

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Brittany Calame](#)
Subject: FW: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Tuesday, August 14, 2018 2:28:53 PM

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

From: sunset@sunset.texas.gov <sunset@sunset.texas.gov> On Behalf Of Texas Sunset Commission
Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2018 1:40 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: Kelly

Last Name: Daniel

Title: Licensed Professional Geoscientist

Organization you are affiliated with:

Email:

City: Austin

State: Texas

Your Comments About the Staff Report, Including Recommendations Supported or Opposed:

I oppose the recommendation to eliminate the TBPG. Based on their reasoning:

1. No complaints have been brought by the public, and history shows that there was no demand from the public to create the agency in the first place.
Response: Just because this has not occurred historically, does not mean it will not be demanded in the future.
2. There has been no measurable impact of Geoscientist licensing on Public protection. Response: Measuring this can be subjective in nature. Indicating "no measurable" is not something that can be proven.
3. The Board was not established in the first place to protect the Public, but primarily "to legitimize the profession" and to protect Geoscientists from the Engineers and from untrained competitors. Response: Helping the public identify who is adequately trained in itself provides protection.
4. Almost no geologists deal directly with the public – our clients are mainly organizations. Therefore, licensing is not necessary for public protection. Response: While I do not directly deal with the public, the consequences of my judgements indirectly affect the public.
5. There are too many (50%) Texas geologists who are exempted from the requirement to get a license. Response: Re-evaluate this policy.
6. No meaningful enforcement action over the life of the Board. Response: Unaware of the board's historical actions, cannot comment.
7. More direct oversight of geoscientists' work is provided by other state agencies' (Texas RRC, TCEQ), which renders ongoing state regulation of geoscientists unnecessary to protect the public. Response: These agencies are overwhelmed and understaffed, they cannot be the only ones rendering this regulation.
8. 78% of CURRENT Texas PGs are Grandfathered, therefore did not take ASBOG, therefore there is no guaranty that they are, in fact, well-trained.
Response: I do not disagree with reconsidering grandfathering.

9. The licensee population is steadily declining, from 6,600 in 2003 to 4200 in 2017. Response: There is a need for folks to enter the geosciences and a documented shortage of geologists, licensed or unlicensed.

10. Less restrictive means exist to ensure the safe practice of geoscience (i.e. certification by AIPG, AEG, AAPG, etc.) Response: These are not adequate to ensure safe practice of geoscience. They are not as rigorous as the ASBOG.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: If concern regarding qualifications exist, then change the grandfathering rules to require licensees take the ASBOG. Other certifications and regulatory oversight are not a reasonable substitution for the rigorous nature of the ASBOG. There are diminishing number of geoscientists who are licensed. Perhaps this is a failure of our public education institutions to adequately prepare geoscientists to enter the workforce. Encourage GIT completion by graduation of a four year university.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree