

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Brittany Calame](#)
Subject: FW: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Thursday, August 16, 2018 5:21:38 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: sunset@sunset.texas.gov <sunset@sunset.texas.gov> On Behalf Of Texas Sunset Commission
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2018 5:08 PM
To: Sunset Advisory Commission <Sunset@sunset.texas.gov>
Subject: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Agency: TEXAS BOARD PROFESSIONAL GEOSCIENTISTS TBPG

First Name: Mark

Last Name: Brotherton

Title:

Organization you are affiliated with:

Email:

City: Houston

State: Texas

Your Comments About the Staff Report, Including Recommendations Supported or Opposed: I'm a professional geoscientist in Texas (license #2035) and in Louisiana (license #1176) and I oppose sunseting the PG license. While the review committee has, no doubt, done extensive research and made some valid points regarding aspects such as enforcement, impetus for creating the board, duplicity of oversight, grandfathering, and public safety, I'm not sure any of these points are a valid reason for abolishing the system. Valid points, not valid reasons. If the PG license is to be abolished, it should be because these aspects are an undue burden on the system. If they are not, what does it accomplish? Once abolished, there is no guarantee that the oversight agencies will adequately take on the mantle of protecting public safety because all the PG's currently held to a high ethical standard in those agencies will no longer be obligated Key word here is obligated.

Just because a person is employed by a regulatory agency doesn't imbue a sense of ethics, although it should. Without some mechanism of accountability such as a PG license, we go from a system of "we might catch someone being unethical" to one of "we now have no measuring stick of accountability".

To take a quote from the Executive Summary of the sunset report, "When an occupational licensing agency cannot be justified by a clear threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the public, Sunset staff has a duty to report this finding..." Why does there have to be a clear threat to justify the agency? Can it not be just a potential threat that would justify the agency?

No one compensates for future calamity by waiting for the calamity.

Hurricane Harvey taught us that. That's tantamount to the adage that if you fail to plan you plan to fail. In abolishing the PG license, I don't think there will be an assurance that the ethical standards will be adequately transferred to any other agency or license currently extant. The review committee may have found justification for why the PG license hasn't played out as expected, but I don't think they have found justification for why it should be unnecessary or even undesirable.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: Leave the licensing in place as it is.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree