



**CTA FALL MEETING
October 31, 1997**

The 1997 CTA Fall meeting will be held on Friday, October 31st at the Holiday Inn Center in Odessa (see map) in conjunction with the 68th annual meeting of the Texas Archeological Society (TAS). As stated in the last issue of *Texas Archeology*, preregistration for the TAS meeting ends on October 1; reservations at the conference hotel (1-800-465-4329) must be made by September 30 to receive the special rate (\$61 for 1-4 people). Of course, other motels are available as well. Several airlines, including American, Continental, Southwest, and United, provide service to Midland-Odessa International Airport.

Fall 1997 Meeting Agenda

Noon: Call to Order, President Alston Thoms
Approval of the Minutes of the Spring 1997 Meeting

Officer Reports:

- President
- President-Elect
- Secretary-Treasurer
- Newsletter Editor

Standing Committee Reports:

- Governmental Affairs
- Ethics and Standards
- Auditing Committee
- Contractor's List

- Public Education
- Native American Relations

Special Committee Reports:

- Accreditation and Review Council
- Archaeological Survey Standards

Old Business:

- Contractors List Fees
- CTA Web page
- Contribution to Archeological Conservancy

New Business:

- Committee Appointments
- Membership Drive
- Spring Meeting Plan and Scheduling
- Proposed changes to Bylaws

In this issue ...

Presidents' Forum	2
More on Lake Gilmer	10
Committee Reports	12
Other CTA Business	14
Article: Looting	16
Announcements	18
Minutes of the Spring Meeting.....	21
CTA Membership Form.....	27

Presidents' Forum

Making Texas Archeology More Relevant to the Public

Alston V. Thoms, Current President

I wrote in the CTA Newsletter last year that my agenda as President-Elect included the following: (1) encourage meaningful discussion and debate about the research contexts and results of the membership's archeological studies; (2) disseminate these results at CTA meetings and to interested parties; and (3) broaden CTA's audience and support base. As current President, I will strive to insure that CTA continues to maintain and promote the goals of professional archeology in the State. In doing so, I will work to enhance CTA's role as a key player in the complex business of making Texas archeology relevant to more of the people of Texas. Importantly, this goal is consistent with the archeological advocacy, public education, and proactive approaches undertaken by past CTA presidents, most recently, Steve Black (1996/1997) and Margaret Howard (1995/96).

For more than 20 years now, dues-paying CTA members have designed, implemented, written about, and evaluated the vast majority of archeological investigations undertaken in the State. As Steve Black wrote last year: "We...bear a mountain lion's share of the responsibility for the way Texas archeology is today, for better or worse." Among the better news this year has been a growing interest among Texans in archeology, as it applies to educational issues in general, to Native American lifeways, and to written history, including the Civil War and even WW II. Some of the worst news, however, is that all too much of the growing interest may be economically motivated, as commercial values of archeological things escalate, and as looters become better organized and gain political strength.

A few weeks ago at a quickly-called meeting sponsored by the Office of the State Archeologist, members of the CTA Executive Committee, along with representatives from state agencies, the Texas Archeological Society, the Texas Archeological Stewardship Network, other avocational organizations, Native American groups, and

professional archeologists, discussed how best to respond to organized looting (see accompanying article by State Archeologist Patricia Mercado-Allinger and CTA President-Elect Doug Boyd). That so many practitioners, many of whom are CTA members, gathered so quickly for this meeting demonstrates what Margaret Howard emphasized two years ago: "All of the archeologists in Texas must work together...to direct the course of our profession."

Current Directions

Our ongoing work demonstrates that CTA is ready, willing, and successfully endeavoring to maintain and promote the goals of professional archeology in the State of Texas. Although we are not always as successful as we might be, we are actively involved in many endeavors that make archeology more relevant to more people. CTA should continue to do so and to enhance its productive work:

- Active participation of members in the Public Archeology initiative sponsored by UT-Austin's LBJ School of Public Affairs, as well as in other public-education endeavors (TAAM; see accompanying article by Brett Cruse), including ongoing efforts to curtail organized looting in the state (see accompanying article by Patricia Mercado-Allinger and Doug Boyd).

- Widespread, hands-on support by the CTA leadership, and its membership as a whole, of legislation that insures protection of unmarked graves in Texas (see accompanying article by Doug Boyd) and of related efforts to foster better communications between CTA and Native American groups with vested interests in Texas (see accompanying article by Margaret Howard).

- Provision of a forum for information gathering, debate, and commentary on current issues such as reburial of human remains from San Antonio's San Juan Mission, and the political-ization of the Lake Gilmer archeological project (see accompanying articles by Steve Black and Bill Martin).

- Development of standards for archeological surveys (see accompanying article by Ross Fields) and curation facilities (see accompanying article by Linda Johnson, Eileen Johnson, and Carolyn Spock).

I also want to call attention to Aina Dodge's and Brett Cruse's work in putting together CTA's new *Contractor's List* (see accompanying article by Brett Cruse).

These and other topics, including those noted below, will be discussed at the fall meeting to be held during the 68th annual meeting of the Texas Archeological Society at the Holiday Inn Center in Odessa on Friday, October 31, from noon until 2:00 p.m. (see preliminary agenda in this issue).

Other Agendas

I am convinced that through continued dialog and public education, CTA can work toward a better understanding, if not consensus, among most of those with vested interests in Texas' cultural heritage. Our Governmental Affairs, Public Education, and Native American Relations committees have all worked to foster better awareness and enhance communication. To the extent that my own e-mail, telephone, and lab/office/café conversations can be used as gauges, CTA's voice is being heard more clearly. The trick, of course, is to do it constructively.

Site-Significance Issues: Determinations about site significance are integral to the design of archeological investigations and the management of archeological resources. For some time now, the State's archeological grapevine has clattered and hummed with news about how governmental agencies are increasingly challenging recommendations by Principal Investigators that a given site is significant and thereby merits data-recovery level excavations. Just what makes a particular site or group of sites significant has long been a matter of considerable debate in the United States. The debate has resurfaced in Texas. Recently, I heard tales about an increasing reluctance by agencies to approve data recovery plans for burned-rock midden sites in central Texas, for buried sites in the sandy uplands of the coastal plains, and for surface sites in the western part of the state. The professional community as a whole must be involved in working out the details of just what it takes for a site to be determined significant and thereby merit a substantial data recovery effort. To air these and related issues, CTA's Executive Committee has proposed an open forum at the TAS meeting this fall in Odessa. Agency and contracting archeologists will serve as panel members and will address questions from the audience.

Encourage Archeological Research and Dissemination of Results: I also want to call attention to, and encourage, CTA's role in foster-ing much-need research. Some of the most excit-ing research being conducted in Texas is about fire-cracked rocks as artifacts and features. The "Hot Rocks" workshop Steve Black put together in conjunction with the 1995

Spring CTA meeting was integral to setting the stage for the innovative Headwaters Experimental Workshop (1996/97), which while not sponsored by CTA, was led and well attended by CTA members. Nonmembers, including Lewis Binford and LuAnn Wandsnider, also attended. All twelve papers in the "Cook-Stone Archeology in Texas" symposium at the last year's TAS were presented by CTA members. In short, the interpersonal and interorganizational networks established by the CTA membership during the last 20 years provide fertile grounds for collaborative research. Now that we have tapped the Internet, the productivity of these grounds seems to be improving. We should make sure it stays that way.

Strengthening Critical Links: CTA played the archeology-leadership role this year in opening communications between archeological and Native American communities in Texas. Our organization should continue to do so. Meaning-ful dialog should also occur more regularly between professionals who manage the State's archeological training grounds at academic institutions and those who work throughout the State to extract and document archeological records. For a decade or more, and at least partially in response to the privatization trend in cultural resources management, academic arche-ologists have been drifting away from CTA. We need to reverse that trend by encouraging and challenging more academic archeologists to join and actively participate in CTA.

Membership Drive: Several weeks ago, I lamented to other Executive Committee folks that my efforts to recruit new CTA members from anthropology students and faculty at Texas A&M had not been especially successful. To my sur-prise, the other Committee members responded that indeed there had been a significant increase in Aggie graduate-student memberships. Apparently my recruiting effort has paid off , albeit not so for the faculty. Immediate Past President Steve Black assured me that there are potential members in other parts of the State as well, and he proposed to spearhead a renewed CTA membership drive this year. I encouraged him to do so.

Spring CTA Meeting: It seems that CTA meetings are best attended when held in Austin during the late morning, accompanied by a professionally-interesting workshop in the early afternoon, and closed by an early-evening social that allows most folks to get home by dark or soon thereafter. Accordingly, my working plan is to hold the business meeting at 10:30 a.m. at the Pickle Research Center's Conference

Building located a short distance from TARL. I also propose to conduct a “workshop” (ca. 1:30-4:00 p.m.) on site-significance and related issues as a follow up to the open forum at the TAS meeting this fall. The workshop will focus on fine-tuning and operationalizing suggestions offered by representatives from regulatory and funding agencies and other interested parties. The next *Newsletter* will provide details and information about the early-evening social.

To effectively realize CTA’s mission demands long-term commitments and sustained directions, especially with regard to making archeology more relevant to the public at large and to groups and organizations with vested interests in Texas archeology. To identify viable pathways requires considerable travel along bumpy corridors that we believe lead in those directions. Our experiences this year with Texas’ unmarked-graves protection bill and related legislative processes, as well as with efforts to insure preservation of archeological resources on private lands, attest to the need for long-term strategies. From my perspective, CTA is working productively on a variety of fronts, but there is still much to be done. My message here is: “endeavor to persevere.”

athoms@unix.tamu.edu; FAX [409] 845-4070; telephone [409] 845-4044; Center for Environmental Archaeology, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843-4352.

[The Unmarked Graves
Protection Act and Native
American Relations:
Where Do We Go from Here?](#)

Douglas K. Boyd,
President-Elect

As most everyone knows by now, the “Unmarked Graves Protection Act,” informally known as the unmarked burial bill, is dead once again (pardon the pun). It passed in the Senate (SB 810) thanks to support from its sponsor, Senator Gonzalo Barrientos. The Senate version was then adopted by Representative Elliot Naishtat to replace the similar House version, but there it died in committee before ever reaching the House floor. It was apparently killed because of opposition from landowner rights groups, especially the Texas Wildlife Association whose lobbyist is former House Speaker Gib Lewis.

This was yet another frustrating experience for those who worked long and hard to promote the bill (especially Dr. Richard L. Schott of the LBJ School of Public Affairs who coordinated this effort). As was the case in past legislative sessions when similar versions of this bill were put forth but ultimately defeated, this bill received widespread general support from the archeological community, but this time the Council of Texas Archeologists took a more direct role in speaking in favor of it. Unfortunately, it is now 1997, and 10 years after the first such bill was introduced, Texas still does not have a law to provide equal protection for unmarked burials regardless of ethnicity. So what does all this mean and where do we go from here?

First, the current version of the graves protection bill may not be perfect, but it is a good piece of legislation and deserves another chance at becoming a law. We should not give up the fight!

Second, while many CTA members have been active in supporting the unmarked burial bills in the past, the organization has generally played only a minor role in supporting them, usually passing a resolution and sending a letter. CTA has always chosen to keep a very low profile because we are a nonprofit, tax exempt organization and cannot spend more than 10 percent of our revenue on lobbying efforts. But there is a difference between hardcore lobbying, which costs lots of money, and taking a strong stance in favor of or against a piece of legislation. As an organization, CTA took a more active role in stating its support of this unmarked burial bill than ever before (e.g., a CTA representative was present at all hearings to make sure the organization’s voice was heard). While we must be careful not to go too far, CTA should be more active in supporting selected legislation of paramount importance. This opinion is not new, however. In discussing future directions for CTA in 1993, for example, Elton Prewitt suggested that the organization should “actively lobby legislature for cultural resource preservation” (*CTA Newsletter* 17[1]:4-5).

Third, archeologists and Native Americans have generally worked together to support the unmarked burial bill in the past, but the spirit of cooperation seems to be greater than ever. The original unmarked burial bill presented to the Texas Legislature in 1987 was drafted Mr. Ray Apodaco (then Executive Director of the now-defunct Texas Indian Commission) and was pushed hard by the Office of the State Archeologist, the Texas Archeological

Defense Fund (created in 1983 specifically as a lobbying group; TADF is now defunct), and many individuals in the archeological community (*CTA Newsletter* 11[1]:14-15). Cooperation between Native Americans and Texas archeologists was also important when various versions of the unmarked burial bill went before the legislature in 1989, the year it passed in the House and Senate but was vetoed by Governor Bill Clements (*CTA Newsletter* 13[2]:4-5), and again in 1995 and 1997. A hard lesson was learned in 1993, however, when disagreements between archeologists and Native Americans over proposed amendments killed the unmarked burial bill late in the legislative session at a time when it probably had the best chance of actually being signed by the governor if passed! (*CTA Newsletter* 17[1]:16). Through the years, these interactions, both conflict and cooperation, have allowed most Texas archeologists to gain a greater understanding of Native American views, and vice versa. Both parties realize, now more than ever, that we have many causes in common. The Texas archeological community is beginning to rethink its entire approach to dealing with Native Americans, especially when it comes to matters relating to human burials. We must now be concerned with how we handle *all* Native American burials, not just those that fall under NAGPRA because they happen to occur on Federal land or be found during the course of a Federally funded project. The old idea that archeologists should fight to keep their "right" to dig Native American graves on private lands is not something we can justify any longer. Archeologists must initiate dialog with various Native American groups to reach compromises that take different scientific, religious, and ethnic perspectives into account. Mott Davis recognized this simple truth in 1986 when the discussions over unmarked graves first began (*Texas Archeology* 30[3]:10-11). CTA took a major step toward this goal when Tim Perttula, Margaret Howard, and Alston Thoms proposed the creation of a Native American Relations Committee (*CTA Newsletter* 20[1]:15-16; 21[1]:10-11). We still have a long way to go, so let's start talking.

Fourth, despite the united support of Native Americans and Texas archeologists, the most recent unmarked graves protection bill was defeated by stronger powers in the political process. The bill was killed by landowners who opposed it because they feel it is a threat to landowner rights. In the past, there was serious opposition to the bill from prestigious art-gallery owners, wealthy antiquities collectors, and pothunters who didn't want to lose their "right" to dig Native American graves on private

lands. Some of these people are also landowners and they may have had an impact in convincing other landowners that the most recent bill was an attack on landowner rights. However, I think everyone who carefully studied and worked with the bill this time around will agree (and legal opinions support this) that the landowner's fears are simply not justified. In fact, there are some well-informed landowners who supported the bill and feel that it strengthens, not weakens, their rights. It seems clear that the unmarked graves bill will never stand a chance unless the archeological community, including CTA, works with land-owners and landowner groups to convince them that this law would not be bad for them. If given the opportunity to look closely at the issue, I think most landowners, with the exception of the hardcore pothunters, would support the unmarked graves protection bill.

Events of the past two decades have taught me much about the science of archeology, the business of archeology, the politics of archeology, and the perceptions of archeology that are held by the general public and Native Americans. All of these things are in many ways intertwined and have long been of concern to the profession. Since its humble beginnings in 1976, CTA has been interested and active, to some degree or another, in all of these areas. I propose that CTA make some minor changes that add to its mission by doing the following five things:

(1) CTA should take an even more active role in supporting the unmarked graves protection bill the next time around. We should start now to establish dialog with landowners and landowner groups to muster their support. We need to obtain written legal opinions that can placate the fears that uninformed landowners may have. Land-owning CTA members and other preservation-minded landowners and politicians could play an important role in turning the tide.

(2) We should be careful not to become a lobbying organization, but CTA can and should be more vocal in stating our consensus opinions on various State and Federal legislation relating to protection of cultural resources. CTA should not be afraid to take stronger positions than in the past and should be willing to do more than simply pass resolutions and write letters. Past experience has proven that cultivating long-term individual relationships with preservation-friendly political allies is a far more effective tool than last minute letter-writing campaigns (that usually occur after the important decisions have already been made). We need to

become more sophisticated at playing the political game. Perhaps a cooperative arrangement with a preservation lobbying group, such as Preservation Texas, could be a viable avenue for political maneuvering. In addition, CTA's Governmental Affairs Committee should expand its horizons to coordinate more closely with similar committees of other national, state, and local archeological and heritage organizations (e.g., Society for American Archeology, Texas Archeological Society, Texas Historical Foundation) to integrate our efforts.

(3) CTA should look at new ways to encourage more of its members to express their individual opinions to the organization and to become more active in the political process.

(4) CTA should continue its dialog and interaction with Native Americans and work toward improving relations in all areas, especially with regard to consistent and respectful treatment of human remains. We should start with our common goal of stopping (or at least significantly slowing) illegal grave robbing by pothunters and work toward reaching cooperative agreements with specific Native American tribes/groups that would eventually allow scientific archeological investigation of burials that are threatened by erosion, construction, or vandalism.

(5) CTA should acknowledge a major addition to our focus through a formal change in our bylaws. To that end, I propose that the stated goals of the organization be changed as follows (underlined portions indicate new language or changes):

Article II.

Section 1. Purpose.

The Council of Texas Archeologists is a nonprofit voluntary organization which exists for the purpose of maintaining and promoting the goals of professional archeology in the State of Texas. These goals shall include but not be limited to:

1. The promotion and coordination of communication and cooperation within the archeological community;
2. The promotion and coordination of communication and cooperation between the archeological community and Native American peoples as well as other ethnic groups and segments of society we study;
3. The preservation and conservation of the cultural resources of Texas;
4. The promotion and dissemination of information which enhances public awareness of the

limited and nonrenewable nature of our cultural resources.

Any comments on these ideas, for or against, are welcome. Please call me (512-459-3349) or e-mail at: <prewittarcheology@compuserve.com>.

Archeology at Lake Gilmer: Bad Precedents and Conflicting Interests

Steve Black, Immediate Past President

This fall, archeologists from the Division of Antiquities Protection (DAP) at the Texas Historical Commission (THC) will be completing federally mandated archeological investigations at Lake Gilmer, a reservoir being built under permit with the US Army Corps of Engineers (COE) in the piney woods of Upsur County, about 95 miles east of Dallas. THC is doing the work because of a rider attached to its biannual appropriations bill by State Representative Bob Glaze (D-Gilmer), a member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee. The specter of the Texas State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the state's archeological regulatory authority, conducting compliance research should be troubling to CTA members for many reasons. State funds, which the agency would ordinarily devote to fulfilling its stated mission (broadly, historic preservation), will be used to hire a project archeologist and a field crew to conduct excavation and analysis of the sort ordinarily done by private and university CRM organizations. Since SHPO is doing the compliance work, who will serve as an independent State reviewer? Will THC issue itself an Antiquities Permit and assume all responsibilities of existing Gilmer permit? Why hasn't this matter come before the Antiquities Advisory Board? What happens when the next member of the Texas Legislature decides that THC should do the compliance work for a municipal authority in his/her district?

The City of Gilmer (population 5,000) is damming the waters of Kelsey Creek to provide an adequate water supply. The reservoir will inundate dozens of Caddo sites including numerous hamlets. Archeological investigations began in the late 1980s with an initial 10-percent reconnaissance by Horizon Environmental Services (David Brown, PI). This was followed by a more intensive survey and testing program also by Horizon (Peter Nichols, PI). The finding of extensive and apparently significant sites such as 41UR133, a reasonably intact middle-late

Caddoan hamlet, led to a data recovery program (also by Horizon) that began in the fall of 1995. The data recovery program stemmed from a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) signed between the City of Gilmer, the COE (the lead Federal agency), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Texas SHPO. Work continued until March 3, 1996 when the City of Gilmer abruptly decided it had spent enough money on archeological investigation. Horizon pulled its excavation crew from the site under excavation (41UR133), leaving partially completed block excavations wide open and many aspects of the planned work under the MOA unfinished. The unprotected excavation walls soon began collapsing. Months later, local archeologist Bo Nelson (a Steward for the Office of the State Archeologist and one of the crew members during the Horizon excavations) finally persuaded the City to provide plywood and plastic so he could cover the excavations (on his own time). The temporary covering lasted a few months and has since deteriorated. Since the winter of 1996, the City of Gilmer has been wrangling with COE and THC over the matter. According to Horizon Environmental's President James Wiersema, the firm is no longer participating in the negotiations and is awaiting a formal decision before turning over the artifacts and records to the State.

