From: Sunset Advisory Commission
To: Brittany Calame
Subject: FW: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Tuesday, August 14, 2018 9:56:02 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: sunset@sunset.texas.gov <sunset@sunset.texas.gov> On Behalf Of Texas Sunset Commission
Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2018 9:09 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: Jerry

Last Name: McCalip

Title: Vice President, Exploration

Organization you are affiliated with: Trinity Materials, Inc.

Email:

City: Plano

State: Texas

Your Comments About the Staff Report, Including Recommendations Supported or Opposed:
I am a Texas Licensed Professional Geoscientist (#3845 - Geology), and a Louisiana Licensed Professional Geoscientist (#878). I was licensed under the Texas license grandfather provisions in 2003. I am 66 years old, and still working, mainly because I like geology and the mining industry. I currently work for a company in Texas that is in the mining industry for the past 4 years. I have worked for a global mining company (27 years), and have been a consulting geologist (10 years), all in the mining sector. I am responding to the current position statement of the Texas Sunset Advisory Commission regarding the Commission's recommendation to abolish the Texas Board of Professional Geoscientists (TBPG).

I am not required to maintain a license for my current employment. I am required to maintain a license as the principal for my privately owned consulting geobusiness, under exisiting Texas law. I am opposed to abolishing the TBPG, as my opinion, licensure is a key factor in training, developing, managing and improving the knowledge and quality of geology, as it applies to various disciplines within geology. I will address the discipline of mining geology.

During my career, I have witnessed the good, bad and the ugly with respect to geologists and their opinions and work product, in many states. There are many people that either have or don't have a degree or license to practice geology, but are offering geologic opinions with respect to groundwater, mineral extraction, reclamation, reserve assessments and other issues that can best be determined by a qualified geologist. Pre-Licensure in Texas allowed engineers and engineering firms to practice geology, and as such, many reports generated by engineering firms that included geological assessments did not contain the level of investigation and expertise that should have been employed by a licensed professional.

While most people do not understand the complexities of geology, including structural geology, sedimentology, palentology, raw material sampling, mapping, groundwater and mineral assessments, mining plans and other related

studies, there are often unprofessional individuals that advise others with substandard work product and opinions that are directly associated with geology. Instances involving substandard work has a direct impact on the safety and welfare for those whose property, business and investments are negatively impacted by incompetent or uninformed advisors whom use geology infrequently to offer an opinion, and profit from that work.

While a piece of paper with a stamp does not guarantee that the work product of an individual is perfect, it does mean that the individual with that credential has committed themself to standards accepted by their peers, and in the case of the TBPG, their requirements for a commitment to ethical practice is a strong statement for the agency and is a sincere commitment for any licensed individual.

Prior to licensing in Texas, I saw too much bad science promulgated by unprofessional or uncompetent advisors, with geologic opinions that were directly responsible for decimating individuals and their investments. Since PG licensure was adopted, there appears to be much fewer incidents of bad geologic science being used improperly.

In my area of competency, which is mining, the investments, outside of land, are often very high, for example, a mid size aggregate or frac sand processing plant can cost $30,000,00 - $50,00,000 with larger facilities being closer to $100,000,000. A cement mill investment requires $700,000,000. Power generating facilities using lignite for fuel are equally expensive. All of these examples should require the highest level of expertise related to the quantity and quality of the subsurface materials for operating and reclaiming those mine sites, and without highly qualified geologists available, the economic and operational success can be challenging. During my career, I have seen millions of dollars of private and corporate expenses wasted directly due to poor advice from an unqualified person practicing Geology, with none of them being licensed in Texas. Having requirements for PG licensure can be directly correlated to maintaining a qualified group of professionals who continuosly maintain their skills, as required by licensure.

Lastly, please see the points in favor of retaining the TBPG:

- Continuing Education, as required in current TBPG rules, is a strong tool for professionals to continue to be committed to sound
  science and ethical practice

- Licensure will ensure that licensees have an agency that has authority to act in the event of malpractice

- Licensure will aid businesses, communities, infastructure projects, individuals and the financial industry, as qualified PG
  professionals will continue to support geo related projects with competence and knowledge

I offer the following to support my position:

1.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: Eliminate the PG designation for a soil scientist

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree