The Spring 1998 CTA Meeting (10:00 - 12:00 a.m.) and Research-Strategies Workshop (1:30 - 4:00 p.m.) will be held on Friday, April 17, in Room 1.122 of the Commons Building at the Pickle Research Campus in north Austin (see map). Lunch – cafeteria style – is available on the premises or at many restaurants, almost all of which are located ca. .75+ miles from the Commons Building. A social event will be held directly after the afternoon session at an Austin location that will be announced at the meeting.

For more information about the Research-Strategies Workshop, see Alston Thoms’ article in the Presidents’ Forum section entitled “Encouraging Discussion and Debate About Research Strategies: A CTA-Sponsored Workshop for the Spring 1998 Meeting.” The Workshop is a follow-up to the CTA-sponsored forum on Current Site-Significance Issues held last fall at the TAS meeting in Odessa. As Bill Martin recently informed us in a THC News and Views commentary, the kind of
discussions that took place at the forum are important components in the development and implementation of sound research strategies for Texas’ nonrenewable cultural resources. The Research-Strategies Workshop promises to be informative and well worth the membership’s participation. We encourage you to participate in the workshop and bring along a fellow archaeologist(s) so they, too, can learn more about and contribute to the practice of archeology in Texas.

SPRING 1998 CTA MEETING AGENDA AND SCHEDULE: 10:00 - 12:00 a.m.

10:00 a.m.: Call to Order. President Alston Thoms
• Approval of Minutes of the Fall 1997 Meeting

Officers’ Reports:
• President
• President-Elect
• Secretary-Treasurer
• Newsletter Editor

Standing Committee Reports:
• Governmental Affairs
• Ethics and Standards
• Contractors’ List
• Public Education
• Native American Relations

Special Committee Reports:
• Accreditation and Review Council
• Archaeological Survey Standards
• Other Committee reports

Old Business:
• The New CTA Web Page
• Membership Drive
• Other old business

New Business:
• Presentation of the Proposed 1998-1999 CTA Budget
• TL&CA: Update and Request for CTA support
• Establishment of a Student Scholarship
• Update on the Texas Preservation Trust Fund Program
• Update on the Archaeological Conservancy program in Texas
• Other new business

12:00 Noon: Meeting Adjourned

12:00 - 1:15 p.m.: Lunch

RESEARCH-STRATEGIES WORKSHOP SCHEDULE: 1:15 - 4:00 p.m.

1:15 - 1:30 p.m.: Introduction. A. Thoms and M. Howard

1:30 - 2:00 p.m.: Productive Research Strategies for Burned Rock Midden Sites. Two 10-minute statements by S. Black and W. Martin, followed by 10 minutes of general discussion

2:00 - 2:30 p.m.: Research Strategies for Surface Sites and Related Issues. Two 10-minute statements by D. Boyd and M. Miller, followed by 10 minutes of general discussion

2:30 - 2:45 p.m.: Break

2:45 - 3:15 p.m.: Research Strategies for Sites Buried in Sandy Mantles and Related Issues. Two 10-minute statements by A. Thoms and N. Kenmotsu, followed by 10 minutes of general discussion

3:15 - 4:00 p.m.: General Discussion and Closing Comments. Margaret Howard, discussion leader

4:00 - 5:30 p.m.: Annual Post-Meeting Social.
Location to be announced
Encouraging Discussion and Debate
About Research Strategies:
A CTA-Sponsored Workshop for the
Spring 1998 Meeting

Alston V. Thoms, Current President

The CTA-sponsored forum on site-significance issues held at last year’s TAS meeting provided an opportunity for some Texas archaeologists to discuss and debate issues about sound research strategies and cultural resources management. This year, in conjunction with our Spring Meeting on April 17, CTA will hold a workshop on heuristically useful research strategies for recovering significant archaeological data. It will be held from 1:15 to 4:00 p.m. at the Pickle Research Campus in north Austin (schedule and agenda outlined above).