COE archeologist Skipper Scott says that the reservoir project was a model project until 1995. Cultural resource work was on track, environmental mitigation projects were being done ahead of time, and all was well. Then a new city manager, Scott Thompson, came on board and discovered that the costs were rapidly exceeding estimates. Apparently, previous city officials had used best-case scenarios to construct an unrealistically optimistic budget. When costs started mounting, the City of Gilmer was in crisis. Ironically, the cultural resources portion of the reservoir project was one of the smaller areas of budgetary concern. Purportedly, 8 of 11 budget categories were over budget, with land and environmental mitigation costs being particularly high. However, costs overruns in these areas involved payments to local landowners, who while supporting the need for the project, were able to get top prices for their land. Politically, the far lower cultural resources costs were a much easier target.

According to Thompson, the total projected cost of the Lake Gilmer project is about 11 million dollars. Originally, the City budgeted \$500,000 for the archeology and tree-planting as part of the environmental mitigation. To date, the archeological work alone has cost \$477,000 (4.3 percent of the total project costs). Thompson says that the original budget

was based on estimates from the environmental and archeological contractor (Horizon) in consultation with State and Federal officials. He says that the archeological work was done on an open-ended contract and that costs continued to escalate well beyond the original estimate. COE's Scott attributes part of the archeological cost overruns to "several [unanticipated] burial situations," but added that as far as he could determine, the contractor's costs were legitimate. Sources at SHPO hint that the archeological work was poorly managed and that travel charges were excessive. Thompson says that he has no basis for evaluating the cost effectiveness of the archeological work, but that the City pulled the archeological plug in 1996 because it saw no end to the spiraling costs. He argues that the City did its best to comply with Federal and State regulations, but that "the choice came down to between archeology and water," and that his priority is on the health and safety of Gilmer citizens.

Frustrated with his ability to get COE or THC to modify their requirements, Thompson asked local Representative Glaze, a Gilmer chiropractor, to enter the fray. Glaze owns land in the aimed-at vicinity of the reservoir and some observers have speculated that he might have a financial interest in seeing the reservoir completed. However, Wiersema and Thompson both say that Glaze played no part in the City's land purchases which apparently included the Representative's "own backyard" as a scheduled part of a Federally-approved environmental mitigation plan. Whatever his motivation, Glaze began to play hardball with Federal and State officials involved in the cultural resource situation. When his blustery attempts failed to coerce the COE to back down on the agreed-upon archeological mitigation requirements, he purportedly vowed to force the State to take care of the problem.

Representative Glaze made the matter his top legislative priority during the recently concluded session of the Texas Legislature. From his position on the House Appropriations Committee, Glaze was able to attach a rider in THC's appropriations bill which, in essence, forces the agency to bail out the City of Gilmer (and Horizon) from fulfilling its obligations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Texas Antiquities Code. THC apparently raised quiet objections to the rider, but were unable to change the outcome. Apparently, Glaze even threatened to "zero out" THC's budget unless he got his way. The outcome highlights the agency's extreme susceptibility to political pressure.

DAP head Dr. James Bruseth considers the matter moot and faults the Council of Texas Archeologists

for missing its opportunity to protest the rider while the appropriations bill was being considered. He points out that because THC is prevented by State law from lobbying on behalf of specific legislation, the agency could not put out an alert to preservation-minded organizations. Bruseth repeated his oft-voiced opinion that CTA should hire a part time Executive Director whose responsibilities would include closely monitoring each legislative session to keep an eye out for bills which adversely affect the professional interests of the archeological community. Bruseth says he has no choice but to comply with the appropriations rider and complete the excavation, analysis, and reporting of the Lake Gilmer work. Insiders say that Bruseth was directed by THC Chairman John Nau to strike a deal with Representative Glaze and get the matter settled. After DAP's initial budget to complete the work was purportedly rejected at a June meeting by Glaze (apparently because the City's share of the costs were too high), it was pared down.

Mark Parsons, who served in a similar capacity during Horizon's Gilmer work, has been hired as Project Archeologist by DAP beginning September 1st. THC (using State funds and \$80,000 from the City of Gilmer) will apparently hire four entry-level crew members for work at 41UR133. One wonders how many years of analysis and report preparation will be necessary to bring the entire Gilmer archeological work to completion? Who will pay for curation of all of the materials collected by Horizon and the THC? Were these costs factored into the deal? How will the financial drain and distraction impact DAP's ability to perform its review work? Who will be the new holder of the Antiquities Permit? If it's Bruseth, how can a permit-holder objectively evaluate (in his role as the Deputy SHPO) the compliance of other permit-holders across the state? According to Bruseth, the need for regulatory oversight will be handled by "building a firewall" at DAP to isolate Bill Martin (who previously handled review responsibilities relating to Lake Gilmer) and Mark Denton from taking part in any other aspect of the work, making them eligible to serve as "independent" reviewers. Bruseth points out that Federal agencies including the COE and the National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation will also be reviewing the work.

After talking to many participant-observers involved in the Lake Gilmer affair, I keep coming back to the same thought: the unfolding situation is an abomination of the regulatory process. It reveals the extent to which state and local politics can adversely affect the outcome of cultural resource

management projects. Sadly, the pro-posed revisions to the Section 106 review process (see the latest issue of *CRM News and Views*) will shift the Federal-State balance even further by placing more of the regulatory responsibility on SHPO. This change bodes particular ill here in Texas. The word from Gilmer is already out among the municipal authorities in northeastern Texas that with the right political pull at the State capitol, cultural resource "problems" can be taken care of. As one CRM contractor put it, "I should begin advising my clients to call their legislator."

City Manager Thompson says he hopes the Gilmer case will set a precedent that will encourage SHPO to work more closely as a "partner" with local governments to make sure that cultural resource projects are affordable. The costs of cultural resource investigation and mitigation must, of course, be balanced with other aspects of development. However, the use of political pressure to resolve financial difficulties that stem from poor planning and project mismanagement is most unfortunate. Archeology is a scapegoat all too convenient.

To avoid real and perceived conflicts of interest, it is crucial that the Texas SHPO remains an independent regulatory authority and leave compliance work to professional contractors. I, for one, think that it is in the best interests of the Council of Texas Archeologists to take what ever steps we can to make sure that the fishy stink arising out of the Kelsey Creek valley spreads no further in future sessions of the Texas Legislature. This may not be an easy task.

Bad Precedents, Abominations, and Apathy: The Gilmer Incident and CTA

William A. Martin

I want to make it clear that this article is my personal response to Steve Black. This is not an official comment by the Division of Antiquities Protection (DAP) or the Texas Historical Commission (THC). I am speaking simply as a CTA member who has worked in Texas for 15 years and has watched many debates take place among the membership over political issues affecting archeology in this state.

Overall, Steve Black presents a fairly comprehensive summary of the situation that led to DAP being dragged forcibly into the contract

archeology business, but a few corrections and clarifications are in order, and the specific questions he raises need to be addressed. First of all, I agree wholeheartedly that the concept of SHPO conducting fieldwork, analysis, and write up for a Section 106 project is a terrible precedent. I think that everyone at DAP feels the same way. DAP is being forced to make the most of a bad situation – a situation that, hope-fully, will not escalate into a series of more bailouts for cities who claim to have spent more money than they wanted to.

Secondly, I agree that the Gilmer situation is “an abomination of the regulatory process.” However, abominations happen! The fact that politics can adversely affect CRM projects is hardly a revelation. Although Lake Gilmer is an extreme example, it happens to a lesser degree on other projects from time to time. When the political heat is turned up high enough, sources higher than DAP intervene, and archeological considerations no longer come into play. Most CTA members seem content to gripe among themselves about the invertebrates at DAP who “caved in” to the politicians instead of standing up for “Truth, Justice, and the American Way.” Some people will call DAP to express their outrage, and occasionally, someone like Steve will write a commentary urging the CTA to consider action, but these commentaries never include a specific solution. What specific steps does Steve recommend that CTA should take prior to the next legislative session?

Steve asks many questions and I will address them here. First, I will act as the “independent” reviewer on this project. DAP asked the Advisory Council if it would like to assume sole review responsibility in light of possible conflict of interest concerns, but it respectfully declined. However, I can testify that the “firewall” Jim Bruseth has constructed is working well because reading Steve’s article was the only way I found out how much money Gilmer is contributing to this project. Jim and I don’t discuss it.

Regarding the Antiquities permit, DAP will cancel Horizon’s permit and carry out the data recovery plan previously agreed upon. However, it makes little sense for DAP to issue itself a permit. DAP is bound by state law (the rider attached to the appropriations bill is law) to complete this work and it will do so. The report will be the means by which the archeological community will judge the adequacy of this research.

What happens when the next member of the legislature decides that THC should perform the

compliance work for a city in their district depends on what CTA is willing to do between now and the next legislative session. If it does nothing, then DAP may find itself in the contract archeology business once again.

Regarding the matter of covering the abandoned units, I would like to point out that Jim and I convinced the City Manager to provide the money for the materials Bo Nelson used to cover the units. We are grateful to Bo for informing us about conditions at the site and for his volunteer efforts to keep an eye on it during this long period of abandonment. It was irresponsible of Horizon to leave the site in that condition, and Bo shouldn’t have had to cover the site on his own time, but we are thankful that he was there and was willing to take action.

Regarding curation costs, the City of Gilmer is aware that it will have to pay for the costs of curation. DAP’s ability to perform its review work will be unaffected by the work at Lake Gilmer. DAP worked for nearly a year with two reviewer positions vacant and Jim gone to Matagorda Bay, yet still managed the work load fairly well. A new reviewer was hired recently, so DAP will continue to provide timely reviews.

It may be true that the word is out among municipalities that they should contact their representatives to put pressure on DAP, but there is no evidence of this to date. On the contrary, one Northeast Texas municipality that is considering constructing a reservoir similar in size to Lake Gilmer came to DAP in the very earliest stages of planning wanting to know what it would take for them to avoid ending up like Gilmer. They were quite willing to budget for archeology to avoid the hassle Gilmer went through and I suspect that this type of reaction will be more typical than immediately running to the legislature.

Despite the fact that Steve presents a relatively accurate picture of the Gilmer project, his discussion still contains overtones implying that DAP somehow did not do its job, or caved, or sold out, or did something sneaky. This couldn’t be further from the truth. At one point, Dr. Glaze asked me flat out if I’d like to see my agency’s funding cut in half next year. If DAP was going to cave, that would have been the point where the expedient thing to do would have been to say that all archeology at Gilmer is complete. Instead, DAP insisted that more work needed to be done at 41UR133 and that a full report had to be prepared on all sites mitigated at the lake. Now DAP

is being forced to carry out the work (as Mark Denton says, “This is an unfunded mandate of an unfunded mandate”), but at least the archeology will get done. Steve’s comment about Jim being directed to strike a deal to lower the City’s share of the costs ignores the fact that Glaze intended THC to pick up 100 percent of the costs, but in the end, agreed to have the City pay a substantial share. Overall, we did what we think will be best for the resources, and that, in my opinion, is our job.

I would argue that the Gilmer situation is just one of many examples of political situations where archeology, as a discipline, “lost.” Sadly, CTA has never learned any lessons from past losses, and the apathy of many CTA members ensures that we will continue to lose political battles in the future. No wonder archeology is such a convenient scapegoat! Everyone knows that there will be no repercussions from anyone, including members of the archeological community, if funding for archeology is tossed aside. A few years ago, the Attorney General informed THC archeologists that they can join CTA, but cannot become officers in the organization because it is a trade organization that can lobby the legislature. If he had looked at CTA’s history along these lines, he probably would have said, “Go ahead and become president, for all I care.”

In my opinion, it is important for CTA to take an active role on two fronts. On one front, the organization should elect, appoint, hire (or whatever) someone to monitor proposed legislation and express the organization’s views on legislation that will affect the practice of archeology in the State of Texas. This action should be initiated well before the next legislative session. On another front, CTA can become involved in the outcome of specific Section 106 projects by becoming an interested party on agreement documents (MOAs and PAs) that govern the research to be conducted on individual undertakings. This would give the organization an opportunity to influence decisions made about projects such as Lake Gilmer.

The “fishy stink” will continue to emanate across the archeological landscape until CTA takes concrete steps to stem it at its source. No amount of complaining to DAP will rectify a project that has been elevated to a political battle, and it is in everyone’s best interest to keep projects from reaching this state.

Regarding curation costs, the City of Gilmer is aware that it will have to pay for the costs of curation. DAP’s ability to perform its review work will be

unaffected by the work at Lake Gilmer. DAP worked for nearly a year with two reviewer positions vacant and Jim gone to Matagorda Bay, yet still managed the work load fairly well. A new reviewer was hired recently, so DAP will continue to provide timely reviews.

It may be true that the word is out among municipalities that they should contact their representatives to put pressure on DAP, but there is no evidence of this to date. On the contrary, one Northeast Texas municipality that is considering constructing a reservoir similar in size to Lake Gilmer came to DAP in the very earliest stages of planning wanting to know what it would take for them to avoid ending up like Gilmer. They were quite willing to budget for archeology to avoid the hassle Gilmer went through and I suspect that this type of reaction will be more typical than immediately running to the legislature.

Despite the fact that Steve presents a relatively accurate picture of the Gilmer project, his discussion still contains overtones implying that DAP somehow did not do its job, or caved, or sold out, or did something sneaky. This couldn’t be further from the truth. At one point, Dr. Glaze asked me flat out if I’d like to see my agency’s funding cut in half next year. If DAP was going to cave, that would have been the point where the expedient thing to do would have been to say that all archeology at Gilmer is complete. Instead, DAP insisted that more work needed to be done at 41UR133 and that a full report had to be prepared on all sites mitigated at the lake. Now DAP is being forced to carry out the work (as Mark Denton says, “This is an unfunded mandate of an unfunded mandate”), but at least the archeology will get done. Steve’s comment about Jim being directed to strike a deal to lower the City’s share of the costs ignores the fact that Glaze intended THC to pick up 100 percent of the costs, but in the end, agreed to have the City pay a substantial share. Overall, we did what we think will be best for the resources, and that, in my opinion, is our job.

I would argue that the Gilmer situation is just one of many examples of political situations where archeology, as a discipline, “lost.” Sadly, CTA has never learned any lessons from past losses, and the apathy of many CTA members ensures that we will continue to lose political battles in the future. No wonder archeology is such a convenient scapegoat! Everyone knows that there will be no repercussions from anyone, including members of the archeological community, if funding for archeology is tossed aside. A few years ago, the Attorney General informed THC

archeologists that they can join CTA, but cannot become officers in the organization because it is a trade organization that can lobby the legislature. If he had looked at CTA's history along these lines, he probably would have said, "Go ahead and become president, for all I care."

In my opinion, it is important for CTA to take an active role on two fronts. On one front, the organization should elect, appoint, hire (or whatever) someone to monitor proposed legislation and express the organization's views on legislation that will affect the practice of archeology in the State of Texas. This action should be initiated well before the next legislative session. On another front, CTA can become involved in the outcome of specific Section 106 projects by becoming an interested party on agreement documents (MOAs and PAs) that govern the research to be conducted on individual undertakings. This would give the organization an opportunity to influence decisions made about projects such as Lake Gilmer.

The "fishy stink" will continue to emanate across the archeological landscape until CTA takes concrete steps to stem it at its source. No amount of complaining to DAP will rectify a project that has been elevated to a political battle, and it is in everyone's best interest to keep projects from reaching this state.

Committee Report

Accreditation and Review Council Update

Linda Johnson, Eileen Johnson
and Carolyn Spock

Background. This update is the second in a series to keep the CTA membership informed of activities of the Accreditation and Review Council (ARC). The first update was published in CTA Newsletter 20(1):16-18, 1996. That report outlined the origin and purpose of the ARC and explained the philosophy behind accreditation. The steps of accreditation were outlined and a timeline for development of the program was projected through the year 2000, at which time the Division of Antiquities Protection had stated all repositories and museums wishing to house State archeological collections must be accredited. This second update focuses on the past year's activities in developing the documents necessary for

implementation of the ARC's accreditation program. Those documents are:

- Accreditation Application form
- Self-Evaluation questionnaire
- Self-Evaluation Documents Checklist and Comments form
- Field Review Checklist
- Field Review Written Narrative and Recommendation
- Field Reviewer Expense Report
- Field Reviewer Training Manual

The ARC accomplishments of the past year are due in large part to the efforts of the two Museum Science graduate students affiliated with the Museum of Texas Tech University who became involved in the development of the ARC's accreditation program for practicum credit during the fall of 1996. Their input was a major factor in allowing these ARC documents and related activities to be created or to occur in a timely manner.

This Year's Activities. A second field test was held at Crosby County Pioneer Memorial Museum (Crosbyton). This test proved beneficial in fine-tuning the Self-Evaluation questionnaire and Field Review Checklist. It also made known the need for a third document to relay information gained from the pre-visit phase (self-evaluation) to the field reviewers: the Self-Evaluation Documents Checklist and Comments form. This form comments on the Self-Evaluation and records specific issues that need to be followed up on during the field review.

A document for summarizing the results of the field review, the Field Review Written Narrative and Recommendation, has been developed. This form records the field review team's findings and its recommendation for granting or denying accreditation; it accompanies the Field Review Checklist back to ARC for review and decision.

Minor documents such as the application form and the field reviewer expense report have been drafted. However, work this past fall and spring has concentrated on the development of the Field Reviewer Training Manual and the training methods that are to accompany it in preparing field reviewers. Field reviewers will be required to attend a training session prior to conducting field reviews for the ARC.

By the end of spring 1997, the training manual was ready for input from the professional community. A training manual review/input session coinciding with CTA's spring meeting was held in April.

Eighteen people attended the session where the training manual, as well as various training methods, were presented. Attendees were given review forms to be completed and returned to the ARC later, allowing time for careful analysis of the training manual.

Thoughts and ideas relayed through the field review forms are being utilized to make needed changes in the training manual. The information gained from this review session has been invaluable in that it has allowed the ARC to view the training manual through the prospective of people in institutions that may be undergoing accreditation, as well as through prospective field reviewers.

Projections for Future Activities. At this point, the development of the accreditation program is on schedule with the projected timeline published in the CTA spring 1996 newsletter. The first trial run of a field reviewer training session will be held sometime this coming fall. The final documentation to be developed is the information packet that accompanies the Self-Evaluation questionnaire to the applicant repositories and museums. Once that is in place, applications may begin to be taken for ARC accreditation.

In order for the ARC accreditation program to be successful, it is critical that the Field Reviewer Training Manual serve its purpose by providing field reviewers with the knowledge to conduct competent field reviews and to answer questions posed by applicant institutions confidently and accurately. The ARC welcomes interested CTA members to review the manual and provide their input. For a copy of the manual and a review form, contact Dr. Eileen Johnson (ARC Chair) at The Museum of Texas Tech University, Box 43191, Lubbock, Texas 79409-3191; telephone (806)742-2481; fax (806)742-1136; or e-mail mxegj@ttacs.ttu.edu.

archeologists gathered to listen to and converse with Judge Steve Russell, president of the Texas Indian Bar Association (TIBA), Ray Hernandez, director of the American Indians in Texas at Spanish Colonial Missions, and several other Texas Indians. The discourse was thought provoking, centering on issues of repatriation, cultural patrimony, and Senate Bill 810 – proposed legislation that would have extended protection over all human burials on private lands in Texas (the bill failed).

Recently, the Executive Board directed the Native American Relations Committee to consider a proposal from Russell that TIBA and CTA sponsor a joint conference modeled on the conference on reburial issues held at the Newberry Library in 1995. The purpose of this conference would be to seek common ground on a broad legislative program that extends beyond Senate Bill 810, including consideration of: (1) the ongoing loss of the cultural heritage of Indians and other Texans; (2) current Texas laws that pertain to this issue; (3) any federal laws that support these issues in Texas; and (4) proposals for legislative solutions. Potential participants include TIBA, CTA, the Office of the State Archeologist/Texas Historical Commission, the American Indian Religious and Educational Coalition, the American Indian Law section of the Texas State Bar, and nationally known speakers if funds can be raised to support their participation.

If you have interests or concerns regarding this proposed conference and/or other issues regarding the interaction of Native Americans and archeologists in Texas, consider attending the next Native American Relations Committee meeting, to be held in late September in Austin. For more information, contact chair Margaret Howard at 512/389-4875 (day), 512/453-4348 (evening), or at margaret.howard@tpwd.state.tx.us (email).

Native American Relations Committee

Margaret Howard

The Native American Relations Committee was officially established by vote at the spring 1997 CTA meeting, having operated on a trial basis since August of 1996. The committee has sponsored two symposia to foster communication between archeologists and Indians about issues of common interest and concern. The symposium at the spring CTA meeting was particularly successful; approximately 40

Update on Survey Standards

Ross Fields

In August 1997, members of the Archeological Survey Standards Committee met with Department of Antiquities Protection staff to discuss the standards proposed by the committee for intensive surveys in Texas, as published in the August 1996 and October 1996 issues of the CTA Newsletter. After discussing DAP's comments on the proposed standards and revisiting the question of why we thought standards might be a good idea in the first place, we decided to

rethink our approach to the problem. During September and October, the committee and DAP staff will be exploring the feasibility of developing relatively concrete standards that will apply only to small survey projects, since these are the ones where DAP tends to see most of the problems. These standards will primarily deal with how hard one should look to find sites (e.g., shovel testing intensity and transect intervals), and they will be brief (no more than a page or two) so that they can be easily used by project sponsors (many of whom lack archeological backgrounds). The potential advantage of such standards is that they will allow sponsors, contractors, and DAP to quickly develop a common understanding of what needs to be done on a given survey; this is particularly important on small projects since they often have to be done under short schedules.

Because of the size of large surveys, more factors must usually be considered when evaluating the appropriate level of effort. For this reason, we probably will not be proposing concrete standards for larger projects. Instead, the focus will be on developing mechanisms for ensuring that DAP has input into scopes of work (in most cases, this already happens). The idea here is that early consultation is the key to heading off problems on large projects. In the August meeting, we discussed revamping the standards proposed in 1996 to serve as guidelines to help project sponsors and DAP in devising scopes of work for larger projects, and this is something that we will explore in the coming months. The committee plans to meet with DAP in September for another round of discussions, and we hope to present a revised set of standards at the Fall 1997 CTA meeting.

Other CTA Business

Proposed Fee Changes for Contractors List

Brett Cruse, Secretary-Treasurer

From the time the CTA Contractors List was first published, there has been confusion over the different categories and fees that contractors must pay to be included on the list. Currently, in addition to a contractor's individual *membership* dues, each contractor pays a \$25 *listing fee*. An additional \$25 *institutional fee* is paid if the contractor or firm employs more than one cultural resources employee. Despite efforts to clarify fee categories, many contractors have not understood the differences between individual dues, the listing fee, and the

institutional fee. Consequently, some contractors do not pay the appropriate fees.

It is important that this problem be resolved because: (1) it is not fair to contracting firms that *do* pay the correct fee amounts; and (2) the listing fees and dues that CTA anticipates receiving each year are what our annual budget is based on. If we don't collect the appropriate amounts from each contractor, then we will continue to operate in the red, just as we have been doing for the past few years.

CTA officers have discussed this problem and believe a reasonable solution is to simply eliminate the different fee categories and establish a single listing fee that would be the same for all contractors wishing to be included on the list, regardless of the number of employees their firm may have. The cultural resources director from each contracting firm would still pay individual CTA membership dues, but the firm would pay a separate, single fee to be included on the Contractors List. We proposed the Contractors List fee be set at \$100 annually.

Until this year, approximately 400 copies of the Contractors List have been printed with each print run, and every copy is usually distributed. The Texas Historical Commission distributed every copy they had of the November 1996 list, and some 80 or so additional copies were made in order to meet demand for the list. Some requests for the list come from students or other individuals seeking contacts with potential employers, but most requests come from municipalities or companies seeking to employ a contracting firm.

The print run for the July 1997 list was increased to 550 copies to meet the anticipated demand, and cost \$680 to print. Assuming a similar amount for the second printing in December, it will cost CTA \$1,360 to print the Contractors List this year. It cost about \$1.25 to mail a copy of the list. Assuming we mail 100 copies (to each contractor and to others requesting a copy) twice during the year, it will cost an additional \$250. That brings our annual cost to print and distribute the list to \$1,610. To date, we have received \$1,725 in listing fees. This will cover our costs to print and distribute the Contractors list, but is well short of our budgeted amount of \$2,200 to cover other operating expenses and obligations.

There *is* a need and demand for the Contractors List. It is the obligation of CTA to meet this demand, but we must also meet our other obligations as well. The proposal to simplify the fee structure of the Contractors List by having a single listing fee should

be welcomed by contractors. We believe the proposed listing fee of \$100 is fair and equitable given the amount of advertisement and exposure each contractor receives with the distribution of the Contractors List. Please give these proposals your consideration. They will be placed on the agenda for discussion and action at the fall meeting.

Proposed Amendment

Proposed Bylaw Amendment

Douglas K. Boyd

The following is an excerpt from Doug Boyd's article (see *Presidents' Forum*, pp. 4-7) regarding proposed changes to CTA's bylaws (underlined portions indicate proposed changes):

Article II.
Section 1. Purpose.

The Council of Texas Archeologists is a nonprofit voluntary organization which exists for the purpose of maintaining and promoting the goals of professional archeology in the State of Texas. These goals shall include but not be limited to:

1. The promotion and coordination of communication and cooperation within the archeological community;

2. The promotion and coordination of communication and cooperation between the archeological community and Native American peoples as well as other ethnic groups and segments of society we study;

3. The preservation and conservation of the cultural resources of Texas;

4. The promotion and dissemination of information which enhances public awareness of the limited and nonrenewable nature of our cultural resources.

Any comments on these ideas, for or against, are welcome. Call Doug at (512) 459-3349 or contact him by e-mail addressed to Doug's attention at <prewittarcheology@compuserve.com>.

NOTE FROM THE EDITOR

Note from the Editor:

The CTA Bylaws will be printed in the next newsletter following the fall meeting to incorporate any changes or additions (see Doug Boyd's article in *Presidents' Forum* and *Other Business*).

You may notice a discrepancy between the map to the Holiday Inn Center in Odessa that appears on the first page of this newsletter and that appearing in the TAS newsletter (vol. 41, no. 3). The Holiday Inn Center in Odessa is located at the intersection of I-20 (business) and Loop 338, not on Parkway Blvd.

Any comments about the new format of the *CTA Newsletter* are welcome. Please contact me via e-mail: rplyle@tamu.edu

Robyn P. Lyle
CTA Newsletter Editor

ARTICLE

The Rising Tide of Commercialized Looting in Texas: A Wake-up Call

Patricia A. Mercado-Allinger,
State Archeologist (Texas Historical
Commission)
and

Douglas Boyd, CTA President-Elect

LOOTER: "An individual who plunders archaeological sites to find artifacts of commercial value, at the same time destroying the evidence that archaeologists rely upon to understand the past..." (from Sharer and Ashmore, *Archeology: Discovering Our Past* [1987:595]).

Any archeologist who has conducted research in Texas Archeological Research Laboratory site files or investigated sites in the field knows that the problem of looting is not new. Many of us have personal knowledge of individuals who have mined or are mining sites solely to obtain artifacts to sell. Occasional landowners have even been willing to

grant people access to sites on their property in pay-to-dig arrangements.

While looting has always been a problem in Texas, recent trends among certain factions of the commercial looting business suggests that the problem is poised to grow at a more rapid rate than ever before. Self-proclaimed “amateur archeology” groups, both at the national and state levels, have become better organized and are now branching out to create local chapters (such as one recently organized in Victoria, Texas). Commercial digs sponsored by national and state organizations have been conducted on private property in the central and eastern Trans-Pecos regions of the state. In these ventures, landowners are paid for the right to dig on their land, and the artifacts recovered are apportioned between the land-owners and dig participants. In their quest to find cooperative landowners in the Bandera area, a classified ad put out by one “amateur archeology” group offers cash rewards of \$500-\$1,000 in exchange for permission to conduct a weekend of “arrowhead hunting.” The same ad promises a \$200 finder’s fee to individuals who identify landowners willing to enter into such a contract.

Not only is the uncontrolled digging of sites on the rise, but the heavily promoted artifact shows/markets held each year in various communities around the state seem to be increasing in number and intensity. These shows facilitate the buying and selling of artifacts, increase demand for artifacts, and cause artifact prices to rise significantly. According to various sources, single dart points now may have price tags in the thousands of dollars at these shows. Not all commercial transactions are made in local public shows, however. Artifacts deriving from East Texas and the Texas-Mexico borderlands are reportedly finding their way into international markets at extravagant prices. Whether artifacts from Texas sites are sold in domestic or international markets, the outcome is the same – continued damage to and destruction of archeological resources. In this vicious cycle, increasing demand for artifacts fuels the need to dig more sites to increase the supply.

Vocal proponents for commercial looting have also entered the political arena, petitioning for a state law to allow surface artifact collecting at Texas state parks. Such a bill was introduced (House Bill 2260) during the 75th legislative session, but stagnated in committee. These same individuals are also responsible for disseminating misinformation concerning the failed unmarked graves protection bill

(SB 810), stating, “In other words, they can claim anything you have is a funerary object because all of this has at one time or another been found in association with a grave site.” (from *The Texas Cache Magazine*, Volume 3, No. 4, Summer 1997).

Although some are solely in it for the money, perhaps the most disturbing aspect of these trends is that many of these new “amateur archeologists” are convinced that they are doing science and helping to “preserve” archeological information by digging for artifacts. Their philosophy espouses that professional archeologists are enemies because we do not condone their “archeological methods.” Even more frustrating is the fact that these groups are a black eye on the face of the true community of avocational archeologists who are an essential part of Texas’ archeological preservation and research efforts.

