AIPG is establishing international professional relationships with Australia, Canada, United Kingdom, the European Economic Community, and now the USSR.

Shown above is William V. Knight, Executive Director at, AIPG's first technical session in Moscow. Front row includes the Russian interpreter, William V. Knight, CPG 153, Robert C. Weissmann, CPG 776, and Martin A. Vaughan, CPG 1972. Knight reported on USSR trip in the September issue of TPG.

HAPPY HOLIDAYS

from AIPG's Executive Committee, Officers, and the Headquarter's Staff
Move Up With Alamo.

Now members can move up with Alamo. In addition to great rates and exceptional service at all our locations, we're giving you a certificate for a free upgrade on your next rental. Alamo features a fine fleet of General Motors cars, all with unlimited free mileage nationwide. Special weekend rates are also available by requesting Rate Code A1.

For reservations, call your Professional Travel Agent or call Alamo at 1-800-327-9633. Be sure to request Rate Code BY and use your Membership I.D. number _BY-218167_.

FREE UPGRADE NATIONWIDE

- Certificate good for ONE FREE UPGRADE to next car category, luxury and specialty cars excluded, subject to availability at time of rental.
- A 24-hour advance reservation is required.
- Offer valid 1/2/91 through 6/30/91.
- One certificate per rental, not to be used in conjunction with any other certificates.
- Certificate must be presented at the Alamo counter on arrival.

U22B I.D. #BY- 218167

Alamo features fine General Motors cars like this Buick Regal.

- This certificate and the car rental pursuant to it are subject to Alamo's conditions at the time of rental.
- Offer not valid 2/14/91-2/16/91 and 3/28/91-3/30/91.
- Offer not valid for rentals over 21 days.
- For reservations call your Professional Travel Agent or call Alamo at 1-800-327-9633. Be sure to request Rate Code BY and use your Membership I.D. number.

Where all the miles are free
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President's Message

Susan M. Landon

As I enjoy these warm sunny days of mid-November in the foothills of the Colorado Rockies, it is difficult to believe that the end of the year is rapidly approaching. I have been an eventful year for me. The opportunity to serve as President of AIPG has been very fulfilling (and time consuming.) I have also begun to build my own consulting practice after leaving Amoco Production Company last fall. I want to thank all of the individuals who worked to make this a very rewarding year for AIPG and a special year for me.

I attended the GSA meeting in Dallas as AIPG's representative to the AGI Member Society Council meeting. I also helped man the AIPG booth. One of our Members stopped at the booth to ask a question. He had just received his dues statement and asked me what he got for his money.

When I had opened my dues statement, I had a similar reaction and I was prompted to review the past year. I repeated this review to our Member at GSA and he was convinced of the value of his dues. So much of what this organization does is basically transparent to the Membership in general. A tremendous amount of effort, by staff and volunteers, has gone into a large number of activities.

By the first of December, each Section will have received a package of resource documents to assist in the development of a Geologist's Practice Act. AIPG, as stated in policy, supports peer certification. As a response to the efforts of AEG to introduce legislation into those states which currently do not have a registration law, AIPG is providing comments and alternative wording for use by our membership in those states where registration is being advanced. The resource documents include three parts. The first part is AEG's suggested "Geologist's Practice Act." This document was prepared by a joint committee of several of the major geological organizations (CoPGO) and was subsequently submitted to counsel for review by AEG. AIPG has provided comments based on Membership input and policy and provides alternative wording for an act. The AIPG document should be used as may be appropriate for the geologic community of a state. As any legislation is developed, thought must be given to the potential of reciprocity with other states and AIPG hopes that these resources will assist in achieving maximum commonality in legislation.

Haydn, I wish you a great year next year and Happy Holidays to everyone! •

Summary of Executive Committee Meeting

Larry R. Rhodes, Secretary

The Executive Committee held its quarterly meeting on October 9 and 10, 1990, in Long Beach, California. The Committee expressed its appreciation to all officers and committee members for their work during the past year. A brief summary of the business conducted follows.

Treasurer Norman Olson presented the Treasurer's Report indicating that during the first nine months of 1990, the Institute was in the black. It was decided that the Institute should maintain its current dues through 1991.

Editor Robert Jordan stated that several new publications are due to be published within the next year.

We had three special guests from England, Richard Fox, President of the European Federation of Geologists, John K. Shanklin, President of the Institute of Geologists, and Richard Bateman, Executive Secretary of the Geological Society, who spoke to us concerning their organizations.

Executive Director William Knight recommended that an ad hoc committee be created to investigate the possibility of establishing sustaining sponsors to generate additional revenue for the Institute. Executive Director Knight also briefly discussed his trip to Russia.

Ross Shipman, Chairman of the Continuing Education - Accreditation Committee recommended the creation of an accreditation program for short courses. This would consist of Members to act as a review board and staff at Headquarters to conduct the program.

President Susan Landon assured the Committee that there would be an AIPG - recommended version of a Model Registration Bill by the end of 1990. There was general discussion regarding the format, length, and content of the bill.

Secretary Larry Rhodes would like all Sections to complete new bylaws in 1991 to comply with the national Bylaws. A sample set of bylaws, to be used by the Sections as reference, will be forthcoming.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:18 pm, October 10, 1990. •
A Discussion Of Certain Aspects Of
The New AIPG Code Of Ethics - Part 1

David M. Abbott, Jr., CPG 45701,2

Introduction

This paper reviews some aspects of the new AIPG Ethics Code. I will be discussing examples primarily from my own experience. The point of the examples is to show how fuzzy things sometimes get. I believe that the examples will call similar situations from your experience to mind. What did you do? What would you do differently if the situation comes up again? What should the Institute's policy be regarding the application of the rules?

I chair a committee charged with explaining the Code of Ethics and this paper is part of that effort. But in this paper, I'm speaking for myself because I believe that the entire Membership should have an opportunity to participate in developing ethical positions adopted by the Institute. I do not believe that the Committee can write the standards without exposure to and revision by the Membership. The various revisions to the Code of Ethics over the years and the often passionate debates surrounding those revisions clearly demonstrate the diversity of opinion between Members on at least some ethical issues. I want your input. I want letters to the editor or phone calls discussing these ideas. This debate will help generate such consensus as may be possible.

As I noted in my opening paragraph, ethical issues which seem clear cut initially become fuzzy as various examples along a scale are examined. Where is the line between ethical and unethical? This fuzziness is the major point of this paper and of the debate I hope to generate.

Characteristics of the "New" Code of Ethics

The Code of Ethics adopted on December 11, 1989 (the "new" Code) significantly reorganized the pre-existing Code but did not make significant changes in the fundamental ethical standards. The "new" Code consists of three levels or parts of ethical consideration: the Canons, which are broad principles of conduct; the Ethical Standards, which are goals to which Members aspire; and the (mandatory) Rules of Conduct (Preamble). The reorganization of the Code into Canons resulted in a far more logical grouping of the various concepts of the previous Code. The five new Canons are: (1) General Obligations; (2) Obligations to the Public; (3) Obligations to Employers and Clients; (4) Obligations to Professional Colleagues; and (5) Obligations to the Institute and the Profession. I personally feel that the reorganization inherent in the "new" Code is a tremendous improvement.

The reorganized the "new" Code separates and focuses the debate over whether the Code was something to aspire to or a Code of minimum conduct. Various Members - with good reasons - objected to the negative approach of some of the provisions, an approach I frequently have used in speeches and elsewhere. Gerald Mendenhall expressed this view eloquently in his article in TPG3. Gerald believes that the Ethics Code should be "...for the most part, aspirational rather than compulsory. In the Canons and the Ethical Standards of the revised Code 'should' replaces 'shall' of the old Code." I agree. Practicing ethically is not easy. Choices whose ethical considerations are not clear arise all the time and an aspiration to practice by the highest standards is required. However, there is also conduct which is clearly unacceptable, conduct which should result in expulsion from AIPG. Establishing and maintaining these minimum standards is negative but necessary. Knowledge of both good and evil is necessary to know either; this is one of the lessons of the story of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden.

Ethical Rules Versus
Ethical Optics

The distinction between aspiration to ethical conduct and compliance with rules of minimally acceptable ethical behavior is the distinction between ethical rules and ethical optics. Ethical rules begin with the form Thou shalt not... or Thou shalt... Ethical optics focus on avoiding "even the appearance of impropriety" (Canon 2); or, put in question form, "Would you want your conduct featured on the front page of the paper?" Many of the ethical scandal debates involving public figures in recent years are excellent examples of this distinction between ethical optics and ethical rules. The outraged accusers focusing on the appearances of impropriety and the accused retorting that the law was not broken. Gerald Mendenhall addressed ethical rules versus ethical optics issue by stating, "If a member, in complying with the Code, must deliberate about an act as to whether it is ethical or not, then the act is, most likely, unethical even if determined to be legal."

Although I don't entirely agree with Gerald's statement, I find it true most of the time and feel that it neatly gets to an essential feature of ethical issues. I would like to turn to Rules 2.3.1 and the related Rule 3.2.3 and some conduct examples which convince me that not all ethical questions are so neatly resolved as Gerald suggests.

continued on page 6
Example 2: Employment of graduate students by companies to do thesis work on specialized company problems. The employment of graduate students to do thesis work on company problems is a long standing method of industry support of education from which many of us have benefitted. The company gets the results of research work done using the latest technology and concepts and supervised by professors for a fraction of the cost of hiring a consultant to do the same work although the results are made public in the thesis. The students work on problems of real concern to the companies. As in the preceding example, the educational benefits are clear but again, some consultant missed out on a job or the company didn't need to hire as many staff geologists. Should this long-standing practice be modified, restricted, or eliminated?

Example 3: Professors using school labs and equipment while doing consulting work without payment therefore or billing for their use. This situation was pointed out to me by a consultant several years ago when the relevant ethics rule was slightly different, but the example still makes a point. The example involves the situation in which a professor supplements his salary by consulting with at least the approval (and at some schools, the active encouragement of) the administration. School resources including office, fancy lab equipment, computers, etc. are used in the consulting work but the professor neither pays the school rent for these resources nor does he charge his clients for their use; he simply bills for his time. Clearly, a consultant, who must pay for such resources and therefore bill for their use, is placed at a severe competitive disadvantage by this situation. However, the situation does permit the school to retain and indirectly compensate the professor at less cost with resultant benefits to the students and taxpayers. So this example, like its predecessors, has arguments on both sides. What do you believe AIPG's position on this type of practice should be?

The preceding three examples lie somewhere along the continuum between the ethical and the unethical. Each example contains a readily identifiable educational (and therefore) public benefit and the equally identifiable loss of consulting income to a member of our profession. But the relative weight of the benefits and losses are not the same nor are the ethical optics. I closed each example with a question. Did any of these examples cross over the line into unethical practice which should result in expulsion from AIPG if a Member were found to engage in such conduct? I believe that these examples point out the fuzziness I noted earlier. If the line occurs between examples 2 and 3, as I happen to believe, just where is it? If the professor in example 3 billed for the use of the school resources, but did not turn that amount over to the school, how would your view of the situation change? Or suppose that the professor did reimburse the school, would that be okay? If so, how should the professor and the school determine what rate to charge, the cost to the school or the commercial cost? Should the professor or the school get the "profit" of any differences or should they split the "profit"? Clearly, the questions continue? But the fundamental question remains, where should AIPG draw a line across which its Members may not cross?

Footnotes
1. This paper is based on a talk presented to the Colorado Section - AIPG, April 16, 1990.
2. The Securities and Exchange Commission, as a matter of policy, disclaims responsibility for any private publication or statement by any of its employees. The views expressed herein are Mr. Abbott's and do not necessarily reflect the view of the Commission or of Mr. Abbott's colleagues on the Commission's staff.
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Registration: Concept and Practice

In the "Consultant's Column," TPG, October 1991, Fred Fox makes a thoughtful case against the concept of registration based on moral and ethical grounds. I believe most all of us agree that these frailties exist. But these are frailties of human nature and society and not of the registration concept. It is not the concept of registration that is wrong but, rather the practice of that concept by individuals that produces the problems that Fred mentions.

What Fred seems to suggest is that registration is only a matter of individual choice and expression, rather than also a specific matter of social evolution. In most cases, registration is simply an extension of a professional's schooling and experience credentials. An extension which indicates some civic or peer review and certification, i.e., a license to practice publicly. The importance of this, to both society and profession, is public recognition of geology as a profession.

In the larger sense, Fred's arguments hold almost equally against AIPG certification as a concept, but I don't believe he means that. The main thing wrong with professional licensing is not one of ethics or morality, but one of public perception - the idea that licensing repeals the natural law of caveat emptor.

Of course there are distinctions and we still live in a real world. However, unlike abortion, which is against almost everyone's principles, but then becomes pro-choice among so many in practice, geologists don't need to compromise any principles to register and practice geology. If PEs wrongly assume responsibility for our work and, in the process, mislead and/or damage the commonwealth, where does the professional geologist's responsibility lie? It is certainly not to just sit on our pinacles of pious principles, but, rather, to mount a geological crusade of truth against the infidel engineering malpractices. If, through registration we have the best means to get the truth to the public, then how can the mere concept of registration itself be immoral? Clearly, if professional geologists have any moral and ethical responsibility to society, and surely we must, then conveyance of truth through registration must certainly represent the essence of the matter. What's more, this responsibility can only be exercised successfully if it's applied in a manner of high principle. In that context, of course, Fred is still right.

As to saving society from itself, the best contributions most professional geologists can make is again: get registered and otherwise more socially and/or politically involved. The better our public relations are, the better we can serve the public. Otherwise, we'll just have to let "George" do it even if "George" is only a registered PE.

Walter E. Heinrichs, CPG 688

Fox Replies

Thanks for your comments, Walt. However, I think we have a misunderstanding. I didn't say that the concept of registration is wrong - I just said that I reject it and gave several reasons why. The nut of it is that I believe that most people who want registration are primarily interested in the privileges that go with it (and I think that's a weak reason), and furthermore that they deny that's the reason they want it, and that's even worse.

Nor do I think that registration is "...a matter of individual choice..." or agree that it is "...extension of a professional's schooling and experience..." Registeration is a totally legal animal having nothing at all to do with the individual. It is a function of society - the group - and its object is to regulate and control.

Your comments make me realize that writing to find out what I think isn't enough. Obviously I haven't been at all clear. I shall endeavor to be more articulate in the future. However, let me take this opportunity to get another thought on paper.

I'm surprised to find that many of our number think that all we have to do is "get registered," to which my reply is "get real!" If it were only a matter of passing a registration law formulated by ethical geologists and ethical public servants, I'd probably favor it. But it's not. Professional Engineers already registered in New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and I don't know how many other states are stopping every effort of geologists to "get registered." Those engineers already have a license to practice geology by default, and they aren't about to let us practice our own profession. The fact that they do a lousy job of it and serve poorly the public seems to be completely overlooked. It is a blatant disregard of ethics and ethical principles but, by heaven, they are registered, and therefore protected by the very laws they're thumbing their noses at. If I'm against registration it's because it doesn't work - it doesn't accomplish what it's supposed to accomplish. "Truth through registration" is, I'm afraid, a contradiction of terms.

I fear that many of you will reject the foregoing paragraph, and that's too bad because it's true. "Getting registered" is a virtually impossible task in many states because we are locked out. In some cases we might be able to get a law passed if we permit the Professional Engineers to register (as geologists) along with us, but I'm not willing to pay that price and hope that you aren't either. (This too is a fact - Professional Planners in New Jersey got a registration law years ago by letting Professional Engineers register as Professional Planners along with them.) It seems that engineers can be anything they like by registration. Some deal.

Fred L. Fox, CPG 1273
Executive Director’s Column

ASBOG, AIPG AND WHAT IT’S ALL ABOUT

William V. Knight

You may notice that there are more than the usual number of references to registration of geologists in this edition of The Professional Geologist. This is no accident. Wherever I go, one of the first questions asked is “What is going on with registration?” We get telephone calls at Headquarters asking the same question. When I am invited to speak at meetings of geologists, invariably the topic requested is registration.

The answer to this question is pretty straightforward. A lot is happening...and more is in prospect. There was a time when most geologists thought we could head off any movements to regulate our profession. Like it or not, that time is past. Now the question is not how such movements can be stopped, but how and to what extent we can influence them.

There now is some form of regulation of geological practice by statute or rule in more than one-third of the states. More appear to be on the way.

Registration legislation has been introduced in three states and is being prepared for introduction in eight more that I know of. One of the technical societies is very active in promoting the introduction of legislation. In fact, the Association of Engineering Geologists has gone to significant expense to revise, print, and distribute a document based on the draft act produced by the Council of Professional Geological Organizations (CoPGO) last May. AIPG has likewise spent much time and money in gathering, preparing, and distributing comments on the AEG document. DPA and SIPES have both been active in making their views known by participating in CoPGO. In fact, CoPGO was first organized under the leadership of DPA. All of this is to try to exert some influence on the future direction that our profession takes.

There are those who think that the advent of registration in a state obviates the need for AIPG. ‘Now that we have a registration board, it will protect us,’ the thinking goes. Not so. Read on.

The Association of State Boards of Geology (ASBOG) held its first annual meeting at Williamsburg, Virginia, November 17, 1990. Most of the states that register or certify geologists were represented. The stated purpose of ASBOG is “...to provide an organization through which member boards may act and counsel together to better discharge their responsibilities in administering the practice of geology...” In practice, the main purpose is to help the boards to carry out their purpose of protecting the public as efficiently as possible. Major topics of concern presently are reciprocity (or “comity”), a national examination, and providing non-regulating states with the benefit of their experience if and when those states begin to regulate geologists. Most of the national geological societies were invited to send observers. Those who did were AIPG, AEG, and AIH. We were the guests of ASBOG and, as such, participated in the discussions only as we were invited to do so.

