter was sent by Wallace Stewart (CPG 4163) to Senator Simpson asking if the proposed acid rain legislation had considered natural sources of pollution. The following letter is Senator Simpson's reply.

Dear Wallace,

Thank you for your good letter regarding acid rain legislation and other natural sources of sulfur dioxide (SO2).

Moderate senators are trying to come up with a reduction plan that would require a 10 million ton decrease in SO2 emission for the nation as a whole. This is near the 50 percent cut that scientists have recommended to reduce the damage to aquatic and non-aquatic ecosystems in the East.

I appreciate your note about other sources of SO2 emissions, including the article from Geotimes which shows large volumes of SO2 from volcanoes. Congress has considered the fact that volcanos do add to the acid rain problem. In fact, scientists have measured acid rain out in the Pacific Ocean in areas that are not close to any industrial sources. However, we must make every effort to reduce industrial sources of SO2 because the environmental effects are very acute within several hundred miles of the source. We cannot do anything about volcanos, but we can do something about industrial sources. That is why I support action on acid rain this year.

I have also sponsored the Proxmire-Simpson acid rain bill which calls for a major reduction with the least cost to consumers and industry. It provides maximum flexibility in reducing SO2 emissions including provisions to allow fuel switching to low sulfur coal or clean coal technologies.

The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee has held hundreds of hours of hearings with scientists knowledgeable in the field of acid rain. We have considered the natural sources of pollution - that is part of the equation.

Thanks for taking the time to bring your very valid concerns to my attention. I appreciate your interest in this issue and the material you sent along.

With warm personal regards,

Most sincerely,
Alan K. Simpson
United States Senator
State Boards of Registration Meet

Norman K. Olson, CPG 1611

On November 19, 1988 representatives of geologists' registration boards from seven southeastern states met at St. Simons Island, Georgia. This was the second such meeting (March 1988 meeting reported in TPG) which was aimed at the feasibility of a single, standardized written examination (for the applicable states), various aspects of reciprocity, and any other topics state representatives wanted to discuss.

Board and staff members from Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia each described briefly their board composition and current status of activity. Discussion then centered on the possibility of a common written examination. Georgia representatives favor the concept of a standardized national examination for geologists; Arkansas, Florida, and South Carolina people expressed their views for a southeastern regional examination. The writer, at this moment in the discussion, relayed to the group the telephone request he had received from AIGP President Sam Evans. The representatives were informed that AIGP has modified its policy on state registration or certification. The writer explained that AIGP would like the opportunity to assist the present group of assembled states, and would like to be considered for performing the administrative functions of any future organization that might evolve from this group. He presented the built-in advantages of linking with AIGP and mentioned the counterparts in law, medicine, and engineering on a national level.

Some suggestions/comments concerning examinations from the group were:

- ask Educational Testing Service to develop a geologists' examination similar to the format of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE); a state board could adopt it by rulemaking;

- states form a Regional Board Committee which develops the examination; consulting services, if needed, would be paid by participating states which would pay dues to the regional board.

- the Georgia representatives favored a uniform national examination; one of the Florida delegates suggested putting out a request for proposals (RFP) for preparing a national examination and select a bidder; and

- the Department of Professional Regulation (DPR), State of Florida, emphasizes minimum competency and occupational relevancy as required for licensure (not required for certification).

A South Carolina board member led the next session on reciprocity. Some suggested guidelines for achieving consensus on reciprocity were produced:

- require at least 6 years of relevant work experience and licensure from another state;

- distinguish between qualifying (by academic and work experience) for taking the exam vs. qualifying for reciprocity;

- consider a waiver for an engineer with 20 years or more of work experience to qualify for Geologist-in-Training (GIT) exam only;

- set guidelines (or definitions) defining veteran, experience, etc.; and

- consider having a different exam (oral?) for veteran geologists wanting to be registered through reciprocity.

Some states present at the meeting already have a policy of allowing reciprocity only to out-of-state applicants who have become registered by examination in at least one state among those in which they are registered.

Among the highlights of the meeting was a resolution which could shape the direction and scope of a national association interested in the same objectives as our southeastern regional group. That resolution, not yet in final form, was given preliminary approval and is as follows.

At the second meeting of state boards of geology, held November 19, 1988 at Sea Palms, St. Simons Island, Georgia, it was recognized that there are common interests in issues related to reciprocity, examinations, policies and procedures. It was also recognized that all of the boards represented are experiencing similar challenges in administrating their responsibilities. And, there was unanimous agreement by the participants that they should continue to interface for the purpose of sharing experiences and resources for their mutual good.

Therefore, be it resolved that a committee of seven members, one from each of the states participating in the November 19, 1988 meeting, be established to develop draft rules and by-laws, a code of ethics, and proposal on reciprocity for an association of state geology boards.

