

Minutes: Geochemical Society Board of Directors Meeting
May 20, 2005; Moscow, ID

Present - Board of Directors: Sue Brantley, Peggy Delaney, Patricia Dove, Tim Drever, Jeremy Fein, Johnson Haas, Gil Hanson, Carla Koretsky, Frank Podosek, Vincent Salters, Michael Whiticar, Scott Wood, Youxue Zhang

Visitors: Enriqueta Barrera, Seth Davis, Rhiannon George, Mike Hochella, Borge Svane Nielsen, Eric Oelkers, Baerbel Sarbas, Susan Stipp, Simon Turner, Dominique Weis, Bruce Yardley

The meeting was called to order at 8:45 am

1) Summary of Written Geochemical Society Internal Reports: (see appendix to read these reports): A brief summary of written reports was given by the society president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, business office manager, GCA editor, special publications editor, and GN editors.

Discussion Points:

- The board discussed ways to improve the society's website. Dove suggested using a professional webpage designer. Podosek thought that Bob Nicols, the current webmaster, could design the webpage if given specific guidelines. An ad hoc committee was formed to look into improvement options. Members of the committee include: Patricia Dove (chair), Frank Podosek, Youxue Zhang, Seth Davis, and Johnson Haas.
- There was a general discussion of the pros and cons of maintaining ties with Elsevier. General consensus to maintain current relationship, but to revisit issue regularly in the future.
- General discussion of how the GS can use Geochemical News as a recruitment tool for society membership.

2) Discussion on Increasing Community Pressure for Geochemistry Research: led by Enriqueta Barrera, Program Director for Geobiology and Environmental Geochemistry at the National Science Foundation: Barrera presented a summary of NSF programs that fund geochemical research and led a discussion of what NSF and the GS can do to educate decision-makers about the role and use of geochemistry research in general. There was discussion of specific ways that the GS can organize pressure to increase funding for geochemistry from a range of funding agencies.

Motion: The Geochemical Society Board of Directors should create a committee to interface with funding agencies, investigating ways that the society can help increase funding to the geochemical community in general. (Motion made by Hanson, seconded by Wood). Passed unanimously. Members of the committee will include: Sue Brantley (chair), Jeremy Fein, and Carla Koretsky.

3) Overview of Society Finances – Youxue Zhang presented a general status report of the financial status of the Geochemical Society. The financial health of the society is strong. Zhang was asked to prepare a short report to the Board that details the historical growth and origin of current financial reserves.

4) Treibs Award Timing – There is not a clearly defined policy concerning where and when the Treibs medal is awarded each year. This year, the award will be presented at the International Meeting of Organic Geochemists (IMOG). The Treibs Award Committee of the Organic Geochemistry Division of the GS needs to be more proactive in working with the award recipient to determine the award location and timing each year.

5) Award Committees Procedures – The Board discussed an inconsistency that exists between Society by-laws, which state that award committees should nominate two candidates for each award with the Board making the final choice between them, and committee practice, which has been to nominate one person only for approval by the Board. The Board also discussed involvement of the European Association of Geochemistry in the award

selection process, and they discussed whether committee members are permitted to submit award nominations or write support letters for nominees. On the latter point, the GS Handbook states that award committee members should not nominate or write letters of support, but rather should solicit both, and there was general agreement on the Board that a more active role would represent too much of a conflict of interest by the committee member. There was also general agreement to use *Elements* to solicit a wider range of nominations for all awards. The Board also discussed whether to make Clarke and Patterson award winners GS/EAG Fellows automatically as is done with Goldschmidt Award members who are not GS/EAG Fellows. There was general consensus that Fellows status is awarded for sustained career effort, so this should not be automatically awarded to Clarke award winners.

These discussions led to several motions:

Motion: The By-Laws of the Geochemical Society should be changed to request that each award committee nominate only one person. (Motion made by Dove, seconded by Brantley). Passed unanimously.

Motion: An officer of the European Association of Geochemistry should serve as a voting member of the three Geochemical Society medals committees (Patterson, Goldschmidt, Clarke). (Motion made by Hanson, seconded by Wood). Motion passes - For: 6; Against: 5.

Motion: Future Patterson awardees should become GS/EAG Fellows automatically if they are not already Fellows. (Motion made by Salters, seconded by Zhang). Passed unanimously.

6) *Geochemical Society Development Plan.* The Board created an ad hoc Membership Development Committee to attract and retain members. The committee will include Seth Davis, Tim Drever, a student member, and others to be named later. The Board also discussed resetting GCA subscription rates for Senior GS members, leading to the following motion:

Motion: The GS Board will ask Elsevier to consider lowering its subscription price for GCA for seniors to be equal to the student rate. If Elsevier does not agree to this, then the GS Board should authorize that the senior price for GCA be the same as the professional rate; the senior GS membership rate would remain unchanged and equal to the student rate. (Motion made by Wood, seconded by Hanson). Passed unanimously.

The Board also authorized Frank Podosek to investigate the possibility of Elsevier offering electronic-only subscriptions to GCA as a choice for GS members.

7) *Goldschmidt Conference 'Ownership' Issues.* The Board discussed 'ownership' of Goldschmidt conferences and what 'sponsorship' entails. The Board also discussed a proposal by Bruce Yardley to hire a permanent Goldschmidt Conference Coordinator who would work for both societies (GS and EAG) in order to provide corporate memory for conference planning, and who would interface between the GS and EAG Boards and local conference organizers. The Coordinator position could be financed through a modest tax on Goldschmidt attendees. Members of the Goldschmidt Forum, along with a few previous conference organizers, will move these issues ahead.

8) *Elements Update:* provided by Mike Hochella. Current status of the magazine *Elements* was discussed, including publication and circulation statistics, sponsoring societies, terms of editors, and membership fees and finances in general.

9) *Goldschmidt Reports:* The Board heard progress reports from the following Goldschmidt conference organizers:

- 1) Melbourne 2006. Aug. 27 – Sept. 1, 2006. Scientific Program – organization well underway. Chair and co-chairs signed up, with international program committee for each and topics identified. The meeting will take place at a convention center in downtown Melbourne: all sessions in one venue and under one roof; posters displayed for the duration of the conference; wireless access for all. Breakeven point is 1200 delegates. Likely fees: \$676USD for a GS member; \$769 for a non-member; student fee will be \$463 for members; student non-member will pay \$514 (No meals included in these approximate costs – but housing and meal costs are lower than in most places). Extensive field trip options getting set up.
- 2) Cologne 2007. Aug. 19-24, 2007. Regional organizing committee set up. Held at University of Cologne – can handle 2000 or more delegates. German scientific societies have offered support. Scientific program still broad, but getting set up. By end of 2005, the IPC will be established to suggest session topics within themes. Potential field trips being set up. Prices are being kept down as much as possible.
- 3) Vancouver 2008. July 13-18, 2008. Regional organizing committee getting set up. Held on UBC campus. Actively working to keep prices down. Working with Tourism Vancouver. IPC will be set up. Some sponsors signed up. Lots of possibilities for field trips.
- 4) Copenhagen 2004 Final Report. Had to split sessions because of so many participants and desire to keep expenses low. Loans from societies repaid. Membership fees paid in full to GS and EAG. All bills paid. Resolution of financial issues should come within a few months. Looks like break-even or a very small profit. Member fees of \$460 USD, students \$215. Used professional conference organizer to handle registration, hotel booking, food, web page management. Didn't use Cambridge Publications in order to keep costs down. Over 1500 participants (600 posters; 1000 talks). Suggest archive available after conference for: abstracts, program, participant list with addresses, job pages, photos, etc.
- 5) Idaho 2005. Accepted 1713 abstracts. 1534 registered (including 34 accompanying persons). 36 exhibitors (10 are societies with free booths) – successful due to strong marketing efforts. 5 Field trips before or after, 2 during. Projection: a net profit likely, the exact amount depending on final registration and meal numbers.

10) Varia: The Board discussed various issues, such as the procedure for choosing GS officers, and the possibility of direct election of officers. The Board also continued its discussion of new ideas for the GS logo, and the Board discussed a proposal by Bruce Yardley, the President of the EAG to merge the EAG with the GS.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted on 31 May 2005 by,

Jeremy Fein

Secretary, The Geochemical Society

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Tim Drever

The Geochemical Society is in good shape in its 50th year. Our membership (currently at about 2,300) has been increasing slightly. The Goldschmidt Conference in Copenhagen was a great success, with approximately 1500 attendees. The Moscow Goldschmidt, with over 1600 abstracts submitted, promises to be the largest by far in North America. The past year saw the launch of *Elements*, which promises to be a great vehicle for promoting interaction among the various geochemical and mineralogical societies. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* continues to be the premier journal in geochemistry under the excellent leadership of Frank Podosek. More than 5,200 pages were published in 2004 and even more are anticipated for 2005. Plans are well underway for the next three Goldschmidts, in Melbourne, Cologne, and Vancouver.

We have expanded our interactions with the Geological Society of America, with a good number of GS sponsored sessions at their annual meetings. I believe it is valuable for the GS to have a forum where we can meet in the fall (late October or Early November), particularly when the Goldschmidt is early or in a relatively distant/expensive location. We have also increased our interactions with AGU. The joint AGU-GS Advisory Committee for Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems (G-cubed or G³) has been revived and we look forward to having input on this journal. AGU has invited us to propose sessions and participate in planning for their spring—but not their fall—meeting. They feel that the fall meeting is already oversubscribed and they are not interested in doing anything that might expand it. We continue to have excellent working relationships with the European Association for Geochemistry. We also continue to have a great corps of volunteers who serve on our various committees and make the Society function.

We do have a number of issues to address at this Board of Directors meeting, particularly with regard to some of our internal procedures and questions of the meaning of “sponsorship” of a Goldschmidt conference. My main message, though, is that we are in great shape for a 50-year old.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

The following report summarizes the actions that were taken by the GS Board since the last Secretary's Report was submitted:

- 1) Approved the slate of nominees put forward by Sue Brantley to fill openings on Geochemical Society committees (8/04).
- 2) Approved a new RiMG volume on sulfides to be edited by D. Vaughn (8/04).
- 3) Approved the following changes to the Geochemical Society's By-Laws (8/04):
 - i) changed the definition of a quorum for BoD meetings to be a majority of the 17 Directors.
 - ii) created a new Director position for the Editor of the Geochemical News.
 - iii) created wording to clarify how Goldschmidt conferences that take place outside of Europe or North America are considered in the NA-Europe rotation. Specifically, these meetings will be considered as 'insertions', rather than substitutions for NA or Europe.
 - iv) eliminated the position of Vice-Chair on the Joint Publications Committee.
- 4) Approved the 'Goldschmidt-to-Goldschmidt' period for GS members signed up as delegates at a Goldschmidt conference (10/04).
- 5) Approved the nomination of Gunter Faure for the 2005 Distinguished Service Award (9/04).
- 6) Approved the nomination of Bruce Watson for the 2005 Goldschmidt Medal (12/04).
- 7) Approved the nomination of James A. Van Orman for the 2005 Clarke Medal (12/04).
- 8) Approved the nomination of Kenneth Bruland for the 2005 Patterson Medal (12/04).
- 9) Approved the nomination of Nicholas Arndt, Stein Jacobsen, Stuart Wakeham, and Lynn Walter to be named as Geochemistry Fellows at the 2005 Goldschmidt Conference (12/04).
- 10) Approved the nomination of Jaap S. Sinninghe Damste for the 2005 Treibs Medal (2/05).
- 11) Approved the choice of Eric Oelkers as the 2005 Gast Lecturer (2/05).
- 12) Approved the increase in society contributions to Elements from \$10/member to \$12/member for the 2006 contribution to Elements (2/05).

Financial Assessment from the Treasurer (prepared by Becky Lange)

The following is a summary assessment that accompanied a detailed written financial statement submitted to the Board for approval: The numbers look great this year (the GS brought in \$60 K more than it paid out), and this appears to be a result of two factors. First, Elsevier paid the GS an extra \$36 K this year for back payments, and the GS was only invoiced by Elsevier for \$78.5 K this year (instead of ~\$112 K last year). Youxue Zhang and Seth Davis will confirm with Elsevier that the GS is fully paid up for 2004. Otherwise, the financial outlook is very good.