A message that came through loud and clear is that registration of geologists is here to stay, so we had better get used to it. A second message, equally loud and clear and frequently stated, is that the assignment of the boards is to protect the public, not the profession. If the profession is to be protected, it must be by the profession itself, largely through the activities of such organizations as AIPG. The ASBOG delegates recognized the importance of our organizations in this regard. They several times remarked that a close, but arms-length, relationship must be maintained between ASBOG and the professional and technical societies. To this end, ASBOG has established an Affiliate class of membership for the societies. Affiliates’ representation will be somewhat like that of the territories’ representation in Congress. They will have no vote, cannot serve as officers or committee chairmen, and will participate only by invitation. Their views may be heard, but not necessarily accepted.

Obviously, a strong professional society will be needed to work in this environment. As it happens, I met two days later with my counterpart at the National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE), along with two of his senior staff. The engineering profession has already travelled much of the road we geologists currently are on and we can learn from their experience. We also are working with them to smooth that road and to solve some of the problems that exist between our professions. The NSPE administration recognizes AIPG as its geological counterpart. They are willing to help and teach us as much as they can. The first lesson is the value of political involvement. This brings us back to ASBOG.

It is essential that we work with the boards. Our spirit must be cooperative, but we must be strong enough to also serve as ombudsman and advocate for our profession. We must be strong enough to have some influence, much as the NSPE and the various state societies of Professional
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Engineers do. There are many more engineers than there are geologists, so we must have greater participation from our colleagues. A few geologists cannot do the whole job. AIPG officers, volunteers, and staff can do much, but they cannot do it without support. That support must come from the Members, not just money but their active participation. The more Members we have the greater the support that can be given. And, the more support we have, the more we can do. As old doors are closing to us, new ones are opening and we must recognize and exploit them. Each of these opening doors is an opportunity. They do not stay open long. Already, we have let too many close before us. We cannot afford many more. How many geologists do you know who have not accepted this responsibility, this obligation, to support their profession?

Sometimes I hear people complain that AIPG does not do anything for them. Certainly, we do not publish learned technical journals (which seems to be what is meant). What we do is much less obvious. But, it is tangible. A couple of current examples: How many geologists have evaluated a petroleum or mineral property for financing this year? In several states, they would not have been allowed to do that, were it not for the lobbying of AIPG. Even now, we are working to protect that right for geologists in all of the states. How many geologists can sign off on environmental site assessments or underground storage tank investigations? Many could not, were it not for the work of AIPG. And, we are working to gain that right for geologists everywhere. So, if you hear someone say AIPG does not do anything for its Members, ask them who else is doing these things, not just for the Members, but for the entire profession. The organization provided by AIPG is essential. One person cannot do these things working alone.

And that's what it's all about. ●

MEMBERS IN THE NEWS

Allan P. Bennison, CPG 2824, is the 1990 recipient of SEPM’s Distinguished Service Award, given for his generous and enthusiastic support of geology, geology students, geological societies, and their publications.

Philip R. Berger, CPG 1896, and his wife Eleanor have both been elected to Lifetime Membership in the National Stone Association.

George H. Davis, CPG 707, has received the Award for Distinguished Service in Hydrogeology of the Hydrogeology Division of GSA.

Gloria A. DePaolis, CPG 7147, has opened the Tampa, Florida office of U. S. Technical Environmental Consulting, Inc.

Herbert E. Fry, CPG 7163, has been promoted to Manager of Technical Services for the Texas office of R. E. Wright Associates, Inc.

Robert R. Jordan, CPG 1262, has been elected Chairman of the North American Commission on Stratigraphic Nomenclature for 1990-91.

Douglas C. Kent, CPG 4002, will serve on the National Board of Directors of NWFA for 1990-91 representing AGWSE. Tyler Gass, CPG 5042, will be an Observer for AGWSE.

Rodney J. E. Smith, CPG 7359, who had served in many parts of the world with Exxon, Royal Dutch Shell, and Monsanto, has retired from Mobil Exploration and Producing U.S. Inc, but will continue as part-time consultant for Mobil.

John M. Wilson, CPG 2083, has been appointed Manager of Geraghty & Miller’s Tampa, Florida office.
FY 91 Budget Boosts Geo-Interests

The turmoil that accompanied the final stages of developing the FY 91 budget package has dissipated. It now appears that the overall geo-community was treated not only fairly, but in several cases quite well. The members of the several appropriation committees decided, for FY 91, to address some new issues and to renovate some old proven programs that had been allowed to languish.

In FY 91, funds will be available: to study global warming phenomena, for space investigation, for pre-college education, environmental protection, waste management, and infrastructure rehabilitation.

The Environmental Protection Agency is slated to get a 19 percent increase. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s budget is to be increased 13 percent. There will be an 18.8 percent increase in funding for federal-state highway and bridge projects. Even the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence project was funded. Energy-related activities, particularly those private sector undertakings, that address new or developing technology or methodology to foster non-conventional and conventional energy sources received favorable financial support. The "funding" for such private sector projects is generally expected to be in the form of specialized tax incentives.

There are even some current forecasts that view the personal income tax situation as less severe than the original predictions.

Energy Policy Options In Administration FY 92 Budget

The administration’s FY 92 budget proposal, which will be submitted to the Congress in January 1991, is likely to contain some elements of a national energy strategy. At the president’s direction, the Department of Energy has had such a strategy under development since July 1989. The formal strategy documents are due to be released in April 1991. The elements that are currently thought to be subject to inclusion in the administration’s FY 92 budget proposal are: energy security, increased fuel efficiency, nuclear power development, integrated resource planning, environmental/energy balances, fossil energy opportunities, renewable energy programs, hydropower initiatives, and science and advanced technology priorities.

Water Policy Legislation

In October, Senator Mark Hatfield (R-OR) submitted an amendment as a substitute to his previously offered bill, S. 1996, the Western Water Policy Act. The bill was directed at the water programs of the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Geological Survey, as well as related water programs in the Department of Interior. The amendment is designed to broaden the scope of the original bill by establishing a 5-year National Water Commission to provide recommendations, including any proposed legislation, on all federal and state water-related policies and programs for the next 20 years.

