ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN STATE GEOLOGISTS

MINUTES OF THE 1993 ANNUAL MEETING
COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO
JUNE 5-8, 1993

AASG Executive Session

June 5, 1993

In accordance with Article V, Section 2 of the AASG Constitution, the Executive Committee met on the afternoon of June 5, 1993 to approve the agenda for the 1993 annual meeting and to approve Chairpersons and members of Annual Meeting Committees. Appointed were:

Auditing: W. H. McLemore, Chair, J.P. Bluemle, C. Christenson
Balloting: C. D. Gardner, Chair, R. Foster, J. Robertson
Resolutions: N. C. Hester, Chair, E. Cleaves, S. C. Knox
Awards: P. B. Wigley, Chair, K. N. Weaver, L. D. Fellows,
         D. C. Haney, R. R. Jordan
Future Meetings: T. E. Smith, Chair, E. T. Luther, P. C. Grew

Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting are available as Annex A.

Sunday, June 6, 1993

CALL TO ORDER

President Morris W. Leighton called the 1993 Annual Meeting of the Association of American State Geologists to order at 8:00 a.m., Sunday, June 6, 1993 at the Coeur d'Alene Resort in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho and proceeded with the agenda (Annex B).

ROLL CALL

Secretary Schmidt called the roll call of the states. Forty-three states were represented by their state geologist or their delegate. Those attending were:

Alabama - E. A. Mancini
Alaska - T. E. Smith
Arizona - L. D. Fellows
Arkansas - N. F. Williams
California - J. E. Davis
Colorado - V. J. Cowart
Connecticut - R. Lewis, delegate for R. Hyde
Delaware - R. R. Jordan
Florida - W. Schmidt
Georgia - W. H. McLemore
Idaho - E. H. Bennett
Illinois - M. W. Leighton

RECEIVED
SEP 03 1993
OIG'S OFFICE
INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Other state survey staff present and introduced by Association Members were: L. L. Brady, Kansas; D. A. Eversoll, Nebraska; D. L. Gross, Illinois; R. Hennings, Wisconsin; J. R. Hill, Indiana; K. Johnson, Oklahoma; J. D. Kiefer, Kentucky; W. R. Lund, Utah; R. Marvinney, Maine; J. C. Reid, North Carolina; I. R. Satterfield, Missouri; R. G. Van Horn, Ohio; and J. D. Vineyard, Missouri.

INTRODUCTION OF HONORARY MEMBERS

We were honored by the presence of six honorary members. They were: A. F. Agnew, S. G. Conrad, R. C. Milici, J. W. Rold, A. A. Socolow, and K. H. Weaver.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS

President Leighton recognized and introduced the new members present. They included: Cleo Christensen (SD), Emery Cleaves (MD), Vicki Cowart (CO), Richard Foster (MA), Bill Marsalis (LA), and Jamie Robertson (WI). President Leighton also recognized the two acting state geologists. Attending
the meeting was Harold F. Bonham (NV), and not in attendance A. W. Zupan (SC).

(the list of participants is included as Annex C)

WELCOME

Our host Earl Bennett welcomed the meeting participants to Idaho and provided information on logistics for the meeting and fieldtrips.

1992 MIDYEAR MINUTES

The minutes of the 1992 Midyear Meeting held in Cincinnati were presented (Annex D). N. F. Williams moved adoption, seconded by R. Lasmanis. Motion passed by acclamation.

PRESIDENT'S AD HOC MEETING COMMITTEES

President Leighton announced the appointed special committees for the Annual Meeting as approved by the Executive Committee with the replacement of E. T. Luther by W. E. Marsalis on the Future Meetings committee.

In addition, President Leighton announced some changes to other committee assignments. C. Chapin in place of J. Price on the Federal Liaison Committee, and L. Allison for J. Price as the National Geologic Mapping Advisory Committee nominee to the Secretary of the Interior.

REPORT OF THE OFFICERS

PRESIDENT

President Leighton noted this has been a year of change in government and in our association. He reviewed several policy shifts, and pending bills which will impact our members organizations. These included the National Geologic Mapping Act, the Flood Insurance Act, Coastal Erosion, Water Quality Monitoring, Reauthorization of the National Earthquakes Hazards Reduction Act, the Clean Water Act, and the revision of the criteria for the siting of nuclear power plants. The Officers have worked hard to stay on top of the changes due to the new administration in Washington. The Presidents Newsletter was initiated with its first four issues. Issues of primary concern included the implementation of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992, and the appointment of a new director of the U.S. Geological Survey. The AASG submitted member names in nomination for the National Geologic Mapping Act Advisory Committee, the Statemap Peer Review Panel and the Education Committee. Members of our Implementation Committee met with representatives from the USGS to complete the final details of the implementation plan. The first Program Opportunity Notice (PON) for the STATEMAP component was sent out and responded to. The AASG has been active in recommending full appropriation to the authorization levels for the mapping act. Various national professional organizations have supplied support.

The association’s various committees provide counsel and advice to congressional committees and staff. Noted were the work of the Continental Margins Committee regarding their work with MMS, the Environmental Affairs Committee working with
EPA and the USGS on the Radon project, the Federal Liaison Committee and others. We are beginning to turn some of our attention to non-federal organizations. Our first action involves a joint booth with AIPG at the annual meeting of the National Council of State Legislatures later this summer in California. Other groups we should look into include: the National Governors Association; the Council of State Governments; the U.S. Conference of Mayors; the International City and County Management Association, the National Association of Planners, and others. President Leighton, noting the involvement of AASG members in this year’s activities, thanked all the members for their support and hard work.

VICE-PRESIDENT

Vice President Hoskins reviewed his responsibilities in overseeing the AASG booths at the annual meetings of the Geological Society of America, and the American Association of Petroleum Geologists. The theme this past year was the use of geologic maps as a tie in to the National Geologic Mapping Act.

SECRETARY-TREASURER

Secretary-Treasurer Schmidt presented an unaudited financial statement of receipts and expenses (Annex d). Upon the President’s call for a motion to adopt the Treasurer’s report, R. Fakundiny moved and D. Hoskins seconded. The motion was approved by acclamation. Secretary Schmidt also made it known that the State Geologists Journal now had a Library of Congress, International Standard Serial Number (ISSN Number) assigned. It is: ISSN 0039-0089.

HISTORIAN

Historian Koch stated that he had received the files from past Historian Ole’ Olson, but had not had an opportunity to review them in detail yet. He anticipates they will be scanning the files to make a better permanent record. This should also assist with records searches in the future such as some of the questions which have come up recently regarding Honorary Member records.

EDITOR

Editor Berg supplied a copy of his written report (Annex E). The printing schedule for the Journal was described. It was reported that the Ohio Survey recently acquired a new desktop publishing system which should help greatly in the future. Due to the time-consuming nature of the proofreading for the various publications Tom asked if any Honoraries would be willing to assist with this aspect of production.

STATISTICIAN

Statistician Kasabach provided his written report (Annex F). Total income for FY 91-92 increased by 2.3% over the prior year. Direct appropriations decreased 7.0%, and federal funds increased by 22.8%. Trends show an increase in "soft" money. State funded support positions showed a decrease; however, there is an increase in Federal funds and part time staff. The overall summary seemed to say that State Geological Surveys were "holding their own" at about level funding.
In the current fiscal environment this can be considered a "success".

LIAISON COMMITTEE REPORT

President-Elect Hull presented the Liaison Committee Report (Annex G). This past spring's meeting was for four days due to the vast number of new faces appointed or pending appointments by the new administration. This has truly been a confusing time in Washington D.C. The committee visited Federal agencies and Congressional staff to share the Association's viewpoint on pending legislation, the fiscal year 1994 Federal budget, implementation of the National Geologic Mapping Act and operation of various Federal programs. Some discussions on possible future cooperative relationships were held, such as with the Forest Service, and FEMA specifically their Coastal Erosion and Earthquake Hazards programs.

Pending legislation of interest to AASG members included bills on mining law reform (S. 257, S. 775, H.R. 322 and H.R. 1708), coastal erosion (H.R. 62), and water quality (H.R. 1116). Later this year the Congress will consider legislation to reauthorize the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, Clean Water Act, and Superfund.

Constructive meetings were held with newly appointed members of the Clinton administration, many of whom were awaiting confirmation, including Asst. Sec. DOI, for Water and Science Elizabeth Rieke, Director of the Bureau of Land Management Jim Baca, and Director of Federal Emergency Management Agency James Lee Witt.