Finally, the group accepted the invitation from the Georgia board to host the committee of seven members (the "Gang of Seven"), one per state, as stipulated in the resolution, on April 4, the day prior to the start of the technical sessions for the annual meeting of the Southeastern Section of GSA (Radisson Atlanta).
Canadians Offer Inexpensive Hydrology Training

The Northern Alberta Institute of Technology in Edmonton offers a two-year diploma in Groundwater Technology. However, applicants who have completed course work equivalent to the first year of the program may complete the diploma in ONE ACADEMIC YEAR (i.e. two 17-week semesters). This option should appeal to students currently enrolled in earth sciences and related engineering disciplines, or retraining for a specialty in hydrology.

The curriculum covers topics in water resource and contaminant hydrogeology, field hydrogeology, ground-water geophysics, water quality studies, and geotechnique. Facilities include several on-campus boreholes, completed in a large channel aquifer, which are used for monitoring and aquifer testing.

The annual (two semesters) tuition fee is $487.00 for Canadian residents and $806.00 for non-residents. The student association fee is $75.00. Books and supplies will cost between $450.00 and $500.00.

The Northern Alberta Institute of Technology offers more than 60 diploma and certificate programs. In 1988-89, there were some 6000 full time students and more than 24,000 continuing education students enrolled. The campus is located 3 kilometers from downtown Edmonton.

Contact the Groundwater Technology Program, 11762 106th Street, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5G2R1 (403) 471-7400.

Northwest Mining Association includes AIPG Member in Leadership

The Northwest Mining Association has chosen several experts to lead its nearly 2,500 members in 1989.

Ta M. Li, vice president and general manager for Behre Dolbear-Riverside, Inc., was elected president of the NWMA on Tuesday, Nov. 29, by the organization's board of trustees. Li will begin his duties on January 1, 1989, in Spokane, Washington.

Mark Anderson, general manager ASAMERA, of Wenatchee, was elected 1st vice president. David A. Holmes, CPG 6316, exploration manager for Meridian Minerals Co. in Englewood, Colorado was elected 2nd vice president. Karl W. Mote, executive director of the Northwest Mining Association of Spokane, was re-elected vice president.

Re-elected secretary was John L. Neff, Spokane attorney. David M. Menard, vice president of Washington Trust Bank in Spokane, was elected treasurer.

As the incoming president, Li made the following proposals which were approved by the board of trustees.

"A sense of urgency and the need to communicate better. These are the key words that underline your Association's Agenda in the coming year.

"The areas in which we can have a beneficial effect, both in combating negative legislation and regulation in proposing positive change include:

- Education
- Environmental Control
- Taxation
- Maintaining the location/patent laws

"A special opportunity exists to further share knowledge among members through the annual meeting, short courses, and cooperative efforts with other professional organizations. Examples of such efforts include:

- Coal industry information
- Industrial Minerals
- Joint Operations Symposia

"By applying our limited resources to those problems for which we have special capabilities, and by networking efforts with others and sharing ideas, we will increase our positive impact on those controls which are critical to growth of the vital minerals industry."

(The Northwest Mining Association was organized in 1895 in Spokane, Washington, to support the minerals industry in the Northwest. With headquarters still in Spokane, the Association now has 2,200 members throughout North America representing all aspects of the minerals industry.)

Headquarters 1989 Holidays

New Year's Day - Monday, January 2
President's Day - Monday, February 20
Memorial Day - Monday, May 29
Independence Day - Tuesday, July 4
Labor Day - Monday, September 4
Columbus Day - Monday, October 9
Thanksgiving Day - Thursday, November 23
Day After Thanksgiving - Friday, November 24
Christmas Day - Monday, December 25
My 1989 Goals for the Institute
by Richard J. Proctor, President

1. Seek new benefits for our members. My directive to a revitalized and larger Membership Services Committee: Pursue group health insurance; disability insurance; more short courses; more publications; ways to increase involvement between Sections and National; other ideas.

2. Promote new AIPG publications. Being considered are:
   - Geologic Hazards (70% complete)
   - Strategic and Critical Minerals (70% complete)
   - Professional Ethics (talked about for years)
   - Geologic Maps (in cooperation with the USGS)
   - What the New Homebuyer Needs to Know
   - Starting Your Own Consulting Practice
   - Update our 3 existing Issues and Answers booklet on Radioactive Waste, Hazardous Waste, and Groundwater (we need volunteer authors).

3. Continue the revision of our Constitution, Bylaws, Code of Ethics, and Disciplinary Procedures, per the legal review and recommendations of Alan Stover.

4. Appoint an AIPG Advertising Coordinator to promote advertising in the TPG and Directory as a source of income and member information.

5. Increase AIPG's Washington D.C. visibility and activities:
   - Through our paid Washington Representative
   - By reactivating our standing committee on External Appointments
   - To have our annual (highly successful) Governmental Affairs Conference held this year in conjunction with our annual meeting in Washington D.C. on October 4.
   - By directing our Governmental Affairs Committee to lead in preparation of AIPG Position Papers (see item 6).

6. Prepare more AIPG Position Papers and Public Policy Statements on subjects of concern to our profession. Circulate widely. (I believe AIPG should help educate and influence lawmakers on geologic issues.)