Farm Legislation

Just before the 101st Congress ended, it sent to the White House for signature, a 5-year farm bill that includes several geo-apt provisions. The bill will authorize new environmental programs, including provision for a one-million-acre wetlands reserve, and new conservation requirements for farm lands. The bill will also require record-keeping when certain selected chemical compounds are used. The bill, however, limits access to such data.

The $40 billion measure continues crop subsidy, but at a 15 percent reduction, and export and nutrition programs. The administration is expected to sign the bill into law.

The Department of Energy (DOE) has been granted conditional approval to store radioactive and hazardous waste at the WIPP site in New Mexico. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has authorized the storage of 8500 drums of waste, or about 1 percent of the overall WIPP site capacity, for a 5-year test period. Under current law, EPA cannot authorize land disposal of untreated hazardous waste unless it has been demonstrated that the material cannot migrate beyond the disposal site boundary. It is anticipated that EPA’s action will be challenged in court by representatives of the environmental community who consider the official "no-migration" assurances unfounded and suspect.

This accommodation for conditional storage of waste does not, however, serve to address one of the major aspects of the WIPP site controversy. Still at issue is congressional approval to transfer title of the 10,000-acre site from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to the Department of Energy (DOE) in order for DOE to administer the site. Senator Pete Domenici (R-NM) has indicated that he plans to block the title transfer until he is satisfied that waste shipments to the site pose no threat for the state of New Mexico.

The General Mining Law and BLM’s Window Of Opportunity

The conclusion of the 101st Congress ended the recent spate of mining-law reform legislation. The administration, through its agent, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), has taken the opportunity to initiate some "mining law reforms" of its own. According to BLM Director Cy Jamison, the Bureau plans to: replace the $100 requirement for reclamation work with an annual fee of $100 (this proposal is a FY 91 budget item) and to develop regulatory criteria for public-land mining claimants. Two additional continued on page 11
BLM proposals will require congressional action: elimination of the $2.50 per acre patent fee; and removal of all common variety minerals from location.

The BLM proposals, however, address neither of the basic concepts that shaped the recent congressional initiatives for mining law reform, i.e. the Senate’s leasing proposal, nor the House’s diligence proposition. So its a safe bet: that new and various attempts will surface "to reform" the Mining Law of 1872 during the next Congress.

**Clean Air Act - Regulatory Nightmares**

A House-Senate Conference approved the Clean Air Act legislation in the final days of the 101st Congress. When the bill is signed into law, it will impose stringent pollution abatement controls upon a wide range of industrial and commercial activities including automobile manufacturing, coal-fired power plant operations, oil refining, automobile service stations, commercial bakeries, and dry-cleaning establishments to name but a few.

The legislation is very specific in its detail of abatement and compliance requirements. This was done in order to provide the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which has the regulatory authority for the Act’s implementation, with precise standards for enforcement and compliance. The formulation of the regulations will take several years and the complexity of the act will, no doubt, generate many ambiguities.

The prospects for effective regulations are not promising. The bill was passed, in haste and under great pressure, very late in the legislative session. There was insufficient time, prior to the session’s conclusion, to prepare an extensive legislative report which explains and clarifies congressional intent for a piece of legislation. Lacking a thorough legislative report for the Clean Air Act, EPA must compensate for its absence through its own interpretations of congressional intent.

Given this “playing field,” both industry and environmental interests are expected to devote a great deal of time and effort on helping EPA develop the regulations.

**World Academic Environmental Concern**

A recent conference at Talloires, France was convened to focus the concern of the international academic community on “the urgent need to move toward an environmentally sustainable future” throughout the world. The meeting of university presidents pledged: to emphasize research on environmental issues, create programs to develop expertise in environmental management, and to integrate environmental issues throughout the curricula of their respective institutions. Efforts, also, are to be made to enhance an awareness of environmental issues in all university disciplines in order to develop more environmentally-enlightened university communities.

The declaration issued by the conference attendees, who represented 22 nations from North and South America, Europe, Africa, and Asia, state, “We human beings have become a danger to ourselves. We must act in time. ...Although differences in regional perspectives and academic traditions necessarily create a diversity in our teaching and research, we share and aspire to common goals in developing the intellectual capital for an environmentally sustainable future.”

The meeting was organized by Jean Mayer, president of Tufts University in Medford, Massachusetts. Tufts has recently initiated an Environmental Literacy Institute in order to train faculty on ways to integrate environmental issues into their areas of specialization.

Thus far, at Tufts, environmental issues have been addressed within the disciplines of drama, engineering, medicine, veterinary science, and diplomacy.

**Edifying Geo-Trivia**

After 83 years of construction, Washington’s National Cathedral is finally completed. The finial, as the last stone is called, was placed on the southwest corner of the St. Paul Tower of the Cathedral Church of St. Peter and St. Paul (the official name) in late September. The cathedral locale, which is known as Mount St Albans, is at the highest elevation in Washington, DC. The site, which occupies 53 acres, is underlain by bouldery/gravely marine deposits of the Cenozoic Brandywine Terrace.

The principal construction material for the edifice is Indiana limestone, and the embellishments include several historical geo-details. The Pilgrim Steps are made of materials from a quarry owned by George Washington. Ten rocks from Mount Sinai have been placed in the floor in front of the High Altar, and a stained-glass memorial window dedicated to space exploration is embedded with a rock sample from the moon.

The construction for the cathedral began in 1907, when President Theodore Roosevelt placed the foundation stone. As a geotechnical commentary on just how much things have changed since 1907, the cathedral structure may not be in compliance with current building-code standards. The reason? The structure, which is the size of two football fields and weighs about 150,000 tons, contains no reinforcing steel.
Postal Service

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[NOTE: "Fibrous Minerals, Mining, and Disease," a report prepared by the Geological Society of America, addresses the scientific ramifications of this issue, and is available upon request from GSA Membership Services, P.O. Box 9140, Boulder, Colorado 80301; (303) 447-2020.]

Environmental Protection Agency

Corps Of Engineers
Proposed rule 33 CFR Part 325 Proposal to amend permit regulations for controlling certain activities in waters of the United States. Contact: Jack Chowning (202) 272-1781. 55 FR 41354.

Environmental Protection Agency

Occupational Safety and Health Administration

[NOTE: Professional technical-performance qualification criteria included.]

Office Of The President
Executive Order 12731 of October 17, 1990 - Principles of ethical conduct for government officers and employees. 55 FR 42547.

Federal Emergency Management Agency
Proposed rule 44 CFR Part 15 Conduct in buildings and on grounds at the National Emergency Training Center. Contact: Robert Face (301) 447-1223. 55 FR 42216. [Applies to all visitors, contractors, consultants, guests, or trainees at facility]

Defense Nuclear Agency
Notice of intent to prepare a draft environmental impact statement for a Superconducting Magnetic Energy Storage-Engineering Test Model (SMES-ETM). Contact: Public Affairs Office (703) 325-7095. 55 FR 42243. [Includes geotechnical site assessment and feasibility].

Environmental Protection Agency

National Science Foundation

[NSF management-confidential data submittals]

General Services Administration

[RE: GSAR Chap. 5 (APD 2800.12A)]

Minerals Management Service
Notice of availability final environmental impact statement proposed marine mineral lease sale, Exclusive Economic Zone adjacent to Hawaii and Johnston Island. Contact: Robert Paul (213) 894-2233. 55 FR 42502.

Department Of Defense/General Services Administration/National Aeronautics and Space Administration

General Services Administration

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Final rule 10 CFR Part 40 Custody and long-term care of uranium and thorium mill tailings disposal site. Effective date: November 29, 1990. Contact: Mark Haisfield (301) 492-3877. 55 FR 45391.

Department Of Energy
Notice of intent to develop an environmental restoration alternate business strategy. Contact: Owen Robertson (301) 353-2393. 55 FR 45844.

Environmental Protection Agency

Environment Of Transportation
Advanced notice of proposed rulemaking 49 CFR Part 195 Transportation of a hazardous liquid in pipelines operating at 20 percent or less of specified minimum yield strength. Contact: Joseph Wolf (202) 366-4560. 55 FR 45822.
Montana

The 1990 Montana Section meeting of the American Institute of Professional Geologists was held on September 28th and 29th, 1990, in Butte, Montana. The meeting began with a welcome by Section President Fred Earl, CGP 6. The Section's general business meeting discussed progress on the adoption of new state bylaws when the national AIPG finishes setting up model section bylaws, and the probability that one specific change will be the election of a President-Elect and Section officers before the national AIPG meeting so that the President-Elect can attend that meeting. The decline in Section membership was addressed, and what would be necessary to increase membership, why geologists should become members of AIPG, and just what benefits were derived from the annual dues. The second topic of discussion was registration vs. certification and what was being done in nearby states, especially Idaho and Wyoming. A part of this discussion also covered proposed legislation that might require that geologists appraising mineral or oil and gas properties to pass an estate appraisal exam. The third topic of discussion was introduced by John Montagne, CGP 422, who felt AIPG should be addressing the large picture of "preserving the earth" rather than just protecting geologists' jobs. Presently "preserving the earth" is a very popular topic, and AIPG and its Membership have unique knowledge that should be used to further illuminate the subject. Geologists can use their knowledge to promote extraction of mineral and oil and gas deposits with minimal damage to the earth, and to help solve problems of hazardous waste disposal and ground-water contamination.

On the afternoon of Friday, September 28th interested members went to the Montana Resources Continental Pit, a copper and molybdenum open pit mine.

On September 29th, the business meeting reconvened. Ed Ruppel, CGP 666, Director of the Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology, gave a talk entitled: "Late Cenozoic Pull-Aparts in Southwestern Montana." He discussed new geologic evidence that major faults in the area are mostly strike-slip rather than normal faults as they have been interpreted by others. If these basins are pull-aparts with a detachment surface in the Precambrian, no Paleozoic sedimentary rocks would be expected to be found under the Tertiary basin fill, thus greatly changing the area's potential for oil and gas generation and production.

On Saturday afternoon members attended a field trip led by Phyllis Hargrave in the Flume Gulch-Browns Gulch area north of Butte where field relationships of the Lowland Creek Volcanics were observed.

Nevada

The Nevada Section of AIPG is sponsoring a field trip January 25-27, 1991 originating in Las Vegas. Highlights include:

(1) Coliseum Mine Tour
(2) Geology of Frenchman Mountain (Complete stratigraphy, Precambrian through Tertiary)
(3) Hydrogeology of Landfair and Ivanpah valleys
(4) Hoover Dam Tour
(5) Goodsprings Mining District

The tours will originate at the Hacienda at 7:30 each morning.

For information and applications, please contact:

Mark Stock (702) 364-1066
Las Vegas, Nevada
or
Earl Abbott (702) 827-2324
Reno, Nevada
or write to:
AIPG Nevada Section
P.O. Box 1749
Reno, NV 89505 ●

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S ITINERARY
(subject to change)

The Executive Director is visiting various Sections, agencies, campuses, and other organizations. He is both talking and listening, exchanging information and ideas. Members are encouraged to attend these meetings wherever and whenever possible. His itinerary for the next six months, as presently scheduled, is:

December 12 - 13:
December 14 - 16:
January 10 - 16:
January 12:
January 28:
January 30:
February 22 - 23:
February 25 - 28:
March 4 - 5:
March 5 - 6:
March 7 - 8:
March 25 - 26:
April 7 - 10:
April 13 - 14:
April 19:
April 25:
May 25 - 26:

Members and related societies, Grand Junction, CO
Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky agencies, and universities
Executive Committee, Bloomington, IN
CESR/NSPE, Alexandria, VA
Tennessee Section and Vanderhill Unbr., Nashville, TN
Oklahoma Section, Edmond, OK
Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration (convention), Denver, CO
Louisiana Section and Louisiana State Unbr., Baton Rouge
Mississippi Section and university
Alabama Section and universities
American Geological Institute, Alexandria, VA
American Association of Petroleum Geologists, (convention) Dallas, TX
Executive Committee, Arvada, CO
Nevada Section, Reno, NV
Pennsylvania Section, Pittsburgh, PA
European Federation of Geologists, Stockholm, Sweden
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U.S. 18892
AGENCY: Department of Labor/Occupational Safety and Health Administration
TOPIC: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND POLLUTION CONTROL
SUMMARY: Provides for accreditation of training programs for hazardous waste operations.
AGENCY CONTACT: Thomas Hall, Division of Consumer Affairs, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Room N 3645, Washington, DC, (202) 883-8815.
CITATION: 29 CFR 1510
PROPOSAL DATE: 09/14/91
COMMENT DEADLINE: 01/21/91
HEARING DATE: 12/20-21/91, 2/5-2/6/91, 2/12-2/14/91
MEETING: PUBLIC HEARINGS

U.S. 18994
AGENCY: Delaware River Basin Commission
TOPIC: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND POLLUTION CONTROL
AGENCY CONTACT: Susan M. Weimken, (202) 883-9200
CITATION: 18 CFR 401
PROPOSAL DATE: 10/18/90
COMMENT DEADLINE: 12/01/90
HEARING DATE: West Trenton, NJ, 12/12/90, 1 p.m.

U.S. 17000
AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency
TOPIC: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND POLLUTION CONTROL
SUMMARY: Limits effluent discharges to waters of the U.S. and the introduction of pollutants into publicly owned treatment works existing and new sources in the organic chemicals, plastics, and synthetic fibers point source category.
AGENCY CONTACT: George M. Jett, (202) 362-7151
CITATION: 40 CFR 414
PROPOSAL DATE: 10/15/90
COMMENT DEADLINE: 11/16/90

U.S. 17165
AGENCY: Department of Energy
TOPIC: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND POLLUTION CONTROL
SUMMARY: Revises the existing rule entitled “Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.”
AGENCY CONTACT: Carol M. Borgstrom, (202) 586-4600
CITATION: 10 CFR 1021
PROPOSAL DATE: 11/02/90
COMMENT DEADLINE: 12/17/90

U.S. 17259
AGENCY: Department of the Interior/Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement
TOPIC: RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND PRESERVATION
SUMMARY: Amends regulations governing protection of the prevailing hydrologic balance at surface and underground coal mining operations through the use of best technology currently available.
AGENCY CONTACT: Douglas J. Growitz, (202) 543-1907
CITATION: 30 CFR 701, 818, 817
PROPOSAL DATE: 11/10/90
COMMENT DEADLINE: 01/14/91

FLORIDA 8004
AGENCY: Department of Professional Regulation/Board of Landscape Architects
TOPIC: BUSINESS AND CORPORATIONS
SUMMARY: Determines that the Uniform National Examination adequately assesses the competency of potential landscape architect licensees.
AGENCY CONTACT: Pat Aird, Executive Director, Board of Landscape Architecture, Northwood Centre, 1840 North Monroe St., Tallahassee, FL 32399-0750.
CITATION: FAC 209A-11.201
PROPOSAL DATE: 08/07/90
DATE WITHDRAWN: 10/19/90
MESSAGE: PROPOSED RULE WITHDRAWN

ILLINOIS 3977
AGENCY: Pollution Control Board
TOPIC: RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND PRESERVATION
SUMMARY: Prescribes various aspects of ground-water quality, including methods of classification of ground-waters, standards for quality of groundwaters, and various procedures and protocols for the management and protection of ground-waters.
AGENCY CONTACT: Dorothy M. Gunn, Clerk, Pollution Control Board, 100 West Randolph Street, Suite 11-500, Chicago, IL 60601.
CITATION: 35 IAC 620-1, 107 thru 619 (nonseq); Appendices A & B.
PROPOSAL DATE: 11/02/90
COMMENT DEADLINE: 12/17/90

KENTUCKY 7065
AGENCY: Public Protection and Regulation Cabinet/Department of Housing, Buildings and Construction
TOPIC: LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT
SUMMARY: Sets the minimum requirements for determining technical competency and proficiency of companies who are responsible for the installation of underground petroleum storage tank systems by qualifying individuals and determines the financial responsibility through proof of insurance.
CITATION: 815 KAR 30-060
PROPOSAL DATE: 11/01/90
COMMENT DEADLINE: 11/16/90
HEARING DATE: 11/21/90

MISSOURI 2532
AGENCY: Department of Natural Resources/Land Reclamation Commission
TOPIC: RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND PRESERVATION
SUMMARY: Defines certain terms used throughout the land reclamation emergency rules for surface mining of minerals; sets forth the requirements for surface mine operators to obtain the necessary permit from the Land Reclamation Commission; allows for variances from the operation, reclamation or conservation plan requirements; sets forth the requirements for the Commission, director of authorized agent to enter upon surface mined lands in order to conduct inspections.
AGENCY CONTACT: Land Reclamation Program, Department of Natural Resources, Ed Badler, Staff Director, P.O. Box 178, Jefferson City, MO 65102.
CITATION: 10 CSR 40-10.01 thru .110
PROPOSAL DATE: 10/15/90
COMMENT DEADLINE: 11/14/90

MISSOURI 2551
AGENCY: Department of Natural Resources
TOPIC: RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND PRESERVATION
SUMMARY: Lists the basic technical issues expected to be addressed in a completed application for a Metallic Minerals Waste Management permit and references other rules containing technical information; provides guidelines regarding an approvable ground-water monitoring and protection plan; provides guidelines regarding the Integrity, design, construction and maintenance of metallic mineral waste management structures including, but not limited to, tailings, dams, and slag waste piles; provides guidelines for reclamation of permitted metallic minerals management areas.
AGENCY CONTACT: Larry A. Steffensmier, Director of Staff, Clean Water Commission, Department of Natural Resources, P.O. Box 176, Jefferson City, MO 65102.
CITATION: 10 CSR 45-6, 010 thru .240
PROPOSAL DATE: 10/15/90
COMMENT DEADLINE: 11/14/90

OREGON 7045
AGENCY: Board of Engineering Examiners
TOPIC: BUSINESS AND CORPORATIONS
SUMMARY: Reflects the name change of the national Council and also adds a new section defining substantially equivalent requirements for registration as a professional engineer by comity as it related to applicants who have been registered in another jurisdiction for over 20 years.
AGENCY CONTACT: Edward B. Graham, Executive Secretary, Board of Engineering Examiners, 750 Front Street N.E., #240, Salem, OR 97310, (503) 379-4160.
CITATION: OAR 620-10-220
PROPOSAL DATE: 11/01/90
COMMENT DEADLINE: 11/16/90
HEARING DATE: 12/07/90

SOUTH DAKOTA 1475
AGENCY: Department of Water and Natural Resources/Board of Water and Natural Resources
TOPIC: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND POLLUTION CONTROL
SUMMARY: Establishes application submission deadlines to the Department of Water and Natural Resources, application review procedures and indirect cost rates all relating to ground-water contamination, ground-water sampling, pollution prevention and remediation, and ground-water management.
AGENCY CONTACT: Groundwater Program, Department of Water and Natural Resources, 905 Building, 525 East Capitol, Pierre, SD 57501.
CITATION: [TO BE CODIFIED] groundwater contamination applications
PROPOSAL DATE: 12/12/90
COMMENT DEADLINE: 11/07/90
HEARING DATE: 11/08/90
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Applications Received

(as of November 30, 1990)

Applicants for certification must meet AIPG's standards as set forth in its Bylaws 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.

Full Membership


BROWN, G. Reynolds, Jr., 6904 Cedar Forest Trail, Dallas, TX 75226. Sponsors: Ken Prince, Jr., Ken Elliott, Bill Clayton.

BULL, Louis P., 163 Baywood Drive, Newport Beach, CA 92660. Sponsors: Robert D. Goldman, David Burt, Dennis Parley.

CHANDLER, Margaret, 1963 Wagar Road, Rocky River, OH 44116. Sponsors: William E. Thompson, Robert Krellick, Roy Chamberlin.


MACK, Bruce G., 33555 North Indian Lane, Wildwood, IL 60030. Sponsors: Michael T. McCarrin, Marvin Saines, Glen Mann.


RATTE, Kevin G., 4717 Ames Lane, Carnation Road, N.E., Redmond, WA 98053. Sponsors: H. Randy Sweet, Dennis Goldman, Brad Authier.


TURNER, Dennis L., P.O. Box 441, Latham, NY 12110. Sponsors: Mark J. Zdunczyk, Thomas E. Newman, Jerry Zaykoski.

VAAG, Myra K., 2102 Yellowstone Street, Golden, CO 80401. Sponsors: Charles Haddox, Gerald Forney, Keith Ketner.


Candidate for Certification

PHILLIPS, Bruce E., 5253 0gilvie Avenue, Paducah, KY 42001. Sponsors: Peter Whaley, George D. Klein.

New Members

(as of November 30, 1990)

BERGEON, Mark A., CPG 8025, Green Bay, WI

BURKART, Burke, CPG 8026, Arlington, TX

DICKSON, Terrence L., CPG 8027, Dallas, TX

GLOVER, Alexander S., Jr., CPG 8028, Stafford, VA

HOSEK, Ronald J., CPG 8029, Wichita, KS

LINDEN, Michael A., CPG 8030, Troutville, VA

NICHOLAS, Barbara V., CPG 8031, Falls Church, VA

RODGERS, Robert W., CPG 8032, Edinburgh, TX

STINGER, Sarah L., CPG 8033, Lovettsville, VA

STOELTING, Raymond D., CPG 8034, Texas City, TX

TARVIN, Jeanne M., CPG 8035, Jackson, WI

WEBB, Thomas R., CPG 8036, Lexington, KY

YANCEY, Clyde L., CPG 8037, Corpus Christi, TX

YOUNGER, Michael A., CPG 8038.

IN MEMORIAM

James H. Montgomery, CPG 1013

Harry W. Oborne, CPG 123, July 24, 1990

Fred M. Ratliff, Jr., CPG 2847, September 5, 1990

L. Orlando Rowland, CPG 425, February 21, 1990

Guillermo Armando Sales, CPG 3382, 78, Mexico City, Mexico, June 29, 1990

Melville W. Sherwin, CPG 1264, 82, Jackson, Mississippi, May 21, 1990

Raymond D. Sloan, CPG 1775

Horace Sutcliffe, Jr., CPG 2756, October 13, 1990

Louis Unfer, Jr., CPG 367, August 27, 1990
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AIPG's last Technical Session in Leningrad. The photograph above includes William V. Knight, Executive Director, the Leader of the Russian Technical Group, and his interpreter.

Build For The Future Through

THE AIPG FOUNDATION

Support Geologically Oriented
- Public Information
- Public Education
- Research on Public Issues
- Forums for Professionals

Send your tax deductible contribution to the endowment fund of

The AIPG Foundation
c/o A. U. Honkala, Treasurer
13405 Woodbriar Ridge
Midlothian, VA 23112

Be Proud of Your Certification...
Display Your AIPG Membership...
With These Distinctive Items...

AIPG INSIGNIA ITEMS AVAILABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership Certificate (CPG)</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Plaque - Regular</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Inking Stamp</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Die (left, right, or bottom)</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Die (replacement insert)</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black and Gold Mug</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue and White Mug</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deluxe Ballpoint Pen</td>
<td>$5.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Lapel Pin/Tie Tack</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL ...........................................

Name ...........................................

Mailing Address  ....................................

Day Phone Number ....................................

CPG #  ........................................ Date Confirmed: ....................................

Make checks payable to: AIPG
To order by phone call: (303) 431-4831
Visa and Mastercard accepted