Key moves for 2005: At the end of June 2005, the two Washington Mutual C.D. accounts will mature. These two C.D. accounts will be liquidated and the funds sent to the Solomon Smith Barney Long Term Investment Account, which is what the Board agreed to do last year at the Copenhagen meeting. I strongly endorse this transfer of funds, as the Long Term Investment Account is conservatively invested by professionals and is very likely to do far better than these C.D. accounts. Also, the National City Bank in Ohio account will be closed out in June 2005, because Seth Davis no longer uses it for deposits.

GEOCHEMICAL NEWS 2004-2005 REPORT

Four printed issues of the *Geochemical News* were produced in 2004 (Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct), at a total cost of \$30,116.81. This total broke down as: \$10,336.67 (printing), \$9766.31 (mailing), \$9255.00 (honoraria), \$758.83 (misc). We received \$1500 in advertising revenue (\$750 from Elsevier; \$750 from RockWare). With the launching of *Elements* in January 2005, the *Geochemical News* will move from four printed issues annually to one printed edition and three all-electronic issues. This should represent a considerable savings in printing/ mailing costs. The initial electronic version of *G.N.* was completed in January 2005 at a cost of \$2960. We anticipate advertising revenues of \$900 for 2005 (again from Elsevier & RockWare). The April issue of *G.N.* will be available in print for members attending the Goldschmidt conference, and will be posted on the Geochemical Society website for all other members.

Content of the *Geochemical News* continues to be somewhat distinct from that of *Elements*, with a focus on society news, interviews with prominent geochemists, book reviews and articles describing major geochemical research facilities (e.g. US National Laboratory Series begun in January 2005), for example. The new electronic version has the advantage of allowing full color pictures to be included with articles, and allows us to increase the length/content of issues without incurring additional cost. We have not yet received any feedback from the membership regarding ease of downloading and whether they are less likely to read an electronic vs. printed newsletter.

It is our intention to initiate one issue per year that will focus entirely on the Goldschmidt Conferences. This year, such an issue will be produced in July. We are soliciting input from symposia and field trip organizers participating in the Moscow meeting. Additionally, we will include information on logistics, site and scientific content of the upcoming 2006 meeting in Australia.

SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS EDITOR'S REPORT

Special Publications

1) Giggenbach Volume: Volcanic, geothermal and ore-forming fluids: Rulers and witnesses of processes within the Earth. Editors - Stuart F. Simmons and Ian Graham.

- Joint publication with Society of Economic Geologists (SEG)
- This volume is identified as SEG Special Publication No. 10. There is no GS Special Publication Number on the volume but it is considered to be GS Spec. Pub. No. 8. The GS logo *does* appear on the volume.
- Was available at Kurashiki Goldschmidt.
- Total volumes sold as of 4/1/2005: 424
- Net income = \$14,235.43; GS share = \$7,117.71

2) Special Publication 9 (Kaplan Volume): Geochemical Investigations in Earth and Space Science: A Tribute to Isaac R. Kaplan.

- Published by Elsevier, and was available shortly after Goldschmidt in Copenhagen
- A total of 269 copies sold in 2004.

Although I do not have the data for all GS Special Publications, it is my impression based primarily on the Crerar volume (SP 7), that the sales of the Giggenbach and Kaplan volumes have been better (but not by orders of magnitude) than our other volumes over similar time scales. For example, in the first four months after it became available, 155 copies of the Crerar volume were sold. This indicates that collaboration with SEG and Elsevier has increased to some extent the ability to sell these volumes.

Reviews in Mineralogy and Geochemistry

Volumes Sponsored to Date by Geochemical Society

- 1) Molecular Modeling Theory and Application in the Geosciences, v. 42 (2001)
- 2) Noble Gases in Geochemistry and Cosmochemistry, v. 47 (2002)
- 3) Applications of Synchrotron Radiation in Low-Temperature Geochemistry and Environmental Science, v. 49 (2002)
- 4) U-Series Geochemistry, v. 52 (2003)

No additional GS-sponsored RiMG volumes are currently in the pipeline. I have not been very active in soliciting new proposals owing to the distraction of organizing the 2005 Goldschmidt meeting.

GCA – EXECUTIVE EDITOR’S REPORT

1. Publisher's Meeting

The Publisher's Meeting is the occasion at which representatives of the publisher, the sponsoring societies and the editorial staff get together to discuss the state and future of the journal. The last Publisher's Meeting was held at the Elsevier offices in New York on February 5, 2005. Participants were GS President Tim Drever, MS publications committee member Greg Herzog, JPC chair Nathaniel Ostrom, Publishing Editor Friso Veenstra, Issue Manager John Fotia, Elsevier Assistant Manager Greg Domke, Editorial Manager Linda Trower and me.