The threat to Texas’ archeological resources by commercial looters varies considerably across the state, depending primarily on the market “value” of the types of artifacts that may be found in any particular area. While the overall threat from commercial looting is still relatively small, these new trends clearly show that the potential for this threat to increase dramatically in the near future is very real. According to the information at hand, all reported collecting and digging activities by these “amateur archeology” groups has been accomplished with landowner permission and is perfectly legal according to the laws of the state of Texas. We are not in any way proposing here to add or change state laws to impose restrictions on private landowners forcing them to protect archeological resources. Such legislation would undoubtedly be controversial, difficult to pass, and even more difficult to enforce, if passed. We do not advocate that this course of action be pursued. Instead, we contend that we fight fire with fire. These new “amateur archeology” groups have, in effect, launched a massive educational campaign that teaches people the joys of digging up, buying, and selling artifacts and teaches landowners that they should profit from selling artifact mining rights. The archeological community must respond in kind with an equally massive educational campaign that teaches people what real archeology is all about and teaches landowners the advantages of protecting archeological resources.

It is imperative that all of us in the archeological community convey clear and positive messages. The messages directed at the “amateur” diggers should be ones that: (a) specify that real archeology entails the careful recovery, study, interpretation, reporting,

and curation of cultural remains; and (b) teach that real archeology is much more informative and rewarding than simply digging for money. Acknowledging that we will never sway the hardcore pothunters from their business, we must target those with a genu-ine interest in prehistory and cultivate that interest into something greater. The messages directed at landowners should be ones that: (a) clear up misconceptions about laws pertaining to archeo-logical sites on private lands (such as the common idea that the state can come and take lands containing good sites); and (b) promote the preservation of archeological sites from many different perspectives (e.g., the preservation ethic, landowner rights and control of resources, tax incentives). Avocational archeologists and societies obviously have a strong role to play here, but we contend that professional archeologists also have a responsibility as well.

CTA must work in tandem with the Texas Historical Commission/Office of the State Archeologist, the Texas Archeological Society, and local archeological societies statewide (and any other preservation groups we can muster) to combat increasing threats to Texas archeological sites. Many of the ideas currently being proposed can and should involve CTA, both individual members and the organization. One such idea is to organize avocational and professional archeo-logists into speaker's bureaus to present effective and informative public archeology programs in "hot spots" where commercial looting is on the increase. Another idea is for a concerted effort on the part of professional and avocational archeo-logical organizations to begin communicating with various landowner groups to present our message. These, and many more ideas, will certainly be discussed in the near future. When the time comes, we have a responsibility to do our part in the call to arms against commercial looting in Texas.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

TAAM To Move To October

Brett Cruse, Office of the State Archeologist

Since its inception in 1989, the annual Texas Archeology Awareness Month (TAAM) observance has been held in April. But, beginning in 1998,

TAAM will move to October. The Office of the State Archeologist coordinates and sponsors this observance each year, with the Texas Archeological Society (TAS) and the Council of Texas Archeologists (CTA) as cosponsors. The decision to move TAAM to October was made after consulting with the cosponsors, with the TAAM Committee, with teachers who have utilized the materials, and with numerous groups around the State that host events each year.

The idea to change the date of this annual observance was first discussed last fall at the TAS Annual Meeting in San Antonio. Members of the TAAM Committee and other interested individuals thought the move to October might offer some clear advantages and benefits. First, teachers generally teach Native American studies and archeological topics during fall, at the start of the school year, rather than in April when the school year is winding down. Because teachers make up the vast majority of those ordering TAAM materials, it was felt that we should do what we could to accommodate them. Second, if the observance is held during October, then the TAS Annual Meeting can be incorporated as an event and publicized to a broader audience. If TAS continues the Public Forum program that was started last year and that proved to be very successful, then both TAS and TAAM can be promoted more widely to the general public.

Between February and June of this year, TAAM sponsors and participants were asked to vote whether TAAM should remain in April or be moved to October. A preference for moving TAAM to October was expressed by a majority of those who responded. The TAAM Committee voted unanimously for the move to October. Of the event sponsors that responded, 65 percent also preferred the move. Likewise, of the teachers that responded, a majority said they preferred October.

The move to October beginning in 1998 will offer a number of new opportunities to reach more of the public and spread the message of archeo-logical preservation in Texas. As representatives of the professional and avocational archeological communities in Texas, it is our duty and responsibility to support the public outreach and education efforts of TAAM. To those of you who have contributed to TAAM in the past, your support is greatly appreciated. I hope you will join me in making TAAM 1998 a success by continuing to give financial support to the program and by hosting or assisting with events in your area. Questions or comments concerning the TAAM program should be sent to

Brett Cruse, Texas Historical Commission, P.O. Box 12276, Austin, TX 78711, or telephone (512) 463-6090. Email can be sent to bcruse@access.texas.gov.

Briscoe Consulting Services

THC has just accepted the final report on BCS investigations at Copper Breaks State Park in Hardeman County. The investigations included a 100-percent survey of the park. A total of 90 sites were located in the park. A Permian trackway was also located that may be one of the earliest lizard tracks known in the Southern Plains. Texas Parks and Wildlife will be distributing the report shortly.

James Briscoe
Briscoe Consulting Services
bcs@telepath.com

Strecker Museum

Strecker Museum would like to announce its newest publication in the series *Occasional Papers of Strecker Museum* No. 4. This hard-bound, limited edition is titled "Wilderness at Risk," by Glen L. Evans (photographs by Glen L. Evans, drawings by Darla Evans).

"In these pages Glen shares with us some of his experiences with animals from mosquitoes to longhorns, coyotes to owls, and you can learn a lot about people, too, in his stories... observing nature came as naturally to Glen as breathing...he is one of those complete naturalists we thought had all gone extinct by early in this century." *Michael B. Collins*

"Mr. Glen L. Evans has often been referred to as the 'Dean of Texas Paleontology' and by the current generation as the 'Father of Geoarchaeology'...he has taken a long look back at some of his first observations about the many facets of nature...enjoyable and at the same time, educational." *Calvin B. Smith*

"Wilderness at Risk" is now available for \$20.00 from the Strecker Museum Store, Baylor University, P.O. Box 97154, Waco, TX 76798-7154. ISBN-1-878804-16-2. For more information, call 254-710-1110.

Two other publications which may be of interest to CTA members are also available through the Strecker Museum Store:

(1) "Horn Shelter Number 2: The North End, A Stratified Rock Shelter in Bosque, County, Texas." *Occasional Papers of the Strecker Museum* No. 3, by R.E. Forrester. ISBN 1-878804-14-6, \$10.00 each.

"Mr. Forrester's paper documents the archeological record of Late Prehistoric and Archaic periods of Indian occupation of Central Texas." *Albert J. Redder*

(2) "Proboscidean and Paleoindian Interactions." Edited by John W. Fox, Calvin B. Smith, and Kenneth T. Wilkins. ISBN 0-918954-55-X, \$22.50 each.

This work represents a collection of papers presented on Proboscidean and Paleoindian interactions during a conference held at Baylor University in conjunction with the Texas Archaeological Annual Meeting in October 1987.

CALL FOR PAPERS

1997 Texas Archeological Society
Annual Meeting
Odessa, Texas
October 31-November 2, 1997

Abstracts are sought for papers, posters, and/or symposia to be presented at the 1997 TAS Annual Meeting in Odessa, Texas (October 31 to November 2, 1997). TAS strongly encourages presentations by avocational, student, and professional archeologists on any topic of archeological interest. Submit all abstracts using the form (or format) presented below via e-mail (preferred – no attachments, please), fax, or mail.

Individual PAPERS must be presented in 20 minutes or less, a limit that will be rigidly enforced in order to accommodate concurrent sessions and enable TAS members to attend talks in different sessions. Paper abstracts must be received by FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 19TH. Of course, abstracts will be gratefully accepted any time before that date.

The organization of thematic SYMPOSIA on any topic, area, major project, time period, etc., is also encouraged. Each symposium will be allotted two hours for a minimum of five presenters. Abstracts for symposia must be received by SEPTEMBER 1ST. Organizers, please submit information on your proposed symposium, including a schedule order for

speakers. Alternative formats such as discussion sessions, hands-on workshops, and demonstrations will be considered. Feel free to contact me well in advance with your ideas.

POSTER SESSIONS are also an effective medium for presenting topics of interest. To ensure that your poster session is included in the program, abstracts must be received by SEPTEMBER 19TH, although I will attempt to accommodate last minute entries for this category (only)! *Pat Mercado-Allinger, Program Chair*

1997 TAS ANNUAL MEETING PROPOSAL

Name

Presenter or organizer (circle one)

Address

Phone ()

E-mail

Fax

PAPER/SYMPOSIUM/POSTER (circle one)

TITLE

ABSTRACT (150 words maximum)

Send to: Pat Mercado-Allinger
Office of the State Archeologist
Texas Historical Commission
P.O. Box 12276
Austin, TX 78711-2276
Phone: (512) 463-6090
FAX: (512) 463-2530
<pmercado-allinger@access.texas.gov>

MINUTES

Council of Texas Archeologists
Spring Meeting, April 26, 1997

Brett Cruse, Secretary-Treasurer

President Steve Black called the meeting to order at 9:20 a.m. at Stark Camp in Dripping Springs, Texas. Approximately 40 members were in attendance. As the first order of business, Steve called for approval of the minutes of the Fall meeting as they appeared in the latest issue of the CTA Newsletter. A motion was made and seconded that the minutes be approved as printed in the Newsletter. The motion carried.

President's Report: President Steve Black stated that he believed the past year had been a good one for CTA and that we had moved in the right direction on a number of important issues. Specifically, our efforts to strengthen our relationship with Native Americans have moved forward and are encouraging. Our efforts to build our membership must continue, as well as our efforts to strengthen our relations with the general public. Steve stated that the Public Forum that was held at the TAS Meeting in San Antonio last fall was very successful and a step in the right direction. He encouraged the members and President-Elect Alston Thoms to continue to promote archeology to the public.