7. Pursue reciprocity with Australian and Canadian geologic societies (at their request), and also with those state-licensed geologists in states that have certification requirements as stringent as ours. (Possible states include Arizona, California, Oregon, and Idaho.)

8. Create an Ad Hoc Committee on Model Geologists Registration Law. In 1988 AIPG officers met with officers of DPA-AAPG, AEG, and SIPES on this controversial subject.

9. Create an Ad Hoc Committee on National Geologists Exam. This committee will work with a similar AEG ad hoc committee and will include individuals who have both AIPG and AEG memberships. This effort will give AIPG positive visibility among the 18 existing states' geologist registration boards, as they struggle with uniformity of exam questions and future reciprocity between states.

10. Create a new national standing committee: Applicant Screening Committee - a 3-person committee to review all applications. This should reduce the review process from 9-12 months down to 4 months, and provide uniformity of review criteria.

11. Exhibit at more allied societies' annual meetings. We now exhibit at AAPG and GSA, and sometimes at AEG and AIME. This effort is good public relations and a source of new members. In July we will exhibit at the International Geologic Congress in Washington, D.C.

12. Hire an Executive Director. If one is hired in 1989, to work with him/her to promote the Institute's image and goals and coordinate the duties with our excellent two-person Headquarters staff.

13. Direct the Continuing Education Committee to investigate the desirability of requiring annual reporting of continuing education to remain a member of AIPG.

14. Mail copies of our fine TPG to national presidents of sister societies, including AAPG, DPA, AEG, SEG, SIPES, AGI, and GSA. This will help spread the word on what AIPG represents and what we are doing for our profession.

15. Establish an ad hoc committee to reevaluate the idea of involving students and young geologists to become affiliated with AIPG.

16. Develop an AIPG Register of Experts in various disciplines willing to speak at hearings and testify in court. This list will be kept at Headquarters and be on-call from attorneys, and from legislators and special interest groups that need educating with views consonant with AIPG. (Send in your name and expert specialty.)
Dr. Priscilla Grew to Keynote Michigan Geological Symposium

Tyrone J. Black, CPG 6103

Dr. Priscilla Grew, Director of the Minnesota Geological Survey, will be the speaker at a banquet to be held on the evening of March 16, 1989, at the Kellogg Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. The topic of Dr. Grew’s talk will be: "So When are you going to finish the State Geological Survey?" In spite of the humor implied in the title, Dr. Grew intends to address the ups and downs of geological surveys over the years, the present decline of student enrollment as a symptom of society, and the compelling need for more and better communication between the geological community and the general public.

The Symposium, Michigan: Its Geology and Geologic Resources is being jointly sponsored by the Michigan Geological Survey and Michigan State University. It will be held on March 16 and 17, 1989. The Kellogg Center on campus of MSU will be headquarters for the symposium. Some forty presentations are scheduled covering various facets of Michigan geology, including a number on the Michigan Basin portion of the midcontinent rift system. If you would like additional information or registration materials for the symposium please contact: Robert C. Reed, Deputy State Geologist at (517) 334-6907, or write to Symposium, Geological Survey Division, Michigan DNR, P.O. Box 30028, Lansing, Michigan 48909.

1989 Executive Committee Meeting Schedule

January 20-21
Pasadena, California
Pasadena Hilton
150 S. Los Robles Ave.
Pasadena, CA 91106
(818) 577-1000

April 15
Athens, Georgia
Athens History Village
Quality Inn
295 E. Dougherty Street
Athens, GA 30601
(404) 546-0410

July 22
Arvada, Colorado
Ramada Hotel
8773 Yates Drive
Westminster, CO 80030
(303) 427-4000

October 4-6
Washington, D.C.
Hyatt-Regency-Crystal City
2799 Jefferson Davis Hwy.
Crystal City, VA 22202
(703) 486-1234

PRELIMINARY ANNOUNCEMENT
AND CALL FOR PAPERS
32nd ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF ENGINEERING GEOLOGISTS
"Engineering Geology of Mountain and Plain"
Marriott Mark Resort
Vail, Colorado
October 1-5, 1989

The Association of Engineering Geologists is pleased to announce the 32nd Annual Meeting and to invite all interested earth scientists and engineers to submit papers for oral and poster presentation. High quality papers are invited in the fields of:

- Engineering and Environmental Geology
- Engineering Geophysics
- Geological/Geotechnical Engineering
- Landslides/Slope Stability
- Ground Water Hydrology and Hazardous Waste Management
- Geochemistry/Geophysical Surveys
- Earthquake Engineering
- Soil and Rock Mechanics
- Natural and Man-induced Ground Subsidence
- Disposal of Low- and High-Level Nuclear Waste
- Transportation Engineering
- Significant Case Histories (Dams, Tunnels, etc.)
- Forensic Engineering Geology
- Deterministic and Probabilistic Hazard/Risk Assessment

ABSTRACTS DUE MAY 1, 1989

For further information and abstract forms, contact:
Michael W. West, Technical Program Chairman
Michael W. West & Associates, Inc.
200 Bank Western Building
8006 West Bowles Avenue
Littleton, CO 80123
(303) 972-1537

Sinkhole Research Institute Announces Conference

This highly successful conference brings together engineers, geologists, hydrologists, and geographers from all over the world to share their practical experience solving engineering and environmental problems in karst terranes. The third meeting of this multidisciplinary group will be held at Petersburg, Florida, October 1-4, 1989, at the luxurious Tradewinds Hotel. Very advantageous rates have been negotiated for the conference.

Papers are invited on all subjects related to applied karst geology and hydrology, but are particularly encouraged in the engineering field. All authors will be expected to present a 20 minute talk and a written manuscript for publication in a professionally published proceedings volume. At this time, please submit a prospective title. Abstracts will be due by April 17, 1989, and manuscripts by June, 30, 1989. Send to: 3rd Multidisciplinary Conference, Florida Sinkhole Research Institute, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL 32816.
1989 Annual Meeting

Dear Members:

The 1989 Annual Meeting Steering Committee invites each of you to be our guest in Washington, D.C. from October 4th through the 7th, 1989. Your colleagues of the Virginia and Capital sections are honored to host this Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the American Institute of Professional Geologists. Although we will be meeting in Virginia, just across the Potomac River, at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Crystal City (adjacent to National Airport), it is only a 10-minute trip to the Mall by Metro and about a 15-minute drive by car (about 9 blocks).

The Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting is shaping-up into one of the best. On Wednesday morning (Oct. 4), National will be having its highly successful Governmental Affairs Program and luncheon. On Thursday morning (Oct. 5), two panel discussions are being planned on the topics of solid and hazardous waste management and asbestos from a geological point of view. On Thursday afternoon (Oct. 5), a session will be given on the GLORIA Program, ocean mineral resources, and mapping of the ocean floor. On Friday morning (Oct. 6), papers of national interest will be given on the topic of radon. On Saturday (Oct. 7) a field trip to selected localities along a "cross-section" beginning in coastal sediments on the east across Piedmont crystalline rocks and ending in sedimentary rocks of Triassic-Jurassic age to the west. Biographic data on the speakers and abstracts of their presentations are planned for the TPG in future issues as is other important information.

There are several items that I wish to bring to your attention at this time. Because of several factors that affect this meeting, each of you is encouraged to reserve your room(s) at the earliest opportunity. Only a limited number of rooms have been blocked for this meeting because of the potential penalty your hosts will incur if they are not used. Please reserve your lodging at the Hyatt Regency and please do not go outside of the "block" (unless our Annual Meeting block is full). The reserved room block will be released to the general public on September 4, 1989. An additional reason for your early reservation is that there is another convention at the Hyatt Regency at the same time that we are meeting.

Our room rates are less than the normal hotel rates at $95.00/night plus 9.5% tax. The special convention rate will apply two days before and after the official dates of the Annual Meeting. The hotel check-in time is 3:00 p.m. and check-out is at 12:00 noon. The hotel has complimentary transportation to and from Washington National Airport. If you want to make reservations early, please call the Hyatt Regency in Crystal City (Arlington), Virginia at (703) 418-1234. Please mention the AIPG when making the reservation.

If you have any questions or desire further information on the meeting at this time, please contact me at (804) 293-5121.

Stan Johnson
General Chairman
Hotel Reservation Form
American Institute of Professional Geologists
1989 Annual Meeting
Arlington ("Crystal City"), Virginia
October 4-7, 1989

Complete and mail to: Hyatt Regency Hotel
2799 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 22202
Telephone: (703) 418-1234

Name__________________________________________________________
Address_____________________________________________________________________________________________
City_________________________________________________________ State________ Zip________

Please complete the remainder of the form below. The Convention Room Block is being held until September 4. After this date
reservations will be accepted on an availability basis only. Convention rates are $95.00 for a single or a double (plus 9.5% tax).

Check room type desired: Single_________ Double_________ : Number of persons______________________________
Number of Rooms_________________________ Arrival Date________ Departure Date__________________________

Hotel accepts MASTERCARD, VISA, AMERICAN EXPRESS, CARTE BLANCHE, DINERS' CLUB and DISCOVER.
One night's deposit is required.

Credit Card Name_________________________________________________________ Card Number__________________________
Expiration Date_________________________ Your Signature___________________________________________________

Complimentary transportation to and from Washington National Airport is available.

ATTENTION: Reservation should be made as early as possible to insure one of the rooms allotted by the hotel for this meeting.
FROM WASHINGTON...

By Guerry Newton, AIGP Washington Representative

The New Administration—Terra Incognita and Suspect Terranes

The Republicans will remain in control of the Executive Branch (and with a resounding margin), but the American electorate has chosen to reinforce the practice of divided government through “ticket splitting” as the way to vote and thereby allocate power. The Democrats will control the Senate for the 101st Congress by a margin of 55-45, and the House of Representatives will be made up of 260 Democrats and 175 Republicans.

One of the more fascinating aspects of the 1988 election was the gain of Congressional seats by the party losing the presidential election. The last time that occurred was 1960. How the “divided government” is going to function is anyone’s guess, but a much more conciliatory attitude seems to exist among the branches of government than did in 1980 and 1984. And, of course, there’s always a “honeymoon” period allowed in the initial days of a new administration.

A few of the key people whose actions will have an impact on AIGP interests are: Senator George Mitchell (D-Maine), Majority Leader, who has demonstrated interests in environmental issues; Representative Jim Wright (D-Texas), Speaker of the House, who has strong interests in energy issues, and the incoming Chairman of the House Budget Committee, Representative Leon E. Panetta (D-California), who represents a state with strong environmental and energy-related interests.

Manuel Lujan, Jr., the Administration’s choice for Secretary of the Interior, is a long-time member of the House Interior Affairs Committee as well as the former ranking Republican on the Science, Space and Technology Committee. Lujan is considered a consensus-maker and his nomination brought favorable reactions from both parties. The conservationist and environmental communities are not supportive of Lujan’s nomination. The nominee for Administrator of EPA, William K. Reilly, however, does come from the environmental community; he is currently President of the Conservation Foundation, and has served as a senior staff member of the President’s Council on Environmental Quality. Reilly, a lawyer and urban planner, also enjoys a reputation as one who is able to get disparate interests to work together.

It is much too early and foolish to attempt to identify any specific issues that will be addressed by this Congress or the President. Reality suggests, nevertheless, that key issues will be: the deficit, the deficit, national security, and environmental concerns.

Energy Policy

In a recently issued report, United States Energy Policy 1980-1988, the Secretary of Energy stated, “energy fortunes have improved substantially” and the nation has “laid a new energy security foundation from which it can move forward into the 1990s and the 21st century.”

The 175-page report states that energy diversification has made substantial progress, and that technology will, in the long-term, enable the U.S. to expand its energy options and address energy-related environmental concerns. (The report is available for $12.00 from the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402-9325. Stock No. 061-000-00714-8.)

In January, former President Reagan approved the finding of the Commerce Department that oil import fees would “not be cost effective and would, in the long run, impair rather than enhance national security.” Reagan acknowledged that there are “substantial energy concerns” and called for deregulation of natural gas prices, oil exploration and development of ANWR and the OCS, increases in the oil depletion allowance, and the construction of new nuclear power plants.

Georgia Offshore Minerals Assessment

The MMS has issued a request for data, information, and public comment on an assessment of mineral resources located in Federal waters off the coast of Georgia. A copy of the assessment can be obtained from Dr. William McLemore, Georgia State Geologist, telephone (404) 656-3214. All responses to this request will be reviewed and analyzed by a Federal/State task force. At present there is no pending Federal or State action to lease or offer for sale any non-energy marine minerals offshore the State of Georgia. The current assessment and requested comments are being solicited in order to assist State and Federal officials in determining whether to proceed with other activities related to mining marine minerals on the OCS. (53 FR 51170.)

Great Plains Now in Private Sector

The coal-to-synthetic gas plant, located near Beulah, North Dakota is to be operated by the Basin Electric Power Cooperative Association. The transfer of ownership of the nation’s largest synthetic fuels facility from the public to the private sector could ultimately return more than 1.8 million dollars to the Federal government according to DOE. The new owners plan to develop the plant’s chemical by-products, such as anhydrous ammonia and sulfur, for market in addition to the project’s synthetic natural gas.

Energy Department Clean Up Costly

DOE has projected a cost of $91 billion to $128 billion to clean up all of its contaminated industrial and research facilities. It would take about 20 years to bring the operations into compliance with environmental and safety laws. The recently
released analysis covers 45 DOE facilities ranging from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in Louisiana to the Solar Energy Research Institute in Colorado. The range of estimates reflects uncertainty about what laws and standards would apply. Twenty-nine facilities need modifications or up-grades to meet water pollution standards; 28 need improvements for handling solid toxic or radioactive wastes.

An earlier report has estimated that the clean up of DOE's nuclear-weapons facilities alone would cost about 50 billion dollars.

**Our Only Certainty... Taxes**

The Technical Corrections and Miscellaneous Revenue Act of 1988 (H.R. 4333), one of the final legislative actions taken by the 100th Congress, was initiated to make technical corrections in the 1986 tax reform legislation, but ended up as a means for several tax changes. Several provisions are of interest to AIPG membership.

* The tax exclusion for employer-provided educational assistance, such as tuition reimbursement, was extended one year, through December 31, 1988. However, for tax years beginning after December 31, 1987, the exclusion does not apply to any graduate-level courses leading to a degree except for benefits paid to graduate teaching or research assistants.

* The research tax credit was extended one year, through December 31, 1989. The bill, however, requires that a company's deduction for research expenses under Section 174 be reduced by 50% of the taxpayer's research credit.

* The Treasury Department is directed to conduct a study of Section 1706. Section 1706 is a 1986 tax reform provision that provided the determination of whether an employer-employee relationship exists for skilled technical professionals (engineers, geologists, and the like) would be made under a common law test. Several technical societies have urged Congress to repeal the 1986 provision.