The Federal budget presented by the new Administration for fiscal year 1994 (FY94) was reviewed with numerous agency personnel and staff for House and Senate appropriation committees. A modest increase of $1.2 million (5%) is provided in the administration budget request for the National Geologic Mapping Program whereas a reduction of $300,000 (50%) is planned for the MMS-AASG cooperative Continental Margins program.

Details of the Committee's discussions are included in the written report, in addition handouts from the Federal agencies were made available at the meeting for those interested.

AASG-USGS CLUSTER MEETINGS

Eastern Cluster - E. Cleaves and W. Schmidt supplied a written report on the discussions from the Eastern Cluster held in Annapolis on February 21-23, 1993 (Annex H). E. Cleaves summarized state concerns which included: the need to include infrastructure needs in the geologic mapping priorities, USGS was asked to supply a complete listing of past COGEO MAP projects with funding amounts for each (this was promised once again, to be supplied this summer), concerns for the reduction in the number of topographic maps being supplied to states were raised, final state radon reports were requested, it was suggested the NAWQA projects need geologic framework components (it seems these projects are primarily surface water), coastal states have not received word on the proposed coastal geology program.
A report on the Status of USGS/EPA State Radon Booklets was made available by R. Milici (Annex I).

Central Region Cluster - P. Wigley provided a written summary of the meeting (Annex J) held in Kansas City, MO on September 17-19, 1993. Discussions included: the types of projects to be funded under the STATEMAP program and how multiple year projects would fit in, the lack of adequate sampling sites for the state radon booklets, the need to continue the Geologic Division Activity reports - there has been little if any state contacts regarding their in-state work, the central states were pleased that they were contacted about the upcoming petroleum reserve assessment.

Western Cluster - E. Bennett summarized the meeting held in Montana last October 5, 1992. The National Geologic Mapping Act dominated discussions, how the proposals would be handled, what the PON would entail, etc. The U.S.G.S mineral assessment program was discussed (it was stated that a program review has been carried out by the U. of Arizona and is in circulation), royalty returns on federal lands was discussed, it seems it will be left to individual states to address, general public geologic education was discussed (opposed to the common theme of K-12 programs), lastly they reviewed the idea of holding the next cluster in Washington, DC to jointly discuss the National Geologic Mapping Act with their elected officials.

HONORARY MEMBERS COMMITTEE

Chairman Jordan supplied a written committee report (Annex K). The first order of business was to address the existing nominations for Honorary Membership. A letter of nomination from R. Foster was submitted to the committee in support of nominating J. A. Sinnott (MA) to Honorary Membership (included with Annex K) N. Williams moved the nomination, seconded by W. Anderson, the motion carried unanimously. A second letter was received from W. Marsalis in support of nominating C. G. Groat (LA). The committee again fully endorsed the nomination and a motion was called for. It was moved by N. Williams and seconded by T. Berg. Without objection the motion carried. The two newly elected Honarary Members were given a round of applause in absentia.

The rest of the committee report was then given. The committee reviewed the criteria for Honorary Membership and recommended no changes. A revised list of Honorary Members and another of the deceased Honorary Members was supplied. Additions and corrections were requested. In addition, a list of all persons who have ever served as a State Geologist was produced. This list was made available for members to offer corrections. It was asked if "acting state geologists" were included, the answer was yes it was intended to be comprehensive.

The committee noted the existence of two dozen portraits of past State Geologists by R.C. Moore. These are archived in Kansas. It was suggested that AAGS may wish to use these for the basis of a display, and consider awards based on this form of a memorial.
C. Mankin brought the membership up-to-date on the recent activities and current status of the Geologic Mapping Act. A one-page proposal (Annex L) was prepared for the membership's consideration regarding a strategy change in trying to get the act implemented with appropriations at a more equitable distribution among the four components. For FY 94 the act calls for a $42m appropriation, however, the President's budget calls for about $23.2m (an increase of about $1.2 m over FY 93). The USGS intends to divide this $1.2m in half with half going to the State Surveys and half being kept by the USGS. This yields a $600,000 (minus 18% overhead to the USGS) increase. The new proposed strategy was reviewed and discussed. Upon completion of discussion D. Hull moved adoption and N. Williams seconded. The motion carried unanimously. At a later point in the meeting a one page AASG Position Statement was prepared on this issue and is herein attached to Annex L. Those State Geologists who have Senators on the Senate Appropriations Committee were urged to contact them regarding solicitation of their support. It was observed that we have many Senators and Congressional members in favor of this program, but we have no champion! We need someone to carry the standard. We have seen that we cannot rely on the administration or the Federal programs to support the state needs. Considerable discussion regarding delegation contacts, communication of funding amounts and amounts that the states have available to match followed. J. Rold suggested that Honorary Members don't have the political constraints that many of the current state geologists have.

C. Mankin proposed that he approach Sen. Nickles to see if he would be interested in taking the lead on supporting this. The membership concurred.

The Statemap Peer Review Panel reviewed the proposals in response to the PON's. There were 55 proposals submitted from 43 states. Requested funding in total was $3.142m for $1.2m available funds. The committee suggests a mechanism be set up to assist those states which were not successful, to prepare better proposals next time. Workshops were considered at Clusters or at the Midyear meeting. The PON's also need some revision. Input was requested to C. Mankin who will compile the comments and address these concerns with the USGS, in addition these will be sent to all State Geologists. President Leighton requested that C. Mankin work with the Cluster Coordinators to determine the best approach and to inform the executive committee of their recommendation. J. Williams discussed the advantages of having a state geological mapping committee.

President Leighton reviewed the status of the Advisory Committee to the Dept. of the Interior. The committee had not yet met and it has been over a year since names were submitted. This created a problem with the "At Large" member nominated for the first one year term (D. Haney). Considerable discussion followed regarding the Advisory Committee members, who can call a meeting and other related issues. C. Mankin was to discuss with D. Peck later during the meeting the need to call a meeting of the Advisory Committee. At a later point in the meeting the Executive Committee met and then proposed to the membership the reappointment of D. Haney (with a three year term as At Large member) to the Advisory Committee. The proposal was moved by N. Williams and seconded by D. Koch, it carried unanimously.
DIGITAL MAPPING COMMITTEE

Chairman L. Gerhard submitted a written committee report (Annex M). It was reported that the NAS Mapping Science Committee published its third report, entitled "Toward a Coordinated Spatial Data Structure for the Nation." The USGS Digital Data standards and mapping standards report - for the fourth year in a row there is no progress to report. OMB Circular A-130, Management of Federal Information Resources was being revised it was reported. A New Section 8 would require information management planning to consider the effects of their actions on state and local governments and ensure consultation with those governments. The committee did a survey of the State Surveys regarding activities in GIS. The results had 31 of the 50 states responding. Of these, 12 states had no activity towards a state GIS program, and 19 states said GIS was important in their states or at least well along in implementation, 15 of these states played an important role in the system. The majority having any GIS available used the software package ARC-INFO, several others used AUTOCAD. Other details of the survey are available in the Committee Report.

It was also suggested that an E-Mail system or electronic bulletin board linking the State Surveys would be a useful and rapid and informal communication device. The pricing or cost of digital products for the public is a difficult issue. Looking into this, as well as licensing, was recommended as a committee charge for next year.

ASSOCIATION FOR WOMEN GEOScientists

R. Fakundiny reported that the AWG was interested in working with the State Geological Surveys to search for the needed expertise among the women geologists throughout the country to get involved with the national geologic mapping program. Leaflets describing the AWG were made available.

FEDERAL LANDS COMMITTEE

Chairman E. Ruppel supplied a written committee report (Annex N). This year's report included a map of the U.S. showing the percentages of federally owned surface lands for each state. The Bumpers/Rahall bills to repeal the mining Law of 1872 was briefly discussed. Reduction of access to resources on public lands by continuing expansion of wilderness areas by enthusiastic but ill-conceived proposals was also reviewed. It was reported that the endangered species list may also soon include fossils, on both U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands (a letter on the subject from a Forest Supervisor in Nebraska was included with the committee report). This is known as the Baucus bill (SB 3107).

CONTINENTAL MARGINS COMMITTEE

Chairman W. Fisher referenced the written committee report which was mailed to all members (Annex O). The primary activity of the committee has been the coordination of the AASG/MMS State Cooperative program. The tenth year of the program will come from the FY-93 budget ($300,000), this is about half of the prior years total. MMS will have difficulty restoring this for a second year (FY
94). As a result Chairman Fisher supplied all coastal states with listings of both House and Senate Appropriations subcommittee members which could play key roles in restoring the funds.

