



2001 CTA FALL MEETING
Friday, October 26th
1 - 4 pm
Corpus Christi, Texas

The 2001 CTA Fall Meeting will be held in conjunction with the Texas Archeological Society's Annual Meeting in Corpus Christi, Texas. The CTA meeting will be on the afternoon of Friday, October 27, 2001 starting at 1 pm.

Meeting Agenda

Registration: 1:00 pm
Call to Order: 1:30 pm

Approval of Minutes: Spring 2001 Meeting
(as published in this CTA Newsletter)

Announcements

Officer's Reports

- President*
- Secretary-Treasurer*
- Newsletter Editor*

Standing Committee Reports

- Governmental Affairs*
- Contractors List*
- Public Education*
- Multicultural Relations*
- CTA Web Page*
- Membership*

Special Committee Reports

- Accreditation and Review Council*
- Archeological Survey Standards*
- Anti-Looting Committee*
- Guidelines Revision*
- Curation Issues Task Force*

Old Business

Revised Survey Standards Discussion

New Business

- Election of President-Elect*
- Election of Newsletter Editor*
- 2002 Budget*
- 2002 Officer Nominations Committee*
- E. Mott Davis Outreach Award Nominations*
- RPA*
- THC Announcements*
- Other New Business*

Adjourn: 4:00 pm

In this issue . . .	
Presidents' Forum	2
Officer's Reports	4
Committee News:	
Membership	5
Government Affairs	5
Contractor's List	6
Web Page	6
Multicultural Relations	6
ARC	9
Survey Standards	12
Curation	20
Other CTA Business:	
Minutes of 2001 Spring Meeting	21
Articles and Updates:	
25th Celebration	25
THC News	26
Announcements	27

Presidents' Forum

David O. Brown

25 years

Next year the CTA will turn 25, a respectable age for any organization. Through the next few newsletters, we hope to present some bits of CTA history. Our current plans call for some appropriate celebratory functions at the next spring meeting. As we reach this milestone, it seems appropriate to reflect on the past and consider the future. When we look back to the origins of the CTA, we see a group of archeologists concerned for the future of the profession in Texas at a time when CRM was beginning to experience explosive growth. Since that time, CRM has continued to grow and evolve, constantly incorporating new challenges. During the last 25 years the CTA has been there, serving as a forum for communication among professionals as well as a means of voicing the concerns of the group as a whole regarding the practice of archeology. From its earliest days, the CTA has been focused on maintaining high standards for Texas archeology. During the first few years, the notion of regulating archeological practice and archeologists by means of adherence to a code of ethics with offenders castigated by a committee of their peers and perhaps removed from the organization for serious or repeated violations, was a key concept. While the CTA Ethics and Standards Committee persisted as an organized body until only recently, it became obvious almost from the first that the CTA would not be able to truly sanction ethical violations. Instead, the Ethics and Standards Committee became a dispute resolution mechanism, with very few cases ever brought before it. At times its members went for years without a single reported violation. Fortunately, the rise of the Society of Professional Archaeologists in the 1980s took away some of the pressure for local regulation of archeologists. While SOPA was able to achieve some success in this area, its deficiencies led to the formation of the Register of Professional Archaeologists in the 1990s. The ongoing debate over the Register, as evidenced in the archives of ACRA-L, suggests that this organization still

has some way to go before it is universally accepted. While we recognize these problems, the CTA as an organization is committed to the same ideals as the Register of Professional Archaeologists, and encourages CTA members to join.

Not dismayed by its failure to license or otherwise formally regulate archeology or archeologists, the CTA did not abandon the attempt to influence Texas archeology. Over a period of years, the organization developed a set of guidelines for the practice of archeology that have been revised several times and are once again in the process of revision today. These guidelines were subsequently used informally by the Texas Antiquities Committee and the Texas Historical Commission for evaluating the practice of archeology in the state. Later, the CTA developed the Accreditation and Review Council to promulgate artifact curation standards for institutions that would receive state permitted collections; and, more recently, the CTA has developed survey standards for small projects that the THC currently sends to entities that require archeological investigations under state and federal laws.

The CTA has done many useful things over the past 25 years, including donating thousands of dollars to worthwhile causes and the promotion of public education in Texas archeology. Either of these last two alone would justify the existence of the organization, but it is in the arena of self-regulation discussed above that we are the most successful and perhaps the truest to our original purpose. At present we continue this self-regulatory process with the attempt to revise the minimum survey standards that the THC uses for small projects. The changes are minor but nonetheless significant. While they slightly raise the level of effort for the lowest level of project, the most important change is providing more information about other aspects of the archeological process such as investigator qualifications, reporting requirements, and curation to clients and other non-specialists who are unlikely to want to wade through the longer and more technical guidelines for archeological projects. These changes have been undertaken with input from the THC and revised in accordance with comments from various CTA members and it is hoped that, with some last minute tweaking,

they will be approved at the fall meeting and ultimately adopted for use by the THC.

On another front, however, our attempts at self-regulation have been under assault. The recent THC Discard, Disposal, and Destructive Analysis policy was initiated with only minimal involvement from the general archeological community. While the CTA and its members were able to assert themselves in the development of the final product, the 3D policy has led us to a complete rethinking of the ARC process and the nature of CTA involvement in the regulation of museums and repositories. What was once seen as voluntary self-regulation has become a considerably more complex issue. For a discussion of some of these problems, see the note in this issue by Pat Clabaugh. In principle, the CTA remains fully committed to this process, and the accreditation of repositories and curatorial facilities continues without delay. Our goal, however, is to reduce any direct liability that we might incur as a result of our activities in this area by making it clear that the THC is the final arbiter of who will receive collections.

The 3D policy turned out to be only the advance guard of a broader curation policy that is now being studied by the THC. While some members of the CTA have had input and will probably continue to have input into this document, like the 3D policy, the new curation policy is not a product of our organization but rather imposed upon us. While we recognize the need for the THC to develop such standards, and their ultimate responsibility to initiate such policies, we still insist on our right to take a serious role in the development and subsequent modification of such policies. Without such input, the relationships between the THC and the various institutions and individual archeologists of the Texas professional community could become strained.

This is not intended as an accusation of the THC, nor is it a general call to arms against the proposed policy. Most aspects of the policy appear to be perfectly reasonable and in line with existing federal guidelines. I simply remind the THC that we are eager to help in the development of this and other future agency policies that might affect the practice of archeology in Texas. And I remind CTA

members that they have an obligation to keep informed of such developments, to consider them seriously, and to voice their opinions where possible. In the long run, the active partnership between a vocal CTA membership and a THC that values our input will help to continually improve the practice of archeology in Texas and to advance the cause of historic preservation. If we can do this, the next 25 years could be even more successful than the last 25.

Antiquities Advisory Board Meeting

The summer meeting of the Antiquities Advisory Board and the Antiquities Committee of the Texas Historical Commission was held on July 26th in Austin. The meeting featured the usual State Archeological Landmark nominations among other items. Of some note was a decision by the board to determine the boundaries of the Hatchell-Mitchell SAL as equivalent to the state-owned boundaries (because the actual site is much larger). Testimony was heard from several people on the potential sale of this land but neither the AAB nor the THC may have much of a say in this matter. These discussions presented a mixed view of the sale. This is a complex issue which needs some study, but if you have opinions on the potential sale of this site, which Jim Bruseth called the most important Caddo site at the AAB meeting, I urge you to contact the THC and the General Land Office. The next meeting of the AAB will be in Albany the day before the CTA and it may not be possible for us to attend. If any of the CTA members live in that area and would like to volunteer to attend the meeting on Thursday before heading down to the CTA and TAS, please contact me via e-mail at david.brown@mail.utexas.edu.

A Regrettable Loss

This summer, Karen Harry accepted an academic post at the University of Nevada Las Vegas and was forced to resign her new position as president-elect of the CTA (see her statement elsewhere in this issue). Prior to her election, Karen served as co-chair of the public education committee where she brought considerable energy and determination to that role. She was an outstanding committee chair and she would have made a fine president, but all things considered, many CTA members would have

jumped at the chance she was offered. Nonetheless, we will all miss her and wish her well in her new job. At the fall meeting, we will elect a replacement. I hope to see you all there.

Officer's Reports

Missi Green
Secretary-Treasurer's Report

On behalf of the CTA Executive Committee, I would like to thank all those who contributed to our Spring Fling. The Fling was a great success. Without the many contributors of time, energies, foods, dry goods, and other incidentals, it would have gone nowhere. Several contractors also gave a little extra to help cover some of the additional expenses of bring Dr. Fred Limp to the meeting. The generosity of PBS&J, Geo-Marine, Prewitt & Associates, Anthony & Brown, and Blanton & Associates was greatly appreciated.

Recently, our accounts have been fairly idle. The Scholarship Fund currently holds \$5,330.07. Donations slowed after the Spring Meeting and usually pick up again at the Fall Meeting. Please do not hesitate to contribute at any time to this worthwhile endeavor. The Money Market account maintains \$8,546.99 and the Checking account is at \$8,570.18.

There will be a discount to next year's membership dues to all those who join the Register of Professional Archeologists at the Fall Meeting. At the same time, a discount is likely for those who are presently RPAs and remain in good standing for 2002. Details will be finalized prior to the Fall Meeting.



Karen Harry
President-Elect's Report

As most of you are aware, I recently left Texas to accept an academic position with the University of Nevada Las Vegas. Unfortunately, this means that I must resign my position at CTA president-elect. I thank the members for electing me to this position — however briefly I may have served! — and urge those of you with ideas for my successor to contact the nominating committee.

