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Introduction

The Second Conference on "Renewing Our National Archaeological Program" met in Tempe, Arizona on February 9-11, 1997. The session was sponsored by SAA and SOPA and hosted by the Department of Anthropology at Arizona State University. Participants were:

Chuck Redman, co-chair, Arizona State University
Bill Lipe, co-chair, Washington State University; SAA President
Roger Anyon, Consultant on tribal cultural resource programs
Ron Anzalone, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Washington office
Cathy Cameron, University of Colorado; SAA Board member
Tom Green, Arkansas Archaeological Survey
Bill Lees, Oklahoma Historical Society; President-elect, SOPA
Frank McManamon, National Park Service, Washington office
Chuck Niquette, Cultural Resource Analysts; past President, ACRA
Lynne Sebastian, New Mexico SHPO; SAA Secretary-elect
Donna Seifert, John Milner Associates; SAA Board member
Gary Stumpt, Bureau of Land Management, Arizona

Mike Moratto was unable to attend because of last-minute scheduling conflicts, and Ed Friedman was unable to attend because of illness.

The primary goal of the conference was to develop an implementation plan for some or all of the recommendations developed by the 1996 Renewing Conference. The 1997 conference started by reviewing the 1996 Conference Report, in light of the comments received at the open forum held to discuss it at the 1996 SAA meetings in New Orleans, and in letters and other communications sent directly to Bill Lipe. [The report and a summary of these comments were published in SAA Bulletin 14(4)]. After general discussion, smaller working groups were formed to develop specific implementation recommendations for five groups of issues. These working groups circulated drafts of their recommendations, and the full group then reconvened to discuss them. Comments made in open discussion were incorporated into the final drafts of the implementation plans, which are presented below.

I.

Improving Archaeological Resource Stewardship and Study
Under the National Historic Preservation Act

Ron Anzalone, Gary Stumpf, and F. P. McManamon

Principles

Several principles structure why and how archaeological resources are considered historic properties and are taken into account in the procedures and review actions carried out under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). These principles, which underlie the recommended action items, are as follows:

1. Use archaeological information and resources to advance knowledge of the past and public appreciation for archaeology.

2. Ensure high quality, professional archaeological advice on national and state policies affecting archaeological resources.

3. Encourage archaeological resource conservation balanced with continuing study. Promote policies and methodologies accordingly.

4. Establish effective, efficient procedures that address important resource values and public interest needs.

5. Give preference to programmatic solutions for archaeological identification, evaluation, and treatment needs over individual project review.

6. Encourage better integration of archaeological work with other land-use planning, environmental study, and social impact assessment.

Recommendations

1. Programmatic Quality Improvement

a. The SAA President and Government Affairs Committee (and other archaeological organizations, as appropriate) should develop a strategy to have an archaeologist appointed to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. [There will not be a vacancy for an "expert member" until 1998. There is a potential vacancy now for a "private citizen" member. Pursuing an appointment will require obtaining political support for a nominee from someone with substantial influence with the Administration. Possible connections should be considered with Bruce Babbitt or Roy Romer. It may be that Dick Moe of the NTHP would also be willing to add support for this effort; this should be considered. Now is the time to develop and initiate this strategy so that when a vacancy is available, support for an archaeological nominee is in place, and action on the new appointment can be taken.]

b. The SAA President and Government Affairs Committee (and other archaeological organizations,
as appropriate) should write to the Director of the NPS supporting strongly the inclusion of a professional archaeologist position (or several) on the staff of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

c. The SAA President and Government Affairs Committee (and other archaeological organizations, as appropriate) should write to the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers (NCSHPO), and possibly the National Park Service (NPS) and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), to suggest that State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) should establish professional archaeological advisory panels for general oversight and assistance to SHPO and staff. Such professional panels can help to solve issues sometimes referred to as "the archaeology problem". Establishment of such panels is authorized by the provisions for State historic preservation review boards in NHPA and/or state statutes.

d. The SAA President and Government Affairs Committee (and other archaeological organizations, as appropriate) should write to the NPS and ACHP urging them to find better means of using existing legal authorities (e.g., NHPA, Sections 110, 202(a)(6), 101; AHPA) to use professional review to improve the quality, effectiveness, and consistency of federal agency and SHPO programs related to archaeology. NPS should be queried about which agencies are developing or have developed Section 110 programs according to the requirements of that section, and NPS should be encouraged strongly to seek the consultation required of agencies by this section. The ACHP should be asked to review a least one specific federal agency program annually which in SAA's opinion is having a major impact on archaeological resources. Both agencies should be asked to work together in the next round of SHPO office reviews to ensure that Section 106 review and compliance activities are evaluated. These NPS and ACHP reviews should include professional input and participation.

e. The SAA President and Government Affairs Committee (and other archaeological organizations, as appropriate) should write to the ACHP and NCSHPO urging them to ensure that all programmatic agreements for Sec. 106 are developed with adequate public participation and contain mechanisms for periodic review, evaluation, and modification that include outside professional involvement. Most importantly, these reviews need to be done regularly and actively. The lack of such periodic review of existing agreements calls into question how effective they are in producing resource preservation results.

2. Standards

a. SAA, in cooperation with other major archaeological organizations, should establish a working group to assist the ACHP in revising the proposed Sec. 106 regulations to ensure that the profession's concerns are addressed. This group should also identify where explanatory guidance is needed and appropriate.

The working group should ensure that the regulations accomplish the following:

(1) Specify clear time frames, as well as the roles and responsibilities of participants throughout the Section 106 process. Consider carefully how public participation is addressed.
(2) Include in the regulations, or by reference to other guidance documents, clear directions for resource identification and evaluation.

(3) Address concerns that have been raised about archaeological data recovery as a "standard treatment".

(4) Provide for closer articulation between agency NEPA procedures and Section 106 procedures. Use agency procedures for public participation when this is sensible.

(5) Shift Council and SHPO oversight toward the large number of agencies that do not have well-established historic preservation programs and qualified staffs and away from the few agencies that do.

(6) Focus ACHP and SHPO advice at the broad level of overall agency historic preservation policies and procedures and at the level of the results (products) of agency policies and procedures, not in between.

(7) Involve the SHPOs, and on occasion, the ACHP, in early planning consultation for projects and programs, and in controversial or non-routine actions where their involvement can be most effective.

b. The SAA should establish a working group in coalition with other national archaeological organizations to assist NPS and the ACHP in developing better written guidance for identification, evaluation, and treatment of archaeological resources. The SAA President and Government Affairs Committee (and other archaeological organizations, as appropriate) should write to the Director of the NPS and the Executive Director of the ACHP offering assistance and requesting that NPS and ACHP also involve representatives from agencies with established archaeology programs in the development of guidance.

(1) The guidance itself should cover topics related to archaeological resource identification, evaluation, and treatment. These might be covered in a single guidance document or in several. Of particular concern is addressing the issue of "consensus determinations of eligibility (DOE)" for archaeological properties. The two primary concerns about this process are to ensure that it is applied consistently by practitioners throughout the country, and to ensure that the significance of the archaeological resources considered in fact warrants their potential listing on the NRHP and consideration under Section 106.

(2) The development of new guidance documents should include a thorough review of existing guidance and draft guidance documents being used at national, state, and agency level. Examples include:

- existing and draft proposed Section 110 guidelines
- current Secretary's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation
- the ACHP draft handbook "Treatment of Archaeological Properties"
- existing DOE guidelines.
(3) The guidance should address programmatic approaches to dealing with classes of archaeological properties such as low density lithic scatters, 19th century farmsteads, and others that exist in large numbers and individually have minimal research potential. It also should consider the use of wide-area synthesis as an appropriate means of impact mitigation for projects, and how to provide for public education and outreach more consistently through Section 106.

(4) In order to use case studies and "best practices" examples as guidance, the NPS and ACHP should develop a means of collecting and publicizing successful efforts to address historic preservation issues involving archaeological sites. The process of examining and selecting cases should also serve as a means of identifying, collecting, and evaluating "best practices" related to archaeological resources.

(5) The written guidance should be used as a basis developing new professional training options, as well as for improving existing training and continuing education programs. The appropriate subcommittee of the SAA Public Education Committee should be included in discussions about improving existing academic and professional training programs.

3. Peer Review

a. NPS and ACHP should work with the SAA Government Affairs Committee, the Consulting Archaeology Committee, the SAA Committee on Government Archaeology and the Federal Preservation Forum to establish a peer review system. One basic requirement of such a system should be that it not complicate, increase, or lengthen the existing procedures of project or program review. A peer review system might be envisioned as substituting for the existing procedures, not as being tacked on at the end, or in the middle of these procedures. The intent of such a system would be threefold:

(1) To focus on discovering ways of improving the products or programs in the public archaeology arena.

(2) To provide a means for evaluating the results of major projects, based upon the magnitude of the project impact, cost, importance of resources, public values, or other factors.

(3) To provide for the identification of innovations or solutions to archaeological planning and management problems that might be generalized, based upon their success in individual projects or programs.

b. If a working group is established to explore a peer review system, it should be charged with addressing the following questions:

- how and when would peer review be requested and used?
- what organization(s) should carry out the reviews?
- if costs are involved, how can these be provided for?
- what criteria would be used to evaluate projects or programmatic solutions?
II.

Dissemination of Information to the Public

Roger Anyon, Donna Seifert, Cathy Cameron

Principles

The public benefits of archaeological research are important.

The dissemination of research results is essential for public benefit.

Archaeologists are responsible for ensuring that research results are disseminated to the public.

Statement of Support and Encouragement:

The SAA applauds and supports the efforts of the SAA public education committee, government agencies, consulting archaeology companies, academic departments, museums, local organizations, and individual archaeologists, involved in public education about the benefits of archaeology. The SAA encourages the continuation of these efforts, and the development of new and creative initiatives that further this important aspect of archaeological research.

Recommended Actions

1. Encourage the academy to include public education as a product of research.

   a. The SAA president will draft a statement for the SAA Bulletin encouraging academic archaeologists to develop public products as part of their contribution to the profession, and will encourage academic departments to recognize public products as professional contributions.

   Schedule: Fall 1997 publication in the SAA Bulletin

2. K - 12 education efforts.

   a. The SAA President and Executive Board will encourage the Public Education Committee to continue its efforts with schools and teachers.

   Schedule: Prepare as a resolution for Executive Board action in Nashville.

3. Develop guidance concerning ways to incorporate public benefits in federal and state
archaeological projects.

a. The SAA president will ask the SAA Public Education and Government Affairs Committees to draft guidance for agencies, with 3 or 4 members of each committee acting as a working group.

Charge: to develop a statement concretely detailing the benefits of public products to the agencies and the public. The statement will identify the kinds of products, ways to fund these products, and means of product dissemination

Schedule: report to SAA Executive Board by the 1998 Seattle meeting

4. Evaluate public participation in the practice of archaeology.

Issues: what is the benefit to the resource; what is the real cost of using volunteers; does volunteer experience foster stewardship and support for historic preservation.

a. The SAA president asks the Public Education and Ethics Committees to develop a working group to assess and report on the benefits and to assess the costs of volunteer participation (in all aspects of archaeology) for archaeology and the resource.

Schedule: Report to the SAA Executive Board by the 1998 Seattle meeting.

b. The SAA president writes a letter to the NPS asking it to develop guidelines for public participation in archaeology (to address the whole range of participation opportunities, not just excavation) and to prepare this guidance in consultation with the working group established under Task 1 above.

III.

Recognizing Multiple Interests

Roger Anyon, Donna Seifert, Cathy Cameron

Principles

There are multiple ways of knowing the past.

These multiple values must be considered in the practice of archaeology.

Recommended Actions

1. Develop an SAA Bulletin article.
Issue: address the following; how to conduct appropriate consultations; how to incorporate Native Americans and their viewpoints in archaeology (at the research design, fieldwork, and interpretive stages) and in long-term resource management; how to develop professional education and training for managers, private sector consultants, academics, and Native Americans.

Task: The SAA president will task a small working group from the Native American Relations and Ethics Committees, and request the assistance of a few agency representatives, to develop an SAA Bulletin article providing guidelines to address the above issues. The group should consult, utilize, and reference existing SAA task force and committee reports and agency guidelines.

Schedule: guidelines article to be prepared for SAA Executive Board review and action at the 1998 Seattle meeting with publication of the approved version immediately thereafter.

2. Develop additional guidelines.

Task: Following the completion of B.(1), above, the SAA Executive Board will identify another working group to collaborate with the SHA in developing similar guidelines and a second Bulletin article regarding other groups, such as descendant communities and local interest groups.

3. Determine the benefits of archaeology for industry and developers.

Issue: demonstrate to business how protecting archaeological sites is good for business.

Task: The SAA president establishes a working group composed of some members from the Task Force on Consulting Archaeology and requests assistance from ACRA to collect case studies of development projects that have successfully incorporated archaeological resources into products which have benefits for business, archaeology, and the public. In addition, they should identify what products work for the mutual benefit of archaeology and business, and discuss how this information can be disseminated to the archaeological and business communities. The working groups should consult on this matter with the ACHP and the NPS/National Register's “Public Benefits of Archaeology” publication resulting from the 1995 Santa Fe conference.

Schedule: report to the SAA Executive Board by the 1998 Seattle meeting.

IV.

Training and Professionalism
Issues

There is no single, accepted standard of professionalism in American archaeology. Further, there is no widely accepted mechanism to identify levels of competency within archaeology or to hold individual practitioners accountable for their behavior as archaeologists. We find this problem exists within the CRM business community; with agency preservation programs at the local, state, and federal levels; and within the academy.

There are currently many standards for what constitutes a professional archaeologist. It is essential that we move toward a single standard and avoid the development and maintenance of different statements of standards at the state, agency, or organizational level. Related to this, there is a need to achieve parity in the multitude of permitting processes with regard to professional standards.

We recognize that this is not something that any single group can accomplish, but that top-down guidance is needed from federal agencies who are pursuing similar goals. We further recognize that this is not something that will happen overnight and that many working professionals who do not meet the new standard must be given reasonable time and realistic opportunity to achieve the level of professionalism defined in the standard.

Recommended Actions

The profession must establish a standard of professionalism, assist individuals in obtaining the knowledge, skills, and abilities to attain and maintain that standard, and implement a process whereby archaeologists are held accountable to appropriate standards and qualifications. This can be accomplished through:

1. Promoting registration of individuals, field schools, and firms through the Society of Professional Archeologists (or ROPA if it is created).

   a. Task SOPA (ROPA) to consider a program for the registration of CRM firms.

   b. Add a continuing education requirement to the existing standards for individual registration under SOPA (ROPA) and develop or encourage the development of a program to offer the requisite continuing education.

   c. Ask SHA, SAA, AIA, ACRA, NCSHPO, and SHPOs to encourage registration of qualified individuals under SOPA (ROPA), as well as voluntary compliance with the standard maintained by SOPA (ROPA).
2. Developing programs for professional certificates at the university level in specialized areas of archaeology. Certificate programs may be at the B.A., M.A., or Ph.D. levels.

   a. Task SOPA (ROPA) and SAA Committee on Consulting Archaeology to work with departments interested in developing such a certificate program. Task SOPA (ROPA) to develop a program to accredit or register such certificate programs.