The Third Symposium on the Continental Margins Program was held in Austin last November. This meeting invited industry representatives. Transactions should be published later this summer. Although the last couple of years have been difficult, this has been a model Federal/State partnership program. It was emphasized that states need to complete their projects timely, to continue the good working relationship the Association has with the MMS program people.

MINERALS POLICY COMMITTEE

Chairman R. Lasmanis reviewed the committees activities. They reviewed a "Draft Ecosystem Management Strategy for the East and Midwest" from the U.S. Forest Service. The document only concerned itself with biological resources. Unaddressed were: geology, geomorphology, hydrogeology, hydrology, surface water, erosion, sedimentation, climate and others. They conclude the issue of "ecosystem" management needs watching, it is the current buzzword and generally poorly understood.

Correspondence with the U.S. Bureau of Mines on mineral statistics included four separate issues. a). Confidential data and the draft USBM document titled "Handling Proprietary Survey Data - Standard 92-5." b). Quality of mineral statistics. c). Lumping of commodities and counties. d). Inconsistent use of value added. Chairman Lasmanis stated that Mike McKinley of the USBM has been very responsive. In a letter to D. Hull he invited those states which believe that current USBM statistics are inaccurate, that a cooperative effort between a state survey and the USBM could help. R. Lasmanis would meet with McKinley during our meeting to continue their discussions. Changes in the Mining law of 1872 were discussed by prior committee reports, however, the membership was reminded that a panel will further discuss the issues on Tuesday morning as part of our agenda, in addition mineral assessment and availability subjects will also be covered by a second panel. Discussion on the Mining Law followed. It was mentioned that the Western Governors Assoc. will suggest a resolution regarding proposed amendments. R. Lasmanis and D. Hull requested input from members for an AASG resolution. Congressional action in some form is expected this year. The committee report and notes from R. Lasmanis's discussion with McKinley are filed as Annex P.

ENERGY POLICY COMMITTEE

The principal activity this year was giving testimony on behalf of AASG to the Committee on Applied Research Needs Related to Extraction and Processing of Oil and Gas, a Committee of the National Research Council's Board on Chemical Science and Technology. Testimony was also given to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the U.S. Senate concerning the status of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. (the committee report is Annex Q, in addition Chairman Fisher stated that copies of the testimony can be supplied to interested parties). Relative to the NRC study some concerns were raised. The report is set for review this June. C. Mankin will be one of the reviewers. The recently issued DOE
carbonate reservoir PON awards was discussed. PON's for other reservoir classes will be released later. The DOE FY94 budget was briefly reviewed, as was the "natural gas atlases" funded by DOE and GRI. It was reported that the USGS/MMS next resource appraisal is underway. They should be contacting each state where oil production exists to coordinate data and request input.

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The committee chair, W. Schmidt, provided a written report (Annex R). The EPA's final guidance document for states developing their "Comprehensive State Ground Water Protection Programs" was summarized. In addition, the EPA draft of their "Ground Water Resource Assessment Technical Assistance Document" was reviewed by the committee and selected "case study" states.

The AASG Wetlands Statement was supplied to interested parties by the committee and the Liaison Committee. The proposed National Institute for the Environment flyer describing their intent was provided to the membership. In addition it was reported that the NAS, Committee on Environmental Research, was asked to study the "ecosystem" issue within federal agencies that deal with environmental research and permitting. Their report came up with four levels of recommendations ranging from strengthening federal agencies within existing organization structures, to recommending a Dept. of the Environment (this would include EPA, NOAA, USGS, parts of NASA, Ag, Energy). The final AASG/EPA Radon project summary was submitted to EPA as our final deliverable (provided to the membership as part of the committee report). Some states are still waiting to see the final draft of their state booklet.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCIENCE TEACHERS

D. Haney reported that NAST has been trying to get earth science involvement in their meetings. Don reviewed their last meeting in North Carolina which AIME took a lead in providing a booth and display materials. Upcoming regional meetings will be held in Denver (Oct. 25-27), Louisville (Nov. 11-13), and Orlando (Dec. 16-18). Rock and mineral hand-outs are needed for these meetings. These public school teachers are extremely enthusiastic about geology participation. Don encouraged State Geological Surveys to get involved.

GEOLOGIC HAZARDS POLICY COMMITTEE

Chairman Davis summarized the committee's activities for the year. The first topic they have been tracking is the reauthorization of NEHRP. Also they have been reviewing the revisitation of Appendix "A" of the Federal Code. Part 100 (power plant siting codes). The committee had requested input from the membership to reply to the March 1993 deadline for comments. In reviewing some of the activities of FEMA (recent earthquakes and hurricanes), it was noted that according to law that FEMA has to have an emergency before it can act. One would suggest that the statute needs restructuring. A preplanned response is needed similar to the one set up in California regarding Earthquake preparedness. A NEHRP Advisory Committee is proposed to advise the federal agencies (this includes FEMA as the lead agency, USGS, NSF, and the Bureau of National Standards). Providing a greater role for insurance coverage is apparently being discussed. Another issue is the setting up of minimum standards for hazard
reduction in terms of building codes, etc. Next year's funding for the USGS regarding geologic hazards should be at about the current level. The survey that the committee did of the membership last year regarding the use of geologic mapping for hazards reduction should be ready for distribution at our midyear meeting.

WATER POLICY COMMITTEE

Chairman Kasabach mailed the committee report with attachments to all members (Annex S). The committee met with USGS-WRD Chief Philip Cohen and his staff on April 16, 1993. The agenda is included as part of the committee report. A listing of State Geologists who are considered cooperators was included. If you as the state geologist are not the one who signs the agreement, the USGS does not consider you the cooperator. Phil mentioned that the USGS has invested about $140 million in updating their computer system and shifting to work stations. It was stated that any state for a modest investment in a work station can access USGS data from any USGS data file as soon as it is entered (this would be real time data). They continue to cut back on monitoring network stations. The Clean Water Act reauthorization and recommendations of the Intergovernmental Task Force on Water Monitoring (ITFM, of which Chairman Kasabach is a member, and E. Cleaves is a member of the Ground Water Focus Group) were touched on. The USGS 11% H.Q. overhead on cooperator's in-kind services was discussed without resolution. Tom Muir (USGS, Wetlands) described the wetlands issues. The NAS has two years to review technical issues and make recommendations. Beginning Oct. 1994, the National Biological Survey will be formed which will divide the country into "eco-regions." The committee also met with Bob Hirsch (Water Resources Institutes), Ken Hollett and Hayes Grubb (Office of Ground Water), who stated that the WRD is now more involved with the Geologic Division for Geologic framework studies, David Moody (Water Assessment and Data Coordination), Gary Cobb (Computer Technology), Gene Hampton (Scientific Publications), Tom Yorke (National Water Information System), and Pat Leahy (NAWQA). Phil Cohen ended the meeting stating that he would like to instigate regional meetings with cooperators.

President Leighton noted from the committee report that, the NAWQA programs have a proposed increase of $14.2 million, and $140 million going into the computer system, massive sums available to do that work, yet additional dollars for geologic mapping to match $18 million available state dollars, one of their supposed priority items, cannot be managed!

RADIOACTIVE WASTE COMMITTEE

J. Price, Chair of the Radioactive Waste Committee mailed the committee report to all members (Annex T). The committee this year reported on both High-Level and Low-Level Radioactive Waste. Section 801 of the National Energy Policy Act of 1992 instructs the EPA to set standards for releases of radioactive materials from the Yucca Mountain site. It seems the standards would not be met for the release of carbon-14 from the repository. DOE would like another look at the standards to be written into the policy act because the standards are not realistic. The law instructs EPA to seek recommendations of the NAS. In December of 1992 the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board released its report.
The report notes that meeting a deadline of 2010 for waste emplacement is unlikely, they further stated that an effort to rush to meet overly demanding schedules could affect the quality of the scientific work. It was also reported that Congress ordered EPA to strengthen radiation protection standards for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in New Mexico. The draft standards issued by EPA increased from 1,000 to 10,000 years the minimum time that WIPP must prove it will guard against excessive human exposure to radiation, and that rad levels in the local ground water must stay within acceptable limits for 10,000 years.

