

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Brittany Calame](#)
Subject: FW: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 11:14:33 AM

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

From: sunset@sunset.texas.gov <sunset@sunset.texas.gov> On Behalf Of Texas Sunset Commission
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 10:55 AM
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: David

Last Name: Hamren

Title: President

Organization you are affiliated with: DCH Environmental Consultants LLC

Email:

City: Sugar Land

State: Texas

Your Comments About the Staff Report, Including Recommendations Supported or

Opposed:

Opposed:

I am a P.G. and have been in the field of Environmental Geology for about 28 years. I saw the quality of work before and after licensing. The quality of investigations and innovative ways of dealing with environmental impacts has definitely improved over time, especially with the start of the P.G. license.

It used to be that anyone could be an "Expert" in the field, even without a basic understanding of the geological nuances that effect potential contamination in the near surface and ways of dealing with it. P.G.'s have a different way of thinking that non-geoscientists do not have training or experience in. This is a critical item that the State of Texas uses to "protect the public."

The P.G. requires a certain "Degree" of training, knowledge and experience to be licensed. The required Continuing Education (Such as those required by P.E.'s, lawyers, etc.) ensures that a P.G. will continue to keep abreast of new changes and ideas that assist them in making their decisions. The required Ethics is valuable as well.

Regarding the argument that persons who were licensed in the 1st year without taking the ASBOG examinations may somehow be less competent is weak. All PG applicants were required to have a minimum of a BS degree and five years of verifiable experience. This standard was also required for the 1st year licensing for Asbestos and Mold Consultants/inspectors etc. Does the author feel the same way about these professions? Have there been allegations that "undermine the promise of competence" of these licensing agencies? Should those who earned their license that way be considered less competent than those that later took the whole exam? P.G.'s and other professions licensed in the first year have time, experience, and Continuing Education to bolster their knowledge and competence.

The fact that the Board has not had to deal with complaints that dealt with "Significant Harm or risk to the public" either internally or from other agencies should not be considered a weakness worthy of abolishing the Board.

An argument could be made that thru its standards a potential “Significant Harm” has been averted. If there had been a “Significant Harm or risk to the public” that the Board had to deal with, would that justify its continuing existence?

Though a minor argument, the P.G. pays for itself and more for the State General Fund. It is not a burden on the State of Texas.

The people of Texas now receive more competent professional service that protects them and the interest of the State of Texas for our State’s soils, streams, lakes, bays, and drinking water. The TBPG holds its members to a higher degree of professionalism than non members. I strongly believe that the TBPG should be allowed to continue in its current role.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: Consider issuing a warning prior to issuing a violation. A Violation in minor cases can be issued after a warning is not heeded.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree