Council of Texas Archeologists

Newsletter
Volume 26, Number 3
September 2002

2002 CTA FALL MEETING

October 25, 2002

1-5 pm Hibiscus Room, Laredo, Texas

The 2002 CTA Fall Meeting will be held in conjunction with the Texas Archeological Society's Annual Meeting in Laredo, Texas. The CTA meeting will held in the Hibiscus Room at the La Posada Motor Hotel.

FALL MEETING AGENDA

Registration 1:00PM
Call to Order 1:30 PM
Approval of Minutes from Spring 2002 Meeting (as published in the last CTA newsletter)
Announcements

Officer's Reports
- President
- Immediate Past-President
- Secretary-Treasurer
- Newsletter Editor

Standing Committee Reports
- Governmental Affairs
- Contractor's List
- Public Education
- Multicultural Relations
- CTA Web Page
- Membership

Special Committee Reports
- Accreditation and Review Council
- Anti-Looting Committee

Old Business
- Chapter 29 Update
- 41VT98 Update
- CTA Web Page Committee / Internet Communications Committee

New Business
- Proposed 2003 Budget
- Nominating Committee for 2003 Elections
- TAS and Texas Archeology Academy Two Day Spring Meeting
- Texas Rock Art Data Base
- THC Announcements
- Other New Business

Adjourn 5:00PM

In this issue . . .

Presidents' Forum

Cell L. Bond

We've moved to the border! The fall meeting of the CTA will be held in Laredo at the La Posada Motor Hotel in conjunction with the Texas Archaeological Society (TAS). This should be a great meeting and provides a chance to renew acquaintances, make new friends and meet some interesting characters. In part, for atonement for our not-always-stimulating business meeting, and to develop a stronger bond with TAS, the CTA is hosting a hospitality reception at the hotel on Friday evening after the TAS forum. Additionally for the TAS meeting, CTA Past President David Brown is organizing a CTA-sponsored symposium on Rio Grande area archeology.

I believe that the CTA and TAS interaction can only be beneficial. As described by Margaret Howard in this issue of the newsletter, TAS members are starting several new initiatives that are important to Texas archeology. Often the overall interest of both organizations in history, prehistory and preservation are the same. Unfortunately many members of both organizations do not know the purposes, differences and importance of each. Often we, as archeologists, are our own worst enemy when it comes time to express our concerns, influence political decisions or communicate with the rest of the world. There is strength in numbers and our relationships with others who share our interests are often as important as the artifacts and data we recover from the ground.

When the CTA was formed in its present incarnation some 26 years ago, it was an enthusiastic and sometimes disharmonious group. I can report that things have not entirely changed, although the enthusiasm is sometimes dependent on the crisis at hand. Since our spring meeting the primary issue has been with the Texas Historical Commission's (THC) proposed Chapter 29 rules on curation and the certification of curatorial facilities (see the Governmental Affairs Committee report in this newsletter issue). As debated and discussed at our spring meeting, the originally proposed rules would have placed an unacceptable burden on cultural resource management in Texas. Although CTA acted as a body to influence the rewriting or the rules, I was somewhat disappointed in the small number of responses and comments that were provided by the members. I must also admit that I was pleased that we did not all agree on the recommended language changes to the proposed rules. As we tend to be crisis-driven, I believe that we need to increase our lines of communication. To that end I will probably be increasing my number of mass e-mails to the membership. If you're not interested in these, please feel free to exercise your delete key.

Speaking of enthusiasm, in this issue Steve Black makes an impassioned plea for a two-day spring meeting. Claiming that our business meeting is slightly less than scintillating, he suggests that the second day be a research conference where CTA members would report on current research and, hopefully, promote networking and cooperation among professional archeologists in Texas. I have placed this item on the fall meeting agenda for discussion. Leave your American Express card at home, but bring your willingness to debate and, if the two-day session is adopted, be prepared to participate.

No newsletter would be complete without the usual mention of the need to increase our membership. At last count we had 138 members and 40 contractors on the roll. We could do better. Among other things, we talked about offering additional student discounts, considered the potential of incorporating the THC Stewards into our membership, and have discussed ways to influence those who work in higher education to be recruiters. We have not capitalized on the numerous archaeological technicians who are working in our state. Many of the larger contracting firms hire numerous technicians to complete their surveys and excavations. In some cases these people are from out of state and may only be around for a single job. In other cases they return project after project. I challenge every Texas cultural resource management firm to enroll its temporary employees that are working in Texas in the CTA. At the maximum it will probably cost only $15.00 per employee and will expose them to the CTA. I think it's time for the contractors to pony up.

Officer's Reports

David O. Brown

PAST-PRESIDENT

The Continuing Saga of 41VT98

The excavation of eighty-odd burials from 41VT98 and the analysis and disposition of the remains from the site has been one of the most complicated and controversial issues in Texas archaeology since it was suggested earlier this year that the human remains and associated artifacts might be reburied without documentation or analysis. A brief outline of the history of the project and some of the early missteps, which have unwillingly brought Texas archaeology into the national spotlight, are presented in the spring CTA newsletter. Subsequently, Bob Skiles and I attended a meeting in Corpus Christi on 28 March 2002 with Jan Stokes and Carolyn Murphy from the Corps of Engineers Galveston District, Margaret Howard, Skip Kennedy, and Chuck Tamplin from the Texas Archeological Society, Lynn Sebastian and Alston Thoms representing the Society for American Archeology, and Hugh Charlton from DuPont. I reported on this get-together briefly at the spring CTA meeting, but it took place after the CTA newsletter had gone to press, so I will summarize some of the details here. In the morning, we were taken to the Coastal Environments Lab in Corpus Christi, where we were allowed to view some of the remains and given brief summaries of the finds by Bob Ricklis, the site's excavator and Project Principal Investigator, and Glen Doran, Project Bioarchaeologist. In the afternoon, we met at the Corpus Christi State University campus (minus Bob, thanks to some notion of a conflict of interest by the Corps — note also that the Texas Historical Commission, which is by definition a part of the consulting party process, was not invited to either of these sessions). After some initially awkward moments (perhaps encouraged by the rhetoric on TXARCH-L at that time), the participants began making concrete and useful suggestions on what could and should be done with the site. The Corps assured everyone that it had no intention of reburying the materials without analysis, but was required by law to take into account Native American concerns as well as the wishes of the landowner, DuPont. On the whole, the meeting ended on a positive tone with various concrete suggestions for proceeding.

This past spring's CTA meeting featured a session on 41VT98 in which Bob Ricklis answered questions about the site and the recovered materials. While Bob was constrained by the Corps of Engineers in what slides he was able to show, he went well beyond the talk he had given in Victoria and spent more than an hour answering questions from the Austin audience. Immediately after that talk, representatives from the CTA and TAS met with the Corps to discuss plans for future consulting regarding the analysis of remains from the site. Jan Stokes from the Galveston District office listened to our suggestions and assured us that the Corp would make a good faith effort to bring a fair conclusion to the consulting party process in which the CTA is now involved.

Several weeks later the Corps conducted another of several planned meetings with Native American groups to listen to their concerns and to present to them the plan for analysis of site materials that had been developed by the Corps, Bob Ricklis and Glen Doran with suggestions from the CTA, TAS, and SAA. This document, dated 3 May 2002, presents the site and its significance in clear prose, and links the proposed analyses to questions of scientific and cultural importance. In deference to the Corps request that the draft proposal not be published until it is finalized, we present only a brief summary here.

Following an introduction which outlines some of the basic facts about the site and the ongoing process to determine the fate of the remains, and a section emphasizing the importance of the site and outlining why some level of analysis is necessary, the draft proposal for analysis of 41VT98 materials presents a series of scientific questions:

1. How old is the Buckeye Knoll cemetery and how long was it used?
2. How closely are the Early Archaic people at Buckeye Knoll related to other Early Archaic people in North America?

3. Were the Early Archaic people at Buckeye Knoll related to later people in this region?
4. Did men, women, and children have different roles in Early Archaic society?
5. Was social status achieved during a person's lifetime, or was it based on descent?
6. Did the Early Archaic people at Buckeye Knoll trade with distant groups directly or indirectly?
7. What food sources were used by the people who were buried at Buckeye Knoll, and how far did they travel to get those foods?
8. How healthy were the people who were buried at Buckeye Knoll?
9. How did diet change over 10,000 years at Buckeye Knoll, and how were those changes related to climate and/or season?
10. How did technology change over 10,000 years at Buckeye Knoll?

A series of analyses are proposed to answer these questions. Three basic principles are mentioned in the preface to these analyses, all of which were more or less agreed to at the meeting of consulting parties.

1. Analyses would only be conducted if they are likely to yield important information.
2. Sampling of human skeletal material for destructive analyses would be the minimum required to obtain scientifically valid results.
3. Human remains would be handled with great care and respect.

Finally, the proposed analyses themselves are presented in the draft proposal. These include metric and non-metric analyses of human bone, accelerator mass spectrometry dating of human bone, DNA analysis of human bone, stable isotope analysis of human bone, analysis of sediment from burials, photodocumentation of human remains and associated artifacts, identification of animal bone, shellfish and land snails, animal seasonality studies, charred plant remains identification, radiocarbon dating of animal bones, shells, and charcoal from the site, pottery analysis, stone tool use-wear analysis, analysis of organic residues on tools and pot fragments, and other analyses that include standard identification, counts and measurements (and in some cases source determinations) of many items recovered from the site.

Unfortunately, the initial response to the proposal by the Native American groups present at a meeting on May 8-9, 2002 was little different from that which had been voiced at a previous meeting in January. While not all groups were present at this meeting, those that were present (the Alabama-Coushatta, the Comanche, and the Kiowa) were emphatic in their demands that the entire site collection be reburied immediately. This position was reiterated in a subsequent letter to the Corps. The Corps has also received letters from the Mescalero and the Caddo, who have also indicated that they feel the remains should be reburied, and who have also reportedly expressed concern about destructive analyses. Finally, the Corps has met separately with the Tap Pilam group, and although they were not included with other groups because of their lack of federal recognition, the Corps promised to listen to their concerns. While we are sympathetic with many of the issues that are raised by the representatives of the various Native American groups, we obviously cannot support reburial without analysis.

Now the consulting parties are once again going to meet with the Corps of Engineers, this time in Galveston on 23 September 2002, and this time with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation added as an additional consulting party. At the meeting we expect to discuss our stance on the draft proposal and the future prospects for analysis and disposition of the materials with the Colonel in charge of the Galveston District. While we don't know yet the specifics of what we will say, or what anyone else will have to say, the draft proposal is basically sound as it stands, and makes some important acknowledgments to Native American groups, such as limiting destructive analysis and treating the remains with due respect. These ought to be standard considerations in any such analysis, but some reassurances are certainly in order in this case. For the most part, the analyses envisioned by the draft proposal are non-destructive. The primary destructive analyses, direct AMS

dating of skeletal materials, DNA studies, and stable isotope analyses, are clearly the most controversial, but in many ways the most important. In all three of these cases the Corps has suggested a limited sample of tests to be run with the analysis expanded as considered necessary, and then only after consultation with all the relevant parties. While we support the concept of limited samples to determine the feasibility of these tests, where those results are positive we are likely to suggest a maximum number of samples. To what degree the limits on analyses are dependent on project funding, and to what degree such limits may be due to a consideration of Native American concerns is still too early to determine, but we intend to push for maximum analysis where it is reasonable.

All the available evidence indicates that 41VT98 is one of the most important sites ever excavated on the Texas coast, and perhaps one of the more important sites of its time period anywhere in the country. These burials suggest a degree of social complexity that seems well beyond what we have previously ascribed to the hunter-gatherers of seven to nine thousand years ago. If the initial impressions regarding the site prove true, we may have to reexamine our notions of the evolution of cultural complexity during the early and middle Holocene. Because of the unique nature of this site, it is difficult to place ordinary limits on the analysis. On the whole, however, we find the research questions useful and the analytical techniques appropriate, given an adequate sampling strategy.

After analysis, it seems likely that most of the human remains would be reinterred, although the proposal suggests that this would not occur for several years while the analyses are ongoing. Such reinterment could be undertaken in crypts that are marked so that it might even be possible to re-examine the materials some day if all parties were in agreement. One of the key players in the disposition of the human remains form the site (aside from the Native Americans who all favor reinterment) is the Dupont corporation, which may also favor reinterment. Should reinterment be indicated, there is a potential future issue over what should be reburied; there is some discussion over whether all materials from the site would be reinterred or whether reinterment would be limited onto to skeletal materials and clearly associated grave good.

It's still too early to tell how much the decision on 41VT98 might be affected by the recent judgment against the government and the Corps in the Kennewick case (see http://www.kennewick-man.com if you haven't already read this). Since that decision will likely be appealed, and since the 41VT98 remains are not considered to fall under NAGPRA, it may have little if any significant impact. Everyone involved in the consulting process will have read this opinion by the time we meet, however, and the decision will at least reverberate in the background as the final discussions take place. In the meantime, we will go to Galveston and make our best case for thorough analysis of the remains from 41VT98. As always, we hope to have your support in this endeavor and welcome suggestions or comments on this process.

Missi Green

SECRETARY-TREASURER

I just wanted to give everyone a reminder that membership dues are for a calender year — January to January. Notices for membership renewal will be sent via e-mail in December. When renewing, please make sure that all of your information is correct, particularly your e-mail address.

Currently there are 149 members of CTA, almost double the number recorded at this time last year. Eleven of these are student members. Forty contractors are currently on the list, up by 8 from last year. All accounts are in the black: $9149.72 in checking, $8647.72 in money market, and $5926.92 in the scholarship fund.

I am working with Sue Linder-Linsley to set up a CTA PayPal account. If everything goes as planned you will be able to pay your dues on-line using a credit card or checking account. Details will be forthcoming.

Andy Malof

NEWSLETTER EDITOR

A few months ago I was relaxing at my desk when I received a call from a well-known archaeologist, I'll call him RR, who asked if I'd be interested serving as Newsletter Editor for the Council for Texas Archeologists. I was surprised, to say the least, but curious, and asked what the job entailed. "Oh, not much," was the reply, "Just gather articles from committee chairs, assemble them, and send them off for formatting."

That didn't sound too bad, so I essentially agreed, and proceeded to research the CTA a little. The first thing I found out was that I was suddenly a member of the Executive Committee. Then followed the horrifying realization that there would be meetings I'd have to attend, and presumably decisions to make. I couldn't figure out if this was an honor or some sort or punishment for misdeeds during my undergraduate years.

Regardless the deed was done and I began to sort through the various CTA web pages, looking at past newsletters, bylaws, committees and their duties, and most importantly, began to decipher just who chaired these committees. Somewhere in the charter it must be stated that the newsletter editor is actually the Official Harasser of Committee Chairs. As a relative newcomer to the CTA, I have not yet taken this aspect of the job too seriously; I was told it takes about a year to get in the groove. So as time goes by I may get more annoying to those with lives. In the meantime, I'd like to thank all of those who submitted articles, as well as those who have helped me navigate these first few months.

One of the major challenges was trying to get a handle on the various committees, their duties, and the chairs of those committees. The section on the web was a start, but it required browsing previous newsletters to get a fuller list, and even then it was difficult to determine which committees were active or were even in existence. As these committees are an essential part of the CTA, a concise list of committees would undoubtedly be useful. A tentative list is published towards the end of this newsletter. Please review it for accuracy and completeness and send any corrections to myself or Missi Green.

I would also like to make a few comments regarding one of the pronounced goals of CTA, and an emphasis in this newsletter, that of increasing the interaction between the avocational and professional communities. Undoubtedly these concepts have been tossed around previously, in other venues or formats. But they are new to me, and likely are issues for others as well.

The Council of Texas Archaeologists is a professional organization that "exists for the purpose of maintaining and promoting the goals of professional archeology in the State of Texas." It is open to students and professional archaeologists. Membership is voluntary, but most professional archaeologists subscribe to the Professional Guidelines as amended and accepted by the CTA. Another of the goals of professional archaeologists, or should be, a high level of interaction between themselves and the interested public. And it is the avocational archaeologist that is can most easily provide that link.

Most professionals have professional organizations, but off-hand, I can think of few professions where avocationals are as active and knowledgeable as in archaeology. Yet, if CTA admits avocationals, it would no longer be a "professional" organization. Consider, however, the student. A student, by definition, is not a professional. It might be argued that we are all students, which is true, but at what point, then, do we become professionals? There was a period of time, after I had finished my BA, and had not yet entered graduate school, when I would tell people I "do" archaeology; I did not consider myself an "archaeologist". That period of insecurity, if you will, has passed, and I do now consider myself an archaeologist by profession. Yet every day I reminded, in one form or another, of my lack of knowledge or expertise in some aspect of the field. It is often the avocational helps clarify some question I may be struggling with.

Another example lies at the LCRAs Nightengale Archaeological Center, where an educational program built and designed by the

late Bruce Nightengale has introduced the concepts of archaeology to thousands of students over the past ten years. A revitalized teacher workshop attracted participants from as far away as Missouri this past summer. The Center, however, could not exist in its present form without the dedicated assistance of the Llano Uplift Archeological Society, members of which volunteer their time week in and week out. To me, these are professionals in the truest sense of the word. They bring a wealth of knowledge and experience and contribute it freely, enhancing the most important aspect of archaeology, the education of the public.

The line between the professional and the avocational is not clear-cut, and indeed, the groups grade one into the other. The CTA promotes a system of standards that help to maintain the integrity of the field, while TAS and regional groups infuse vitality and enthusiasm from the vast pool of talent that exists outside the paid arena. I'm not sure there are any immediate answers; I'm not even sure there is a problem. It does seem clear, however, that by addressing potential voids as they become evident the field of archaeology in Texas can only be strengthened.

Committee Reports

Sue Linder-Linsley, Chair

CTA WEB PAGE COMMITTEE

Name Change — at the last meeting we suggested that the CTA Web Page Committee change its name to the Internet and Communications Committee this change will better reflect the wide range of tasks that the committee is involved with. We also suggested that the Internet and Communication Committee be included in the CTA Bylaws as an official committee. There will be a vote on these issues at the meeting.

I will not be at the meeting but would like to add that I spent in excess of 40 hours on each Newsletter and at least 8 - 10 hours each month on the web pages and other communications issues. The name change will better represent all of the tasks (e-mail, newsletter, etc.) and types of communications that the committee deals with beyond the a web page.

Since our last report we have made frequent changes to the Contractor's List. I have corresponded with the Contractor's List Committee and they have come up with some new ways to deal with all the changes (see Contractor's List Committee Report). The web pages are up to date with correct information as far as we have been notified by the contractors. The Contractor's List Committee spent several months getting the pdf version up to date (much of the information was three years old due to an oversight by the previous Contractor's List Committee) but the file I have been sent (twice) has an error with the file type and I am having to reformat the file.

Many firms were late (by months) with renewing their dues but we now have 40 contractors. Its time now to be thinking about sending in your renewal for 2003. Check with Missi or look at Contractor's List on the web page to see if your 2002 information on file is the same as what you want it to be for 2003. Membership Dues and Contractor's List Fees are Due January 1 each year.

As discussed at the last two CTA meetings we will start limiting access to the current *CTA Newsletter* to dues paying members. If you are reading this, all 2002 members received a CTA password by e-mail with the announcement of this issue. Please encourage others to be come dues paying members instead of sharing the password. If you have changed your e-mail address be sure to send us your new information (see below). You will need this password to download current issues of the *CTA Newsletter* beginning with this issue (Volume 26 No 3). Only current issues will require the password. As new issues of the *CTA Newsletter* become available the previous issue will become available to the general public.

Following the last falls CTA meeting we sent Steve Black a CTA web page with links to our site for inclusion on the Texas Beyond History net. This summer we finally received

information back and have added a description and link back to the Texas Beyond History web site.

Our newest committee members Laura West and Mike Crow worked on updating some of the information on various pages including the member page. Some of the information on file following the spring meeting was not current and therefore is not correct on the web page. Unlike the Contractor's List we cannot up date the member list but once or twice a year. We need you to be sure Missi has your information correct when you pay your dues. The member list will be updated approximately one month following the spring meeting.

An organization that is the size of the CTA always has someone changing his or her address, phone number, fax number, or e-mail address. While we all try to keep up with the changes we need your help to do so. Please remember we have implemented a new way to communicate membership information, address, phone, e-mail updates, etc. We have two e-mail addresses for communicating changes and problems. The first of these is for general CTA members. CTA members should send their changes and updates to: cta-members@c-tx-arch.org. This address automatically sends the message to Board and Committee members who need to keep their files up to date. All messages involving your CTA membership status can be sent to this address. The second address is for CRD's and Contractors. All updates, changes, questions or problems involving the Contractor's List should be sent to: cta-contractor@c-tx-arch.org. It is our hope that by keeping everyone in the loop when a change is reported these changes will be implemented in a timelier manner.

I am working with Missi Green to set up a CTA PayPal account. You will be able to pay your dues/contractor's listing fee via the web and make donations to the scholarship fund. Details will be forthcoming.

Jorge Garcia-Herrerros

and

Meg Cruse, co-Chairs

CONTRACTOR'S LIST COMMITTEE

The committee in charge of the contractors list has discussed making the following changes in order to keep the contractors list updated. These changes should result in keeping the postings on the list up to date. If approved the proposed changes will be implemented for the 2003 calendar year. The changes suggested are presented below:

1. *A deadline will be placed for contractors to register and be placed on the list. This deadline will be a month after the two bi-annual meetings. If they do not register at this time a $10.00 to $15.00 late registration fee will be added to the cost of registration.*

2. New contractors can register at any time with no added fees.

3. One month after the bi-annual meeting e-mails will be sent to contractors that have registered to review their listings on the web site and make sure that they are satisfied.

4. The money collected for late registrations will be later used to sponsor speakers and presentations concerning cultural resource management and other archaeological issues in applied archaeology.

We are presenting these changes in the newsletter so CTA members will be aware of what is being considered. During the fall CTA meeting a vote will conducted in order to accept or reject said changes. If you have any questions regarding these changes please contact Meg Cruse or Jorge Garcia-Herreros at: cta-contractor@c-tx-arch.org.

Eric Schroeder , Chair

GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Revision of Chapter 26 and Chapter 29 for the Antiquities Code of Texas

As you all know a meeting regarding the maintenance and care of artifacts and collections (proposed Chapter 29) was held in June. The main opposition to the proposed Chapter 29 Rules included:

the piece-by-piece inventory of collections,

and

the re-inventory of collections by curatorial facilities every 5 years,

the certification deadline.

As a result of the meeting these issues were dropped and the deadline for certification was moved back to December 2005. These revisions were incorporated into the proposed Chapter 29 Rules, which was published in the Texas Register on August 30, 2002.