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that states that have low-level radioactive waste disposal sites may bar further out-of-state shipments beginning January 1, 1993. The NRC proposed a rule that on-site storage of low-level waste will not be permitted after January 1, 1996. Only four states have progressed through various siting processes to the point of selecting disposal sites. These states are Nebraska, California, Illinois, and Texas. Only Texas it was reported seems to be making headway (it was pointed out that Vermont and Maine will join the Texas site).

**PROFESSIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

The committee report was given by Chairman J. Williams (Annex U). Three tasks were assigned by the President: the AASG Fact Book, monitoring the status of the various states professional geologist registration activities, and monitoring the fiscal status of the state surveys. Regarding the Fact Book a format change was made to insert the mission statements. The cost for printing went down because a low bid printer was found making the cost much cheaper. Extra copies were printed to be sent to the upcoming National Association of State Legislatures conference in California. The committee maintains contact with several organizations regarding licensing. Included are AEG, AIPG, SIPES, ASBOG, consultants and a variety of other sources. The committee's written report summarizes the activities by state, and includes a listing of the States Registration Boards for Geologists. It was reported from the floor that the Texas bill was dead this year and the Illinois bill passed both houses and awaits the governor’s signature.

The ASBOG activities were briefly reviewed. They are currently working on a standard national examination for prospective geologist registrants. The exam has been given, for official purposes, to applicants in Arizona, Wyoming, and South Carolina. The exam is available to all member states (current members of ASBOG include: Virginia, Oregon, Arizona, Arkansas, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Wyoming).

Based on the results from the committee's survey it seems many states are relying more and more on contracts and fees to fund their programs. Several state examples are included in the written report (Annex U). The advantages of a State Geological Survey having an advisory committee was briefly discussed.
President Leighton opened the Monday Business Open Session at 8:00 am. All federal guests and visitors were welcomed and recognized. This included representatives from the Geological Survey of Canada, the Alberta Geological Survey (representing all the Provincial Surveys), the U.S. Geological Survey, Department of Energy, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Minerals Management Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the American Geological Institute, and the U.S. Forest Service. Dr. Robert Bartlett, Dean of the Mining College at the University of Idaho and Director of the Idaho Geological Survey was introduced to welcome the attendees to Idaho. Dr. Bartlett announced that they have just recently completed the background work on a new building and would be opening bids for a new Survey Building June 8th (the next day).

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Director of the U.S. Geological Survey, Dr. Dallas Peck was introduced to review the year's activities and upcoming events involving the Survey. Also in attendance from the USGS were John Dragonetti, Phil Cohen, Mitch Reynolds, Ron Worl, Dick Witmer, and Nancy Milton. New DOI appointments were mentioned, of which there about 40 political type appointed positions within the Department. It was reported Edward Brown is still there as acting Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, and Dallas is still there. Other than those two all other appointed positions are not yet approved. Dallas reported that Secretary Babbitt has a BS in geology and a MS in geophysics, and he was from Arizona. It was also mentioned that the Secretary is the front runner for filling the vacant Supreme Court seat. Betsy Rieke was identified as the new Asst. Sec. for Water and Science. Tom Lovejoy was identified as the new Secretary's Science Advisor. He will also be the primary advisor on the formation of the new National Biological Survey. The Secretary has stated what his priorities are. Dallas listed them as follows: 1. the National Biological Survey (which includes endangered species issues), 2. National Parks (their operations, facilities, and infrastructure), 3. Indian Schools and tribal self determination, 4. Science for management, 5. Increase revenue from federal lands (fees, sales, royalties, etc.). The National Biological Survey (NBS) budget for next year is proposed at about $180 mill. and about 1600 staff (most coming from Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, some from BLM and others). A NAS committee has been asked to assess the issues and make recommendations. The "National Performance Review" under Vice President Gore was mentioned. This is referred to as the reinventing government program, finding ways to operate more efficiently. Dallas stated that one upcoming change involves himself. He has been director for the last 12 years and has announced he intends to step down as director and return to research. The Secretary has asked him to stay on until a replacement can be found. The Secretary has asked the Academy for a list of nominations.

Dallas then reviewed some USGS budget trends over the last 12 years. Directly appropriated funds have increased from $370 m to $579 m per year from 1982 to 1993. About one-third of their budget now comes from other outside agencies. The grand total is now $895 m per year. There has been a net loss of about 4% staff. Overall factoring in inflation etc. they have been close to level the past 12 years. The current budget calls for about $598 m (which is about a $20
This will mostly go to a new building at the EROS data center in South Dakota. Water studies, digital cartography, and geologic mapping. Congress is now discussing cuts which could be in the neighborhood of $5-$10 m to their programs.

Dallas then summarized the various division’s budgets and programs. WRD’s main new activity is in the NAWQA programs, in preparing the Ground Water Atlases, some external program growth (with DOE at Yucca Mt. and DOD military base pollution assessments), revising the old WATTSTORE, the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act, and some educational materials and posters for children and teachers. Mapping Division: program highlights include some reprogrammed funds to increase the effort in digital cartography; facilities are being constructed and workstations are being added as they modernize; digital orthophotos of quarter quads is active resulting from interest from other agencies; Land-Sat VII - the imagery will be at Sioux Falls (they will be working on much declassification of data); map distribution is proposed to be handled by private contractors; and the needs of the Federal Geographic Data Committee are being coordinated. Geologic Division: their budget has seen a 20% decrease (adjusted) over the last 12 years, and a 25% loss in staff positions. Dave Russ has moved to Associate Chief Geologist, Bonnie McGregor has moved up to Assistant Chief Geologist for Program, and Will White has moved to be Chief of the Office of Mineral Resources. This past march marked the 10th anniversary of the establishment of the EEZ, and they have been mapping this offshore area with sonar images. Regarding coastal erosion, congress requested a new plan and they have been involved in partnerships with some State Geological Surveys. The volcano program continues active. Their earthquake program is involved with FEMA (lead) and NSF. As far as energy studies, they are preparing the next oil and gas estimate for 1995. They will be working with each state survey. Regarding mineral resources, they are preparing national assessments for some base metals, and working on the methodology and approaches to quantitatively assess these resources (an advisory committee has been set up). There is continued emphasis on global change. They are working on some pollen studies from bogs, microfossils from marine deposits, and ice cores from Greenland, Antarctica and continental glaciers (a dedication of their new ice core facility in Denver will occur this Aug. 4th). Support Divisions: the budget of Information Systems has gone down 40% the last 12 yrs. The Administrative budget is down 12%, but staff is about stable.

Outlook: In the next few years there should continue to be constrained budgets (do more with less). They will need to work more with partnerships such as State Geological Surveys. The environment and infrastructure needs will dominate more of their work. GIS development and Remote Sensing will increase. Water Quality, spacial data, geologic mapping, and geologic hazards will also demand their attention based on events (many of these issues are natural event driven).

Dallas closed by saying, unless Secretary Babbitt takes a seat on the supreme court (thereby delaying Dallas’s stepping down) this will be his last address to the AASG group as USGS Director. He praised the group and thanked them for continued cooperation. Dallas suggested "sometimes AASG may push too hard". He was asked what he meant by that by L. Fellows. He responded that he felt that we may have leaned too hard on some congressional staff regarding coal quality,
which resulted in their getting their back up. Sometimes "Congressman" Kripowitz can get leaned on so hard he responds by leaning the other way. "Privatization of map distribution centers" regarding the potential impact on state survey cooperators, and the new policy of limiting cooperating surveys to 100 copies of new topos was another concern expressed from the floor by P. Wigley. It was also suggested by Dallas that Geologic Mapping may be an exception to the expected future program budget fiscal constraints because it can be sold on the environmental aspect of its results. D. Hull asked about the reauthorization of the NHERP and if congress had any interest in changing the management structure? Dallas responded that there has been some discussion about sharing the leadership with FEMA. He thought that is a bad idea, and hoped the future leader would do a better job. N. Hester asked about the USGS activities with DOD, regarding base assessments and the future for these studies. Dallas felt it would likely grow in the future. Phil Cohen added that it would be a good area for cooperative programs between State Geological Surveys and the WRD Districts. M. Leighton asked about the relationship between WRD projects and geologic framework contributions. Phil responded that in a formal sense there is very little going on between WRD and the GD regarding the national geologic mapping act. In an "informal sense" geologic maps are critical to many of the WRD programs (they use them and await new maps).

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GEOLOGIC MAPPING ACT

Mitch Reynolds provided an update on the status of the NGMA activities. He reviewed the delays caused by a new administration coming into office. This included no action having occurred on federal appointments, which includes our Advisory Committee. In fact Interior has re-requested a "more diverse list of names". There are many reasons for no action or slow action as we were told. They are now moving through Interior and the Office of Presidential Appointments with their fourth nominee listing. He stated they are encouraged that the first three components of the program "they have been able to sustain", and only the fourth component (the EDMAP component) has remained unfunded.

The first STATEMAP proposals (the PON's) were reviewed. The review panel was comprised of Fakundiny, Hester, J. Williams, Bennett, and Mankin from AASSG, and Newell and Reynolds from the USGS. Fifty four proposals were submitted from 42 states. There were 38 awards made and these were from 36 states. The range of awards was from about $9,000.00 to $100,000.00. Projects developing new geologic map data (not reworking collected data) were the panel's emphasis. The requirements analysis was briefly reviewed. Priorities are established in two parts, the state review and that done by the USGS for federal agencies. It was reported that 23 states have in place some form of Geologic Mapping Advisory Committee to assist the state survey with their requirements analysis.

When an Advisory Committee is finally established, the Draft Implementation Plan (approved by AASSG and USGS in 1991) will be looked at for any needed updating. Five national data bases are required, these include the National Geologic Map Data Base, the Geophysical DB, Geochemical DB, Geochronology DB, and the Paleontology DB. The Paleo DB is being designed, and is almost ready for testing, the Geochron DB has been in operation for several years and they are expanding it. The Geochem DB is the least mature of the data bases and is yet
to be designed. The Geophysical DB is raster data, and as yet there are no raster formats or transfer standards. They are having a workshop to address this need. The Geologic Map DB was reviewed in more detail. The Spatial Data Transfer Standards (SDTS) was described. Formats and procedures to put geologic data into digital form were also discussed. There will be primarily two ways, one using ARC Info, the second would be the System 8 using GS MAP, GS EDIT, and GS DRAW systems. An entire ARC Info. system it was reported would cost about $50,000.00 plus two weeks of operator training. A System 8 (GS MAP System) setup could be obtained for <$6,000.00.

Several Workshops are expected to be announced. They include a Quaternary Map Workshop, a Rock Fracture Workshop (late next January), and some type of STATEMAP Proposal Writing Workshops. In addition, a draft of a USGS Circular on Cartographic Symbol Standards will be sent to each state for review. Also the final copy of the "210 Day" report was promised to all state geologists. Also in response to a question from the floor, all overheads Mitch used in his presentation were to be made available to all state geologists.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FOREST SERVICE

Jack Craven with the USDA, Forest Service in Washington D.C. described their program relating to the AASG. Jack began his federal career with the USGS as a Chemist, in the WRD. Regarding some thoughts on the direction of the agency in the coming months or year, he said he "had no clear sense of direction". There are rumors but no real announcements. They have a new Asst. Sec., Jim Lyons, who is handling natural resources and the forest service. Jack reviewed their activities in minerals within the FS. He supplied a hand-out on "Facts, Minerals on the National Forest System" and the "Forest Service Minerals Program Policy" (Annex V). They have over 196 million acres in the continental U.S. and Alaska, with about $4.9 billion in mineral production. This results in about 40,000 direct jobs and three to four times that indirectly. Jack went on to review several statistics on the FS mineral production (on the Fact Sheet hand-out). The main topic in the FS now is the push in the direction of "Ecosystem Management." He pointed out that geological interpretations are considered basic and fundamental to this concept. He used overheads to demonstrate how they are addressing the ecosystem management concept. They divide the management needs into three components: the Human community needs (crops, animals, and people), the Biological Environment (plants and animals needs), and the Physical Environment (climate, rain, solar, stratigraphy, geomorphology, lithology, soils, and surface and ground water). Then they break down this into global, regional, state, forest, and site specific. They know many of the questions that need to be answered, but they currently don't have the data. Their experience tells them that basing a ecosystem on surface characteristics such as flora, does not work. These other physical parameters as listed need to be understood and factored in. A multifactor analysis such as this allows the best use of a land parcel to be proposed, not just planted pines as has been routine. Geology has not had much emphasis in the past in the FS but now their land management needs will require help and support. They will set up multidiscipline teams to assess land needs as they develop ecosystem management styles. He expressed hope that state geologists could participate in some of these team approaches. Jack also mentioned their rural development programs. This now should include community
needs such as sand and gravel, aggregate, etc. and a community education program regarding the need. He expressed a desire that the FS continue to communicate with and to work with State Geological Surveys.

The Paleo Bill introduced last year by Baucus will most likely be reintroduced again this year. He mentioned a MOU they have with the state geologist of North Dakota regarding the protection of vertebrates, and a need to develop a policy on caves. In response to a question from the floor Jack stated that the FS has about 200 geologists involved in geology and mineral resources. Most are not involved in mapping, however, they are project specific assignments. Finally Jack stated he would send a list of program descriptions to all state geologists.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Don Juckett, the Acting Dep. Asst. Sec. for Fossil Energy, and the Director of the Office for Oil and Gas Exploration and Production reviewed their activities. His review was in three parts, first the DOE reorganizations, second the 1994 budget, and last the Department's initiatives involving oil and gas. The DOD at the time of Don's presentation only had two confirmed political appointments. Secretary Hazel O'Leary, and the Asst. Sec. for Policy, Planning and Program Susan Tearney. The Deputy Secretary designate Bill White was to have his Senate hearing the next week. There was no new information on the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy nomination. Jack Segal continues as Acting Assistant Secretary.

Don used numerous overheads showing 94 FY proposed budget tabular listings and pie chart breakdowns. It was noted that under their Natural Gas R & D program they added a "delivery and storage component", and a "drilling technology" program. The Natural Gas Research Budget showed a significant proposed increase from FY 93 of $143.7m to FY 94 request of $203m. The Petroleum Research Budget program goes from FY 93 of $62.4m to FY 94 request of $80.9m. It was noted that the rate of field abandonment in the U.S. now is at about 3.5% per year.

They are in the process of reworking their five-year strategic plan (partially driven by the energy policy act of 1992). Nine of 14 projects on class I have been awarded. Two other solicitations will be announced later this year for Class III and IV. The Secretary's Initiatives include the setting up of several task forces to review the programs and recommend changes. One is called the "Conventional Fuels Task Force", another is the International Policy TF, and a Culture TF. The National Labs will be looked at. This past April the Secretary announced the "Domestic Energy Initiative." This initiative is intended to develop a coherent set of policies to increase production of natural energy resources within the U.S. while still maintaining a strong commitment to protecting the environment. A joint plan is needed to expand domestic oil and gas production and create jobs. They have been tasked with putting together the policy options for the Secretary's review by Labor Day. The Secretary has put out a call for input from all stakeholders. After the Labor Day deadline there will probably be at least two national meetings to review the initiative and notices will be sent out. The AASG Energy Policy Committee was asked by President Leighton to work with Don on this initiative.
Chuck Job from the EPA Washington D.C. office presented their program summary. Chuck began by reviewing their ground water programs. They have recently released the draft of the Comprehensive State Ground Water Protection Programs (CSGWPP). Their new Administrator Carol Browner has recently described her priorities. They are: Pollution Prevention, Ecosystem Protection, forming Partnerships with federal/state/local agencies, and Environmental Equity.

They have prepared a draft Resource Assessment Technical Assistant Document. This has been prepared with input from numerous agencies including the AASG Environmental Affairs Committee. A final draft is expected later this summer. Upcoming directions? The State Drinking Water Act is beginning; it will need to identify areas around public wells that need protection. Pesticide State Management Plans are moving ahead. The State Comprehensive Plans will pull all these needs and management plans together. In the prevention area their funding should be about level. They are to focus on regulatory aspects of their program. Prevention currently is a voluntary program.

Ground water is one of the Administrator's top 10 priorities. They are working in delineating well head protection areas, demonstration programs, sole source aquifers designation (they are up to 58). They are going to mount an effort to "tell the story of why ground water is important to us and why protection is necessary." They will be needing interpreted information, including geologic and hydrogeologic, which state geologic surveys can help to provide. Chuck showed numerous figures and maps demonstrating the various levels of the state activities within the ground water regulatory and resource characterization areas.