3. Encouraging voluntary adoption of standards by agencies and institutions involved in public archaeology.

   a. SOPA (ROPA) should work to encourage NASA and FPO to adopt ROPA standards for permitting (state and federal agencies)

   b. SOPA (ROPA) should open a dialogue with FPOs to adopt SOPA (ROPA) standards for agency personnel.

   c. SAA and SOPA (ROPA) should work to gain endorsement of SOPA (ROPA) standards by state councils.

   d. SAA and SOPA (ROPA) should encourage NPS to require that all SHPO archaeology staff meet The Secretary of the Interior's professional standards for archaeologists.

4. Working to promote consistency among states that desire to enact licensing programs.

   a. SOPA (ROPA) and the SAA Committee on Consulting Archaeology should conduct a survey of state laws and regulations that pertain to standards in archaeology.

   b. SOPA (ROPA) should formulate model legislation for states desiring licensing.

V.

Information Management

Bill Lipe, Tom Green, Chuck Redman

1. Development of State and Regional Databases

   a. Principles

      (1) Databases should:

      -be structured to facilitate cooperation by appropriate agencies, institutions, and firms in the building and maintenance of information included in the database
-be geographically searchable (geographic interface)
-incorporate project information, including boundaries
-link site data, report bibliographic data, project information, and collections data
-build on and be compatible with existing systems and software to the extent feasible
-have provisions for both allocating and restricting access
-consider research as well as management user needs

(2) The structure and function of systems should be driven by user needs; design teams should incorporate users as well as technical specialists

(3) No single system is likely to be appropriate to all states/regions; consider developing national standards for some aspects of systems, regional standards for others.

b. Recommended action

A number of states and organizations are in the process of making decisions about site information databases or are in some stage of developing new or revamped systems. Information-sharing will be help ensure the success of these efforts.

Therefore, as soon as possible, a workshop should be held that focuses on the development of state and regional databases.

SAA should develop a proposal to NPS to fund such a workshop; NCSHPO and NASA should be invited to participate as partners. ASU or CAST at U. of Arkansas are possible hosts.

Representatives from 8-10 innovative state programs should be invited, as well as 4-5 independent experts in archaeology and 1-2 experts from other fields.

The workshop should consider databases that link site, project, report, and collections information

The overall charge of the workshop will be to review what is currently working and what is not, and to produce recommendations for several kinds of model program.

Representatives of state programs should be prepared to circulate in advance a brief review of their state's experience, including:

-purpose and use of database
-types of information contained and database structure
-hardware, software, other technical aspects of database
-policies on access and type of output provided (online, paper)
-history of development, including history of organizational support and funding
-current maintenance, including current organizational support, funding, and user population
-immediate and future needs
-on basis of experience, what has been learned that would help other states avoid problems or do a better job

The results of the workshop should be rapidly disseminated; SAAWeb can be used, and a summary report can be published in SAABulletin, SOPA Newsletter, etc.

2. Managing Curation and Collections Data

a. Principles

   (1) Planning for curation of records, collections, and related databases must be for the long term

   (2) Repositories for collections and related information should utilize existing institutions which have adequate management capabilities. We need to avoid dispersing collections and information to numerous agencies and institutions, as well as overly ambitious efforts to centralize collections and data management.

   (3) Making collections available for research and education is important, and justifies the expense and effort expended in long-term curation

   (4) Computer imaging capability and the internet should be utilized to provide better public access to collections and collections information; access by rural users must also be considered

   (5) Provisions for access to collections must be designed with user needs in mind; user-friendly access to collections data is an essential aspect of system design

   (6) Links must be established between collections, site files, and research data bases

   (7) Integrated regional systems for accessing collections information are desirable. New federal regulations, guidance, and standards must require electronic access to collections information

b. Recommended action

We recommend a workshop on electronic access to collections data. The charge will be to prepare a report surveying what is happening in this field, and to make recommendations for structuring electronic access to collections.

SAA and SOPA should seek organizational sponsorship and funding for such a workshop. National Center for Preservation Training and Technology should be approached.
Workshop composition:

- 4-6 people who are currently implementing electronic access in a variety of settings
- 2-3 federal and/or state agency representatives with responsibilities for collections management and access
- American Association of Museums should be contacted about representation from the museum field

3. Disseminating Technical Site Reports

a. Principles

(1) Reporting primary archaeological contexts and data remains a basic requirement of archaeological research

(2) The responsibility to report basic archaeological contexts and data can be satisfied electronically and on-demand as well as by book-format reports

(3) Initial efforts to develop electronic means for dissemination of technical site reports should focus on major project reports with substantive archaeological content rather than on those primarily useful for management purposes

(4) Significant cost-savings should be sought through better use of electronic means for publishing large technical reports

(5) Basic contextual data and information must be made accessible to qualified researchers in cost-efficient, way; electronic means provide the a feasible solution in many instances

(6) Primary contextual data should be electronically transferable even if not widely disseminated

(7) Secure archiving of electronically-disseminated reports and data-bases is essential

(8) Major reports should have compact, easily-disseminated, technical summaries readily separable from primary contextual data

(9) Researchers and sponsoring institutions/organizations have a responsibility to promote wide dissemination of substantive and topical summaries of major research projects, using existing journals and other publication outlets

(10) Electronic publication permits a wide variety of reporting formats; organizations and agencies need to avoid premature attempts to impose rigid formats and constraints; ease of use is the primary consideration in determining formats.
b. Action Recommendations

(1) The SAA Publications Committee should:

- Put out a call for examples of electronic site reports, and post responses on SAAWeb.

- Investigate standards for preparing, referencing, citing and archiving electronic publications appropriate to the archaeological field.

- Publicize to the profession existing protocols and standards for referencing, citing, and disseminating electronic publications.

- Examine ways to achieve cost-savings by use of electronic technology in producing and disseminating detailed reports of archaeological contexts and data.

- Work with representatives of the National Park Service to develop:

  - Protocols for a standard report data page suitable for submission to NADB or other electronic bibliographic data bases.

  - A guidance document regarding the submission of primary contextual data reports in electronic form.

(2) The SAA and SOPA presidents should write key federal agencies urging them a) to promote publication of brief substantive synthetic articles from major federally-mandated projects and programs, b) make better use of electronic methods to disseminate and archive the detailed descriptive aspects of major substantive archaeological reports, and c) use cost-savings from more efficient reporting of major archaeological projects to promote scholarly and popular publication of research results. Such requirements should be considered for incorporation in programmatic agreements relating to federal agency cultural resource programs.

4. Providing Information Syntheses

a. Principles

(1) Syntheses are a principal way in which archaeological research becomes cumulative.

(2) Syntheses enable researchers and resource managers to incorporate the results of previous work, and provide the contexts for making research and management decisions.

(3) Syntheses can be effective at different levels—major geographic regions and culture areas, states, localities.

(4) Topical and problem-oriented syntheses can also be effective.
b. Action Recommendations

(1) Tom Green and Fred Limp will prepare an SAA Bulletin article surveying a range of recent regional syntheses. (Include syntheses done under Legacy program, state of Arizona regional syntheses, etc.)

(2) SAA and SOPA Presidents will write a letter to NPS and ACHP urging development of agency guidance regarding preparation of regional syntheses as mitigation measures in appropriate cases.

(3) SAA and SOPA Presidents will write a letter to NPS and ACHP urging development of agency guidance regarding preparation of topical syntheses that can aid problem definition and assessment of significance. The letter should also address the preparation of methodological syntheses (e.g., effectiveness of survey methods) that can assist agencies in selecting appropriate practices in archaeology.

(4) SAA President and Board will consider development of an annual symposium at the SAA meetings that will

- focus on synthesis of a particular region each year

- be structured to promote the prompt publication of the symposium papers