It is generally thought that by making only short-term extensions of many tax reform provisions the Congress is clearly planning for a major tax bill in 1989-90. (ASME Washington Rept.)

**New and Pending Regulatory Issues**

**BLM**


**BLM**

DEIS--Molycorp Guadalupe Mountain Tailings Disposal Facility, New Mexico. Contact: Kent Hamilton, (505) 761-4546. 53 FR 48984.

**BLM**


**EPA**

Proposed rule-40 CFR Parts 122, 123, 124, and 504, National-Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Application Regulations for storm water discharges. Contact: James Gallup, (202) 475-9518. 53 FR 49416.

**FS/BLM**

Final EB-Hardrock Mineral Leasing, Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri (2 PRLA's). Contact: Leon Kridelaugh, (314) 364-4621. 53 FR 49897.

**BLM**


**DOI**


**EPA**


**EPA**

Proposed rule--Hazard Ranking System (HRS) for uncontrolled hazardous substance releases; Appendix A--National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan, 40 CFR 300. Contact: Steve Caldwell, (202) 382-3000 or 800-424-9346. 53 FR 51962.

**OSMRE**


**DOE**

MMS

NOAA

The Last Word
Geo Persona
A recent study, "Job-related Deaths in 347 Occupations," from San Jose State University, ranks the profession of geology as being the fourth most dangerous white-collar profession. The profession has been assigned a risk ratio of 9.5 deaths per 100,000. Geology is considered more hazardous than physics and astronomy (#7) or even engineering (#10). But, alas, it's considered less hazardous than being an airplane pilot (#1), an office worker or courier (#2), or being a retail manager (#3). But remember, ours is the strength of ten for our hearts are pure!

SMC Martin Publishes Regulatory Updates
G. H. Emrich, CPG 2323

Below is the text from the first in a series of technical and regulatory updates SMC MARTIN will be publishing as a part of client service. Please let us know if there is a topic of special interest to you. We'll work on it.

RCRA/GROUNDWATER MONITORING
Proposed Regulatory Changes

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has recently proposed a number of changes to the ground-water monitoring programs at hazardous waste land disposal facilities. The proposed changes, if adopted in their present state, will allow facilities to tailor programs to site-specific conditions, to use unsaturated zone monitoring, and to resume less expensive detection monitoring if compliance monitoring triggers prove to be "false positives." While increasing facilities' flexibility, however, the amendments also give EPA more oversight authority in several of these areas.

Facilities with on-going RCRA monitoring programs, especially programs involving several regulated units, will likely be affected if the new regulations are approved. Public comments on the proposed amendments were accepted through September 1, 1988; no action is required until a final set of guidelines is released. The present regulations and the proposed changes are outlined below.

Current
1. Actual site specific data were not required when an owner/operator attempted to demonstrate that his site could be waived from the RCRA ground-water protection requirements. (Such a waiver required the owner/operator to demonstrate that no potential existed for contaminants to reach the uppermost ground-water aquifer.)
2. No provisions were made to move locations of monitoring wells when existing physical obstacles prevented well construction.
3. Only one of the three ground-water monitoring "programs" could be instituted for a site at any given time, even if the site contained more than one regulated hazardous waste unit or areas on-site. The three RCRA ground-water monitoring programs are:
   (1) Detection Monitoring (implemented to detect contaminant releases).
   (2) Compliance Monitoring (implemented after the discovery of a contaminant release).
   (3) Corrective Action Program (implemented to remediate a contaminant problem).
4. An owner/operator was not allowed to down-grade a RCRA monitoring program to the detection or compliance monitoring levels.
5. Determination of site ground-water flow rate and direction was to be determined annually.
6. The USEPA Regional Administrator's authority to designate the need for supplemental monitoring wells was not mentioned.
7. Regional Administrator required monitoring of the "uppermost aquifer" of the site.
8. Sufficient clarification of owner/operators QA/QC responsibilities was not provided.

Proposed
1. Actual site specific data should be submitted when demonstrating that a site should be waived from ground-water protection requirements (e.g., site pilot studies).
2. Alternate points for locating monitoring wells are allowable when the most preferred location is extremely difficult to access due to existing physical obstacles. Alternate locations for monitoring wells are only allowable when the installation objective is not compromised (e.g., early detection of a contaminant release).
3. All three RCRA programs can be used simultaneously at a given site. However, only one program can be implemented at any given regulated hazardous waste unit or area within a site. It will be necessary to specify the conditions under which each ground-water program will be used at a given regulated
hazardous waste area. Each site may have more than one designated hazardous waste area.

4. A down-grade of a RCRA monitoring program will be permitted if the owner or operator can demonstrate that ground-water contamination has not been greater than background levels for a period of time. The appropriate length of the period of time is a site specific determination. However, a minimum three (3) year period is suggested.

5. Ground-water flow rate and direction is to be determined only when any well exhibits a significant change in water level. Such information is to be displayed in via a flow net presentation.