President-Elect's Report: President-Elect Alston Thoms stated that he appreciated the leadership exhibited by outgoing President Steve Black and that he would strive to be an effective leader of CTA. He said that under his leadership he will attempt to make CTA become more proactive and to promote archeology to the general public. Alston stressed the need for the archeological community to develop and strengthen our relations with Native Americans. He also believes that CTA needs to continue its efforts to strengthen and expand membership to include more students, Native Americans, and other individuals with an interest in archeology. CTA needs to develop innovative ways to facilitate the exchange of information, not only between ourselves, but also between the professional archeological community and the public at large.

Secretary-Treasurer's Report: Brett Cruse distributed a copy of the 1996-97 Income and Expense Report and 1997-98 Proposed Budget to

each of the members attending the meeting. The report showed that total income for the year was \$4,280.00, and total expenditures were \$4,463.65, giving a deficit for the year of \$183.65. However, the 1996-97 approved budget called for a deficit of \$1,480.00. Steve Black pointed out that the reason for the relatively small deficit is due to the fact that the \$1,000.00 donation to the Archeo-logical Conservancy that was approved at the 1996 Spring Meeting has not been sent. The reason the donation has not been sent is on the agenda to be discussed at the Business Meeting today.

Our assets as of April 18, 1997 are \$1,229.35 in our checking account and \$5,947.29 in the money market account, for a total of \$7,176.64. The 1997-98 proposed budget calls for total income to be \$6,050.00, generated primarily from the increase in dues and contractor listing fees. The proposed 1997-98 total expenditures are \$6,200.00, giving a projected budget deficit of \$150.00.

Newsletter Editor's Report: Jerri McLerran stated that the Newsletters had been completed on schedule and she thanked the membership for their contributions.

Governmental Affairs Committee Report: Submitted by Chris Lintz, Co-Chair. The State legislature has been in session since the beginning of the year, and some movement has occurred on key bills affecting cultural resources. With the legislative session winding down, hearings and bills can move relatively quickly through the legislative process. It is therefore important that representatives of CTA – especially those in the Austin area – stand ready to provide expert witness testimony or be ready to lobby House and Senate members under short notice. The legislative process is very interesting and can move very quickly. CTA has been recognized as the professional archeological organization in the State and it is important that we make our views known. For those residing outside the immediate area of Austin, your voice on issues is welcome and needed to sway legislators.

State-Level Reports

The Unmarked Graves Protection Act: S.B. 810 (Barrientos)/H.B. 3425 (Naisthat). The Unmarked Graves Protection Bill relates to the protection of certain unmarked burials and associated human remains or funerary objects and creates a misdemeanor penalty for failure to report human remains discovery, and felony charges for trafficking

in human remains. This bill was introduced into the State and Criminal Justice Committee hearing on April 15th, and with strong support and public testimony from the Native American and archeological communities, it was unanimously remanded to the full Senate where it passed. The companion House Bill is scheduled for a hearing on Tuesday morning, April 29th, and may include the Senate version. Opposition in the House is expected to be heavier than in the Senate, primarily from the coal mining industry and from agricultural and private land sectors.

Bill Allowing the Collection of Certain Artifacts from State Parks: H.B. 2260 (Junell). This bill allows Parks and Wildlife Department to set fees and issue permits for private individuals to collect certain artifacts from State Park lands. The bill does not distinguish between collections from surface or subsurface contexts. The bill has been filed, but it has not been assigned to committee. It probably will not be pushed through on its initial appearance.

Bill Related to Adequate Funding For State Unfunded Mandates: H.B. 66 (Cuellar) merged with H.B. 223 (Pitts). This bill relates to limiting funding and requirements for unfunded state mandates on political subdivisions. These two house bills were merged together and hearings occurred in the House Committee on State Affairs. The bill can affect Texas Antiquities Committee permit related activities. On March 10, the subcommittee hearing recommended that the bill be passed to the House floor. No further activity has occurred.

Bill Related to the Regulations of Geologists: S.B. 486 (Brown)/H.B. 744 (Goolsby). This bill relates to the licensing of professional geologists, geophysicists and provides criminal penalties. The bill passed out of the Senate Committee on State Affairs and was approved by the senate; the companion House Bill has been referred to the House Committee on Licensing and Administrative Procedures.

National-Level Reports

National Historic Preservation Act Amendments. By the end of April, Representative Joe Hefley (R-Colorado) is expected to introduce legislation to reauthorize the Historic Preservation Fund. This bill would also amend the National Historic Preservation Act. Although no drafts of this bill have been circulated, Rep. Hefley's staff have indicated several possible amendments:

(1) to reauthorize OCS deposits into the Historic Preservation Funds for five more years, but also places a cap on appropriations to the States at \$30 million/year;

(2) to require owner consent for individual National Register nominations;

(3) to prohibit Determination of Eligibility by the Keeper of the Register where the owner objects or does not consent;

(4) to establish a date for completion of Mapping National Register Landmark boundaries;

(5) to revise the role of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to emphasize if “dispute resolution capabilities,” and revise Section 106 applicability to relate the level of historic significance to the level of protection afforded;

(6) to revise the definition of an “under-taking” to narrow the applicability of Section 106, perhaps to exclude projects involving licensing;

(7) to remove exemptions of the White House, Congress, and Supreme Court from the National Historic Preservation Act;

(8) to remove the National Trust for Historic Preservation from Title I of the Act;

(9) to transfer responsibilities for Section 110 Guidelines to the Advisory Council from the Secretary of Interior;

(10) to abolish the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training; and

(11) to eliminate Interior’s role in reviewing the transfer of Federally owned historic properties (Section 110 (e)).

It is expected to be referred to the House Resources Committee where it is rumored that the chairman of the National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee, Rep. James Hansen (R-Utah), favors the legislation. Subcommittee hearings are expected in mid-May.

The 36 CFR 61 Regulations. The National Park Service will soon publish in the Federal Register the final revised regulations for 36 CFR 61 that implement the historic preservation funds portions of the National Historic Preservation Act. These apply to the State Historic Preservation Officers, certified local governments, and Section 101(d), tribal programs. Only one section concerning the tribal programs will be preserved, pending additional consultation with the tribes. Representatives of the currently approved tribal programs (N = 15) discussed the proposed draft with the NPS during the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers in March. Following their additional comments and subsequent revisions, a draft will be sent to other federally recognized tribes for comment before the draft is published in the Federal Register.

ISTEA Update. The Senate Environmental Committee will continue its field hearings on the reauthorization of ISTEA, with the latest meeting on April 21 at Warwick, RI.

Ethics and Standards Committee Report: Submitted by Bob Skiles, Chair. There has been no meeting of the Ethics and Standards Committee in the interim since the last CTA meeting, or during my tenure as chairperson of the committee. Two items of business have been brought to the attention of the chair. The first was a request from a CTA member in relation to whether a solicitation letter sent by another CTA member to a client (of the first member’s) was unethical. The member complained that the letter appeared to be soliciting completion of work that was already contracted to the first member. After discussion with the President (to seek his advice on the proper procedure to follow), the President and I reached consensus on two points:

(1) the CTA does not have an effective mechanism for dealing with ethical grievances or complaints against members; and

(2) in our judgment, the letter in question was not asking abrogation of an existing contract, but was a solicitation of future business. Rather than call a meeting of the committee, I responded with a letter to the complainant in the following manner: “I have discussed your letter and request for comments with the President, Steve Black, and sought his advice on how best to proceed. After an examination of the bylaws (which are largely silent on dealing with alleged ethical lapses of members), we are of the consensus that CTA is impotent as an enforcement entity in allegations of ethical misconduct by its members, even in the case that an ethical lapse should be proved against a member. My understanding from discussions with Steve is that CTA has chosen to avoid effectively addressing this issue in the past due to the potential for liabilities and costs incurred through lawsuits. Consequently, we do not have an effective mechanism for dealing with grievances or complaints against our members. Steve and I both have carefully considered the letter that you submitted [from the CTA member to your client]...and are of the consensus opinion that the letter is an offer for future services rather than an offer to complete any present work that you may have under contract.”

This letter was sent on 14 February, and there has been no further correspondence or communication on this matter.

The second matter brought to my attention was a phone call from a CTA member on 13 February 1997 alleging “blackballing” by another CTA member,

which the said “blackballing” had resulted in denial of employment opportunities. I indicated the general impotence of CTA as an enforcement entity, and asked what exactly the member expected CTA to do in response to such a complaint. The complainant indicated the realization that there was little or nothing that CTA could do, but expressed the wish to air the complaint at the Spring CTA meeting in hopes that the blackballing would cease. The complainant was very reluctant to discuss the allegations and expressed a fear of reprisals since the allegations involved a CTA officer. The complainant insisted on complete privacy. I advised the complainant that it would be extremely difficult (or impossible) to handle an allegation or complaint effectively while maintaining strict privacy. Nevertheless, I gave the complainant my personal assurance that I would respect the privacy of our communications and would not discuss the matter further with anyone without express permission of the complainant.

I recommended the following procedure, which was agreed to by the complainant: (1) that complainant write a letter to the chairperson detailing the allegations in full; (2) that the allegations and any substantiating evidence that was submitted would be carefully considered by the chairperson; (3) that after receiving and reviewing the submission, that the chairperson would discuss with the complainant any impressions before proceeding to discuss the matter with any other committee members or officers of CTA; and (4) that if in the chairperson’s opinion, after said review, there was substance to the allegations, the matter would be submitted to the full committee with complainant’s prior approval.

The complainant requested a list of the names and addresses of the members of the Ethics and Standards Committee, which I forwarded to complainant on the same day.

To date, I have received no further communication from complainant in regard to this matter. I shall maintain the notes that I have taken in regard to this matter as personal records, separate from those of the committee, and I do not intend to add them to the committee records, or to divulge or discuss them with anyone, unless the complainant shall indicate a desire to pursue the matter further, either through the committee or through open forum with the membership. No other business has come before the committee.

Auditing Committee Report: Committee Chair Doug Boyd reported that the books were audited on March 25, 1997 and were found to be in good order.