Although I am excited about embarking on a new adventure, it was with mixed emotions that I accepted the job. I have enjoyed living in my home state of Texas for the last 3^{1/2} years, and am pleased to have had the opportunity to work with and get to know so many in the Texas archeological community. Please stay in touch, and look me up if you come to Las Vegas. Otherwise, I look forward to seeing you at future archeology meetings.



Marybeth Tomka
Newsletter Editor's Report

In the last year the CTA newsletter has gone electronic, making it far easier and cheaper for the membership at large, but it hasn't come without your editor learning some new tricks. I have been humbled by the intricacies of producing an electronic document. My hat is off to all those editors I have had the pleasure to work with over the years. I thought electronic databases were nerve racking. I thank you all for your patience as I have learned my job. However, I have found that with my family and other professional responsibilities, it has become impossible for me to continue to serve. I have tendered my resignation effective with the completion of this issue of the newsletter.



Committee News

Membership Committee Karl Kibler, Chair

At the Spring meeting of the Council of Texas Archeologists, the membership approved a plan proposed by the Membership Committee for awarding a \$500 research grant to an eligible CTA student member. The rules and guidelines for applying for the research grant have been posted on the CTA web page. The membership committee has set a goal of ultimately raising \$10,000 for the endowment fund, from which the research grant will be annually awarded. We are currently over half way to this goal. To raise more money, the Membership Committee is planning on holding a raffle at the TAS meeting in Corpus Christi. Prizes have yet to be determined, but will surely be of interest to all and will surely draw a crowd, much like our last raffle. In addition, I would like to see more corporate support for the endowment fund. To date, only two companies from the contractor's list have contributed to the fund (Geo-Marine, Inc., and Prewitt and Associates, Inc.). If all of the private companies on the contractor's list could contribute between \$100 and \$500, our goal of \$10,000 would be met. I think support from the companies on the contractor's list is very important, as it shows student members we support them and that the organization needs them, and it is ultimately an investment in our future employees and co-workers.



Governmental Affairs Committee Eric Schroeder, Chair

Since the Spring CTA Newsletter, the state legislature has adjourned, and a marginal victory was achieved. Although the unmarked burial bill (SB 472) remained in committee and was never voted on, several potentially disastrous bills such as HB1010 (related to the THC's authority to designate State Archeological Landmarks) and SB 934 (related to allowing recreational metal detecting in state parks) died in committee as well. It seems that the unmarked burial bill probably failed due to the same staunch opposition it received in past sessions. One reason for this opposition is the perception that if the bill were enacted into law it would be too difficult to enforce, and viewed as an infringement on private property rights. In referenced to SB934 and HB1010, I would like to thank all of you who responded to my legislative alert when it was thought they might be called to the floor. A great deal of their failure can be directly attributed to our membership.

As you have probably already heard that an adjacent landowner has petitioned the General Land Office to purchase the Hatchel Mound site. For those of you who don't know, the Hatchel Mound site is documented as a Caddoan Mound complex that has been owned by the GLO for some time, and thus afforded protection as a State Archeological Landmark. If sold, it would lose all protection afforded by state law. Testimony regarding this proposed action was presented during the Antiquities Advisory Board meeting in July. The Caddo representative voiced his support for the sale, while another interested party voiced his objection. Although the GLO is considering the sale, no final decision has been made.

The news in Washington is that President George W. Bush, Jr. has appointed a new chairman to the Advisory Council. Congratulations to our own Mr. John Nau III for his appointment.



Contractors List Committee Report
Amy Holmes, Chair

We would like the membership to consider abolishing the Contractors List Committee as it is currently structured and replacing it with a single Contractors List Coordinator. The duties of the Coordinator are explained below in our suggested amendment to the CTA Bylaws, Section 4:

“Section 4. Contractors List Coordinator: The Contractors List Coordinator shall be a member in good standing who will work closely with the Web Page Committee and the Secretary/Treasurer to ensure that contractor information (CRD identification, contractor address, phone, email, and web page info, as applicable) is up-to-date on the CTA Web Page. Each CRD must be a member of CTA and be in good standing in order to be included on the Contractors List. Each contractor must pay the listing fee in addition to the individual membership dues of the CRD, and the CRD can only appear once in the Contractors List. CTA members are responsible for meeting deadlines for inclusion on the CTA Contractors List and timely notification to the Contractors List Coordinator of address and other contractor information changes.”

Please be prepared to vote upon this at the Fall meeting. Thank you!



CTA Web Page Committee
Sue E. Linder-Linsley, Chair

As usual, we continue to add new information and update existing pages. New information on the web site includes guidelines for the CTA Student Research Grant and revised draft Survey Standards with CTA member comments. In May, the web site had a total of 8,372 successful hits while the summer was down slightly with August having 6,674 hits. The number of unique visitors was nearly 800,

ranging from 739 in May to 796 in August. The August visitors included 192 who visited more than once. From May through August, the CTA Newsletter Volume 25, No. 2 was downloaded 223 times. This may indicate that some CTA members are misplacing their first copy and getting a second one. It also indicates that they may be using it on-line more than once. The other possibility is that there are many non-CTA members reading our newsletter. The survey standards document has been downloaded 37 times. In June, the Contractors list was downloaded 56 times, one download less than the newsletter at 57 downloads. In July, the Contractors list was only downloaded twice, but has been downloaded 98 times in August.



Multicultural Relations Committee
Alston V. Thoms, Co-Chair

**Unmarked Graves Protection Legislation
 Fails to Pass, AGAIN**

The latest round of a long-standing effort to pass unmarked graves-protection legislation in Texas — 77th Legislative Session, 2000/2001 — ended unsuccessfully. Nonetheless, this year’s effort captured the attention of an ever-growing contingent of Texas’ citizenry. CTA, along with the Texas Alliance for Public Archaeology, continued to work for passage of protective legislation. Both groups participated in a rally for public awareness, organized by Native American Student Associations from several universities and held on the capitol steps in January. This year, Native American groups played key leadership roles in efforts to pass graves-protection legislation, giving presentations at workshops and conferences, as well as actively lobbying legislators. News stories published in Indian media circles included articles in Native American Village by Steve Russell, “Duty to the Dead: January 21, 2001” and by David Pego, “Texas Indians Seek New Law.” Copies of these articles are available

at: http://www.imdiversity.com/villages/native/Village_index_list.asp

Graves-protection legislation remained a popular topic among avocational and professional archaeologists in Texas, who hotly discussed its pros and cons. Much of the discussion took place in cyberspace, on TxARCH-L, as a debate between proponents of graves protection legislation and property-rights advocates who supported the concept, but not the legislation itself. Clearly, the awareness level within the TAS membership has increased this year and more folks gained a better idea about the diversity of perspectives within the archaeological community.

Major newspapers in Austin, Houston, and San Antonio also carried stories or editorials about graves-protection issues. Randy Reese writes in the *Victoria Advocate*; he included a comment that Texas was one of a dozen or so states lacking equal-protection legislation for unmarked graves in one of his news stories about archaeological excavations at Matagorda city cemetery. An overview article by David Eggert, "Grave Concerns: Proponents of bill to protect Indian sites vow to continue the 'fight for respect' to their death," appeared in the *San Antonio Express-News* (5 August 2001:1G). It included the following statements:

- "This year, SB 472, introduced by Barrientos, unanimously passed the Senate. However, the House version of the bill HB1997, sponsored by Rep. Norma Chavez, D-El Paso, did not make it out of committee." [i.e., State, Federal, and International Relations Committee, chaired by Rep. Bob Hunter, R-Abilene]
- "Hunter said this year's bill and prior legislation has been seen as 'invasive' to landowners."
- "According to a San Antonio-based wildlife group that has fought the legislation, the bill prompts many unanswered questions. 'As in many cases, our problem is not with the concept. Our problem is with the procedure,' said David Langford, executive vice president of the Texas Wildlife Association. 'Anybody who would rob a grave should be taken out and shot. But don't create all these burdens on those who are not doing that...Surely everyone supports a ban of grave looting, but they also back property rights...Do

some tribes have the right to go in and hold services in people's garages?"

"Other questions abound: What constitutes an 'intentional' act? What defines a funerary object? How long is a digging project delayed if remains are found? 'You don't protect things by a bureaucratic edict,' Langford added. 'You protect things by changing people's belief system.'"

- "Bob Sebree, vice president for government at the Texas Oil & Gas Association, said the legislation contained provisions that allowed a sheriff or state archaeologist to shut down a work site if a gravesite were found, but did not specify when companies would be allowed to resume work. Those worries were alleviated by an amendment, he said."

Annette Arkeketa-Rendon, a graduate student at TAMU-Corpus Christi, and Chris TenBerge, a graduate student at UT-Austin, were key players in organizing this year's effort by Native Americans to pass graves-protection legislation. Annette recently hosted a meeting to discuss strategies for continuing the effort to pass legislation. Chris TenBerge's minutes from the meeting included the following suggestions/comments for obtaining passage of protective legislation during the next legislative session (2002/2003):

- Working toward a greater public education effort — a statewide effort to educate the public about the issue and need for a law, including things like billboards, letters to the editor, news articles, workshops, conferences, presentations
- Raising funds to advance a public education campaign
- Holding workshops around the state so that our people who are providing the public education are presenting the same information as part of a consistent message
- More targeting of churches, corporations, other advocacy groups as allies; in general, a greater effort to find more support from a variety of groups
- Design a logo for use in the statewide campaign bumper stickers, T-shirts, posters, billboards, stationary
- Work on the language of the bill and our message so that it is clear that ALL races are included and that the bill applies to all peoples
- Hire a person to lobby for the bill during the session
- Organize as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation so that we can apply for grants to pay for a full time lobbyist, conduct workshops, public awareness, produce a documentary

- Determine a better, more favorable House committee and get the bill out of Bob Hunter's committee — set up meeting with the Speaker of the House, Pete Laney, to make this request
- Set up meeting with the new Governor, who says he is Comanche, so maybe he will be willing to support the bill
- Meet with the Texas Tribes to get more commitment of support from them and get on their council agenda — Annette said she would contact Debbie Thomas with the Alabama Coushatta; Beatriz Garza with the Kickapoo Traditional Tribe; Rick Quezada with the Tigua
- Develop and maintain a website
- Set-up meeting with oil and gas lobby to determine objections and ask them to sponsor a conference.

*77th Session of the Texas Legislature
Recognizes Coahuiltecan Contributions*

The House of Representatives passed (i.e., enrolled on 05/14/01) House Resolution 787 “recognizing the Tap Pilam-Coahuiltecan Nation and its efforts to preserve its cultural and spiritual heritage and traditions” (full text available at: <<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us>>). The resolution also acknowledged that although the United States government did not recognize Tap Pilam-Coahuiltecan Nation, “the Coahuiltecan tribe’s distinguished history in the Lone Star State merits strong consideration for official acknowledgment from the State of Texas and the United States...”

It concluded as follows:

WHEREAS, Descendants of this intrepid tribe celebrate time-honored occasions, such as Indian Decoration Day, and also use ceremonial music and dress as ways of upholding tribal customs; in addition, renewed efforts to ascertain more knowledge about their ancestry are on going; and

WHEREAS, Throughout the years, the Coahuiltecan have played an integral role in Texas' development, and the Native American tribes who were the first Texans have greatly enriched our shared heritage with their culture; and

WHEREAS, Given the tribe's justifiable pride in its distinct history and culture, the Texas House of Representatives finds that it is indeed appropriate to bestow such recognition as will encourage the

preservation of the Tap Pilam-Coahuiltecan's unique cultural heritage and to support those activities consistent with the state's interest in preserving all of Texas' diverse cultural and natural resources for future generations; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the House of Representatives of the 77th Texas Legislature hereby recognize the Tap Pilam-Coahuiltecan Nation for its immeasurable contributions as an indigenous people of Texas and commend the tribe's efforts to preserve its cultural and spiritual heritage and traditions.

The Texas Senate passed (i.e., enrolled on 05/11/2001) a similar, albeit shorter, resolution (SR 1038) “commending the Tap Pilam-Coahuiltecan Nation” (full text available at: <<http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/>>). It resolved “that the Senate of the State of Texas, 77th Legislature, hereby commend the Tap-Pilam-Coahuiltecan for their exemplary preservation of their heritage and their many contributions to the culture of our state and nation; and be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be prepared for the Tap Pilam-Coahuiltecan Nation as an expression of esteem from the Texas Senate” (2001). The President of the Senate formally presented members of Tap Pilam-Coahuiltecan Nation with the resolution in the Senate chamber on May 18, 2001 (Raymond Hernández, personal communication 2001). Comments made by Senator Zaffirini, who introduced the resolution, are available in audio and text formats, or the actual presentation may be viewed, at the following website (scroll down to Senate Session, May 18, part 1, then fast forward 1 hour/19 minutes): <http://www.senate.state.tx.us/75r/senate/AVarch.htm>

*Funerary Objects from
Mission San Juan to be Reburied*

As discussed in one of last year’s Multicultural Relations Committee reports in the newsletter (Vol. 24, No.1), remains of more than 100 individuals, originally excavated from two church-floor cemeteries at Mission San Juan in the late 1960s, were reburied at the mission in November 1999. Reburial arrangements were worked out among representatives of the San Antonio Catholic Archdiocese, Native

American groups in the San Juan community, the National Park Service, and UTSA. Representatives from American Indians in Texas at Spanish Colonial Mission (AIT-SCM) prepared the remains and carried out the reburial.

Associated funerary objects, however, were not reinterred at that time, but plans were to return the objects to AIT-SCM for reburial following completion of archaeological analyses at UTSA.

The last of those items were returned to a representative of the Archdiocese in early August, 2001 (Steve Tomka, personal communication, 2001). As reported by Raymond Hernandez (personal communication, 2001), cultural preservationist for AIT-SCM and a council member for the Tap-Pilam-Coahuiltecan Nation, the Archdiocese recently delivered all of the funerary objects to AIT-SCM for reburial at the mission.



*Accreditation and Review Council
Old and New Business,
Pat Clabaugh, Chair*

The Accreditation and Review Council has been making some headway on old and new business this summer, while this fall is already looking like a full slate. By the time you read this article, ARC will have dispatched our second field review team and will be preparing for deliberations on that applicant institution at our next business meeting (to be scheduled). We took a recent survey to determine the status of the ARC Field Reviewers, to update our mailing list and data summaries. We were pleased to learn that the number of active participants remains constant at fifteen out of twenty-one. Six reviewers are no longer able to commit to the program due to relocation out of state or for personal reasons. Again, we are planning to conduct an ARC field reviewer refresher course sometime this fall presumably in Austin, however, we are still making preparations. If you are a certified ARC Field Reviewer, we will be contacting you via email or snail mail about final scheduling. Contact Pat Clabaugh if you have questions about the course.

ARC proposes the following changes in the Bylaws of the Council of Texas Archeologists, Article VIII, Section 3. ARC considers these

changes necessary to further establish officer duties as ex officio Chair and to clarify the role of the current CTA President concerning ARC's mission.

Election of ARC Officers.

The ARC shall elect by majority one of its members to serve as Chair and another to serve as Secretary-Treasurer. (Members of the Implementation Committee shall act as the first ARC body.) The immediate past ARC Chair shall for one year be a non-voting ex officio member of ARC to provide a smooth transition for the new Chair; and the past CTA President shall be a non-voting ex officio member of ARC to maintain communication between ARC and the CTA Executive Committee.

I am pleased to report that ARC and CTA were well represented at the Society for American Archaeology 66th Annual Meeting in New Orleans last April. The symposium on *The Issue of Curation in Texas: How One State is Dealing with the Curation Crisis*, organized and moderated by Karen Gardner, was very well attended and was an important milestone in Texas

archaeology. Position papers were presented by Karen Gardner (Prewitt and Associates) and Missi Green (GeoMarine Inc.), Missi Green for Nancy Kenmotsu (Texas Department of Transportation), Paddy Paterson (US Army Corps of Engineers), and myself, Patricia Clabaugh (Accreditation and Review Council and Texas A&M University). This session provided diverse perspectives on a variety of curation issues facing Texas today. Our discussant Margaret Howard (Texas Parks and Wildlife Department), initiated discussions based on some more salient points in our papers: curation costs, long term storage (perpetuity), state accreditation, credible curation standards, consulting with tribes on curation issues, artifact redundancy, field collection strategies, overcrowded conditions, deaccessioning, and disposal. The audience was engaged and asked many good questions, often compelled to share their own experiences dealing with curation issues in their respective regions. With prospects for setting up accreditation programs in their own states, several attendees asked that I send them more information about ARC and to let them know if there were opportunities to attend ARC Field Reviewer training or other educational sessions.

That same afternoon I attended a forum sponsored by the SAA Committee on Native American Relations entitled *Native Americans Building Our Side of the Bridge: Efforts in Preservation of Cultural Resources*. The third speaker Marcia Cross, a Tribal Preservation Officer for the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Indian Nation, barely got started when she asked the audience if they knew what Texas was doing to solve their curation crisis. She went on to explain that she attended the Curation in Texas symposium that morning and was surprised and disturbed to learn that Texas was proposing a disposal strategy. As one solution to the problem of overcrowded storage conditions, Texans were going to get rid of (I believe she said dump) redundant or insignificant archaeological collections. She also learned that Texans were

seriously considering digging up sites and then leaving the artifacts on-site. As a Native American archaeologist, her first concern was that there was no plan to engage in tribal consultation. After the session I spoke to Ms. Cross about her concerns and assured her that most archaeologists and cultural resource managers in Texas were not advocating “throwing away” any archaeological collections. I did allow that given the scarcity of federal lands in Texas tribal consultation was not ideal although efforts were ongoing and we were making progress. Mostly I wanted to assure her that the Kootenai collection on loan at my institution (Texas A&M University) was secure and in stable condition.

In July, Alston Thoms and I had the opportunity to further discuss these very issues with Marcia Cross and other tribal members when we traveled to Flathead Indian Nation in Montana. Last year at the tribe’s request, we were asked to hand deliver an archaeological research collection they loaned to Texas A&M University from the Salish and Kootenai Tribal Curation Facility. These collections are owned by the US Forest Service and the Army Corps of Engineers and managed by the tribe. The bottom line is that we all know there is a curation crisis, but archaeologists and Native Americans will usually have very different ways in which they handle archaeological collections. However, we proceed in working out curation problems in Texas and beyond, consultation with the appropriate tribes is not only necessary but critical for understanding multi-cultural perspectives on collections management and doing what is right in the public trust.

State Accreditation: The Final Authority

The Texas Historical Commission’s charge to protect the future of state heritage collections by implementing archeological accreditation standards is commendable. The CTA Executive Committee and ARC continue to define its role in state accreditation as the state’s curation policies and procedures are developed, revised, and legalized. ARC’s function in certifying Accredited

Archeological Repositories (AAR) under current and proposed rules is now in question (see **President's Forum**). As an unfunded mandate, there is a growing departure from ARC's mission as a "Service to Texas" and THC's agenda to designate AAR's by December 31, 2002. Serious concerns about the consequences of this deadline were raised at the April 6, 2001 CTA business meeting by several members and members of the board over the role of CTA ARC acting as an accreditation "licencing" board for THC. The legal consequences of requiring ARC accreditation for museums and repositories who hold held-in-trust archaeological collections are clearly uncertain. It is in CTA's best interest to address these matters with THC to assure that no one penalizes our organization, individual members, or associated institutions for their role(s) in developing and overseeing state accreditation.