6. The Regional Administrator may designate the need for supplemental monitoring wells when site conditions may cause contaminations to move past the present monitoring compliance well(s) without being detected.

7. Regional Administrator can require vadose (unsaturated) zone monitoring. This amendment is envisioned to aid early detection of contaminant releases. Vadose zone monitoring may include:
   (a) Permanent geophysical monitoring stations;
   (b) Soil gas surveys;
   (c) Nested piezometers; and
   (d) Lysimeters.

8. Owner/operators must document design, installation, development of and decommission of monitoring wells, and document sampling, analytical, and QA/QC procedures. Specific EPA guidance is referenced.

For more information on these proposed changes, or for comments or suggestions for future issues, contact Maureen R. Farrell at (215) 265-2700 or write SMC Martin 900 West Valley Forge Road, P.O. Box 859, Valley Forge, PA 19482.

Announcement for Your Calendar

October 13-14 - 18th Geochautauqua sponsored by the Mathematical Geologists of the United States and the International Association for Mathematical Geology on Mineral-Resource Assessment at the University of Delaware, Newark (J. H. Schuenemeyer, Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware 19716; phone: (302) 451-1883)

Congratulations Dr. Friedman -
Brooklyn College
Distinguished Professor

Gerald M. Friedman, CPG 1531, has been named Brooklyn College’s Distinguished Professor effective December 1, 1988. He also serves as professor of Geology in the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York and is President of the Northeastern Science Foundation, a not-for-profit corporation affiliated with Brooklyn College.

NORTHEAST SECTION

Fall Meeting

A well-attended and professionally-satisfying Fall Meeting of the Northeast Section was held at the Lamont Doherty Geological Observatory in Palisades, New York.

The meeting at Lamont was preceded by a field trip to north-central New Jersey led by members of the New Jersey Geological Survey. The trip initiated near the Ramapo Fault and proceeded westward to highly contorted and fractured paleozoic and proterozoic rocks of the New Jersey Highlands. Many thanks to Carol Graff for arranging the trip.

The field trip meshed nicely with the technical program which featured seismic studies and activity in the Northeast, with particular focus on the New York City area. Investigators at Lamont, led by Dr. Klaus Jacob, Chief of the Northeast Consortium on Seismic Risk Evaluation, are making a massive effort to better understand seismic phenomena in our region.

The afternoon presentations, conducted in a poster session and tour manner, gave us a good idea of the available database, Lamont’s computer power for evaluating the data, their real-time monitoring network, and their studies of historical and present-day seismic activity. Of particular interest were studies of the Dobbs Ferry earthquake area in which faulting along a northwest-southeast trend, transverse to the regional structure, has been found to be the cause of significant recent tremors.

Dr. Jacob, who passed up an important geophysical meeting to speak to us, gave the after-dinner talk, a fascinating slide presentation. His general theme was that the historical incidence of seismic activity in the eastern United States is only slightly less than in the west, and that a major eastern earthquake is overdue. He pointed out that damage from an eastern event could be severe, due to the absence of seismic considerations in building design and the high population concentrations. Dr. Jacob would like to see seismic considerations added to the building codes of states in the northeast.
Use Reader Interests to Stay on Track

Hugh Hay-Roe, CPG 3291

Take the time to define your readership and their individual interests in your main point (your NEWS). Ignorance of reader interests is responsible for more bad writing on the job than any other factor.

As we saw in a previous column, a sure-fire way to get started on any nonfiction communication is to define your main point (reflecting your purpose in writing) in terms of **what you offer to, or what you want from**, your readers. A formal statement of either constitutes your NEWS, the bottom-line information that belongs at the top of your text.

To stay on the right track opened by this sound beginning, I recommend taking the trouble to fill out a small questionnaire (below). It really does help to write your answers down. The next question that must be asked is: What are my readers' interests in my NEWS?

Most professionals and business people will solemnly swear that they do consider their readers, and it's true—in an extremely superficial way. The fact is, most of us are so anxious to get the job done that we never stop to think about our readers, and their individual interests in our NEWS.

- The message will have greater impact, because you took the trouble to **get on your readers' wavelength**.
- In analyzing where readers are "coming from" you are more likely to recognize special writing problems (which we'll discuss in another article).

Putting down both name and job title in the questionnaire will help remind you that readers with different professional backgrounds have different interests in your subject—and different levels of knowledge about it.

If you find yourself writing "Accountant" for example, or "Division Landman," you know that such readers will be primarily interested in the financial and acreage aspects, respectively, of your document. At the same time, you know that neither is a scientist familiar with highly technical terms from geology and geophysics. If they are among your key readers, you will have to tailor your message accordingly—or perhaps attach a cover memo highlighting the message in terms that are meaningful to them.

When you note down each reader's interest(s) in your NEWS, be as specific as possible. It may help to phrase those interests as questions: Why do you want to drill here? How do you know the target formation will be present? What are the expected reserves? What will it cost to map the area? Is there a short fuse on this project?