The revised Chapter 26 Rules includes many text revisions to make it more complementary with the revised Antiquities Code. One of the things that was eliminated was Section 26.27 Disposition of Archeological Artifacts and Data, which is now covered under the proposed Chapter 29 Rules. The proposed Chapter 26 Rules were published in the Texas Register on August 23, 2002.

These proposed rules are now under a 60 day comment period, and you can view them at http://204.65.105.13/texreg/index.html. Both of these proposed rules will be voted on at the regularly scheduled AAB quarterly meeting in October. Please address your comments to:

Mr. F. Lawrence Oaks, Executive Director
c/o Texas Historical Commission
P.O. Box 12276
Austin, Texas 78711-2276

Also please courtesy copy:

Dr. Jim Bruseth, Deputy Director
c/o Texas Historical Commission
P.O. Box 12276
Austin, Texas 78711-2276

Revision of the US Army Corps of Engineers Appendix C Regulations for Nationwide Permits

The Corps formulated the Appendix C regulations in an attempt to address 36 CFR 800 in the implementation of the Nationwide Permit program. The Advisory Council objected to the Corps regulations arguing that they fail to adequately address 36 CFR 800. This summer the Corps of Engineers opened discussions with the Advisory Council regarding the revised Appendix C regulations, and has issued interim guidance to all districts. The comment period on Appendix C is closed and nearly sixty sets of comments were received by the Corps. Later this year the Corps will assemble a rewrite team to review and address the comments in an effort to construct a new Appendix C that more closely complements 36 CFR 800, and address the specific issues unique to the Corps Regulatory program. The interim guidance is basically the same as the previous Appendix C, except that it incorporates the coordination requirements with the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Native Hawaiians, and Alaska Natives in conformance with the new 106 regulations.

An Update on the Galveston District's 41VT98 Consultation

A Galveston District draft treatment proposal was sent to all consulting parties (SHPO, ACHP, TAS, SAA, CTA, the tribes, and DuPont by letter dated August 1, 2002. Formal written comments were requested within 60 days of the letter. Representatives from the consulting parties have been contacted in order to determine potential dates for a meeting with Colonel Waterworth of the Galveston District. A date for this meeting has been set for September 23. Please address any comments to the president of your respective organization.

The FCC and Section 106

The Telecommunications & Internet Association (CTIA) issued comments to the

Office of Management and Budget on the Costs and Benefits of Federal Regulations. The letter addresses the FCC's NEPA rules and among the issues are the FCC's late issuance of guidelines for last year's Collocation Programmatic Agreement, and calls on the FCC to "enforce the 30-day time limit for SHPO's response" in the Section 106 consultation process. The authors of the letter are under the misconception that the FCC has rules for the implementation of 106, it doesn't. The agency has rules that implement NEPA. The letter also rehashes the issue of whether or not the telecommunications actions are federal undertakings pursuant to 36 CFR 800. The most valid point of the letter is that it identifies that the FCC needs to issue better and timelier Section 106 guidance.

HR1739 Urban Sprawl and Smart Growth Study Act

This bill was introduced in the House in May 2001, and seems to be stuck in committee. The resolution charges Federal Agencies with regulatory oversight with using urban sprawl as a potential negative effect upon valuable open space, farmland, wildlife, and natural, cultural, scenic, and recreational resources. If enacted into law as currently written, it would mandate that Federal agencies consider urban sprawl as an adverse effect in their environmental reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). It also appears that it would encourage communities to develop Smart Growth policies and establish their own environmental review process. This bill was referred to the House Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality and has had no activity since.

HR 2436 Energy Security Act

This resolution is designed to maximize the energy potential of all land under Federal jurisdiction, and to increase the private sector's access to provide and/or extract this energy without increasing regulations. It basically requires that the Secretary of the Interior provide written justification to the offeror in the event a lease is rejected. If the lease is rejected due to a previous resource management decision (e.g. cultural resources), the justification must include a careful assessment of whether the reasons underlying the previous management decision are still persuasive (i.e. re-evaluation of National Register eligibility?). The act also has a clause that exempts an oil or gas line from National Register consideration unless the owner of the pipeline consents. It also says that Federal land that is available for oil or natural gas leasing shall be available without lease stipulations more stringent than restrictions on surface use and operations unless the Secretary provides a written explanation as to why more stringent stipulations are warranted. The bill passed the House, was forwarded to the Senate, and the Senate made amendments to it. The Speaker appointed a conference to review the Senate amendments, and the conference was held on June 26, 2002. The bill was forwarded to the Committee on Ways and Means.

National Defense Authorization Act for 2003

This act not only authorizes the fiscal year 2003 budget for the military, it also provides exemptions to the military from the Endangered Species Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The bill has passed the House and Senate. As of July 26, 2002 the bill is in committee between the House and Senate and a conference is being held to resolve differences. Senator Hutchison of Texas is one of the conferees. Although this bill does not appear to effect cultural resources at this time, we need to continue to monitor it in case the conferees decide that it will also include exemptions from the National Historic Preservation Act before it is sent to the President for signature. Please write Senator Hutchison and express your views.

Walnut Creek Site

An article in the Austin American Statesman dated August 12th reported that an archeological site was uncovered by the July floods in Walnut Creek Metropolitan Park in north Austin. The site was discovered by an Austin artist and inveterate hiker, Mr. Steve Ashley, who observed a number of prehistoric artifacts along the surface and eroding out of a creek bank. The site was reported to the Texas Historical Commission, and the THC is working with the city to get the site protected.

In addition the THC has been working with Mr. Ashley in completing a site form and turning the artifacts he recovered over to TARL.

Karl W. Kibler, Chair

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

At the Spring 2002 meeting of the CTA the Membership Committee had the pleasure to announce the first recipient of a CTA Student Research Grant. Council of Texas Archeologists student member Larkin Hood of the University of Washington received the $500 grant to pursue her study of residential mobility among Ceramic Period hunters and gatherers of the Galveston Bay area. Ms. Hood intends to use the grant for the creation of ceramic thin sections to examine and determine the sand sources of the ceramic tempers through petrographic analysis. Ms. Hood extends her thanks and gratitude to the CTA, and all of us wish her the best of luck in her investigations.

Now that the CTA Student Research Grant program is in full swing I would encourage all members to contribute to the fund. We would like to raise $10,000 for a permanent endowment and we currently are about $4000-4500 short of this target. I cannot tell you how important I think it is to have contractors from the contractors' list contribute to the fund. At this point in time only two companies, Geo-Marine and Prewitt and Associates, have contributed. I raise this point because I believe those of us in the private sector have all lately experienced difficult times in finding qualified, knowledgeable, and experienced employees for positions ranging from field technician to project archeologist or project/field director. There are a plethora of reasons for this, but I believe that CTA can be part of the solution by funding and supporting student research relevant to Texas archeology. As I reflect on my own career in Texas archeology I think about the skills, knowledge, and experience I gained outside of academia, (when I was younger and my hair was thicker and darker). Experiences and opportunities gained through CRM and organizations like CTA played a large role in my evolution as an archeologist. For these reasons alone I think that the CTA Student Research Grant program is an important mechanism for developing the next generation of Texas archeologists, our future employees and co-workers.

Lastly, since our committee deals with membership, I was recently cruising through the membership list on the CTA web site. I found that a lot of our members are not listed (maybe this is a personal choice of privacy, I don't know). I also found that some members' contact information is from two or three jobs ago! Since CTA is a voluntary organization communication between members is vital for the success and everyday workings of the organization. So please take a look at the membership list on the web site to see if you need to post or update your contact information.

Dana Anthony, Chair

PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMITTEE

At the April meeting, the second annual E. Mott Davis Public Outreach Award was presented to Prewitt & Associates, Inc., the Fort Hood Cultural Resource Management Program, and William Pugsley of Texas Information Network for the Fort Hood Historical Research and Site Evaluations Project. We all congratulate the participants involved in this project for their excellent contribution in public education and outreach. As with the previous year's award, the choice was a difficult one; all three projects nominated were very deserving, but in the end we could only chose one. Congratulations are also due to Cindy Tennis, formerly at UTSA, the Center for Archaeological Research at UTSA, and TxDOT for their contribution to public education through the Mission Nuestra Señora del Refugio Project, and to the T.C. Osborn Tenant Farm Project, Jose Zapata project historian, Center for Archaeological Research, UTSA, and TxDOT. The efforts of each of these

The Second Annual E. Mott Davis award went to the Fort Hood Historical Research and Site Evaluations Project From left: Dana Anthony and David O. Brown present award to Doug Boyd (Prewitt & Associates, Inc.), William Pugsley (Texas Information Network), and Cheryl Huckerby (Director of Cultural Resources at Fort Hood).

projects exemplify ways in which archaeological contractors and project sponsors can reach out to the public about archaeology and historic preservation through printed materials, videos, curriculums, public meetings, and exhibits. This past year's nominated projects are described in detail in the March 2002, CTA Newsletter, Volume 26, Number 2.

In the spring of 2003, we will be presenting the third annual E. Mott Davis Public Outreach Award, and we hope to have a good slate of nominees to choose from. It's not too soon to start thinking about nominating your favorite project for the award. The requirements are that it be a CRM or compliance oriented project during this past year that features education or public outreach as a key part of the process. Nomination forms are on the CTA web site. If you have questions or want to discuss a possible nomination, contact me at <danthony@swtexas.net> . Deadline for submission of nominees is December 31.

CTA Spring Meeting Minutes

5 April 2002 – 9:00 am

The Spring meeting of CTA was called to order by President David O. Brown at 9:45 am. David welcomed everyone and asked, as first order of business, for the approval of the minutes as printed in the last newsletter. A motion was made, seconded, and the minutes approved. Announcements were then asked for; but there were none.

David began his last report at President by thanking Lower Colorado River Authority (LCRA), particularly Dan Prikryl and Andy Malof, for hosting this year's Spring meeting. He went on to report that he had been involved in some intense discussion concerning the THC's curation plan and had been involved as a consulting partner on the 41VT98 excavations.

At this year's (March 2002) SAA annual meeting in Denver, David attended the Council of Councils meeting and reported that the organization's strength as an organization is growing. SAA is working closely with each state's Council to encourage membership. Hope to develop links between the SAA web page and each Council's web page. One of the issues that the Council is examining is the ability to be considered as a consulting party on archeological issues within each state's jurisdiction. All the councils have an interest, but most have been denied such status. CTA is the only state council currently involved as a consulting party on an archeological issue in the State. The Council also discussed the issue of curation across the country. Everyone is strapped for space, note a lack of programs to educate and train archeologists and the public, and have little or no money for research with collections already housed. The problem in Colorado is so bad that the state SHPO quit issuing permits because the Colorado State Museum has no more space and is not accepting collections. This type of situation could ultimately shut down CRM as we know it today, and could even weaken the overall legislation for CRM.

He also noted that the Colorado Council of Professional Archeologists is an extremely strong council, though it is not closely tied to the Colorado Archeological Society as Texas is with the Texas Archeological Society. Colorado has a code of ethics; A Native American board member (as set aside by their bylaws); work with Native Americans to receive a scholarship to Crow Canyon each year; have a book sale based on donated books to raise money; publish their research sessions; conduct field trips along with their meetings; has initiated a peer review journal, and is developing a context for the state through grants. Some of these things are those that CTA might want to consider for the future.

On a personal note, David reported the loss of a friend and archeologist with the death of Smitty Schmidlin. He will be missed.

President-Elect Clell Bond had nothing to report at this time.