There has been a long history of cooperative efforts between CTA and THC to develop important archeological standards in survey, professional performance, curation, and report production. Archaeological accreditation standards are no different and can be used by THC to grant state accreditation. CTA ARC is willing to continue its effort as a service to Texas,

however, it is appropriate that THC is the final authority for granting archeological accreditation to museums and repositories who curate state owned collections. The final disposition of state archeological collections are for THC to decide and we have developed ARC accreditation standards for just that purpose.

CTA ARC has requested that all references to the Council for Texas Archeologists (CTA), and the Accreditation and Review Council (ARC) be stricken from the proposed amendments to §26.27 (relating to Definitions and Disposition of Archeological Artifacts and Data) of Title 13, Part 2, Chapter 26 of the Texas Administrative Code. We requested the same action for all CTA or ARC references in the Draft THC Collection Management Policy and those found in the State Held-in-Trust Agreement recently issued by their office. This in no way affects the way ARC will do business in the future, nor will the policies and procedures of the ARC program be modified because of these changes. ARC will continue to be a service to, and an educational outlet for, museums and institutions interested in improving or developing credible standards in curation and collections management.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON
THE DRAFT ARCHEOLOGICAL SURVEY STANDARDS FOR TEXAS
(as Published in the March 2001 CTA Newsletter, Vol. 25, No. 2)

The following is a summary of the comments and questions received and the committee's responses to them. The Comments are organized into sections that follow the organization of the *Draft Archeological Survey Standards*. General comments and questions are listed at the end of the document.

As a result of this process, some sections of the *Draft Archeological Survey Standards* have been revised. These changes have been indicated with underlining in the following version of the document. Further questions and comments regarding the Draft Survey Standards should be addressed to Marianne Marek, Committee Chair, P.O. Box 476, Wallis, Texas 77485 <marianne@nstci.com>.

INTRODUCTION

Comment: In order to provide THC and other state agencies with the ability to regulate the intensity and quality of archeological investigations, these standards must constitute "the least amount of work that will be considered acceptable" (wording in the current version) rather than being "recommended" (the proposed version).

Comment: I recommend that the first sentence be changed to read, "These survey standards identify the minimum amount of work..."

Response: The first sentence has been changed to read "the amount of work that is normally considered acceptable." The new wording allows for exceptions. The "Minimum" standards are given under Item 6.

Comment: Retain text noting that the standards were developed through consultation by the CTA and THC.

Response: Is this necessary? The THC and CTA worked together on these standards. But the THC will adopt and enforce them when they are finalized. The CTA has no real authority.

Comment: It is unclear whether the Draft revisions of the Texas Archaeological Survey Standards are being generated by CTA for adoption by THC or if we are advising the THC with input on standards. There are real differences in these two approaches. If CTA is developing the standards, then I am concerned about several issues involved in the legal authority to impose the standards.

Comment: I can certainly understand why THC wants CTA input on standards (i.e., drawing on the vast breadth of experience of the CTA members to produce a defensible position), in the end it does not really matter what CTA thinks. What matters are what THC thinks and will be willing to enforce. I continue to think that, once adopted and put into place, these should be viewed as the THC's survey standards, not the CTA's. Remember that CTA got involved only mid-way through this process, specifically to lend the THC a hand.

Response: CTA members expressed dissatisfaction with the current standards being used by the THC. Hence this committee was formed (with the THC's approval) to solicit recommended changes from the CTA membership. This committee has been working with the THC to develop the revised standards. The THC has read and submitted revisions to the standards prior to their listing in the newsletter. Once the CTA finalizes and approves the revised standards, the THC plans to adopt them.

1. PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Comment: The use of 36CFR Part 61 (Procedures for Approved State and Local Government Historic Preservation Programs) in the proposed Survey Standards (“1. Professional Qualifications: Archeological investigations must be supervised by a Principal Investigator that meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards, 36CFR Part 61; or meets...”) is in error. 36CFR Part 61 is the National Park Service regulation defining what qualifications a SHPO staff, review panel, or CLG must meet in order to perform reviews and comment. It has no applicability or authority on agency personnel or anyone else and it does not establish any criteria for a Principal Investigator. It is better to cite the SOI Standards and Guidelines, (which contains the same information but is within the authority of the THC and SHPO to seek.

Response: The Secretary of the Interiors Professional Qualification Standards (48FR 22716) published in September of 1983 state: “The following requirements are those used by the National Park Service, and have been previously published in the Code of Federal Regulations, 36CFR Part 61.” So technically 48FR 22716 says to go look at 36CFR Part 61. I’ve clarified this by adding a reference to 48FR 22716.

4. SUBMERGED ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES

Comment: [This] is fine for informational purposes, but it does not set a standard. Given that, I wonder if it belongs here. Is this something that THC has had a problem with? If not, why try to fix it?

Response: It’s only listed for informational purposes. As are the sections on Geomorphology, Curation, Site Forms, and the rest. Underwater archeology is an area that may need to be considered and archeologists and their clients need to know that.

5. BURIED CULTURAL DEPOSITS

Comment: I believe if there is a potential for buried cultural deposits that a distinction should be made as to whether shovel testing or backhoe trenching would be a more appropriate means of detection. This distinction should be based on the overall thickness of the Holocene deposit...In other words let’s not waste time, money, and effort shovel testing a landform with culturally relevant deposits greater than 1 m in depth and thickness.

Response: Yes, the archeologist should choose appropriate methods based on the particular situation for each project. However, we’re trying to keep the Survey Standards relatively short, and it is impossible to include everything. The more detailed, specific discussions of options for different circumstances should be outlined in a separate document that is provided only to archeologists — such as the CTA Guidelines for Performance, Curation, and Reports. Consider the purpose of the standards more for providing an overview of the entire CRM process to inform clients of what is required. Remember — this document is sent to non-archeologists that need an archeological survey — every land developer, every city manager, and every wastewater company in the state. Subsequent changes to item 5 should address this problem.

6. FIELDWORK

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment: Substantial increases are proposed for the level of shovel/backhoe testing in project areas of 10 acres or less, linear project areas, and areas where cultural materials may be deeply

buried. These changes must be evaluated by the CTA membership and THC to weigh the magnitude of cost increase they will cause against the improved ability to identify archeological sites.

Response: The increased frequency of shovel tests for areas of 10 acres or less should not increase project costs. For 10 acres, it should still only take one day of fieldwork (20 shovel tests). Deviations from the Survey Standards are allowed as long as they can be justified to the THC. Hence, in practice these standards may not increase project costs at all. Or these standards may be used to justify more intensive work to clients in situations where it is needed.

Comment: Does not the shovel testing and backhoe work directly apply to the potential for buried cultural deposits (as stated in item 5)? If so, then how do you reconcile item 6 where ST densities are legislated? On some west Texas mesas, where bedrock covers the entire area, no ST or BHT should be needed to find sites.

Response: There was a formatting problem in the Draft Survey Standards originally published in the electronic CTA Newsletter. [*Editor's note: This problem was resolved and an email sent to the membership announcing the posting of the new version.*] Note 1 beneath Item 6 states that "shovel tests must be excavated in settings with a high probability for buried cultural materials and whenever vegetation obscures surface visibility, except on slopes greater than 20%." Also, the first sentence of the introduction now reads "These survey standards identify the amount of work that is normally considered acceptable..." This acknowledges that justifiable deviations from the guidelines are permissible.

Comment: Notes 2 and 3 of the [former] standards must be retained, because they relate levels of shovel testing for site discovery and definition to a 30% threshold of ground surface visibility.

Response: Their omission was a formatting error that occurred during transfer to Acrobat. Notes 2 and 3 have been combined in the new version, however.

Comment: I strongly recommend that an explicit definition of shovel testing be added to the survey standards. [Such as the definition given in] the general section of the regional standards developed by CTA in 1996.

Response: It has been added. However, we are trying to keep the Survey Standards as short as possible. The committee hopes to incorporate the 1996 Regional Standards into the revised CTA Guidelines for Performance, Curation and Reports.

Comment: I think the notations about shovel tests and backhoe trenches being required in areas with the potential for buried deposits should have qualifiers indicating that this may not be necessary if existing exposures (e.g., cutbanks, roadcuts, etc.) provide adequate subsurface visibility.

Response: "Existing exposures" can be incorporated within "surface visibility." We are trying to keep these guidelines relatively short and cannot include all exceptions to the rules.

TRANSECT INTERVAL

Comment: Why did you unilaterally change/delete the old standards of 15 m transect intervals for west Texas to 30 m transects statewide? Does not the archaeological record of west Texas (Fort Bliss) dictate the closer transects spacing?

Response: This change was made specifically at the request of individuals working in west Texas, who thought that 15m was ridiculous given the great surface visibility. Archeologists should adapt their transect intervals according to the terrain and vegetation. Deviations are permissible, as long as an archeologist can adequately justify their methods to the THC.

SHOVEL TESTS, NON-LINEAR PROJECTS

Comment: I suspect that increasing the frequency of shovel testing for projects up to 10 acres in size would not have a huge impact on costs, but the four-fold increase between a 10-acre project (20 shovel tests) and an 11-acre project (5-6 shovel tests) will make it all that much more tempting for some to tinker with project size (this is less of an issue in the original standards, where there was only a two-fold increase). Also, unless the THC has identified shovel-testing frequency in very small projects as a problem, I would question the need to make these changes.

Comment: How did you arrive at a ST density where a 10-acre parcel is required to have 20 shovel tests, but an 11-acre parcel can get away with 6 STs? Where did these numbers come from and how do you reconcile these figures?

Response: Someone that randomly puts only one shovel test per acre has a good chance of missing sites. We therefore wanted to increase the number of shovel tests for smaller parcels (which normally doesn't affect project costs), but acknowledge that this same level of effort may not be feasible for bigger projects. Hence the scale. Again, deviations from the Standards are possible as long as they can be justified to the THC.

SHOVEL TESTS, LINEAR PROJECTS

Comment: I think the requirement for 17 shovel tests per mile for a linear project is too high. It is much closer to what one "should do" than the kind of minimum that these standards should be espousing. I would be more comfortable with 8 shovel tests per mile.

Response: The committee selected 17 shovel tests per mile because it was a "do-able" number of tests (seventeen shovel tests per mile comes out to one shovel test per 100 meters). We believe that using the per-mile figure allows archeologists the leeway to concentrate shovel tests in areas with a higher potential for archeological sites. Using an arbitrary interval standard (i.e., one shovel test per 30 or 50 meters) often results in shovel tests being unnecessarily located in disturbed or no probability areas. It is permissible to do less than 17 shovel tests per mile, as long as the reasons are justified to the THC.

Comment: It is not clear what the relevance of the 100-ft-wide corridor (in parentheses) is. Does this mean that a 50-ft-wide corridor would need only half as many shovel tests?

Response: No, but it does mean that a 200 ft wide corridor would need twice as many shovel tests on two transects. I've added a "less than or equal to" sign in order to clarify this.

AVERAGE RATE OF SURVEY

Comment: You might want to make it clearer that the two sets of figures given for Average Survey Rate apply to nonlinear vs. linear surveys. Also, based on my experience, the figure of 3 miles per person-day for linear survey is too high. We usually plan on 1.5-3.0 miles per 2-person crew-day, i.e., 0.75-1.5 miles per person-day. I am not sure that I see the rationale for giving a range for linear surveys but a single figure for nonlinear surveys. This is an area where I would probably contradict what I said above about the standards being thresholds below which people should not drop. For example, the figure of 20 acres per person-day is probably a fair average for much of the state, not a maximum figure (sometimes we survey 10-12 acres/day, sometimes 25 acres/day or more). I would use the same rationale to come up with a single figure for linear surveys.

Response: Hopefully, the differences between linear and nonlinear rates are now clarified. Other members didn't like a single average figure for linear surveys — they wanted a range. This has been changed. Since CTA recommends a minimum of a two-person crew for safety reasons, I've made changes accordingly. Other changes include an average for non-linear surveys, and an average range for linear surveys. I consider this section is more for informative purposes rather than being an actual standard. It gives clients an idea of how long a survey will take and can be used for budgeting purposes.

BACKHOE TRENCHES

Comment: In areas where backhoe work is prudent, how did you arrive at a 3x increase in the number of backhoe trench density (1 BHT/acre) over the older standards? I am unaware of the use of this density as any form of prospecting method for finding sites. The concept may work well in large urban regions of east Texas, but the level of effort is insane for many other parts of Texas where backhoes are 2 hrs from job sites.

Comment: My comment regards the number of backhoe trenches per acre. While one per acre seems okay, I can think of some cases where this might be excessive.

Comment: I do not think that requiring one backhoe trench per acre "as appropriate" works. What is "as appropriate"? I recommend keeping the more-enforceable one trench per 3 acres, unless you want to develop a sliding scale as for shovel tests (1-10 acres = 1 BHT per acre; 11-100 acres = 1 BHT per 2 acres; 101-200 acres = 1 BHT per 3 acres??).

Response: BHT density was changed specifically to increase the frequency of testing for small areas that might need it. Hence, the "as appropriate" means that one trench per acre may not always be necessary. We could do a sliding scale similar to the shovel tests. But the conditions for when and where backhoe trenches are required are quite variable, and other means of deep testing (auger tests, units, inspection of natural cut banks, etc.) may be acceptable alternatives. It is impossible to cover all situations in this small document, therefore the backhoe trenching requirement has been removed and is incorporated in Item 5. "If there is a potential for buried cultural deposits within the depth of impacts, subsurface investigations (shovel tests, backhoe trenches, or other acceptable methods) will be required."

8. PROJECT REPORT

Comment: I would suggest that somewhere in the introduction you clearly state that the standards only apply to work performed to comply with Texas Antiquities Permits (conducted on lands owned by the state or a subdivisions of the state). ...Federal regulations take Precedence over state regulations. Thus, a statement like "the archaeologist is required...to submit 20 copies of the final report" is exceeding the authority of both the CTA and the THC. Federal agencies can require any numbers of reports that they wish. Professional ethics dictate that neither the client nor my stockholders pay for extra reports generated to satisfy this requirement.

Response: Technically you are correct, Section 106 does not require the contractor to submit reports to the THC. However, the THC reviews projects on behalf of the SHPO who has federal authority, and the Federal Agencies are responsible for completing the Section 106 process. Besides, in my experience, federal agencies include the 20 THC copies within their contracted number of copies. The Federal Agency then sends the 20 copies to the THC themselves.

Comment: I do not think it is appropriate for these standards to specify that "the archeologist is required to address any comments from the THC." The extent to which THC comments are addressed sometimes is determined by the project sponsor (particularly in the case of federal agencies), not the contractor.

Response: Technically you are correct, only projects under an Antiquities Permit are required to address comments and submit 20 reports. However, the THC reviews projects on behalf of the SHPO who has federal authority, and Federal Agencies are responsible for completing Section 106 consultation. According to the THC, most Federal Agencies generally tell the project sponsor to address THC comments, but this is not always the case. THC policy is that the contractor should either address the comments in the final report, or they should send a letter to the THC explaining why they did not address certain comments. Either way the contractor needs to say something about the comments in writing. But it is not a requirement under the law. In other cases, the project sponsor may be more willing to cooperate with THC comments if they know beforehand that they may need to do so. And some sponsors will just be “ornery” and totally uncooperative because they didn’t want to do this “archeology stuff” in the first place.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment: (Regarding the “Summary of State Survey Standards” starting on page 10 of the March 2001 Newsletter (Volume 25, Number 2). Note that the Supreme Court has ruled in numerous cases that States cannot require a Federal Agency to acquire an activity permit, or a license for performing personnel, UNLESS specific congressional authority has been assigned.

Response: These state guidelines are discussing both State and Federal Cultural Resources Review Processes. Thus, one may need to acquire a Federal Permit from a Federal Agency to conduct archeological work for a Federal Undertaking, and State Permits are issued by the State to work on Public Lands. The States ARE NOT trying to permit Federal Agencies.

Comment: I am in favor of performance standards, but the State doesn’t even have a standard definition of what constitutes an archaeological site, or a threshold of when the site boundaries are to be determined.

Response: We hope to incorporate this in the planned revisions of the CTA standards of performance, curation, and reports

Comment: Based on the extensive work [done] on the initial standards, I feel that the standards should not try to tell people what they should be doing. Instead, they should tell people what not to do, i.e., minimums that they should not fall below (of course, unless there is a good and justifiable reason). This will provide the THC with a more easily enforced set of rules than would “specific fieldwork requirements for the different geographical areas,” as suggested in the second paragraph on page 8 of the newsletter. We spent a great deal of time working on Regionally specific standards before proposing the initial standards; and while this process was informative (particularly in terms of the disjunction between what people thought should be done during survey and what they actually did); we decided that it was not a workable solution to this particular problem.

Response: The regional standards are however very useful guidelines on how to approach the archeology for a particular region — especially if one is not familiar with that region. Hence, it would still be useful to incorporate the regional guidelines into the CTA Guidelines for Performance, Curation, and Reports. All your hard work should not go to waste.

Comment: These standards should be driven by the desire to fix problems. The central question is what about the current system is broken and hence needs to be remedied. Of course, the most important source for information about this is the THC. They are the ones who see...where problems come up. The first paragraph of the introduction to these revised standards lists three specific problem areas (inadequate standards for linear projects, differences between transect intervals for west and east Texas, and lack of requirements for background research

and curation), but it is not clear who thinks these are problems. Based on Bill Martin's article following the proposed standards, it looks like only the first of these may be the kind of thing that truly needs fixing.

Response: The problem areas were defined by members of the CTA membership. The problem with transect intervals for west Texas specifically came from members who work in west Texas.

Comment: This absolutely needs a disclaimer that states "This is for archaeological surveys only. Other classes of cultural resource (such as historic structures and traditional cultural properties may require additional investigations." To the prospective client this implies that the once "archaeology" is done they are through with CRM. I don't think it hurts to prime the pump. Most of the people receiving these guidelines will be complying with Sec. 106. All they want is clearance. They need to know that archaeology is not the end of it. Besides, TCPs are real — a lawsuit waiting to happen. Don't you think when someone sues to stop a project they are going to name the permitting agency, the THC and everyone associated with the permit, including the archaeologist?

Response: The standards state "identify the amount of work that is normally considered acceptable for intensive archeological surveys of 200 acres or less. These standards are not intended to limit additional work...that may be necessary." I would think this covers it. The only way I can think to address this Comment is to add separate items for TCP's and Historic Buildings (similar to item 4 for submerged sites).

ARCHEOLOGICAL SURVEY STANDARDS FOR TEXAS
2nd DRAFT (Revised 8/10/01)

These survey standards identify the amount of work that is normally considered acceptable for intensive archeological surveys of 200 acres or less. These standards are not intended to limit additional work (i.e., more shovel tests or backhoe trenches) that may be deemed necessary to identify archeological sites on the basis of the Area of Potential Effect, anticipated impacts, or the likelihood of encountering significant cultural resources. Survey methodologies for project areas larger than 200 acres should be discussed with the Texas Historical Commission Archeology Division prior to implementing the survey.

1. Professional Qualifications: Archeological investigations must be supervised by a Principal Investigator that meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (48FR 22716 or 36CFR Part 61); or meets requirements as outlined in Title 13, Part II, of the Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 26.

2. Archeologists shall adhere to guidelines provided in Title 13, Part II, of the Texas Administrative Code Chapters 24 and 26 and the *Council of Texas Archeologists Guidelines for Performance, Curation, and Reports*.

3. Background Research: Archeologists must conduct a background literature search prior to field investigations. At a minimum this shall include searches of the Texas Historical Commission and the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory (TARL) records or the equivalent Texas Archeological Sites Atlas Database for previously recorded archeological sites and historic properties, and previous archeological work in the vicinity.

4. Projects crossing navigable state or federal waters may require an underwater survey to locate **submerged archeological sites**.

5. Archeologists must assess the **potential for buried cultural deposits** within the area of potential effect prior to starting field investigations. At a minimum this shall include a review of the USDA soil surveys and geologic maps. If there is a potential for buried cultural deposits within the depth of impacts, subsurface investigations (such as shovel tests, backhoe trenches, or other acceptable method) will be required.

6. Fieldwork

MINIMUM SURVEY STANDARDS For Project Areas of 200 Acres or Less		
Transect Interval	Not greater than 30 meters	
Shovel Tests^{1,2}		
<i>Project Areas</i>	<i>Size</i>	<i>Shovel test density</i>
	0-2 acres	3 per acre
	>2-10 acres	2 per acre
	>11-100 acres	1 every 2 acres
	>101-200 acres	1 every 3 acres
<i>Linear Projects</i>	≤100' (30 m) wide corridor	17 per mile
Number of Shovel Tests required to define site boundaries	6 - 8	
Average Rate of Survey	<i>Non-linear surveys: 30 acres</i>	<i>Linear surveys: 1-3 miles</i>
<i>(2 persons / per day)</i>		

¹shovel tests are excavated in settings that have a probability for buried cultural materials and whenever vegetation obscures surface visibility, except on slopes greater than 20%

²shovel tests are 30 cm in diameter or on a side; excavated to the bottom of Holocene deposits, if possible. They are dug in levels no thicker than 20 cm; and sediments screened through 1/4 inch mesh unless high clay or water content requires that they be troweled.

7. Site Forms: Texas Archeological Site Data Forms must be completed for all archeological sites revisited or discovered during survey. These forms are submitted in TXSITE database and paper forms to the Texas Archeological Research Laboratory, University of Texas at Austin.

8. Project Report: Archeologists are required to submit the results of their investigations in a report to the THC. The THC will normally complete its review within 30 days. Comments from the THC must be addressed and 20 copies of the final report are submitted to the THC.

9. Curation: Archeological field notes, photographs, and artifacts must be submitted to an accredited state repository for permanent curation as stipulated in Chapter 26 and the Council of Texas Archeologists guidelines.



*Curation Special Committee
Karen Gardner*

The Ad hoc curation committee, made up of interested individuals from private contracting firms, state agencies, and curatorial facilities, continues to discuss and review the issue of the curation of archeological collections. Rather than getting mired in discussions of the relative merits of various artifact types, the committee is instead looking at what may be considered the priorities in curating collections. As we all know, different types of projects have different needs as well as potential, and generate different types of collections. Looking at the curation issue from a more general, overarching perspective however, the committee has developed some general priorities and issues to be considered.

The discussions about these issues are in the initial phases, and what is suggested here should by no means be taken as rules or standards. Rather at this point they are considered to be discussion points and topics for consideration, which it is hoped will eventually lead to guidelines for curation issues, such as we have established with the Survey Standards.

Priorities for the Curation of Cultural Materials and Associated Documentation from CRM Projects

1) Records

Field notes and records, lab and analysis records, photographs, maps, and other related

documentation are the critical components of the materials to be curated from a project. The records from a project are truly the most important part of any collection, for they provide the history of the project, specific details about what was encountered and what occurred, along with all the other details of who, what, when, why, and how. Without the accompanying documentation, the artifacts themselves are nothing more than items with limited research value or potential. Original records are preferred whenever possible.

2) Research Design

Research potential is the single most important guiding principle in deciding what materials should be collected during fieldwork, as well as in deciding which items may be collected and later discarded prior to curation. It is essential that curation issues be considered during the preparation of a research design, for it is at this point that decisions can be made about the research potential of the various materials that may be encountered during the course of the project.

It is very important to be careful when making determinations about the "curation value" of an artifact or group of artifacts. All artifacts have research value, often of varying levels depending on the needs of the project, the individual interests of the researchers, and the type and condition of the site/project location.

3) Context

Cultural materials recovered from locations with both contextual integrity (i.e., minimal disturbance) and temporal/spatial associations are more likely to have stronger research potential than those materials from disturbed or unprovenanced locations.

4) Artifact Conditions

Curation decisions are often influenced by the size of the artifact, its condition and/or preservation, and the quantity of a type of artifact. Very large artifacts can be difficult to transport, prepare for curation, and house at a facility.

Artifacts that are in poor condition, have poor preservation, or are actively decaying/rusting/molding, will not only not last long, but also may be a hazard to other collections. Large artifact groups such as burned rock, shell, debitage, some historic materials, etc. may take up large quantities of space.

Of these three issues, the condition and preservation of an artifact is the most critical. Both the size and quantity of artifacts need to be considered, but these are issues that should be taken into account during the preparation of a research design. However, the size of an artifact, or the quantity it occurs in, should never be the basis for determining research potential.



CTA Spring Meeting Minutes 6 April 2001 – 9:00 am

The Spring meeting of CTA was called to order by President David O. Brown at 9:15 am. David welcomed everyone and noted that the meeting should be a quick one. Announced the first award in Public Education would be awarded later in the meeting by Karen Harry. The award, the E. Mott Davis Award for Excellence in Public Outreach, is a tribute to Mott as well as those who bring archeology to the public.

David reported on a few issues he's been following. The Antiquities Board meeting went smoothly. They nominated some sites; generally approved the 3D policy and moved it forward as a THC rule (though comments can still be made); all committees are making good progress; the placement of a list server for the Anti-Looting group; and the burial bill rally had an excellent turnout. A smaller committee within the THC would be examining the curation policy, particularly to discuss what to keep and what to toss. CTA should have some input into this discussion.

Next, the minutes from the Fall meeting were approved and seconded with on discussion. Officer and committee reports were next on the agenda. Immediate Past President Doug Boyd announced that the year 2002 would be the 25th

Anniversary for CTA. On February 18, 1977 the second official meeting was held according to Vol. 1, No. 1 of the CTA Newsletter. Doug would like to put together a Task Force that would look into the history of CTA. He would like to get some student participation in order to get a different perspective on CTA's history. Anyone who is interested should contact Doug. A celebration will be planned for the Spring 2002 meeting.

Newsletter Editor Marybeth Tomka is working through some problems with the electronic newsletter. Right now only four people are requesting hard copies. Secretary/Treasurer Missi Green reminded everyone that membership dues were past due {did get quite a number of payments at the meeting}.

Committee Reports

Governmental Affairs: Chair Eric Schroeder reported that House Bill 1997 was in committee. An amendment was attached stating that the State need to prove that looting is taking place. Senate Bill 934 would allow metal detecting on Texas Parks and Wildlife property. Also House Bill 1010 would limit THC and establishment of State Archeological Landmarks. Mark Denton mentioned that it could gut the

Antiquities Code. The new CFR 800 (Section 106) regulations went into effect as of 11 January 2001 and the Advisory Council web site is a good place to get an explanation of all the changes. The Federal Communications Commission and the Advisory Council were involved in an MOA dealing with cell tower locations. The cell tower industry has filed a suit questioning the regulatory power of the Advisory Council.

Contractors' List: Chair Amy Holmes reported that there were 41 contractors listed on the CTA web site, the most to date. Please remember to pay for registering with the CTA (only 11 have paid as of this meeting date). CTA Web Page Committee Chair Sue Linder-Linsley continues to update the web page. The number of hits has doubled since the newsletter has been posted. The committee is still looking for additional help in gathering data, coordination, and the like. Please contact Sue or Dan Julien about your skills and availability if you are interested in helping out. David Brown complemented the committee for its good work, and in developing a pleasant viewing site that is a good information source.

Public Education: Chair Karen Harry gave a little background on the E. Mott Davis Award and introduced the three outstanding nominated projects. Those projects were Camp Ford, the Ruben Hancock project, and the Freedman's Cemetery project. The award will be announced at the end of the meeting. She also encouraged the membership to nominate people and projects who have done or demonstrated good public outreach, no matter how small the project. Her committee is also working on a web page that should be ready by the next meeting.

Multicultural Relations: Co-chair Alston Thoms reported that the Indian community is in favor of the Senate bill and hopes it does pass as is. House Bill 1975 is held up in committee — Bob Hunter's committee. Paul Moreno is Vice Chair of the committee and is not bringing it up for discussion. There is too much opposition. Alston has a list of Representatives that should be contacted to voice your feelings. He encourages CTA to support the burial bill. Also, there is a press conference on April 21st where the Indian liaison will be talking about this bill.