If you know your readers, this analysis won't take long at all. If you don't know them, find out. It is professionally inept to write without knowing your audience.

In future articles we'll see how to use this analysis efficiently.

*From The Texas Section Newsletter*
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 as far as necessary to process and make decisions on the applications.

ALLEN, Brian L., 46W 117 Hickory Lane, Maple Park, IL 60151. Sponsors: Paul DuMontelle, William G. Dixon, Roberta Jennings, Bruce Poyner, Michael Roche.


BLACKSTONE, Robert E., 4006 Bretton Drive, Casper, WY 82609. Sponsors: David Smouse, Herbert Waterman, Robert Odell, James McAndrew, Ray Harris.

CIPRIANO, Gary S., 7516 E. 77th Street, Tulsa, OK 74133. Sponsors: Lorraine Council, John Fryberger, Steven Testa, Anthony Gogel, John Amiet.


FLINN, Douglas L., 7217 Lock Road, Centerburg, OH 43011. Sponsors: Timothy J. Sainey, David E. Jone, John E. Voytek, Jr., Herbert Magley, Charles Grapes, III.


HILL, William T., 100 Jackson Lane, Hendersonville, TN 37075. Sponsors: Edward T. Luther, Robert Barnes, Richard Stearns, Fred H. Main, Fred T. Fischer.


MCCURDY, Robert, 3 Chesterton Lane, Chesterfield, MO 63017. Sponsors: Ken Fishel, Tom Tveten, Ted Hall, Don Schofield, Doug MacFarlane.


OLIVA, Lawrence J., 12705 Burlingame Avenue, Oklahoma City, OK 73120. Sponsors: Larry D. Woodfork, Robert K. Merrill, Robert J. Reed, David M. Miner, George H. Sylvester.

ONAGA, Francis L., 206 Parkhill Avenue # A, P.O. Box 379, Staten Island, NY 10304. Sponsors: Alex Zahn, Tim Stone, Kevin Penton, Ernest Oayiah, C. E. Nehru.


SWEET, Mark F., Rte. 4, Box 212, Flatwood Road, Corbin, KY 40701. Sponsors: Mark L. Reinhardt, John C. Philley, Gary W. Harned, Anthony R. Herald, Gerald Yahne.


New Members
(as of January 31, 1989)

ANDERS, Fred J., CPG 7560, Vicksburg, MS

ARMBRUST, George A., CPG 7561, Aurora, CO

GUHL, John E., CPG 7570, Germantown, WI

HAMP, Steven C., CPG 7562, Albuquerque, NM

KLIMSTRA, Richard K., CPG 7571, Quincy, IL

LANDLE, Robert C., CPG 7563, Jackson, NJ

MORRIS, Harry H., CPG 7564, Elmhurst, IL

MOTTA, Christopher J., CPG 7565, Kinnelon, NJ

POLLICK, Clifford R., CPG 7572, Santa Ana Heights, CA

ROWAN, Charles D. V., CPG 7566, Olympia, WA

SHARP, Timothy S., CPG 7567, Boca Raton, FL

STEVENST, Donald L., CPG 7573, Anchorage, AK

SWENSON III, Guy A., CPG 7574, Marcellus, NY

TURKA, Robert J., CPG 7568, Delmont, PA

VALVIK, Jeffrey R., CPG 7569, Easton, PA

VOGT III, Rudy F., CPG 7575, Louisville, KY

WINZELER, Douglas K., CPG 7576, Oklahoma City, OK

IN MEMORIAM

John M. Hills, CPG 1376 El Paso, November 20, 1988

Harry F. Oleson, Jr., CPG 6792 December 1988

Robert S. Stewart, CPG 1963 Pittsburgh
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Editor's Note
Robert R. Jordan, CPG 1262, Editor

In his thoughtful articles appearing in the January TPG our 1987-1988 editor, Edward B. Nuhfer, outlined the responsibilities of the AIPG editor and reminded AIPG's members that TPG is a reflection of their interests. All of us appreciate the magnificent contributions that Ed Nuhfer has made to AIPG; only this beginner knows the full measure of his kindness in preparing for the transition. I will attempt to continue to meet the standards Ed has set. If the members will follow his recommendations, we may, together, sustain TPG in service to AIPG.

At the start of my term I find these principal purposes for TPG:

1. To present applicants for membership in the Institute for consideration by the community of Certified Professional Geologists.

2. To communicate messages from the officers of AIPG and generally facilitate the business of the Institute.

3. To provide a forum for the debate of issues of concern to the membership.

4. To convey news of potential interest to professional geologists.

Please note that if your concept of TPG differs from mine, I will welcome your advice and attempt to respond to your needs.

I do not plan to change a successful formula for TPG. It will, however, be necessary to respect the limitations of AIPG's publications budget as it evolves this year and to adjust the potential for advertising in accordance with an earlier decision.

As Ed Nuhfer pointed out: "This is your newsletter." Your contributions and guidance will determine whether it satisfies your needs.

And, thanks again Ed!

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.