Secretary-Treasurer Missi Green reported that there has been a strong response to the renewal reminder for the Contractor's List. There are a total of 32 contractors currently paid up for 2002 and more are expected. The same can be said for the total Membership. Except for a very few bad e-mail addresses, everyone on the list in 2001 was contacted about renewal. Responses have been good with the number of paid members currently at 81. This number has increased this morning and will continue to increase over the next few weeks.

The position of Newsletter Editor has opened again. Steve Carpenter has taken another job and is not able to continue. Nominations for that position are open.

Committee Reports

Governmental Affairs: Chair Eric Schroeder was not in attendance but sent Eric Oksanen to report that House Resolution 1739 encourages Federal involvement through federal permitting for large development in urban sprawl and positive expansion. The Energy Security Act proposes to open up federal lands to petroleum (mainly) exploration and

production. It mandates inventory so that Federal authorities know which lands are available for energy development. Mark Denton interjected that a new agriculture bill was being developed that would provide farmers with a tax abatement for setting aside acreage with historic properties. It could apply to archeological sites as well.

Contractor's List: President David Brown apologized for the mishap earlier this year where several contractors were dropped from the list prematurely. Several measures have been taken to see that it doesn't happen again. There is a REAL need for a new Contractor's List committee. Also there is a change in policy in that the list will go straight onto the web page and the Internet rather than printing hard copies for distribution. Mark Denton pointed out that the list needs to be sent to the THC so that the staff can direct inquiries.

Public Education: Chair Dana Anthony reported that there were three nominations for this year's E. Mott Davis Public Outreach Award. Those nominated were: the Fort Hood Historical Research and Site Evaluations Project conducted by Prewitt & Associates, Inc., Fort Hood Cultural Resource Management Program, and William Pugsley; the Mission Nuestra Señora del Refugio Project conducted by Cindy Tennis of Center for Archaeological Research — UTSA and the Texas Department of Transportation; and the T.C. Osborn Tenant Farm Project conducted by Jose Zapata of Center for Archaeological Research — UTSA and Texas Department of Transportation. Announcement of this year's winner is scheduled later in the meeting.

David thanked the committee for the great job it had done. All three nominations were good nominations. This award is good for contractors, agencies, and clients in that they know that there is good archeology out there and education is so important.

Multicultural Relations: Chair Alston Thoms reported that the committee endeavors to work with more Native American groups and that the committee will continue to support legislation that is good to archeology. Alston also introduced the new Chair of the committee, Bob Skiles. Bob stated that more consultation is needed. There is a need to move away from the mindset that if there is no law requiring it, then no consultation is necessary. The cost of consultation is much less than the potential and actual consequences.

Membership: Chair Karl Kibler reported that the committee had been working on reviewing the student scholarship grant requests (of which there was two and the decision very difficult) and have awarded the first scholarship to Larkin Hood. Larkin is a Ph.D. candidate at University of Washington. Her dissertation research is focussed on the diet breadth and residential mobility patterns of prehistoric hunter-gatherers on the upper Texas coast. She is planning to use the funds to cover the costs of preparing petrographic slides to geologically source the sand inclusions in prehistoric ceramics from her research area. Congratulations Larkin and good luck in your research!

Karl ended his report with a plea for the membership to continue to contribute to the scholarship fund. David applauded the work done and acknowledged five years of hard work getting to this award. Karl replied that the committee's target is to have $10,000 in the scholarship fund and award the stipend from the interest only. We've got quite a way to go, so please contribute.

Accreditation and Review Council: Chair Pat Claybaugh reported that the committee met three times, once in December and twice in February, about the status of this committee due to THC's accreditation program. One of these meetings included President-Elect Clell Bond. Basically the committee is wrapping up their major goal of developing accreditation program standards and guidelines that the state can utilize in their program. It's been a long and hard process. The THC accreditation program policy is complete and will soon be submitted to the Register for comment. Copies can be gotten from THC. CTA continues to supply guidance to institutions that request information, however, CTA is no longer in the accreditation business. Texas is still leading the country in accreditation. THC assures that all the work conducted by this committee over the past few years will not be thrown out, but that aspects of what has been developed will be

utilized. CTA should still be a major player in seeing the completion of these guidelines through. Finally, Pat mentioned that some committee members' time had expired and that the committee wanted to reappoint those members, primarily as part of the redesigning committee.

The committee has talked about new missions, possibly a name change, and move toward a more curation-oriented mission. The new state curation policy has been in process for the last few years with nothing new in the works. The question of who owns the collections is still a concern. The Attorney General has an opinion, but it is difficult to interpret.

Survey Standards: Chair Marianne Marek reported that the discussion at the Fall meeting brought about a few changes. The revised version of the standards was published in the January newsletter and no comments have been received. Lenny Voellinger, a committee member, noted that consideration of TCPs was taken out of the guidelines document. He feels that it is appropriate to add something so that TCPs should be considered in the guidelines — possibly through the context developed for projects.

Anti-Looting: Chair Todd McMakin was not in attendance however, Dan McGregor reported that the committee was having a hard time getting everyone together. The committee is still discussing putting together a poster together to distribute to agencies, but that they need input and agreement on what needs to be on the poster. David noted that there is a good cross-section of agency representation on the committee, both state and federal, but that the committee needs to be more active, if possible.

A*d Hoc Guidelines: Chair* Karen Gardner reported that the committee has initiated its reviews and found that the guidelines as a whole are solid and it is more updating them that is required, including the artifact collection policy. More work is needed with the Web Page Committee for formatting the document. Timeline for something to present is the Fall meeting. David suggested that small revisions be made at a time, present them to the membership, and then proceed.

CTA Web Page: Dan Julien reported that Sue Linder-Linsley has been the most active committee member. The committee would like to change their name from the CTA Web Page Committee to Internet and Communications Committee. David suggested that the committee write themselves into the bylaws and there will be a vote on the name change at the Fall meeting. Dan continued the report stating that the list is being updated regularly and reminded the membership that the newsletter is available through the web page. The newsletters may soon be accessed by paid members only through a password. During the month of March there were over 2000 visitor hits to the web site — approximately 66 per day. The number one hit was to the home page, followed by the newsletter, the contractors list, and the ARC committee page. As a last request, the committee desperately needs help! Two volunteers quickly responded; Laura West and Mike Crow are the newest members of the committee.

History: Chair Doug Boyd reported that the committee has provided historic articles about CTA in the last couple of newsletters. It will continue to be an active committee throughout the 25th Anniversary year and is still soliciting ideas and articles.

Old Business

Five items of Old Business were discussed: the Election of Officers, the Contractor's List Committee, the Government Affairs Committee and Accreditation and Review Council rotations, the Survey Standards vote, and the E. Mott Davis Award. The Election of Officers was made extremely easy this time in that Missi Green agreed to keep the position of Secretary / Treasurer for another two-year term. The single replacement candidate for Newsletter Editor is Andy Malof. Mark Denton quickly moved to close the nominations, which were seconded and favorably voted on. He moved again to accept the votes by acclamation; it was seconded and passed. Congratulations to Andy and Missi!

The second item of Old business concerned the Contractor's List Committee and its need for members. Volunteers were asked for and two members bravely volunteered. Welcome Jorge

Garcia-Herreros and Meg Cruse. It was moved to accept these volunteers, seconded, and they were favorably voted into Committee.

The Governmental Affairs Committee and Accreditation and Review Council rotations were discussed as the third item of Old Business. As Pat Claybaugh mentioned earlier that the term had expired for a couple of ARC committee members and that the committee wanted to reappoint those members. Laura Nightengale and Carolyn Spock were reappointed after it was so moved, seconded, and voted upon. The rotation of members to the Governmental Affairs Committee was completed by volunteers Michelle Dippel and Lenny Voellinger after it was so moved, seconded, and voted. Congratulations to Laura, Carolyn, Michelle, and Lenny!

Survey Standards Committee Chair Marianne Marek announced that the standards were ready for a final vote since there were no comments on the last revisions. Margaret Howard suggested one last change concerning ground visibility — that ground visibility be defined at less than 30%. The actual change would read "shovel tests are excavated in settings that have a probability for buried cultural materials and whenever **ground visibility is less than 30%**, except on slopes greater than 20%." It was decided that change would be made and incorporated into the final standards.

The TCP comments presented by Lenny Voellinger during the committee report were countered by Jim Bruseth and Mark Denton with the questions, "What is the definition of a TCP" and "How does it fit into a survey standard?" TCPs are important but may be too complicated to fall under a specific standard. Susan Snow suggested that TCPs could be addressed when reviewing cultural landscapes. David Brown agreed that the TCP issue needs to be addressed and looked at more closely, but not for these survey standards at this time. He noted that consideration of TCPs and landscapes can be incorporated into the surveys with the standards as is, but a TCP becomes more of an issue when it becomes a significant site. He tasked Lenny to create a committee to look into the issue. Bob Skiles and Jim Bruseth agreed to help Lenny review this issue.

David then asked whether the THC would comply with the standards if passed. Bill Martin said yes, THC would comply. A motion was then made to vote to pass the new survey standards with the amendment suggested by Margaret Howard concerning ground visibility. It was seconded and passed.

Finally, the E. Mott Davis Public Outreach Award was announced. As mentioned earlier there were three wonderful nominations submitted, making the decision extremely difficult. A great job was done by all of the parties involved in the three nominated projects! The 2002 E. Mott Davis Public Outreach Award was awarded to the Fort Hood Historical Research and Site Evaluations Project conducted by Prewitt and Associates, Inc., Fort Hood Cultural Resource Management Program, and William Pugsley. Congratulations to the Fort Hood Project team!

New Business

THC Announcements: Jim Bruseth announced that the THC is looking for new grant applications to the Preservation Trust Fund. The applications are due in the fall. The rules have changed and there is now a 1-to-1 match and the 10% cap is gone. The THC would like to see more archeology applications. Mark Denton mentioned that there is a position open and that details could be found on TXARCH-L.

Other Announcements:

Steve Black announced that there are now 90 sites and 20 theme exhibits submitted for future projects on Texas Beyond History. He thanked CTA for its support and asked for continued support by the membership of the project.

Skipper Scott from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District announced that the Corps' regulatory program has rewritten its cultural resources policy. It is currently under Federal notice for comments, but that the comment period ends on May 7th.

Laura Nightengale announced that TARL would be shifting physical areas and that requests may not be answered quickly. She asked patience from everyone.

David Brown mentioned that CTA had received a request from the Plains Anthropological Society Native American Committee for help in funding Native Americans to participate at the Plains Conference. Should we consider a small amount to the Plains for this? Ruth Marie motioned that CTA donate $200 to help send a Texas tribe member to the Plains Conference. It was seconded. Before it was voted upon, Alston Thoms commented that it was a great idea, but proposed as a friendly amendment that the funds be put into a kitty to send a Native American to Texas associated groups, fostering a Native American student's education in archeology. We shouldn't perpetuate the myth that there are no Indians in Texas. Bob Skiles noted that CTA should retain our funds to put toward helping a Native American in Texas. Ruth Marie withdrew her motion, which was seconded. There is nothing to vote on at this time. David suggested that the Multicultural Committee review this topic.