It would be good to have a CTA representative there for support.

Membership: Chair Karl Kibler announced the plan to award money from the Scholarship Fund and that he had only received comments from one person about his proposal. Also, the committee needs another member. Tim Meade volunteered.

Accreditation and Review Council: Chair Pat Clabaugh reported a Section III — Election of Officers — bylaw change. This change has to do with the rotation schedule. Carolyn Spock rotates off this spring. Also, their second museum review is complete. The council is choosing three field reviewers who will be contacted soon. There is a symposium on curation at the upcoming SAA meetings, and the ARC review will be part of it. It is the only curation symposium on this year's SAA agenda.

Survey Standards: Chair Marianne Marek reported that the draft standards were printed in the newsletter and hard copies could be gotten from Diane Dismukes. The committee is accepting written comments and will be posting these comments on the web page. Their hope is that the membership will be able to vote on the standards at the Fall meeting.

Anti-Looting: Chair Todd McMakin is trying to get a list server up and running to use as an information exchange system. Right now only committee members and members of CTA are allowed access, but then only at the member's request. The list server is known as "Anti-L." Todd is still thinking about a poster in the committee's future. David interjected that contractors should join as should law enforcement and land management agencies so they could all communicate with each other.

Ad Hoc Guidelines: Chair Karen Gardner reported that the last major update to the CTA Guidelines took place in 1992. It is still a good document, but should be updated to include new laws and law changes, new technologies (e.g., GPS, GIS), and curation changes. The committee recommends that the document first be reformatted and reorganized for more user-

friendly access, and that intensive information changes will be done later.

Curation Task Force: Chair Karen Gardner reported that there has been one formally meeting of the Task Force, but communication has continued through e-mail. There are lots of opinions, but have a good basic outline of the key issues (i.e., what's important to collect, keep, document, etc.). Hope to have an initial draft in the Summer newsletter.

Old Business

Two items of Old Business was discussed: Scholarship Fund Award and the Contractors' List. Several suggestions or questions were discussed and voted upon.

1) It was suggested that a letter of recommendation from a professor accompany the application. This was agreed upon unanimously.

2) It was also asked whether the money would be awarded up front or in partial payments. The consensus was that the most acceptable way to award the student would be in one payment of \$500 up front.

3) Margaret Howard asked if there were any penalties if standards were not met? Karl mentioned that there had not been much thought put into that issue.

4) There is currently not enough money in the Fund to cover awards if awarded each year. The discussion was to have the General Fund cover about half of the award so that the Scholarship Fund could continue to grow. A motion was put forth to approve this plan; it was seconded and passed. A Friendly Amendment was issued stating that the entire \$500 would come out of the General Fund this year so that the Scholarship Fund will be allowed to continue to grow. This was seconded and loudly passed.

The second item of Old business concerned the Contractors' List and making it a better and efficient tool. In the Fall of 1999, Robert d'Aigle proposed that a slicker presentation of the List should occur. According to Robyn Lyle, we have been spending about \$700 for 300 copies twice a year. By having the List on the Web Page and print only once a year, the excess monies could go into the Scholarship Fund. So the options are: 1) a real slick once-a-year printing;

2) a less jazzy twice-a-year printing; or 3) continue with the current practice. David Brown came back with a counter proposal that would save money but also serve the contractors better.

1) Increase our reliance on the Web version, maintained in a PDF format that is easily and often amended. Maybe get the List in HTML format later with more fancy layouts, pictures, etc.

2) Create a shorter list — a fax list, three pages — with addresses and phone numbers. It could be maintained easily and often as well.

Robyn mentioned that THC distributes about six Lists a month. Also, trying to get all that information on three pages might be too difficult to read — try five pages.

The motion was made to present and distribute the Contractors' List entirely from the Web Page in PDF and HTML formats where it can be easily downloaded or printed. There would be no more printing of hard copies by the committee. The motion was seconded and passed. The Contractors' List committee, President, and Web Page committee will decide when to update PDF and HTML, hopefully within 30 days of receipt of updates and information.

New Business

The election of a President-Elect was brought before the membership. Nominated is Karen Harry. The floor was opened for any other nominations — there were none and the nominations were closed. Karen was elected by unanimous vote. Congratulations!

THC Announcements: Pat Mercado-Allinger mentioned that copies of the Current Archeology in Texas could be found in the book room — hot off the press! Also, a news highlight concerning the Preservation Fund. Upcoming changes would eliminate the 2-to-1 match that was required previously. The changes should go through easily. This is first call for Archeology Awareness Fair proposals. If the rules change, there will be no need for the 2-to-1 match.

The Texas Preservation Conference is to be held in Austin between April 19th and 21st. There will be training opportunities and luncheons. Several

awards will be presented for preservation efforts. Some of those being awarded are Curtis Tunnell (Archeology), Dusty Bruns (Preservation), Paul Tanner (Preservation), and Mike Quigg (Excellence in Research).

Mark Denton spoke of the 3D Policy. Said that the staff would integrate into the procedures a letter to PIs across the state to help disseminate the information. It may possibly be necessary to put into the Antiquities Permit (when it is submitted) a statement about what will happen with artifacts or documents at the end of the process. All records will be curated no matter what happens to the artifacts. He proposes that the Abstracts and Conclusions sections of reports mention the curation of materials and records.

Mark also spoke about Held in Trust forms and the date rules do not clarify that the 2002 December date is when facilities are to be certified for keeping collections. All curatorial facilities after 2002 December must be certified by ARC. This is the understanding and the rules and forms will be changed accordingly. The major concern is that not all major facilities in the state will be certified by December 2002.

Nancy Kenmotsu stated that TxDOT's position is to load THC up with collections at the end of the project if there is no place to put them by the end of 2002. Alston Thoms stated that ARC as an unfunded group is trying to solve some major problems. CTA/ARC is bearing the burden of solving the problems of curation and getting accredited facilities up to snuff. ARC is a service, not a licensing agency, offered by CTA. David asked how ARC is going to relate to the new rules? Frustrations will run high between agencies, contractors, state officials, the works. We MUST keep the communications open!! Alston asked if CTA could hand off this issue to THC?

Discussion continued for a few more minutes before being cut short for the E. Mott Davis Award presentation. David Brown spoke eloquently of E. Mott, a co-founder of CTA, who was in on every meeting and decision made. He was the official advisor to CTA for years. Naming this award after him would have been enough for his contributions to CTA, to Texas archeological research, and for his teaching and

selfless dedication. His most important contribution was his work in the public sector as a liaison between professionals and advocationals in Texas and nationwide. He dedicated his life to talking to the public about archeology. This award is a fitting legacy to Mott.

Karen Harry continued by speaking about her excitement toward this award. The three nominated projects, Camp Ford conducted by Texas A&M; Ruben Hancock conducted by Mary Black with the support of TxDOT; and Freedman's Cemetery conducted by GMI with the support of TxDOT, Black Dallas Remembered, and African American Museum, all exemplified what we as archeologists should give back to the public and educate them about archeology and the laws that makes this possible. Karen mentioned the outreach efforts: a third grade curriculum and a museum exhibit, Facing the Rising Sun, on exhibit through September at the African American Museum in Dallas. The recipients were TxDOT, who sponsored the project; Black Dallas Remembered and African American Museum as co-advisors for the project; and Geo-Marine, Inc., as the contractor that brought the Freedman's Cemetery project in Dallas to fruition.

The recipients of the first E. Mott Davis Award for Excellence in Public Outreach received the award from Hugh Davis, Mott's son from New Hampshire. Beth Davis, Mott's widow, and Dee Ann Story were also present for this presentation. Hugh thanked the committee in behalf of his family in naming the award after Mott stating that it epitomizes what Mott did in his life.

Nancy Kenmotsu and Anne Irwin accepted the award for TxDOT. Dr. Mamie McKnight accepted for Black Dallas Remembered, and Dr. Harry Robinson accepted for the African American Museum. Members of the Geo-Marine team present for the presentation were Duane Peter, Marsha Prior, Victoria Clow, and Missi Green. Photographs were taken and short thank yous delivered by each of recipient.

As time was running out, no other new business was presented and the meeting adjourned at 11:45.

Articles and Updates**Anniversary Special****COUNCIL OF TEXAS ARCHEOLOGISTS TO CELEBRATE 25th BIRTHDAY***Doug Boyd*

The CTA will officially turn 25 years old on February 18, 2002, and it is time to look back on our beginnings. The CTA had a short life from 1939-1941, and we hope to compile some information about the original organization in a future newsletter, but the CTA was reestablished in 1977. Some unofficial organizing meetings were held in 1976 and 1977 (Elton Prewitt, personal communication 2001), but it was at a meeting in Austin on February 18, 1977, that the organization as we know it really began. Kathleen Gilmore presided over the meeting, and about 125 people attended. An organization structure was adopted and committees were formed. There was no presidential office at that time, but Mary Elizabeth King was elected as the CTA's first secretary-treasurer and Bruce Dickson was elected as newsletter editor. This event is described in the first Council of Texas Archeologists Newsletter (Vol. 1, No. 1, April 1977).

CTA was formally incorporated as a nonprofit organization and we formally adopted our first by-laws at a spring meeting on February 23, 1979 in Austin. The office of president was created, and Bruce Dickson was elected as CTA's first president. Since then, 19 other people have presided over the CTA (see list of past presidents). This list was compiled from old CTA newsletters and could contain some errors. Please let me know if you see any problems in it.

PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE COUNCIL OF TEXAS ARCHEOLOGISTS

1977	No president; Mary Elizabeth King, secretary-treasurer
1978-1978	No president; Frank Weir, secretary-treasurer
1978-1979	No president; Margie Chaffin-Lohse, secretary-treasurer
1979-1980	Bruce Dickson
1980-1981	Kathleen Gilmore
1981-1982	Donny Hamilton
1982-1983	Mark Raab
1983-1984	Elton Prewitt
1984-1985	Gentry Steele
1986-1986	David Carlson (president-elect Daphne Dervin resigned)
1987-1987	Jerry Henderson
1987-1988	Tom Hester
1989-1989	Robert (Skipper) Scott IV
1990-1990	James Corbin
1991-1991	Dan Prikrly
1992-1992	Joan Few
1993-1993	Duane Peter
1994-1994	Duane Peter (president-elect Harry Shafer resigned)
1995-1995	Dan McGregor
1996-1996	Margaret Hines Howard
1997-1997	Steve Black
1998-1998	Alston Thoms
2000-2000	Doug Boyd (bylaw change to 2-year terms)
2000-2002	David O. Brown

THC News

CURTIS DALE TUNNELL: TEXAS'S FIRST STATE ARCHEOLOGIST

Curtis D. Tunnell died on April 13, 2001 after a brief illness in Austin. Friends and professional associates celebrated Curtis's life and his accomplishments during a memorial service held at Mercury Hall (Austin) on May 13th. This was a true celebration, with a photo exhibit, "Curtis stories" swapped and food shared. We were even serenaded by some of his musical friends, including renowned country fiddler, Alvin Crow.

On Friday, May 18th, memorial resolutions acknowledging Curtis's many years of state service as State Archeologist and later as Executive Director of the Texas Historical Commission were read and unanimously passed by members of the Texas Senate and House of Representatives. Later that same day his ashes were interred at the Texas State Cemetery.

To read about Curtis's life, professional career, and memories posted by family, friends and colleagues, visit the memorial website at the following address: <http://curtistunnellmemorial.thc.state.tx.us/index.html>.



TEXAS ARCHEOLOGY AWARENESS MONTH 2001 IS "AROUND THE CORNER"

This year marks the twelfth annual observance of Texas Archeology Awareness Month (TAAM), the state-wide program that aims to foster awareness of and appreciation for Texas's vast archeological heritage. Educational and family-fun events will once again be held in communities across the state. A TAAM 2001 calendar of events has been prepared by the Archeology Division of the Texas Historical Commission and will be mailed to all current members of the CTA. This information will also be available on the THC's website at <http://www.thc.state.tx.us> from mid-September through the month of October.



Other News

CTA Meeting Special

During the fall CTA/TAS meetings the Register of Professional Archaeologists is going to be offering the same special discount for new applicants as was offered at the SAA meetings in New Orleans. That's a \$15 discount off the normal \$35 application fee (yearly dues are the same). If you complete the application form during the meetings you will get a discount on the application fee. The Register's Business office will process your application after they receive your backup documentation by mail. There may also be a special during the meeting for a discount on your CTA dues if you are currently registered or complete an application (details will be available at the meeting). This Register special is for applications turned in during the CTA/TAS meetings or by sending your application, backup information, and \$20 fee (checks payable to The Register) to Missi Green or Sue Linder-Linsley so that it can be submitted with the group of applications collected in Corpus Christi. Both the long and short application forms will be available at the meetings or print a copy from the web site <http://www.rpanet.org> and turn it in at the meetings.

Announcements

Come to Corpus for the 72nd Annual Texas Archeological Society Meeting

This year's TAS meeting will be held on October 26-28, 2001, in the beautiful city of Corpus Christi. Headquarters will be at the Omni Bayfront Hotel, which offers a lovely view and contains the town's premier conference facility (800-843-6664; ask for TAS early bird special room rate of \$95). You may want to spend every moment at the meetings, taking in the numerous presentations, book room, exhibit hall, and silent auction. Many tempting attractions also are in easy reach, including the Museum of Science and History, the Corpus Christi Dog Track, downtown antique shopping, and miles of sandy beaches.

Arrive on Friday in time to attend the CTA meeting from 1:00 to 3:00 pm. Later, enjoy a seafood dinner or other cuisine in one of Corpus Christi's fine restaurants. Back at the hotel, the Friday night public forum will focus on the historic period of the middle Texas coast; speakers include Bob Ricklis on excavations at Missions Espiritu Santo and Rosario, Lupita Barrera on historical outreach programs at Goliad State Park, Greg Dimmick on metal detector surveys at Mar del Lodo and Fannin Battleground, and Jim Bruseth with an update on Fort Saint Louis and the La Belle.

Saturday's paper sessions promise to be varied and informative. Early submissions include a symposium on the historic contact period Stone site, and papers on interpretation of terrestrial environments through gastropods, settlement patterning and chronology of the lower Nueces valley, and hands-on training in rock art recording. More exciting offerings are sure to come. Symposium proposals were due by August 24 but papers will be accepted until September 21. Posters can be submitted up to October 15, but late poster entries may not be included in the program. Don't delay; email your abstract to margaret.howard@tpwd.state.tx.us today.

The Saturday evening banquet speaker will be Marcel Kornfeld, director of the George C. Frison Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology at the University of Wyoming. He will speak on Coloradans Before Colorado: The First People of the High Country. Kornfeld's Middle Park Paleoindian Project is the first comprehensive study of early human occupation in a Rocky Mountain basin. Over the past 10 years, project personnel have recorded 80 Paleoindian sites containing up to 95 components, analyzed nearly 400 diagnostic Paleoindian artifacts, and conducted intensive investigations at four localities. Folsom components are ubiquitous in Middle Park, and the Goshen, Cody, and James Allen complexes also are well represented. Middle Park contains a microcosm of Paleoindian lifeways in the basins and valleys of the Rocky Mountain chain. You won't want to miss this presentation.

So pull out your TAS newsletter and register today, or get a registration form from the TAS Website at <http://www.txarch.org/annual2.htm>. Credit cards are accepted. Discount registration rates are available until September 23, and registration also will be available on-site at the meeting. See you in Corpus Christi!



Attention Students and Faculty Advisors

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



**ANNOUNCING
THE OPENING OF**

QUATERNARY ANALYSIS LABORATORIES

1400 W. 2nd Street

Taylor, Texas 76574 USA

Opening September, 2001

3202 Spaniel Drive

Austin, Texas 78759 USA

(512) 836 -0510

Fax (512) 491 -0672

qal@swbell.net or ccaran@swbell.net

Coming soon : See our Website, qal -online.com

Quaternary Analysis Laboratories is a laboratory/consulting service for archeologists, earth/environmental scientists, engineers, regulators, and researchers worldwide. Services include: geochronology (radiocarbon, other); isotopic/ionic chemistry; selected biochemistry/ DNA; paleontology/micropaleontology; characterization, identification, conservation, and documentation of natural and artificial materials and objects; aerial/satellite image interpretation; archival and oral -history research (Spanish/English); and geoarcheological/geological/ hydrological consulting.



2001 Anthropology Symposium
The First Americans: The Peopling of the New World
Thursday, October 18, 4:00 – 7:45 PM, IMAX Theater
Houston Museum of Natural Science

Members and non-members \$5

For tickets call 713 639-4629 or online at www.hmns.org

In the last ten years, new archaeological discoveries have caused a great shift in the way we think about the origins of the first people in the New World. The general theory of Clovis hunters following big game across the Bering Strait land bridge has been challenged by evidence from sites, theories about water navigation, and European projectile point technology.

The 2001 anthropology symposium will examine ideas about the origins of humans in the New World, drawing on the expertise of scholars from across the Americas. Confirmed speakers include Bruce Bradley, Colorado archeologist (theories of early migration), Jo Ann Nickols, UC — Berkeley (linguistics), Anne Stone, University of New Mexico (genetics), Joe Watkins, Bureau of Indian Affairs — Anadarko, Oklahoma (Native American perspective) and Michael Collins, UT Austin (recent archeological evidence). Additional speakers will address evidence from specific sites and an overview of migration theories.

The Anthropology Symposium is made possible by a generous gift from the Favrot Fund.



Archaeology/Heritage Fair
Saturday, October 20, 2001, 11 - 3 pm

Celebrate Archaeology Awareness Month at the Houston Museum of Natural Science. Visit the Archaeology / Heritage Fair to learn about archaeology in Houston and how you can become involved in the study of the past. Visit the McGovern Hall of the Americas where exhibits will be enhanced by demonstrations and crafts. Find out about opportunities to participate in archaeological studies from local organizations. Bring artifacts for identification by experts in stone tools and historic ceramics. Learn about Texas' Native American heritage from intertribal organizations. This event is free with your paid museum admission.



*CTA Newsletter
Sue Linder-Linsley, RPA
Layout and Copy Editor
c/o Department of Anthropology
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas 75275-0336*

TO:

Council of Texas Archeologists
*Membership and
Renewal Form*

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

- Address correction only (see below).
- I wish to join or renew my membership in CTA.
(membership is based on the calendar year Jan-Dec)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contractors List | \$ 100.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Professional (annual income more than \$20,000 per year) | 25.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Professional (annual income less than \$20,000 per year) | 15.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Student (annual income more than \$20,000 per year) | 25.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Student (annual income less than \$20,000 per year) | 15.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Institution/Library (receive <i>CTA Newsletter</i> only, no voting privileges) | 25.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I would like to purchase a copy of the <i>CTA Guidelines</i> | 7.50 |

Total amount remitted to CTA \$ _____

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