My report at the Publisher's Meeting is provided as an Appendix. That report is divided into three sections: (1) Statistics of manuscript activity; (2) Editorial policies; and (3) Production issues. Since much of the material in that report is still current, the sections below focus on the highlights, referring to the Publisher's Meeting report for details as appropriate.

2. Manuscript Statistics

The rate of manuscript submissions fluctuates significantly on a short-term (monthly or quarterly) basis. On a longer term (annual) basis the submission rate continues to grow slowly, from about 500 per year in 1999 to about 700 per year at present. Most of the submissions (more than 90%) are Articles; the rest are Comments, Responses, Book Reviews, Errata, etc. In five years we have received submissions from 55 different countries, although from many of them it has been only one or two manuscripts. The US accounts for 41% of submissions; Europe accounts for another 34%. Over the long term the acceptance rate is 58%, with no evident secular trend.

At present, we accept Articles for publication at a rate of around 360 per year. At 15 pages per Article, and allowing for other types of publication items, this translates to approximately 5600 pages per year.

The average time from submission to the "AE Report", i.e. when we first report the results of review, is below 90 days. The average "sub-pub" (submission to publication) time is 14 months. Part of this interval, the production time, constitutes a problem which is described in a separate section below.

Additional details regarding manuscript statistics can be found in the Appendix.

3. Editorial Issues

In the past year or so, a few issues requiring development of editorial policies have come up. These are discussed briefly below and in more detail in the Appendix.

We had one case of alleged "plagiarism". This was not really plagiarism but rather inadequate citation of prior work. Basically, the editorial office acted as an intermediary between "plaintiff" and "defendant", who agreed on a set of changes in the text of the Article in question before it went to press, so this affair was resolved peacefully and to joint satisfaction.

A Comment was submitted on a paper previously published in GCA. The Comment was accepted and the targeted authors invited to submit a Response in the usual fashion. The latter authors did submit a Response, but it was deemed scientifically unsatisfactory, and in subsequent iterations these authors were considered unresponsive to AE and EE advice concerning revision. On the one hand, standards for Responses are relatively lax, on the principle that authors who have been criticized deserve an opportunity to respond to criticism, and we have not previously rejected a Response. On the other hand, even after two rounds of revision the Response was considered unsuitable for publication, and the authors unwilling to make appropriate changes. The matter was brought before the JPC and the consensus that emerged was that we could indeed reject a Response on scientific grounds. We did, and the Comment is now in press, with no accompanying Response.

Circumstances surrounding two other papers have resulted in an expansion of the range of material that may be included in an electronic annex. Although electronic annexes were initially perceived essentially as appendices to a paper, publishing extensive material beyond what we would normally agree to print and/or material not suited to the printed page. In the two papers in question, however, electronic annexes are used to convey correspondence documenting the pedigree of relevant data and public but unrefereed correspondence originally cited as an internet location.

4. Annexes, Errata and Reprints

In cases in which published papers incorporate a mistake (either the authors' or the publisher's), it is understood that the printed journal cannot be changed, but authors frequently ask that the files for their manuscripts posted on Science Direct be corrected. For a variety of reasons, this is not possible.

We have, however, implemented a new policy that should go a long way to addressing this problem. The traditional way to announce corrections to mistakes is an Erratum. The new policy is that when we publish an Erratum the compositor will (in most cases) create a corrected (pdf) version of the entire paper and the corrected file will be posted as an electronic annex to the Erratum. This will at least enable the authors to download the corrected files for their papers, print them if desired, and distribute reprints, electronic or hardcopy, in which the errors have been fixed,

5. The Pipeline Problem

As noted above, the average sub-pub time is 14 months, which is too long. We think that the less-than-three-months interval to initial results of review is reasonably short, and in any case it would be very difficult to shorten it without resorting to measures that would compromise the quality of review and evaluation. The average time between the AE report (initial results of review) and transmittal for production is some four to five months, most of which is waiting on authors to prepare a revised version. This is also rather long, but again it would be difficult to shorten substantially without resorting to draconian measures, and at least authors cannot complain about it since they are themselves responsible for it.

The other major interval is production time, i.e. the time between editorial office transmittal for production and actual publication. This time has been growing, and in the past year exceeded six months on average, and was considerably longer in some instances. Time to publication is more important to some authors than to others, and some have expressed considerable dissatisfaction at this delay. We agree that such authors have a case, and that production time *must* be shortened or we will lose some of our best authors.

The problem is not that it takes that long to prepare a manuscript for print; this is reported to be around three months. It is a pipeline problem: Manuscripts were not being printed as fast as they were being transmitted to production, so that manuscripts spent a significant time just awaiting their turn for processing. The magnitude of the problem can be gauged by noting that at the end of 2003 the production pipeline contained enough papers to publish seven months of GCA (at 14 papers per issue).

This problem was identified at the December, 2003, Publisher's Meeting (in St. Louis), and it was subsequently agreed that the page budget would be increased by at least 50 pages/issue to shorten the pipeline. For a few months in 2004 this worked, but in the second half of the year the number of pages/papers printed fell short of target. Over the calendar year 2004 the pipeline actually got longer (by about a dozen papers) rather than shorter. The fundamental problem was identified as a bottleneck at the copyeditor stage: Not enough copyeditors turning out not enough papers.

The issue was raised again at the February, 2005, Publisher's Meeting (New York), and it was stressed that the present situation was unacceptable and the problem must be solved in order maintain GCA's stature in the community. Elsevier agreed to try to secure and train additional copyeditors.

Since issue 2 of this year, we have averaged 20 Articles, 5 more than the breakeven number of 15 per issue. (And we are on a pace to publish 6500 pages this year.) At this rate we should have so far reduced

publication time by about a month. If Elsevier can keep up this pace, the pipeline problem should be largely solved by the end of the year.

6. Quality Control and Production Venue

In the past we had some serious complaints about the quality of manuscript and journal composition. These complaints resulted in the termination of the production contract with Cadmus/Richmond, and introduction of a new supplier, Cadmus/Ephrata. This has worked reasonably well, and complaints about composition have dropped sharply.

Still, problems persist: Despite repeated complaints, and what seemingly should be adequate time to implement appropriate new procedures, there have been chronic problems in linking electronic annexes to the html ("Full Text + Links") versions of papers on Science Direct, in producing proper headings and table-of-contents identification of items other than Articles in Science Direct, and in consistent implementation of author proof corrections. (See details in Appendix.) These errors evidently arise primarily in Elsevier's production office in New York.

Elsevier has been sympathetic to complaints about such problems. In response they have advised us that effective some time in the latter half of this year, production of GCA will be shifted from New York to another of their production facilities, in San Diego. We are optimistic that this will result in improved consistency in the production of GCA. Linda Trower and I will visit the San Diego facility sometime this Summer to meet the relevant personnel and to discuss procedures.

BUSINESS OFFICE REPORT

1 MEMBERSHIP

Society membership is up significantly since 2003. This is mostly due to the automatic membership program through both the Copenhagen and Moscow Goldschmidt Conferences.

Data for 2005 is underlined to indicate that these numbers are not final. They are current as of May 14, 2005. If there are other membership demographics the Board would like to see besides those listed below, please let me know. If possible, I will add them to future reports.

Table 1.1 – Total Memberships

Total Membership	2003	2004	<u>2005</u>
Student	174	463	<u>616</u>
Professional	1,304	1,850	<u>2,061</u>
Senior	84	100	<u>96</u>
TOTAL	1,562	2,413	<u>2,773</u>

Table 1.2 – Organic Geochemistry Division Members

OGD Members	2003	2004	<u>2005</u>
Student	45	48	<u>54</u>
Professional	319	330	<u>319</u>
Senior	19	22	<u>22</u>
TOTAL	383	400	<u>395</u>

Table 1.3 – New and Renewing Memberships

New or Renewal	2003	2004	<u>2005</u>
Renewals	1,416	1,454	<u>1,475</u>
New	146	959	<u>1,298</u>
TOTAL	1,562	2,413	<u>2,773</u>

>>Members via the Copenhagen Goldschmidt have been counted as new for both 2004 and 2005 since they were not required to renew their membership for 2005.