Contractors List Report: Submitted by Gene Davis. The most recent CTA Contractors List was published on November 25, 1996. The list includes 51 contractors. Over the last six months, three important issues have been the focus of this committee: the number of Contractors Lists published each year; the format of the list; and payment of fees.

At the April 1996 meeting it was proposed that the list be published twice yearly, rather than three times a year. At the Fall meeting last October, CTA members again discussed the merits of printing the Contractors List twice a year. It was proposed by the Contractors List committee that the number of additions and corrections to the list did not justify three printings and the money saved from a third printing is significant. The necessary changes to the bylaws were published in the April 1997 CTA Newsletter and a vote on the twice-yearly printing proposal will be taken at the April 1997 meeting.

In April 1996 when Aina Dodge, chair of the Contractors List Committee, took over the duties of publishing the list, she introduced a format change. It was in the interest of simplifying the list that the format change was introduced. This change focused on presentation of the codes indicating the levels of expertise and specialties/ types of technical expertise of each entrant. Over the years, many specialties have been added to the Contractors List. As more specialties were added, the coded representation of those specialties became unwieldy. All codes already in place were reformatted into a tabular format. No new codes were added and no codes were removed. The new tabular representation of the codes was first used in the November 25, 1996 Contractors List.

In December 1996, all Contractors List entrants who had paid their dues and fees were mailed a copy of the November 25, 1996 list. Entrants were asked to evaluate the new format and submit suggestions and criticisms to the committee chair. The chair received two formal responses. One reviewer thought the new format made it easier to read each contractor’s specialties. The other reviewer noted that some entrants may have misrepresented their levels of expertise and/or their specialties/types of technical expertise. This may in fact be the case. It is the opinion of the committee chair that misrepresentation of information was not brought about by the change to the tabular format. In fact, the tabular format served its purpose. Readers are now able to readily understand what entrants claim are their levels of expertise and specialties/types of technical expertise. The ability to misrepresent oneself in the Contractors

List was always possible, just as it is now. However, the Contractors List Committee is not in a position to verify information submitted for inclusion in the list.

Finally, the Contractors List Committee, along with the Secretary-Treasurer, have faced ongoing problems with payment of dues and fees. There has been some confusion over what each Contractors List entrant must pay to be included in the list. To be included in the Contractors List, each entrant must have a designated Cultural Resources Director (CRD) who is a member in good standing of CTA. That is, the CRD's individual membership must be current. Individual membership dues are \$25.00 for those who make \$20,000 a year or more, and \$15.00 for those who make under \$20,000 a year. Each Contractors List entrant must also pay a \$25.00 listing fee. The listing fee is in addition to the \$25.00 membership dues. If the contractor employs more than one person, an additional \$25.00 Institutional fee is also applicable.

Public Education Committee Report: No report.

Accreditation and Review Committee Report: Compiled from notes submitted by Carolyn Spock. The Accreditation documents have been fine-tuned with some modifications made to the Self-Evaluation, Self-Evaluation Documents Checklist and Comments form, Field Review Checklist, and the Field Review Written Narrative and Recommendation. A working draft of the Field Reviewer Training Manual has been completed. The Table of Contents for the manual have been revised from that presented at the Fall meeting. A Training Manual workshop was held the morning of April 25, 1997 at TARL to gain input from the professional community on the draft of the Field Reviewer Training Manual and the training concepts to be employed in actual field reviewer training sessions. A prospective field reviewer questionnaire was drafted and mailed out along with invitations to the training manual workshop. Eighteen people attended the workshop. Based on the responses to the questionnaire, a list of possible field reviewers was formulated. A questionnaire to evaluate the training manual and workshop was also developed. An ARC planning session was held to assess the progress of the development of the accreditation program and make plans for having a field reviewer training session this coming fall. Development of the program is on schedule with the timeline published in the CTA Spring 1996 Newsletter. The draft of the training manual will be posted on the CTA Web page.

Archeological Survey Standards Report: Submitted by Ross Fields, Chair. Work on the proposed standards for intensive archeological surveys in Texas proceeded between the Fall 1996 and Spring 1997 meetings, albeit at a slower pace than originally planned. After the latest drafts of the standards were published in the August 1996 and October 1996 CTA Newsletter, the committee received a few comments and suggestions from CTA members and began discussions with Department of Antiquities Protection (DAP) staff at the THC to make sure that the standards we propose are workable for their review purposes. Because those discussions have not progressed very far, the committee decided to delay putting the proposed standards to a vote of the CTA membership as was planned for the Spring 1997 meeting. The committee will continue consultations with DAP on the proposed standards.

Native American Relations Report: Margaret Howard reported that this as-yet unofficial committee has met several times to study and determine the need for establishing a standing Native American Relations Committee within CTA. Based on results of these meetings, the members of this committee have determined that there is need for, and support for, such a committee. The purpose of the committee would be to inform the CTA membership about Native American issues concerning archeology, and how these issues would affect archeological work that is conducted in Texas. The primary mission of the committee would be to serve as a point of contact for archeologists and Native Americans on issues of mutual interest and concern. A secondary mission would be to study and carefully consider issues on which the committee may advocate action by the CTA board and/or its members.

CTA Web Page Committee Report: Submitted by Kevin Jolly, Chair. Jim Bruseth of the Department of Antiquities Protection helped get the Texas Historical Commission to donate space on their Web server to CTA along with two e-mail accounts to handle web page related correspondence. Over the next six months, CTA needs to put together a letter of agreement between CTA and THC formalizing this arrangement. Working from this web space, the Web Page Committee has put together a basic CTA web site. The address of the site is http://www.thc.state.tx.us/cta_web. The site has a frequently asked questions (FAQ) section, basically taken intact from Joan Few's excellent poster she presented at the Fall meeting. One linked page on the FAQ contains a CTA application. This can be printed and filled out, but not submitted on-line. A

document section contains back issues of the Newsletter, the Guidelines, Bylaws, and a section on the draft survey standards. The Newsletter has basically been dumped into a Web format, with no attempt to make corrections or create complex hyperlinks. To speed up downloading, Newsletters have been broken into sections. There is also a database-driven Events Calendar. Each time a user views the calendar, only upcoming events are displayed. This should help keep maintenance of the pages to a minimum. CTA members, or anyone, can add events to the calendar, so if you have an event you think folks might be interested in, this is a place to post it. The Jobs section of the web space is also a database application. When a user requests the job list, it will display jobs posted within the last 60 days. CTA members, or others, can post jobs here as well. The Links section contains a few links to Texas and other archeology resources. This is a first step and we would like the membership to browse the site and send content, comments, or suggestions to cta_web@nueces.thc.state.tx.us.

Nominating Committee Report: Submitted by Dan Potter, Chair. The committee met and conducted its work by phone and e-mail. A slate of nominees were drafted by the committee and are as follows:

For President-Elect: Gail Bailey and Doug Boyd
 For Secretary-Treasurer: Brett Cruse
 For Newsletter Editor: Robyn Lyle

A position statement was sent to the membership in early April so that members would have more time to learn about the nominees for President-Elect prior to casting votes at the April meeting. These were distributed via e-mail where possible and by regular mail to members without e-mail.

Old Business

Proposed Changes to the Bylaws (see Volume 21, No. 1 of the Newsletter)

Contractors List Schedule. Proposal to publish the Contractors List twice yearly instead of three times each year and to change Article VII, Section 4, accordingly. The motion was made and approved.

Creation of the Immediate Past President Office. Proposal to create the Immediate Past President position as an officer of CTA and to change Articles IV and V accordingly. The motion was made and approved.

Reconsidering the CTA Donation to the Archeological Conservancy. At the Spring 1996

Meeting, the membership voted to increase our annual donation to the Archeological Conservancy from \$500 to \$1,000 with the stipulation that our donation be used to prepare management plans. President Black wants additional discussion of the matter and believes that the donation should be unrestricted given its relatively small size and in light of the challenges facing conservation organizations.

After some discussion, the motion was made and seconded to reduce our donation to the Archeological Conservancy to \$500 and to add \$500 to our contribution to Texas Archeology Awareness Month. This motion failed. The motion was then made and seconded to keep our donation to the Archeological Conservancy at \$1,000 and not to add any stipulations or restrictions. This motion was approved.

Creating a Standing Committee on Native American Relations. Proposal to create a Native American Relations Committee as a standing committee. The motion was made and approved.

New Business

Election of 1997-98 Officers. The nominees for President-Elect were Gail Bailey and Doug Boyd. There were no other nominations from the floor. Doug Boyd was elected President-Elect. Brett Cruse was the only nominee for Secretary-Treasurer and Robyn Lyle was the only nominee for Newsletter Editor. Brett and Robyn were elected by acclamation.

Complaint Regarding the CTA Contractors List. On behalf of Prewitt and Associates, Inc., Doug Boyd had several complaints against the new tabular format of the Contractors List. Specifically, Prewitt and Associates believes the format makes it too easy for Contractors to misrepresent their capabilities. Doug made a motion to do away with the table checklist and to replace the table format with a written statement by the contractor of their capabilities. Doug also stated that the year the firm was incorporated or began work should be included; the number of cultural resources employees from each firm should be included; and the number of reports that conform to the CTA Guidelines that the firm has completed should be included. After some discussion, the consensus among the membership was that the table format should be replaced with a written statement by the contractor and that this statement should be 100 words or less. The contracting firm should be allowed to put any information about their firm they feel is relevant as long as they stay within the 100-word limit. Doug agreed to re-phrase his motion to reflect these suggested changes. The motion was

seconded and approved.

President Black announced that the tribute to E. Mott Davis scheduled for today would be postponed because Mott could not attend the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 11:35.

—

CTA Newsletter

Robyn P. Lyle, Editor
c/o Center for Environmental Archaeology
Texas A&M University
210 Anthropology Bldg.
College Station, TX 77843-4352

Have You Paid Your Dues?

Have you paid your CTA dues for 1997? If you have, there will be a '97 next to your name on your address label. If you haven't, there will be a '96 on your address label. This will be the last *CTA Newsletter* you receive until you pay up. You will find a renewal form at the end of this *Newsletter*, so please don't delay any longer. Send in your dues today!