A lengthy discussion on curation was presented. David Brown stated that there is a serious problem in Texas and that CTA has been trying to develop a program with THC that works, but more input is needed. The program is going under review in two weeks at the Abilene meeting. Darrel Creel said that we should consider that the costs for archeological curation could go up; minimally a 300% upward trend depending on how the regulation is completed. David suggested changes may be made in collections policies and partnerships between repository and agencies be developed. But CTA's position needs to be made known to the Commission in Abilene. Steve Black noted that an item by item inventory is too difficult. Jim Bruseth stated that we all know it is a problem and that the THC wants to find ways of providing for all collections we have; need to achieve better collections. If item by item collections are not feasible, then come up with better approaches. Create open dialogue to Commissioners and develop something good for everyone. David said we'd worked closely with the Commission to get agreement, but the document is too general now and standards are beyond what some repositories can meet. Steve Tomka also noted that the document now is vague and general, ultimately impractical, leaving it open at both ends of the spectrum. He suggested that CTA needs to help spell out the specifics. He ran a small experiment looking at cost increases on projects: 70% on small projects and 300% on large projects. The costs will eventually be put to the client and this could cause additional problems — like having their local legislatures vote to do away with CRM all together. David suggested that CTA ask the Commission to table the policy for one meeting and then offer specifics to the Commission. Nancy Kenmotsu presented TxDOT's concern about the proposed rules and noted that the cost implications are quite real – estimates one dollar for every artifact, twice. Costs are unreasonable and prohibitive to agencies and not in the best interest of understanding the history or prehistory of Texas. Only held-in-trust collections can be curated under these new regulations and it's not a good policy for held-in-trust collections. TxDOT objects to the current proposed rules.

Mark Denton handed out Chapter 29, the actual rules for curatorial policy, and stated that they would be discussed and voted on at the meeting in Abilene. After a specific date, jurisdiction will have to be certified by the THC through the process. There is nothing about how procedures will implement the process; that's not part of the rules. The procedural document has not been created and therefore will not be discussed or voted upon. There are criteria for certification in the document. He stated that there are many concerns by the THC staff and attorney that there are conflicts between the Collections Management Policy (CMP) document and the certification document. Mark noted that the current date for repositories to be certified to accept held-in-trust collections is December 2002 and that only Texas Tech and Corpus Christi Museum are currently accredited. Commissioner Johnson suggested that a new date of December 2004 be presented to the Chairman. Jim Bruseth noted that there is no staff to implement collections management. He notes that Steve Tomka's facts argue the issue more effectively since the Commissioners have no knowledge of what it takes or could do to the industry.

Doug Boyd commented that a strong statement from CTA to the Commissioners is needed and that our voice should be heard in Abilene. He recommended and motioned that CTA send a strong letter to the Commissioners urging them not to vote on the policy as it stands but table

the policy and rules. It was seconded and loudly accepted. Steve Black urged that the letter stipulate cost implications. Laura Nightengale noted that since TARL's rates have gone up, curation as a whole has declined. More often than not, what is curated are records only. This is a negative implication of what we'll know in the future about the past. Aina Dodge commented that the Commission has no idea what CRM does, that the perception is that all collections are from scholarly research. She urged as many people as possible to go to Abilene and be heard. The THC meeting is on the 18th of April.

Last minute presidential requests were made by David Brown who tasked the ARC Committee with having a decision on role changes and the direction of the committee for a Fall meeting vote. He also tasked the Multicultural Affairs Committee with presenting a plan for addressing the issue of monies for Native American participation at meetings, etc. and presenting it at the Fall meeting.

As time was running out, David Brown announced that Robert Ricklis would be presenting information on 41VT98 during the afternoon session and asked everyone to please attend. He thanked CTA for making his term as President meaningful. He then completed his term as President by officially passing the torch to Clell Bond and the meeting adjourned at 12:50.

Articles and Updates

This volume of the CTA Newsletter contains a number of interesting articles on various topics. One of the stated aims of the CTA is closer communication with the avocational community, especially the Texas Archeological Society. Margaret Howard, TAS President, discusses some of the strengths of the TAS and avocational archeologists, and encourages the professional community to utilize this valuable resource and also to become more involved with TAS activities. One way of doing this would be through support of the Rock Art Database Compilation Project. Elton Prewitt introduces Reeda Peel's vision of a long-term, team-driven effort to pull rock art data from scattered locations and make it easily available for researchers across the state. Steve Black argues for a 2-day Spring meeting during which serious research projects at the professional and avocational level could be presented. This might be a good way to raise awareness of the organization and encourage increased student membership.

On a somewhat different topic, Stephen Austin, Daniel McGregor, and Skipper Scott address the protection of cultural resources in the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District, in particular Caddo properties of East Texas. This is a particularly challenging area based on its popularity with looters and a long history of archaeological investigations at varying levels of intensity, as well the concerns of the Caddo Nation in how these sites are managed and protected. Cooperation between parties should be of benefit to both, as well as the resources that are of concern.

James Karbula introduces the American Cultural Resources Association (ACRA), another organization that provides support to the professional community. ACRA provides an opportunity to network with both large and small frims from across the country, as well as become directly involved with the development of national policy.

Bill Martin formally announces the enforcement of the revised survey standards as proposed by the CTA. All archeologists working under the auspices of the Antiquities Code of Texas need to be aware of the changes to the survey standards.

As stated earlier, a concise list of CTA committees, as presently understood to exist, is presented. Please check these for accuracy so that CTA members will have an accurate representation of what the organization is involved in.

Finally, after the Spring, 2002 meeting, following a meal of epic proportions liberally lubricated with liquid libations, a celebration honoring past-presidents was held. A few images of the events are published below, along with a reprint of the list of presidents. These persons have given of their time to support Texas archeology, and their recognition was well-deserved.

It is hoped these articles serve to make this newsletter both informative and interesting. The next newsletter will be out in a few months. Any article of potential interest to CTA members will be considered. Send them to Newsletter Editor Andy Malof at amalof@lcra.org.

CTA and TAS: A Great Partnership

Margaret Howard

President, Texas Archeological Society

Many professional archeologists in Texas first encounter CTA and the Texas Archeological Society (TAS) when they begin doing fieldwork. While CTA is an excellent venue for employment networking and professional standards, the main information source on Texas archeology is TAS. The best publication on archeology in the state is the *Bulletin of the Texas Archeological Society*, now entering its 73rd volume. Professionals join TAS to receive the Bulletin and to participate in the Annual Meeting, the major forum on Texas archeology. But CTA members who think that TAS consists primarily of a bulletin and a conference are missing out on the many ways that TAS can benefit them, both in the workplace and as ethical practicing archeologists.

Texas is one of very few states with an archeological society that includes both professional and avocational archeologists. These two groups have many shared interests, and can bring their diverse talents together to work toward common goals. In Texas, TAS is actually the largest archeological society, with some 1400 members in comparison to CTA's 200 members. The greater 'person-power' of TAS and the active participation of numerous volunteers allows TAS to sponsor many projects and programs that also benefit CTA members.

Avocational archeologists are essential to the study of Texas archeology. The size and diversity of our state makes it a challenge for the relatively small number of professional archeologists to obtain expertise in all regions and familiarity with all site types. Yet it is possible to miss archeological sites or fail to realize their importance if one does not know where or how to find them. TAS contains the largest group of responsible avocational archeologists in Texas. In many parts of our state, avocational TAS members are intimately familiar with the local archeology, and ready and willing to share that information with professionals. Some avocationals are recognized by the Texas Historical Commission as Archeological Stewards. The blend of local avocational knowledge with professional technical expertise is a winning combination, maximizing the discovery and interpretation of our ever-dwindling archeological sites.

Another major area of CTA and TAS cooperation is the TAS Field School, the primary means in our state for teaching sound archeological methods to the general public. To augment the pool of experienced avocational crew chiefs and area supervisors, professional and student archeologists are needed to assist in training TAS members. Working side by side, professionals and avocationals help Field School participants to gain skills through hands-on demonstration of the practice of archeology. Possibly the most important aspect of Field School for professionals is access to the large volunteer labor force, which makes site investigations possible on a scale that could not have been achieved otherwise.

CTA members may hesitate to participate in TAS Field School because they are accustomed to being paid for their archeological skills rather than paying. The registration fee is modest, however, and goes to rental of porta potties, trash pickup, field supplies, and other direct costs. Field School also offers these benefits: fieldwork without write-up (the professional PI is saddled with that responsibility), crew members who are attentive to instruction and eager to learn, short field days (7:00 AM to 1:00 PM), and a chance to work on the landmark archeological sites of Texas.

Plans are currently underway to expand the CTA/TAS partnership in the coming year. Under the direction of incoming president Clell Bond, CTA will have a larger role at the upcoming TAS Annual Meeting in Laredo. In addition to the fall CTA meeting on Friday afternoon, CTA is planning to reestablish the Friday night social, to be held after the public forum. This event offers a great opportunity to visit with old friends and establish new contacts with professional and avocational archeologists

from across the state, aided by a little liquid refreshment. On Saturday, CTA will sponsor a symposium of papers on the archeology along the Rio Grande near Laredo.

Two new proposals also are in the planning stages. Recent events in Texas highlight the challenge that archeologists and Native Americans have in understanding each other's viewpoints. At the April 2002 CTA meeting, professional archeologists made a commitment to improving relations with Native American groups. TAS took this idea and developed the concept of a Native American scholarship program for Field School. While costs would be modest, the face-to-face interactions of such a program could build a bridge between these groups. TAS hopes to initiate this program at the 2003 field school at Presidio San Sabá in Menard, and will be seeking financial support from CTA and other sources.

The Texas Archeology Academy is another TAS initiative that is in the planning stages, springing from the 2002 Strategic Plan. The Academy will equip TAS members with site recording, analysis, and report writing skills so they can save sites and data. Under the direction of Harry Shafer, 2-day workshops will be held in the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex, Houston, and San Antonio in 2003. CTA members can support the Academy by providing local expertise at the workshops, and assisting with field survey training during follow-up weekends sponsored by regional archeological societies. TAS will offer small stipends for Principal Investigators to oversee the field weekends and compile brief reports for *Texas Archeology* newsletter. The ultimate goal of the Academy is to improve the number and quality of site records from private lands and other areas rarely accessed by professionals.

In sum, TAS is much more than a Bulletin and a meeting. CTA members can join with TAS members to teach, learn, reach out, and share the benefits of what archeologists do for a living. As the CTA/TAS partnership continues to grow and develop, more information on Texas archeology will be saved. To join the Texas Archeological Society and be a part of this initiative, log on to the TAS website at www.txarch.org, contact the TAS office in San Antonio at (210) 458-4393, or email TAS at txarch@onr.com.

TEXAS ROCK ART DATABASE COMPILATION PROJECT

Elton R. Prewitt, RPA

Reeda Peel has developed an ambitious multi-year plan to create a comprehensive database of Texas' rock art. Compilation of the data and creation of an element-by-element GIS searchable database will be accomplished by volunteers over a period of five to eight years. Administration of the project will be through the School of Expressive Culture, a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization. I have agreed to serve as Principal Investigator to help Reeda guide and manage the project.

This undertaking will require the efforts of numerous individuals, and the cooperation of many research agencies. The Texas Archeological Research Laboratory and the Texas Historical Commission have agreed to allow use of their data, as has the Center for Archaeological Research, the Center for Big Bend Studies, and The Rock Art Foundation. The support of the Council of Texas Archeologists and the Texas Archeological Society will be important to the envisioned program, and we are asking the board of directors of both organizations for their unfunded endorsements.

TEXAS ROCK ART DATABASE

Reeda Peel

INTRODUCTION

Texas is a large state containing 172 million dry acres divided into 254 counties. It is a land of wildly divergent geography with an equally divergent cultural history. Ancient peoples left the material remains of their existence scattered across the land. The remains consist of campsites, home sites, stone tools, burned rock features, earth mounds and sometimes fragile goods such as baskets or sandals. They also left behind, on the rock walls of shelters and bluffs, pictographs (paintings) and petroglyphs (engravings/etchings) that give us a glimpse into their rich cultural and spiritual identities. The rock art ranges up to 5,000 years of age, but time, nature's forces, air pollution, vandals and development are slowly destroying this resource. At some point in the future, the information recorded by scholars and researchers is all that will be left of most of the rock art sites. Some have already been destroyed during our lifetime.

An estimated 60,000 archeological sites have been recorded in Texas, but no one knows how many of the sites contain rock art. When an archeological site is found, the information, including information about any rock art it may contain, is recorded and sent to the Texas Historical Commission (THC). It is given a permanent identification number (trinomial) and sent to a permanent repository. There, the site records and accompanying photographs, notes and other information are stored in paper folders. The Texas Archeological Research Laboratory (TARL) in Austin is the repository for information on most of the sites, but additional information is scattered throughout the state. THC has a restricted archeological sites database, but the rock art site information is buried within the general archeological information. Access to information for rock art research is difficult and extremely time consuming, necessitating long-distance travel, many hours of searching through paper files, arranging to have photographs copied and various other time consuming tasks. As a consequence, with the exception of the Lower Pecos Region, little rock art research has been done in Texas.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Texas Rock Art Database Project is a planned three-phase team effort to establish a researchable rock art database for the use of rock art researchers and other accredited users. Since more than 90% of Texas land is privately owned, and therefore much of Texas rock art is on private land, the information gathered for this database must remain in repositories with restricted access. THC has agreed to furnish an extension to the current Restricted Sites Atlas to house the Texas Rock Art Database and will control access to it. TARL is developing a database for the archeological information contained in their archives and will also include the Texas Rock Art Data Base as a part of their information network, and, likewise, will control all access to that database, including the Texas Rock Art Database.

Phase I will include the development of a database form that the team will ask THC to designate as the statewide required form to record rock art sites. It will also include the development of a researchable database prototype and the retrieval of all rock art site trinomials and general site information from current archives. Phase II will include education on site recording procedures, the gathering of additional site information from all sources, entry of data into the new Texas Rock Art Database and placement of the database in THC's and TARL's restricted sites. Phase III will include the gathering of additional information and photographs to fill gaps in the records, by whatever means available, including site visitation and re-recording of sites if necessary. The addition of large photographic files to the database will necessitate a large amount of memory and may require the purchase of additional web-server space.

This project is a huge undertaking because of the volume of information that has been collected during the past 70-plus years that must now be retrieved and transcribed into the database. It is difficult to estimate the number of years needed to complete the three phases that make up the project. It is possible that phases may be worked simultaneously to reduce the number of years necessary for completion. Emphasis will be on a team effort to accomplish each goal. Lead individuals are Elton Prewitt, Project Manager; Dr. Carolyn Boyd, Research, Education and Funding; Reeda Peel, Project Chairman, Information Retrieval and Data Entry; Dr. Marietta Tretter, Database Designer; and Jonelle Miller, Data Retrieval and Data Entry Assistant. The project will be a team effort under the 501(c)(3) non-profit School of Expressive Culture, headed by Dr. Carolyn Boyd. Supporting partner organizations are the Texas Historical Commission, the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory, the School of Expressive Culture, the Center for Big Bend Studies, the Center for Archaeological Research, and the Rock Art Foundation. Supporting partner organizations will not be required to furnish funding for the project, but will be asked to assist in volunteer activities according to their abilities, interests and constraints. Funding will be furnished through donations, grants and in-kind contributions.

Two-Day Spring 2003 CTA Meeting?

Steve Black

Not long after the Spring 2002 meeting, I proposed (suggested, really) to President Bond that the Spring 2003 CTA Meeting in Austin be expanded to a two-day affair including the traditional Friday Business Meeting and Symposium, Friday evening Social, and adding a Saturday Research Conference where CTA members presented the results of recent research. This would be aimed at CTA and serious avocational archeologists, rather that at the general public. This, I think, would help give greater purpose to the CTA spring meeting, increase attendance, and encourage the exchange of ideas among active researchers in the CRM industry and those TAS members who are also doing serious research.

I have noticed that at each TAS meeting in recent years there are fewer and fewer professional presentations by CTA members (or non-members, for that matter). This could be because: (1) CTA members don't feel like participating in TAS; (2) fewer CTA members are doing interesting research that they feel like reporting; or (3) most CTA members are so caught up in the business of CRM that they just don't have time/energy to share the results of their research in public forums. Whatever the cause, it signals a declining level of professional interaction and exchange of ideas.

In making this suggestion, I am trying to further the original purpose of the CTA — to promote networking and cooperation among professional archeologists in Texas, and thus improve the quality of research. I think professional meetings that focus on research are essential forums. I note that the equivalent organizations in Arizona, New Mexico, and other states have adopted a similar two-day forum, apparently to good effect. I also think that adding a one-day research conference would be more effective in drawing students to the CTA meeting than all other efforts combined.

We cannot squeeze more into one day. The CTA Business Meeting is necessary if not scintillating. The afternoon symposium is good but, of necessity, focused and too short to accommodate a diverse range of professional papers. Therefore, I suggest we add another day, Saturday, say from 9 AM to 3 PM, just for professional presentations. This would also encourage members to stay for the Friday evening social and would promote professional solidarity. We might even learn something worth knowing.

I am not advocating any lessening of participation in the TAS. The two organizations, CTA and TAS, serve different audiences and different purposes, albeit partially and

— *(continued on page 28)*

Resource Protection and Management in the Fort Worth District

Stephen P. Austin
Daniel E. McGregor
Skipper Scott

Resource protection on public lands continues to be a difficult task and is often made more difficult by having to consider multiple points of views and agendas with regard to how those resources should be utilized, treated, and respected. A long-standing management issue of to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District (CESWF), is the topic of archeological site vandalism and looting on public lands managed by the District, especially in the East Texas area.

There are no easy solutions to the problems associated with the looting of archeological properties, and no land-managing agency can make a claim that they have achieved an absolute range of protection. However, our offices have taken a number of management initiatives that are notable. Some were started in the early 1980s and some are new. Since space is limited here, we would like to discuss a limited few of these management activities and an equally limited few of the difficulties we face in achieving appropriate levels of protection.

Foremost is a program of public awareness. We have frequently utilized the media and public events as a vehicle to insert a resource preservation message into the park-going public's mindset. This message also contains specific references to the legal penalties for disregarding applicable laws and regulations. In the East Texas region, this is reinforced through signage placed at access and use areas of the parks, brochures distributed to the public, posters prominently displayed, a portable display placed at project offices and archeological fairs, and the highly visible presence of a Cultural Resources Manager / Ranger in a marked vehicle. Frequent visitor contacts are made and multiple personnel visit sensitive areas on a regular and irregular basis. In addition, we have actively been recruiting avocational archeologists and other interested personnel as volunteers to assist with shoreline and archeological site monitoring tasks.

As part of our larger, regulation enforcement program, we have evolved specific capabilities to assist with anti-looting activities. Electronic surveillance equipment is placed at specific locations and is frequently moved to other areas according to need. Boats and all terrain vehicles are utilized for patrols and site monitoring activities.

While patrols and monitoring activities have increased, it must be understood that the actual ability to encounter individuals committing a prohibited or illegal activity is fraught with difficulties, especially for those individuals committing crimes meeting the requirements of an *Archaeological Resources Protection Act* (ARPA) conviction. A number of individuals have been charged with destruction of Government property through the use of our Corps authority in the *Rules and Regulations Governing Public Use of Water Resources Development Projects* (36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 327). Persons can be cited under 36 CFR 327.14(a) [*Destruction, injury, defacement, removal or any alteration of public property including, but not limited to, developed facilities, natural formations, mineral deposits, historical and archeological features, and vegetative growth, is prohibited except when it is in accordance with written permission of the District Engineer*] and fined various amounts. These types of citations are being employed as a deterrent even for the casual surface collector. This District was on the forefront of utilizing its 36 CFR 327.14(a) authority. In 1984, we contributed to a National Park Service (NPS) review of ARPA legislation, so that the NPS could demonstrate what was possible utilizing the Title 36 authority, instead of trying to build an ARPA case on a weak apprehension. A review of available documents at the Fort Worth

District indicate that, since 1984, Corps personnel have cited 25 individuals in 13 separate incidents of archeological vandalism at our East Texas lakes (Lake O' the Pines, Sam Rayburn Lake, and Wright Patman Lake). Three of these individuals were convicted under ARPA, receiving probated sentences ranging from 1 year to 18 months and fines ranging from $540.00 to $850.00. Another 17 individuals were fined between $100.00 and $750.00 each under the Corps regulations governing the destruction or removal of public property. Charges against the remaining five individuals eventually were dropped.

It should be noted that Corps personnel do not have arrest authority, and can only cite violators under the Corps regulations governing the destruction or removal of public property.

For ARPA criminal prosecutions, the jurisdiction falls to the Federal courts. One archeological site at Lake O' Pines identified as a Caddo cemetery was the subject of surveillance in 1984 and 1985 in an attempt to catch individuals working there. These individuals were subsequently caught and charged, but charges were dropped by the U.S. Magistrate. For a successful ARPA prosecution several elements must be present, the archeological resource, identification of damages to the resource, the identification of the individual or individuals responsible, the absence of a permit, physical evidence linking the individual or individuals to the damage, and an accounting of the damages to the resource (a site damage assessment). It is the U.S. Attorney's Office that prosecutes the cases, and the U.S. Magistrates who sentence the violators. The Corps has no control over the lengths of the sentences or the amounts of the fines.

No program of cultural resources management is unblemished or without some controversy.

July 1991 excavations at Cooper Lake removing Caddo burials. From left to right: Ross C. Fields (Prewitt and Associates); Donovan Brown (Caddo Nation); CESWF Operations Division Cultural Resource Manager, Daniel E. McGregor; unidentified archeologist in background; Eloise F. Gadus (Prewitt and Associates); and Leonard Williams (former Caddo Nation Chairman). [Photograph courtesy of Prewitt and Associates, Austin, Texas.]

The point of an issue of controversy is to learn where the breakdown has occurred and try to resolve concerns to meet everyone's needs and expectations in the most efficient manner possible. Our ongoing consultations with the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma are a case in point. Our first documented notification to the Caddo Nation was in March of 1985. Since that time, there have been numerous consultations on looting issues and proposed solutions, removal of endangered burials, and other issues such as shoreline erosion monitoring. With almost 1200 miles of shoreline on just the East Texas lakes alone, this is a formidable task. We have also been consulting with the Caddo Nation on the effects of this erosion and are attempting to define practical approaches to preserving archeological properties that are in danger of being impacted by such erosion.

The issue of artifact collecting, pothunting, and looting has been a difficult consultation because of the historical depth of the activity in the East Texas region. Collecting and pothunting activities were a family activity throughout the 1920s, 30s, 40s, and 50s in this region. Both Robert Stephenson's River Basin Surveys (RBS) of 1949 and 1950, and the University of Texas (UT) excavations from 1957 to 1960 associated with the Corps construction of Lake O' the Pines and Wright Patman Lake, note the amount of previous looters activities in these areas. It was reported that UT was able to purchase a number of Caddo pots and other artifacts from roadside stands. Letters on file at the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory (TARL) indicate a close relationship with the UT researchers and individuals well known for their collecting and pothunting skills. Some letters reference the recovery of additional burials and pots after the UT investigators had completed their effort and abandoned the site.

From left: Caddo Nation Historic Preservation Officer Robert Cast, Texas Parks and Wildlife Officer E.L. Lyle, and CESWF Ranger Eric Collins inspect an eroded site in October 2001.

Evidence of the earlier artifact collecting and pothunting activities as well as the excavations carried out by the RBS and UT investigations are still present. In some areas trenches 1500 feet long are still visible as are the large block, small unit, and shovel test, excavations. One site extensively trenched and excavated by UT in 1958, identified as the Dalton Mound (41UR11), removing approximately 70 percent of the mound, was recently the subject of a concern over a potential inadvertent impact. In resolving the contemporary issue, it was demonstrated that the remaining portion of the site was actually several hundred feet away and not impacted by the contemporary activity. The trenches are still present. While contemporary looting has occurred in some other areas of Lake O' the Pines and Wright Patman Lake, it is difficult to separate what is recent, unless it is a freshly dug pit, with that which has occurred in the historic past, or if it is related to the RBS or UT excavations.

The Caddo Nation has expressed a concern about the open excavations and apparent collector/pothunter and looter's holes. The Caddo Nation has expressed a desire to backfill these locations, especially areas where Caddoan cemeteries are located. We agree that such an activity would be beneficial for all parties as it would restore some of the cemetery areas back to a level landform and it would provide us a basis from which we could monitor new looting activities more closely. Additionally, it would remove the massive open excavations left by UT and lessen the attractiveness of these locations to contemporary looters. One location was backfilled in 2000 and we are currently consulting with the Caddo Nation as we prepare to fill additional locations. Of concern to the Caddo Nation is a need to conduct an ARPA damage assessment prior to backfilling any of these locations. We are attempting to clarify with the Caddo Nation the application of an ARPA cost assessment on activities that occurred prior to the enactment of the

CESWF Piney Woods / Sam Rayburn Projects Cultural Resource Manager, Stephen P. Austin, standing in a University of Texas open excavation trench from 1959.

legislation (1979), where damage is related to the historic collecting and pothunting of the 1920s, 30s, 40s, and 50s, and where the excavations are the result of the RBS and UT excavations, and where no evidence exists from which to criminally prosecute the person or persons responsible.

This District, including the operating projects of East Texas such as the Lake O' The Pines, continues to made significant efforts to improve management of our cultural resources, as well as enhance our cooperative relationship with the Caddo Nation. We are actively ensuring that all coordination, consultation, and compliance requirements are met. Comments are actively sought on every action at the operating projects from all consulting parties. We have funded travel for Caddo Nation representatives to attend meetings to discuss issues. We have acknowledged the Caddo Nation's identification of all of the archeological sites located on the operating projects as being of sacred significance to the Caddo Nation, and have guaranteed access to any of these locations upon their request. We have constructed a reburial area according to design specifications prepared by the Caddo Nation and are maintaining the reburial area on one of our operating projects. The project offices have significantly increased their awareness of management responsibilities with information, guidance documents, and cultural resources briefings on topics of concern. We also recently negotiated a cultural resources inventory contract for the East Texas CESWF operating projects that includes a line item for a Native American research associate to assist with identification of areas of sacred significance, as well as to provide their assessment of *National Register of Historic Places* eligibility.

As noted at the beginning of this piece, we are making no claims that every issue has an easy solution. We are actively engaging all points of view and attempting to pursue solutions that are equitable and appropriate. The problems associated with cultural resources management

Caddoan pottery voluntarily returned to CESWF in the 1980s by a former pothunter. Items are now at TARL awaiting repatriation to the Caddo Nation per the requirements of the *Native American Graves and Repatriation Act of 1990*.

are complex and there are no magic formulas for effective resolution. We believe a cooperative effort, fueled by a shared concern for the resources, as well as a respect for all parties opinions and limitations, will go further to resolve issues than will charges of mismanagement or ignoring the concerns of our partners.

— *(continued from page 23)*

importantly overlapping. Both organizations are needed. Better cooperation is laudable. But I still think there is need for committed and experienced researchers, particularly those in the CRM industry, to discuss ideas more often and more effectively.

But it isn't my presidency, praises be to the Earth (Oven) Mother! It is up to President Bond and the CTA membership to debate the merits of this idea and make a decision. In my opinion, the usual excuses — we are too busy, it's too much trouble, etc. — are lame. If we really are a professional community of archeologists interested in research, we ought to be seeking greater interaction and more effective communication of real ideas and real results. Otherwise we are truly in the intellectual death spiral predicted (and pronounced) by CRM's critics. Say it ain't so, Clell, say it ain't so!

The Benefits of Membership in the American Cultural Resources Association (ACRA)

What is ACRA? ACRA is a professional trade organization of CRM firms formed to promote and support the business and professional needs of the cultural resources industry, especially with regard to training, education, public policy and public awareness. Why should CTA contracting firms join the American Cultural Resources Association (ACRA)? I can only speak from personal experience. My firm (Hicks & Company) is a regular member of the CTA contractors list and a corporate member of ACRA for five years. I am a recently elected ACRA Board member. There are three categories of corporate membership, small, medium and large, depending upon on the size of the firm. As a Board member, I represent the small firms category. From my experience as a small contracting outfit with aspirations to do high quality work and be successful, there seem to be four unifying themes that summarize the best benefits for new members, especially for small and medium sized firms. These are: 1) annual conferences and educational workshops; 2) mentoring from the largest most successful CRM firms in the nation; 3) policy making at the national level and 4) updates on national CRM trends.

One of the primary benefits are the annual conferences. I have attended several throughout our corporate tenure. The educational workshops and seminars offered at these events has benefited the growth of my small CRM outfit a great deal. There are numerous important educational topics covered in the discussions and workshops. The most useful to me detail everyday issues faced in client contracting, budgeting and labor relations. In these business sessions, typical and atypical problems faced daily by CRM contractors are openly discussed and real world solutions are offered. Workshops that address recent changes to the regulatory framework are particularly useful (Section 106). Some workshops cover specialty scientific methods

(for example, photogrammetry, GPS spatial technology). Others are multidisciplinary in nature. After all, as CRM practitioners and business managers, we know that CRM is much more than just archeology. ACRA includes numerous firms and offers workshops that specialize in architectural history, history and other disciplines. Most importantly, ACRA conferences are very helpful in terms of developing good business practices. Workshop discussions oftentimes focus on how to maintain the highest quality standards of work and performance. ACRA provides a forum where the best business management practices can be linked to high quality cultural resource management.

Annual conferences generally draw representatives from 60-70 of the top industry leaders in the nation. Many of these firms operate within multiple states and interact with many different SHPO's and state regulators on a daily basis. These firms offer a wealth of broad based experience and readily share this expertise. I find that the larger firms are genuinely willing to provide advice and useful input to smaller firms. Larger firms can be particularly useful in "problem-solving" regarding clients, contracts and regulatory issues, having dealt with a more diversified and complex client and regulatory base. Such mentoring benefits all parties and can occur through discussion, workshops or even subconsulting arrangements. For many of us in the CTA, this represents a potential resource to draw upon for both current and perhaps future issues, especially in dealing with Federal agencies and clients who operate across broad geographic areas. For many of us in the CTA (not all), this may be experience hard to come by. Given the attendees to annual conferences, there is also a very important networking aspect. Networking can lead to teaming arrangements and advertising benefits, at the national level.

With ACRA, you and I have the opportunity to participate in policy making at the national level. ACRA plays a leading role in the development of national CRM policy. ACRA effectively monitors and occasionally lobbies on Capitol Hill regarding important CRM legislation. ACRA has recently been heavily involved in the development of national standardized cell tower legislation. One of the goals of the organization is to insure that the laws and regulations that provide the basis for our industry remain intact and reasonable. In fact, ACRA has emerged as the single, national representative for CRM industry issues with federal agencies and private industry clients. As such, ACRA stays abreast of the latest developments and trends in state and federal legislation. I have found that ACRA actions at the national level often filter down to impact the local level as well. The annual meetings, newsletters, and website provide knowledge of nationwide trends in CRM and how these may impact your business locally.

ACRA exposes and integrates the compliance archeology that you and I conduct on regular basis into a national perspective. Think about the business and regulatory issues that CTA members face everyday, clients, contracts, budgets, Section 106, Federal projects, State projects, cell towers, pipelines, federal land, private land, staffing, employees and labor, to name just a few. Where does one initially get the business and regulatory education and/or experience to deal with multiple and complex compliance projects? One answer is ACRA. Numerous CRM practitioners across the nation face the same issues that CTA contractors deal with on a daily basis. These ACRA firms bring their experience and expertise to the table for the benefit of the membership. Annual conferences, newsletters and the ACRA web page bring professional practitioners from across the country together to learn, share and profit from collaboration, education and networking.

For further information about possible membership please see the ACRA web page at www.acra-crm.org or James Karbula jkarbula@hicksenv.com.

Revised Survey Standards Now In Effect

Bill Martin

The *Archeological Survey Standards for Texas* were revised following more than a year of discussions between the Texas Historical Commission (THC) and the Council of Texas Archeologists (CTA). At the CTA Spring Meeting in April, members voted to endorse the proposed changes to the survey standards, and THC Archeology Division Director, Jim Bruseth agreed to implement the changes.

There has been an ongoing debate among Texas archeologists for many years over the idea of standardizing survey procedures. The debate centered not on the need for standards, but on the level of detail that should be included in the standards and how they should be applied across the vastly differing geographical and cultural regions comprising the state. In 1995, the THC prepared a 24-page draft of survey standards for review by the CTA. This document tried to be all-encompassing, covering everything from use of predictive modeling to appropriate field methods, laboratory methods, and report preparation. A section on obtaining variances from the standards by consulting with the THC staff was also included. Overall, this draft was seen as unnecessarily complicated and overbearing. The CTA responded by forming a committee to develop survey standards that members would support and could submit to the THC for implementation.

A year later, after many discussions and a CTA workshop devoted to developing survey standards, the CTA produced a draft document that was only slightly shorter than the THC version. It was based on the concept that different standards should be applied to different geographical regions of the state. Texas was divided into eight regions, and professionals working in those regions met at the CTA workshop to develop standards for pedestrian transect intervals and appropriate number of shovel tests based on their experience. While this approach made a lot of sense, enforcing it would have been difficult. For example, to ensure that these survey standards were being followed properly for a pipeline survey that crossed the entire state, THC reviewers would have had to make sure that 1 shovel test per 2 acres was dug in one region and 1 shovel test per 3 acres in the adjacent region, with a minimum of two shovel tests dug on a site to determine its boundaries in one region and a minimum of six shovel tests dug for the same purpose in the adjacent region. Considering the fact that no two regions had exactly the same standards, this would have been unacceptably time consuming. Moreover, because regions were drawn along physiographic boundaries rather than county lines, the reviewer would have had to judge which region a given site was in if it fell near the dividing line and then determine whether or not the proper standards had been followed. These proposed standards were never implemented.

Undaunted, the CTA and THC continued to discuss survey standards, but switched from a strategy that tried to produce all-encompassing standards to one that would define minimally acceptable parameters. Instead of creating standards that tried to enforce the highest level of fieldwork appropriate for a given region, the new approach was to specify what must be accomplished *at a minimum* for the work to be accepted by the THC. Finally, in 1998, after several meetings between THC reviewers and a few CTA members appointed by the president of the organization, a one-page set of minimal survey standards was produced. It was implemented immediately by the THC and has been available on the THC website (www.thc.state.tx.us) under "State and Federal Regulations."

The revised survey standards were placed on the web site in June and are now enforced by THC reviewers. The new standards provide a revised sliding scale for the number of shovel tests excavated depending on the acreage surveyed, with three shovel tests per acre on projects up to two acres, two shovel tests per

acre on projects of 3-10 acres, one shovel test per two acres on projects of 11-100 acres, and one shovel test per three acres on projects of 101-200 acres. The rationale for this approach is that if the THC recommends a survey for an area smaller than 10 acres, it is quite likely that something is out there in that small area, whereas on larger tracts, there are often areas that are too disturbed or include landforms that are unlikely to contain intact archeological deposits and do not need to be shovel tested. The major problem with an acreage-based approach to setting shovel-testing specifications was that it did not work well for linear projects with narrow rights-of-way such as pipelines or transmission lines. Under the original 1998 shovel-testing standards, as few as four shovel tests per mile could be dug on a linear project with a 30 m wide right-of-way. The revised standards call for a minimum of 16 shovel tests per mile on linear projects. Another significant change is that shovel tests must now be dug in any setting that could contain buried deposits, regardless of ground-surface visibility. The old standards stated that it was not necessary to shovel test areas that had more than 30 percent ground visibility. The footnote attached to the revised standards notes that shovel tests must be dug whenever ground-surface visibility is less than 30 percent, and also in settings where buried cultural materials could be present regardless of surface visibility.

No single set of standards will ever satisfy everyone, but we believe that the current standards are workable. Be sure to read them and note all of the changes from the older version.

LIST OF COMMITTEES

The following committees are not necessarily active, but are listed at some location within the web site or within recent newsletters. Information on the present officers is also provided.

COMMITTEES

Auditing
Alan Skinner
arcdigs@aol.com

Contractor's List
Jorge Garcia-Herreros
jherreros@bheen
Meg Cruse
mecruse@pbsj.com
cta-contractor@c-tx-arch.org

Governmental Affairs
Eric Schroeder
paleoman@academicplanet.com

Multicultural Relations
Bob Skiles
b.skiles@ix.netcom.com
Alston Thoms
a-thoms@tamu.edu

Nominating
Ron Ralph
ronralph@texas.net

Public Education
Dana Anthony
dananthony@swtexas.net

Accreditation and Review
Pat Clabaugh
pclabaugh@tamu.edu

Membership
Karl Kibler
kkibler@paiarch.com

Web Page / Internet Communications
Sue Linder-Linsley
slinder@mail.smu.edu

Survey Standards
Marianne Marek
marianne@nstci.com

AntiLooting
Todd MacMakin
Todd.McMakin@tpwd.state.tx.us

TLCA NA

Ad hoc
Karen Gardner
kgardner@paiarch.com

History
Doug Boyd
dboyd@paiarch.com

Ethics and Standards (NA)

Laboratory and Curation Alliance NA

OFFICERS

President Clell Bond
clbond@pbsj.com

Past-President
David Brown
david.brown@mail.utexas.edu

President-elect
NA

Secretary-Treasurer

Missi Green
mgreen@geo-marine.com
cta-members@c-tx-arch.org
Newsletter Editor
Andy Malof

amalof@lcra.org

The 25th Party

David O. Brown

The finale of this past spring's CTA meeting was a gathering to celebrate 25 years of CTA history. Held at the Lions Golf Course Clubhouse, the get-together featured food and refreshments provided by the CTA as it has in the past few years. Bumped from our previous site at Camp Mabry because of heightened security, the clubhouse provided an excellent alternative setting for the event that was organized by the "permanent cooking committee" composed of Mark Denton, Dana Anthony, Aina Dodge, and with help this year from Amy Ringstaff. While most of the rest of the CTA members were listening to Bob Ricklis' presentation on 41VT98, Mark and his crew were surfing the local Sam's for food bargains, shuttling kegs, and setting up the tables and chairs for the party. The committee has boasted that it is the most productive of all CTA committees, but unfortunately, except for the photo of Mark cooking, all of the tangible evidence of this productivity seems to have

been consumed at the party. Nonetheless, without this hard-working group, who have now provided the culinary expertise (and often the entertainment) for the past three years, we would

be back at the bars that the CTA used to devolve into after meetings. Lets hope they love their jobs enough to stay at it for a while.

Skipper Scott (left) and Dan Prikryl discuss matters of importance at the Social following the Spring CTA meeting.

Dana Anthony and Mark Denton prepare the main course for the CTA Social.

As part of the festivities, we invited ex-officers of the CTA, especially ex-presidents, to an informal roast. In addition to outgoing president David Brown and new president Clell Bond, past presidents in attendance included Doug Boyd, Alston Thoms, Steve Black, Margaret Howard, Dan McGregor, Duane Peter, Dan Prikryl, Skipper Scott, Jerry Henderson, Elton Prewitt, and Bruce Dickson, the first president of the organization (the first two years the group did not have a president). In an impromptu round of "memorials," each took their turn to alternately compliment and skewer the organization that they had guided. And before everyone had to scatter back to their respective territories, we managed to get at least one photo of the assembled presidents. While not the largest CTA gathering in recent years,

the party was still well attended, bringing together some current regulars with folks that had not been seen at meetings in several years. All in all, it was a good time, and that, if nothing else, may augur well for the CTA's second quarter century.

Past (and present) presidents in attendance, from left to right: Elton Prewitt, Duane Peter, Bruce Dickson, Dan Prikryl, Margaret Howard, Skipper Scott, Dan McGregor, Doug Boyd, Jerry

Henderson, David O. Brown, Alston Thoms, Clell Bond, and Steve Black.

Announcements

TEXAS ARCHEOLOGICAL SOCIETY 73rd
ANNUAL MEETING
October 24, 25, 26, and 27, 2002
La Posada Hotel

SCHEDULE

Thursday, October 24 – evening get together at the Trevino Ranch courtesy of Rose Trevino and Family. 6 til 10 PM. Buses will provide transportation from the hotel and back.

Friday October 25 — La Posada Hotel

9 AM-5 PM	Registration
8 AM-7 PM	Silent Auction/Book Room
1-5 PM	CTA Meeting
2-3 PM	Stewards Meeting
4-5 PM	TAS Board Meeting
5-6 PM	Business Meeting
6-7 PM	Margarita Receptions on the Patio
7-9 PM	Public Forum

Saturday October 26

7:30 AM	Welcome Breakfast
8 AM	Registration
8 AM-4:30 PM	Silent Auction/Book Room
8:30 AM-12	Paper/Presentations
12-1:30 PM	Luncheon
1:30-4:30 PM	Papers/Presentations
5-6 PM	"Ojo Rojo" Complimentary drinks and snacks on the Patio
6-7 PM	Cash Bar
7 PM+	Banquet and Dance

Sunday October 27

8-9 AM	Executive Board Meeting
9:30-11:30	Board Meeting

There will be bus tours of Laredo available on Friday and Sunday.

SPEAKERS

PUBLIC FORUM

Friday October 25, 2002
7 –9 PM

Speakers will be:
Dr. Michael B Collins speaking on "Were Clovis the First People in the Americas?" and Dr. Robert Ricklis speaking on "Patterns of Early

La Posada Inn: 1000 Zaragoza Street, Laredo, Texas

Announcements

Settlement Along the Texas Coastal Plain. Everyone is invited.

TAS ANNUAL MEETING CONTINUED

Luncheon Speaker
Saturday, October 26, 2002,
Noon

Invocation – Rev. Father Pedro Nolasco Hinojosa
Speaker- Dr. Jose Roberto Juarez will speak on "The Streets of Laredo"
Mariachi AZTLAN will entertain.

Annual Meeting Banquet
Saturday October 26, 2002
5:30-6:30 PM
"OJO ROJO" compliments of the Convention and Visitors Bureau in the Museum Patio

7 PM
Invocation by Most Reverend Bishop James Tamayo
Speaker: Leticia Gonzalez Arratia will speak on "The Great Traditions of the Desert Culture: The Petroglyphs, Pictographs and the Mortuary Ritual".

SILENT AUCTION

Items are needed for the Silent Auction. It you have anything to donate please contact Mrs. Ina A. Pool, 2102 Steward St. Laredo, Texas 78043, (956) 724 2903. hgip@lmtonline.com

ATTENTION STUDENTS AND

FACULTY ADVISORS

The Council of Texas Archeologists (CTA) is offering a $500 research grant to eligible graduate and undergraduate students for research pertaining to Texas archeology. The rules and guidelines regarding eligibility, as well as application materials, are available on the CTA web site at: http://www.c-tx-arch.org/cta_membership/StudentResearchGrant.html.

CTA TO HOST
A HOSPITALITY RECEPTION FOR TAS

The CTA will be furnishing a hospitality reception for the TAS on Friday night following the CTA meeting, time and place to be announced.

CTA INITIATING A PHOTO ARCHIVE

Don't forget, the CTA is looking for photos, slides, or other media recorded during past CTA events. Please send items or copies thereof to David O. Brown or Doug Boyd. See Doug's History Committee report (this volume) for more information.

OPPORTUNITY TO TEACH IN TEXAS ARCHEOLOGY ACADEMY

In the spring TAS will initiate the Texas Archeology Academy to instruct interested Texans about how to recognize, record and protect archeological sites. These workshops will be held throughout the state to train volunteers for effective fieldwork. We hope that professional archeologists in each location will volunteer to assist with class and survey. The 2003 sessions will be held in Houston, San Antonio and the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex.

An advisory committee met August 17, 2002, to plan the course with Dr. Harry Shafer who has taken the lead to develop the curriculum. Members of the committee are Margaret Howard, Jim Blanton, Nick Morgan, Clarke Wernecke, Clell Bond, Jimmy Smith, Jonelle Miller, Skip Kennedy, Karen Fustes, Mike Durack, Harry Shafer and Pam Wheat.Basic topics to be covered in the two-day (Sat. – Sun.) class sessions will be survey, procedures for the field and lab, testing, and reporting. For more details see www.txarch.org, About Archeology, Texas Archeology 101.

As the Texas Archeology Academy sessions are conducted around the state, archeologists in each region will be called on to contribute their expertise. Please contact Pam Wheat pwheat@vmplus.com or Harry Shafer hshafer@satx.rr.com to assist in your area.

CTA Newsletter
Andy Malof
Editor
c/o LCRA
PO Box 220
Austin, Texas 78767
cta-members@c-tx-arch.org
cta-contractor@c-tx-arch.org

Sue Linder-Linsley, RPA
Web Committee, Chair
c/o Department of Anthropology
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas 75275-0336

TO:

Council of Texas Archeologists *Membership and Renewal Form*

Return to:
Melissa Green, CTA Secretary-Treasurer
c/o Geo-Marine, Inc.
550 East 15th Street
Plano, TX 75074

☐ **Address correction only (see below).**

☐ **I wish to join or renew my membership in CTA.**
(membership is based on the calendar year Jan-Dec)

☐ Contractor's List	$100.00
☐ Professional (annual income more than $20,000 per year)	25.00
☐ Professional (annual income less than $20,000 per year)	15.00
☐ Student (annual income more than $20,000 per year)	25.00
☐ Student (annual income less than $20,000 per year)	15.00
☐ Institution/Library (receive *CTA Newsletter* only, no voting privileges)	25.00
☐ I would like to purchase a copy of the *CTA Guidelines*	7.50

Total amount remitted to CTA **$** _____

Name (please print): _____
Company/Institution: _____
Address: _____
City/State/Zip: _____
Phone: _____ FAX: _____ e-mail: _____