>>Members categorized as renewals are any member who has been a member in the past, not necessarily continuously.

Table 1.4 – Memberships by Region

By Region	2003	2004	<u>2005</u>
North America	905	1,098	<u>1,369</u>
Europe	418	978	<u>1,017</u>
Asia	163	205	<u>245</u>
Australia / South Pacific	59	79	<u>89</u>
South America	10	12	<u>13</u>
Africa / Middle East	7	41	<u>40</u>
TOTAL	1,562	2,413	<u>2,773</u>

Table 1.5 – Memberships by Submission Method

By Submission	2003	2004	<u>2005</u>
On-Line	3	1,319	<u>1,372</u>
Mail	550	183	<u>166</u>
Fax	408	47	<u>33</u>
Phone	85	26	<u>23</u>
At/Through Conferences	11	821	<u>1,170</u>
Email	505	17	<u>9</u>
TOTAL	1,562	2,413	<u>2,773</u>

Table 1.6 – Memberships by Payment Method

By Pay Type	2003	2004	<u>2005</u>
Credit Card	1,220	1,450	<u>1,464</u>
Cash / Check	342	168	<u>154</u>
Conference Registration	0	795	<u>1,155</u>
TOTAL	1,562	2,413	<u>2,773</u>

2 SUBSCRIPTIONS

GCA	2003	2004	<u>2005</u>
Professional	585	577	<u>505</u>
Student	48	36	<u>34</u>
Senior	39	48	<u>45</u>
Gratis	86	84	<u>81</u>
TOTAL	758	745	<u>665</u>

GS and MS offered 2004 and 2005 Subscription Rates to members for \$130 for Professionals, and \$50 for Students and Seniors.

Elsevier charged GS \$4.70 per issue for Professionals and Seniors, and \$2.40 per issue for Student subscriptions. Additionally members received the Goldschmidt Abstracts issue at a rate of \$19.00.

The 2006 subscription rate will be determined by mid-September and integrated into the 2006 membership drive.

Elements	#1	#2	#3
Labels Submitted	2,464	2,246	2,750
Overprints	150	200	250
TOTAL	2,614	2,446	3,000

Subscription to Elements is included with membership.

The Geochemical Society's fee for Elements in 2005 is \$10.00 per member. This will increase to \$12.00 per member for 2006.

3 SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS

The price listed is the non-member rate. A 25% discount is given to member and booksellers.

Volume 9 has a 1/3 discount for members.

Vol – Tribute	Title	Year	Price	2003	2004	<u>2005</u>	<u>Inventory</u>
1 – Yoder	Magmatic Processes	1987	\$20.00	15	6	<u>3</u>	<u>183</u>
2 – Eugster	Fluid-Mineral Interactions	1990	\$20.00	11	2	<u>1</u>	<u>560</u>
3 – Epstein	Stable Isotope Geochemistry	1991	\$20.00	28	16	<u>1</u>	<u>184</u>
4 – Goldschmidt	V.M. Goldschmidt	1992	\$16.00	7	4	<u>1</u>	<u>403</u>
5 – Burns	Mineral Spectroscopy	1996	\$40.00	8	1	<u>3</u>	<u>1,083</u>
6 – Boyd	Mantle Petrology	1999	\$60.00	28	8	<u>9</u>	<u>595</u>
7 – Crerar	Water-Rock Interaction	2002	\$72.00	37	28	<u>7</u>	<u>766</u>
8 – Giggenbach	Volcanic, Geothermal, and Ore-Forming Fluids	2003	\$66.00	X	12	<u>6</u>	*
9 – Kaplan	Geochemical Investigations	2004	\$90.00	X	21	<u>7</u>	**

*The Society for Economic Geologists (SEG) maintains the inventory for Volume 8.

**Elsevier, Ltd., maintains the inventory for Volume 9.

4 GS.WUSTL.EDU

Usage	2003	2004	<u>2005</u>
Avg. # of Users/Day	154.3	149.6	<u>194.0</u>
Avg. Pages/Use	4.8	5.3	<u>5.8</u>

There has been discussion and a vote by the Board to improve and/or enhance the website, however it has not been made clear to me what is to be done, nor what sort of resources I have available to complete it. The existing website is very functional and I owe a great deal of gratitude to Bob Nichols for his help.