Chuck then concluded by suggesting what role AASG member surveys can play in these programs. Areas included: Resource Characterization, describing what the consequences of not protecting the resource are, informing policy makers at both the state and federal level, informing the public and environmental organizations, and to continue to work with state environmental agencies, form alliances to inform that basic information and data is still needed and it is fundamental to resource protection goals.

June 8, 1993

MINERAL ISSUES MINI-FORUM

Sub-Panel on Mining Reform Legislation - Chair, R. Lasmanis, Washington State Geologist. Panel members and topic included:
John Knebel, AMC, Current Law & Political Perspectives
Hillary Tone, BLM, Overview of New Federal Legislation
Mike McKinley, USBM, Task Force Analyses of Legislation
Barney Guarnera, Dunn-Behre-Dolbear, Inc., Perspectives from Private Industry

John Knebel began the presentations by reviewing the activities in Washington D.C. regarding the Mining Law of 1872. He offered opinions of several currently
proposed bills including: the Bumpers Bill, the Craig Bill, and the Miller/Rahall Bill. He stated that the Dept. of Justice recently circulated a memo stating that the Bumpers Bill has some illegal taking issues associated with it. It is expected that the Craig Bill will go to conference with the Miller/Rahall Bill.

Hillary Oden mentioned that there are at least six bills currently proposed which impact minerals or mineral development. The Rahall Bill, the Bumpers Bill, the Craig Bill, the Orten Bill, the Lautenberg Bill, and the Budget Reconciliation Bill. The status of these and brief highlights were given.

Mike McKinley described the three working groups which were set up to assess the mining law reform. They addressed Technical Amendments, Mining Royalties, and Implementation. All draft reports have been submitted to the Secretary, however, they have not been cleared so the recommendations could not be discussed. Their general topical agendas were reviewed. These reports should be into the Congress within a month; when they would be available he could not speculate on.

Barney Guarnera spoke representing industry. He reviewed the real cost to lease and mine federal land, not just the $2.50/acre as reported by the press. They feel the current administration has created 50,000 mining jobs, all in South America! Their group feels those who call for mining law reform come from two directions. Either the "fair share issues" or that the current law doesn’t adequately protect the environment. In his group’s view, both are lies! He quoted some statistics. Of the public lands in the U.S., less than 1% are being used for mining. The area being used by mining on public lands requiring reclamation is about equal to that paved by the Safeway Supermarket chain parking lots.

Sub-Panel on Mineral Assessment and Availability, Chair, L. Woodfork West Virginia State Geologist. Panel members and topics included:
Ronald Worl, USGS, Status of USGS Mineral Assessment and Mineral Availability Effort.
Jim Davis, California State Geologist, Case Studies-Mineral Availability in California.

David Gross focused on the infrastructure needs of a large highly populated state. He also addressed the coastal zone concerns. David used slides to demonstrate economics of industrial minerals and to show site examples. One telling statistic dealt with the number of quarries in the Chicago area. Of 20 which have operated since 1970, 7 are closed, 6 others are nearly depleted, 2 have been overrun by urban growth, and 1 has been converted to an underground mine. The armored shoreline was reviewed, with the massive rebuilding effort which will require enormous amounts of materials. Their studies indicate that the cost of transporting industrial minerals and aggregate doubles at 20 miles from site and triples at 50 miles. Detailed geologic mapping is needed in urban areas as well as rural townships.
Jim Davis reviewed state requirements in California regarding land use permitting. It was noted that states often require the standards be met by the local governmental entities but very few local governments have geologists to aid them with mining laws or reclamation requirements (they rely on their planners). They have done 50 year projections for aggregate needs. Proven reserves, potential resources, consumptive needs, BLM data and their own information, data from industry, population trends, current demand, etc. These are their general data bases. This has been shown to local governments and their planners can see the need to plan for future mining needs as the population needs it.

Walt Anderson reported on a study which he has been involved in titled Supply/Demand of Sand and Gravel Aggregate in the Northeast States. This was instigated through the New England Governors Association. They are about half way through the supply aspect of the study. Six New England states surveys are involved. They have an Executive Director overseeing and coordinating the project (A. Socolow). They are planning to plot the results at a 1:100,000 map scale. In Maine most of the sand and gravel occurs in the river valleys and lowlands. Many land restrictions exist which limit the availability of sand and gravel. These will all be overlain to show true availability. All products will be in a 1:100,000 digital format. This program was funded by the MMS and the USGS has been involved in NH, MA, VT, CN and RI. They have fairly good data for offshore sand sources. The uplands data was lacking. This program will help educate elected officials about the need and availability of these resources. Heretofore there were many anecdotal, studies but now they will have detailed studies to support their claims.

Ron Worl with the USGS Office of Mineral Resources was the last panel speaker. Their two-year National Assessment Program is a demonstration program looking at copper, lead, zinc, gold, and silver. It is projected to be completed in the fall of 1994. It will be published as a USGS Bulletin. The states will be asked for comments most likely next spring. The long-term plan calls for comprehensive survey updates every five years. The states will be asked to cooperate. They also have a BLM land assessment program, mostly out west. They will be compiling 1:500,000 scale maps on the resource areas, then 1:100,000 second level products. They are also doing mineral studies with the Forest Service. These are approached as with the BLM program. Ron supplied a hand-out on the USGS 2-Year National Mineral Resource Assessment (Annex W), and another on their Role in Identifying Materials to Rebuild America’s Infrastructure (Annex X). A review of the "Three Step Mineral Assessment" was briefly described. The first step was the report done by the U. of Arizona (available to read for those interested), the next step will be inhouse USGS staff critique, then outside input will be sought. Finally, guidelines and standards would be developed. Their office plans to continue research and activities on all commodities not just metals. They would like to pursue cooperative studies with the states.

U.S. MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

Acting Director Carolita Kallaur reviewed two of her program’s areas of interest to AASG members. First the Royalty issues from federal lands, and second the Offshore Oil/Gas and Minerals Programs. In the Royalty area they are trying to
maintain a cooperative relationship with the states and Indian tribes. They have a cooperative auditing program with states and tribes where their auditors work together to define procedures (they currently are working with nine states and four tribes). The Net Receipts Sharing program is another program they are required to implement. This is due to a requirement congress passed where the states are obliged to pay a portion of the administrative cost to run the program. At least two states, New Mexico and Wyoming, are highly concerned and impacted because the money lost is used to fund their education programs. It was mentioned that they hope some currently proposed legislation could resolve this issue. In 1992, MMS collected $3.66 billion (about 1/2 billion is shared with the states).

Regarding the Offshore programs their first goal is to insure those ongoing activities in the Gulf of Mexico, and offshore California, and the exploration offshore Alaska are conducted in an environmentally safe manner, and that companies operating in the OCS are financially responsible. Carolita pointed out that in 1983 there were 69 operators on the OCS and in 1993 there are 162. This shows that many of the majors are giving up much of their areas to independents (30% of these operators only have one facility). Currently it is estimated that 50% of our oil is on the OCS, and 40% of our natural gas reserves. Current leasing is focusing on the central and west Gulf and on Alaska (areas where there is state support and commercial interest).

The MMS is working with the USGS on the national oil gas assessment. As in the past the MMS is responsible for the OCS, and the USGS does the State Waters and the onshore lands. They expect this to be released by the end of 1995. The Continental Margins Program with the Coastal State Geological Surveys continues, although in FY 93 it was cut 40%. They have tried to internally restore the shortfall. It was mentioned that for those states a little behind in deliverables they need to try and catch up. Carolita asked that we communicate with our congressional delegation regarding funding for this program if we think it is worthy of continued funding. The Gulf of Mexico Oil and Gas Atlas Series with the Texas Bureau of Economic Geology should have the first volume completed in 1996, and the second in 1997. The DOE has been a source of funding for this program.

They also have a OCS Non-Energy Minerals Cooperative Projects with all the Atlantic states (except NY and FL), and all the Gulf States (except FL). In the northeast they have worked through the New England Governors Association. All of the east coast states are looking at sand resources for beach renourishment, wetland enhancement, or aggregate. In GA phosphorite is of interest. In the Gulf of Mexico sand and shell is of interest. Hawaii has shown interest in the possibility of extracting Manganese crust.

U.S. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Hillary Oden reviewed several issues of interest of which the mining law dominates their activities. He pointed out that one critique of the Rahall bill determined that the cost to implement could exceed the income generated. The BLM has been revising the procedures and review process through which they issue mineral patents. The first group which they began processing in March are still
not back from the Secretary's office. Final rules on annual rental fees are due out during June. FY 94 budgets are essentially flat. They spend about $70m per year on energy and mineral programs. For FY 95 there most likely will be cuts in oil, gas, and coal programs. They are working on a consistent process to compile an Abandoned Mine Land Inventory on BLM land. Many agencies are doing something on this including EPA, Forestry, OSM, and several states.

The threatened and endangered species now get considerable attention. BLM is trying to look at the whole picture and include all parameters for full ecosystem based management decisions. The biologists want the ecosystem based on critical habitat; hydrologists want it on water sheds; geologists would like it based on geological regions, etc. The New Director, Mr. James Baca, formerly lands director from New Mexico, has indicated he would like to push for more wilderness, more recreation sites, scenic rivers, and conservation areas to help take pressure off the National Parks. In addition other agenda topics of the Director include grazing fee increases, all fees increased (for more cost recovery), and more land exchanges. Computer Sciences Corp. got the contract for $13m in April to expand the Automated Land and Minerals Records System (ALMRS). They expect to spend between $40m and $400m over the next 10 years for hardware, software, and telecommunications.

**WORLD GEOLOGICAL ORGANIZATION**

Chris Findlay with the Geological Survey of Canada briefed the members on the proposed International Consortium of Geological Surveys (ICOGS). Chris used several slides to demonstrate the chronology of events leading up to the current proposal status. In April of 1992 at the International Conference of Geological Surveys held in Ottawa, Canada, they discussed the world relationships of the Geological Surveys. They noted a trend for most all surveys. Surveys first were based on exploration of new frontiers, then their second stage seemed to emphasize economic and scientific concerns, and the third and current stage sees economic, social, and environmental concerns. In Kyoto, Japan at the IGC they came up with a "Charter" for the ICOGS, it basically calls for the promotion of a global network among the geological surveys. Participants decided there is a need to keep ICOGS informal. ICOGS would meet every two years and at the IGC every fourth year. The next meeting is expected in Hungary in Sept. of 1994. They are now in the process of contacting the many other international geological organizations to review their charter, and other interests to avoid duplicating efforts. A report on their findings will be prepared.

Jan Boone, Director of the Alberta Provincial Geological Survey was introduced by President Leighton. Jan was representing the Provincial Geological Surveys of Canada at our conference. He stated he shall take back to their organization (which consists of 12 members) a recommendation to invite AASG members to their meetings. He expressed appreciation at having been invited to our meeting, and saw great benefit to continued interactions.
Executive Director Marcus Milling briefed the membership on AGI’s activities. Marcus pointed out that 1993 is the forty-fifth year of AGI’s operations. A handout describing their program plans and activities was supplied (Annex Y). Marcus reviewed the active role AASG has played in the affairs of AGI, including the past Presidents. It was reported that member associations now stand at 23, and they are having discussions with the Soil Scientist Society of America. Their programs in Government Affairs, Education and Human Resources, Communications and Publications, and Information Systems were reviewed. A second memo on ways for State Surveys to use GeoRef was also passed out (Annex Z).

**EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH**

Don Hoskins reviewed the NAGT cooperative summer field program (the committee supplied a report summarizing the program, Annex AA). This is now an informal program between the AASG/USGS/ and NAGT. Last year four students were placed, this year there are three. The call for 1994 is out. AASG provided a $300 scholarship to NAGT for this program last year. It will be recommended that this be continued.

Marcus Milling briefly described AGI’s K-6 Earth Science Sourcebook and Mentor Program, and their Earth Science Education Clearinghouse and Network System (handouts on both were provided, Annex BB).

Charles Chapin described the highly successful *Lite Geology* published by the New Mexico Bureau of Mines and Mineral Resources. The publication is mailed to earth science teachers, legislators, and newspaper editors throughout the state free of charge. Charles offered and suggested that if any other states would like to pursue a similar format they would be happy to work together. He pointed out that many articles are of a general nature and that they are not state-specific, these could be used by other states. The title could also be used. Copies of three recent issues were made available to the membership.

**NAS/NRC**

Jon Price used some projected figures to describe the Board of Earth Sciences and Resources I’s active committees, and the other Boards under the NRC. Jon mentioned several initiatives they have going. They included: characterizing the upper crust, seismic hazard evaluation issues, strong ground motions, airborne geophysics, the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (this most recent report is published and Jon stated it was available through his office), undergraduate earth science education, and rediscovering geography. Some initiatives that are being considered include: the implications of the shifting domestic resource industry, resources for infrastructure rebuilding, greater public appreciation of mineral resources, and impact of technology on mineral wealth. John also summarized his opportunities to discuss geologic mapping with his counterpart at the NAS who is advising on the National Biological Survey. He also described the discussions they have had with the Urban and Regional Information System.
Association (URISA) regarding the use of geologic maps (and GIS) at the county level. The publication on Solid Earth Science and Society (the "Keck Report") was reviewed. It was pointed out how the state surveys can use the report within their own states.

AASG Executive Session

ENDOWMENT FUND STEERING COMMITTEE

Chairman L. Fellows reported that the committee will be recommending that the association establish an endowment fund. A very clearly defined purpose must be a prerequisite in order to appeal to potential donors. Their current objective is to have some specific proposal to discuss at the midyear meeting in Boston. The committee solicits membership input.

MEETING COMMITTEE REPORTS

AAAS - A. Socolow reported on the annual meeting held in Boston last February. Art relayed his disappointment with the meeting because there were no papers or symposia sponsored by the geology/geography section. The interaction with the other sciences is critical but geology is poorly represented. Art is hopeful for the future because the incoming Vice President of the Geology/Geography Section is Jack Oliver from Cornell who is motivated. It was noted there has been no correspondence from AAAS this past year. Art in investigating this, discovered that AASG has never been an affiliated society with AAAS! They "would welcome for us to apply." Discussion followed, regarding the history of the state geologists and the founding of AAAS. Hoskins moved and Berg seconded that AASG pursue AAAS affiliation status. The motion carried with one nay.

AAPG - D. Haney had no report at this time.

NACSN - R. Fakundiny provided a written report (Annex CC). The three members from AASG for 1992 were T. Berg, J. Bluemle, and R. Fakundiny. In addition R. Jordan represented AAPG. The recent meeting discussed the National Geologic Mapping Act. Of course the North American Stratigraphic Code has been adopted by the USGS and should be the guide to stratigraphic nomenclature in the National Geologic Mapping Program. Other business included proposals to amend the code to clarify allostratigraphic units and to add a designation of hydrostratigraphic units. The former has been published as Note 60 in the May, 1993, AAPG Bulletin, and the latter is on hold due to the delay that Paul Seaber had during his stay in Kuwait. The outstanding contributions that Bob Jordan has made over the last 15 years to the Commission was noted and the membership offered their congratulations.

AGI - D. Haney discussed the Governmental Affairs Program at AGI and the formula for the program's support. The use and potential of this program were reviewed. D. Haney moved and W. Fisher seconded that the AASG increase our support to the AGI Government Affairs Program up to $5,000.00, subject to Executive Committee
review of the Treasury and their determination of the fiscal capability of our treasury. In addition this was a one-year proposal to be visited on each successive year. Motion carried with one nay.

COCORP - N. Hester provided a written report (Annex DD). It was reported that in 1994 they are proposing a deep profile in southern Illinois. A letter from Dr. Ernest Hauser to Norm Hester reviewing the recent COCORP activities was included in the report.

COASTAL EROSION - Chair D. Hull submitted a written report (Annex EE). The committee has monitored federal legislation to amend the Flood Insurance Act. Cooperative relationships with FEMA have been discussed and will continue to be a committee goal. Legislation mentioned included House Bill 62 introduced by Rep. Bereuter (R-Nebraska) to require the study of riverine erosion and mapping of coastal erosion hazard zones, and a proposal by Sen. Kerry (D-Massachusetts) which likely will include erosion and mapping provisions.

EDMAP - President Leighton reported that there has been no contact regarding the start-up of this program.

OLD BUSINESS

SURVEY PERSONNEL EXCHANGE QUESTIONNAIRE - D. Conrad submitted a copy of the questionnaire results to all state geologists (Annex FF). Forty-three states responded. Twelve states have exchanged personnel with other states or countries in the past while 31 have not. Information on procedures and mechanisms used in establishing exchanges is available from Dianne.

AWARDS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS - Chairman P. Wigley submitted a written report (Annex GG). The committee recommended two awards categories. First a Certificate of Distinguished Service: the recipient may be at any stage of his/her career, must have served the Association and the science in an exemplary manner, and AASG membership is required. Second a Certificate of Appreciation: this may be issued by the President/Executive Committee in appreciation for services rendered to AASG, and this award would be for non-members of AASG. These recommendations were referred to the Executive Committee for consideration.

NEW BUSINESS

HONORARY MEMBERS REPORT

A. Agnew supplied a written report and attached several letters from Honorary Members who were unable to attend. Allen reviewed a recent occurrence regarding his supplying geologic input to an elected official and the lack of time available to the Representative to really understand the issues. He suggested the moral is, continued education of our elected officials because when voting time comes they are too busy to get the needed education, it's too late! Honorary Members attending the annual meeting included J. Rold, A. Socolow, K. Weaver, S. Conrad, and A. Agnew. Honorary member updates and status was briefly reviewed by Allen. Letters are attached to the report (Annex HH) from J. Calver who has had three heart attacks since last winter; he is recovering and feeling
fine and was 80 years old on the 15th of June. George Hanson sent his regrets that he could not attend, but he hopes to see us in Boston at GSA for the Midyear meeting. State of Idaho, Representative, Maynard Miller sent his regrets, he said he hopes to attend next years meeting. Jack Simon also sent his regrets.

NECROLOGY

President Leighton was happy to state there was no report.

AUDITING COMMITTEE REPORT

Chair W. McLemore presented the committee report. The books were reported to be well maintained, all checks were accounted for, and there were no inappropriate expenses. It was noted the ledger shows a balance of $4,746.15, however the bank statement shows $4,770.20, a discrepancy of $23.05 in our favor. The treasurer stated he would check into the discrepancy. The committee recommended approval of the budget with a current total of $4,770.20. It was so moved by N. Williams, and seconded by W. Fisher, without objection the motion carried.

Subsequent to the meeting, Treasurer Schmidt reviewed the records and determined that one check (# 112) for $23.05 has never cleared. This is the discrepancy. At the time of compilation of these minutes the uncleared check was being pursued.

BALLOTING COMMITTEE REPORT

Chairman C. Gardner reported that 45 ballots were returned. AASG newly elected officers for the 1993-1994 year are as follows: D. Hull, President, D. Hoskins, President-Elect, N. Hester, Vice-President, W. Schmidt, Secretary/Treasurer, H. Kasabach, Statistician, T. Berg, Editor, and D. Koch, Historian. M. Leighton is the immediate past President. C. Mankin moved and J. Williams seconded a motion to accept the committee report. Motion carried without objection.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Resolutions Chairman Hester read several resolutions. Resolutions to the MMS, the USGS, and the U.S. Congress were moved by N. Williams and seconded by R. Lasmanis. Some discussion followed in that the states of Utah and Wyoming were not really supportive of the MMS resolution, however, it was explained that the resolution was limited to their efforts on coastal and offshore cooperative initiatives. The motion then carried without objection. A resolution to the Idaho Survey was moved by R. Lasmanis, seconded by R. Jordan, passed unanimously. A resolution to President M. W. Leighton was moved by N. Williams, and seconded by E. Cleaves, and passed unanimously. The remaining resolutions were listed and moved by D. Hoskins. Without objection all passed. All resolutions are incorporated as Annex II.

AWARDS COMMITTEE REPORT

Awards Chairman P. Wigley with assistance from committee members Fellows and Weaver read numerous awards for the members.
CULTURE

Culture Chair Bill Williams once again reminded the attendees how a true understanding of Arkansas culture could lead to the White House if you are not careful.

FUTURE MEETINGS

Chair T. Smith reported that next year's meeting is in Ohio (1994), the 1995 meeting is set for Nevada (June 11-15), 1996 will be in Virginia. It was mentioned that in 1999 Alaska will celebrate their 40th year and they would be honored to have the meeting. In addition Illinois will have their 100th anniversary in 2005 and they would like to have the meeting then, and in 2007 Florida will celebrate its 100th anniversary; they asked to reserve that year.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS ADDED TO THE AGENDA

L. Allison mentioned he has noted that many states ask for all publications on the complimentary exchange program, while many states have stopped this practice and charge for all publications. This issue was referred by President Leighton to the Professional Affairs Committee to look into.

R. Lasmanis met with Mike McKinley (USBM) during our stay in Idaho regarding the mineral statistics compilations. Ray will be sending each state geologist a brief report on his meeting. The confidentiality aspect of the statistics will not change as it is a statutory requirement. There are only five commodities that require reporting; all others are voluntary. It was stated that the USBM desires to work with the State Geological Surveys and Mike asked any State Geologist who has problems with mineral statistics in their state to please contact them and they would be glad to work together to improve the system.

NEXT YEAR'S ANNUAL MEETING

T. Berg briefed the membership on next year’s meeting in Ohio, to be held at Maumee Bay State Park Lodge, June 4-8, 1994, near Toledo. Geologic highlights will include the Pleistocene of Northwestern Ohio, Devonian Carbonates, Glacial Geomorphology, Halite mines, and Coastal Sedimentation and Erosion Projects along Lake Erie.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

COMMENTS FROM THE RETIRING PRESIDENT - President Leighton reviewed the vast amount of change which has occurred this year with respect to agency budgets, downsizing programs, a new federal administration and associated changes in federal agency personnel and direction. The dedicated efforts of the members of our association to serve the public, private, and governmental needs was mentioned. In addition the make-up of our membership, which continually offered assistance and untiring effort to assist with the goals of the association, was praised by President Leighton. President Leighton then introduced our next President, Don Hull of Oregon.
COMMENTS FROM THE INCOMING PRESIDENT - Don suggested this will be a year of both challenge and opportunity because of the Administration change in Washington, D.C. There is much unfinished business in the federal agencies as the slow transition occurs with new appointments. The Federal Liaison committee will need to be very active tracking federal legislation, and working with new staff. Don suggested some slight changes for several committees that track topical matters, in that they should be more of a window on Washington. Committees should consider preparing "policy papers" on some of these important issues as federal legislation is followed. These, it is hoped can be developed into congressional testimony or in some cases into amendments to proposed legislation. Don passed out draft listings of committee memberships and chairs (Annex JJ) for the coming year. Some initial thoughts included: 1. for the Awards Committee, tailor some awards for Honorary Members, 2. Continental Margins Committee, can we restore and increase the funding for the cooperative programs? Coastal Erosion regarding FEMA seems to have potential for program cooperation. 3. Earth Science Committee, there is an opportunity to be more active, try to enhance the NAGT intern program. 4. Endowment Fund, the successful development hopefully can occur this year. 5. Energy Policy Committee, continue to monitor USGS and MMS resource assessment. 6. Environmental Affairs, the Radon Program seemed to be a good model of a federal/AASG cooperative program, continue to monitor the reauthorization of CERCLA and RECRE. 7. Geologic Hazards, look at reauthorization of the NEHRP, a more direct role for AASG? 8. Honorary Members Committee, let's keep spouses of deceased members in the loop, consider interim reports so we can keep in touch. 9. Federal Liaison Committee, possibly operate in a little different style, such as including some of the more experienced and politically aware members joining our committee for selected issues. Can we try to create cooperative programs modeled on the Radon experience and the earlier Oil and Gas project. These gave the association a more visible voice on the issues and did wonders for our treasury. The AGI Governmental Affairs program could be used to assist. 10. The Minerals Policy Committee, has a task to monitor the mining law reform legislation. 11. The National Geologic Mapping Implementation Committee shall remain a number one priority of the association. We should look at getting the Advisory Committee going and not wait on the federal agency to get ready. 12. The Professional Affairs Committee should continue to monitor the ASBOG activities. 13. The Water Policy Committee should follow the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act. In addition a Policy Position Paper should be considered on "Ecosystem Management" to share with our friends in Washington the importance of geology, hydrogeology, geomorphology, etc. to their Ecosystem work. 14. On Radioactive Waste there is activity that needs to be monitored on both high-level and low-level rad. waste.

Don thanked the membership for the honor of serving as our President for next year and stated he hoped next year can be as successful as the last.
ADJOURNMENT.

After a few announcements regarding upcoming field trips from our host E. Bennett, President Leighton Adjourned the 1993, 85th Annual Business Meeting at 5:00 PM.

Walter Schmidt
Secretary/Treasurer