The workshop will focus on several of Texas’ better-known site types that are typically found in upland settings: (1) burned-rock middens; (2) surface lithic scatters and hearth fields; (3) sites buried in sandy mantles. I will make a few introductory comments with Margaret Howard who will serve as moderator. Each site type, along with related issues, will be introduced/discussed by two archaeologists, each speaking for 10 minutes, followed by 10 minutes of discussion from the audience. Steve Black and Bill Martin will discuss burned-rock-midden sites; Doug Boyd and Myles Miller will focus on surface scatters and hearth fields, respectively. Nancy Kenmotsu and I will start the discussion of sites buried in the “everlasting sands” of southeast Texas and vicinity. The workshop will conclude with a 45-minute session of general discussion and debate on the identification and implementation of effective and efficient research strategies.

What is very apparent to me is that Texas archaeologists, most of whom are CTA members, are key players in the development and implementation of innovative, CRM-driven research strategies that are readily generalizable and widely applicable. This is clearly evidenced by their recent roles in organizing and participating in SAA symposia on hot topics, including burned-rock middens (1997) and site formation processes (1998). These same topics, of course, have been the subject of CTA workshops, including the one this year. To set the stage for the upcoming CTA workshop, I want to share with you a few comments I made this year at the SAA meeting in Seattle during a symposium organized by Jeff Leach, Donald Johnson, Michael Petraglia, and Rolfe Mandel entitled “Formation Processes in Regional Perspective.”

It is only within the last two decades that archaeologists and other chronostratigraphically oriented scientists in North America have spent significant amounts of time digging and studying upland sites. Because upland landscapes are erosional in their overall character, the sites located there tend to be poorly preserved when compared to those in bottomland settings where the fine fraction of eroded, upland sediments accumulate. From a practical standpoint, it is clear that legislative mandates led to the onset of large-scale work in upland settings, but we are scientifically compelled as well to study sites on upland landforms. Much, perhaps most, of prehistory unfolded in upland settings, albeit that the best-stratified, best-preserved, and best-dated sites are likely to be found in bottomlands. To effectively cope with this ecologically determined paradox, we probably need to know more than we do about how uplands were used through the millennia, but to accomplish that we need a better understanding of site formation processes.

To illustrate this point, I will call attention to and offer testable explanations for several salient characteristics of archaeological records in one subset of upland landscapes: ostensibly low-depositional places with dynamic, sandy sola that support forest-to-savannah vegetation. This setting is found throughout the world. In North America, typical sandy landforms include high, Pleistocene-aged terraces that form the lower slopes or walls of
inland valleys, as well as of the Tertiary- to Pleistocene-aged terraces and interfluves along the inner Coastal Plains, from Long Island to the Rio Grande. The dynamic character of the sola in these settings is shown by the stratigraphic and lateral distribution of projectile points and other temporally diagnostic artifacts.

What has historically discouraged work in the these and other uplands is the fact that most of the artifact-rich sediment packages there are contained within notoriously turbated sola. The scientific challenge, of course, is to understand the genesis of these sediments and their sola, and to then demonstrate that our archaeological interpretations are consistent with “natural” processes that form, deform, and reform archaeological records. Such knowledge is a precondition of the development of innovative methods of deriving behaviorally relevant and significantly meaningful information about the uplands.

For regional and other large-scale land-use studies, reliable data from the uplands are absolutely necessary, but they are apt to be more expensive, and perhaps less reliable, than data derived from typically better-preserved bottomland sites. Fortunately, and as aptly illustrated by regional and national symposia and by recent literature on site-formation processes, tried-and-proven archaeologists along with their fellow scientists continue to entrench themselves in the Earth’s active Holocene mantle and emerge with effective and efficient ecological perspectives.

Future Directions for CTA

Douglas K. Boyd, President Elect

As I prepare to take my turn at the helm of CTA, I look back on where we have been and ahead to where we are going. It is time for me to share my thoughts and lay out an agenda for the coming year.

Perhaps the most important role that CTA serves is that of fostering communication between people representing all aspects of professional archeology. Archeologists employed by universities, federal or state government, private contracting firms, museums, and other institutions often view things differently, and it is healthy for the entire profession to share our ideas. Recent events have shown that CTA, through its newsletter and meetings, can be an effective tool for airing opinions on controversial issues of interest to the professional archeological community. CTA continues to be used as a forum for presenting and debating a wide variety of sometimes thorny issues. This has been, in my opinion, a good thing and should be continued.

When I was nominated as President Elect of CTA, I stated that there are four main areas where CTA should continue to improve and expand: governmental affairs, Native American relations, professional-student relations, and public relations. I still believe that these are the areas where we should concentrate our efforts. For governmental affairs, there are things that CTA has done right and wrong in the past. We have done right by spreading information on legislative actions to our members so that they could act individually as they see fit on a case-by-case basis. This type of information sharing is important and should continue and be strengthened. I will ask the governmental affairs committee to develop an operating plan that includes:

1. a formal plan to keep current on Federal and State legislative affairs by tying into electronic information networks and existing legislative watch groups (e.g., Preservation On-Line News for federal news and the state’s legislative website);
2. a strategy for selecting important information that needs to be passed on to members via e-mail;
3. a standard format of suggesting what actions members might take (e.g., who to call, e-mail, or write letters and what to say); and
4. a procedure for notifying the Executive Committee when emergency action may be needed.

Because there is so much going on all the time, the most important task will be determining what is important enough to pass on and what isn’t.
CTA has in the past offered a collective voice on legislative matters and this has generally been a good thing. The organization as a whole should continue to go on record for or against some issues. When time allows, the consensus opinion is reached through a vote of the membership at a meeting, but there are emergency situations that require more immediate action by CTA’s Executive Committee. This power should be used sparingly, however, and I will ask the Executive Committee to adopt a formal policy regarding emergency actions on governmental affairs. The Executive Committee should take action only when its members are unanimous in their opinions and whenever time allows, the Executive Committee should solicit input from the chairs of all other committees or the membership before taking any action or making formal statements.

With regard to Native American relations, the current committee is working on several projects for the future. The committee is proceeding with plans to co-host, along with the Texas Indian Bar Association, a Joint Conference on Legislative Solutions to Loss of Texas’ Cultural Heritage. No one can really predict where this project or other endeavors will eventually lead us, but the trends are encouraging. I look forward to a day when CTA archeologists and Native Americans frequently get together simply to socialize rather than debate.

To improve professional-student relations, a mentoring program is one concept in the works. Another idea that has been proposed is an undergraduate student paper competition sponsored by CTA as a way of encouraging participation by younger members. I would like to pursue this, so if anyone has any thoughts or suggestions, please let me know.

The final area of concern, public relations, is one of extreme importance to me. We are all keenly aware of the need to make the public more aware of and involved in archeology. The ultimate health of the entire profession depends upon our ability to enhance the public’s knowledge and perceptions of what we do. I personally believe that our("our" being professional archeologists in general, myself included) biggest failing is that we don’t take advantage of the public relations potential for the vast amount of publicly funded CRM field archeology that goes on in Texas. Every single CRM dig we do, whether it lasts a week or a year, has tremendous potential as a public relations event. Why, then, is it only once in a blue moon that a CRM dig sponsors an open house or public talks to inform local folks about prehistory or history in their own back yard? Certainly the Texas Archeological Society and many other local archeological societies (such as the Southern Texas Archeological Association, for example) are to be commended for their superb use of field schools and other local events to foster archeological good will. Although there are many notable exceptions, the vast majority of professional archeological projects do precious little to promote archeological good will. In fact, some do more harm than good by discouraging interested citizens from coming to see what is going on. It is particularly sad when publicly funded archeology comes and goes secretly with the intent of limiting public knowledge for fear of liability or scrutiny.

Here is a personal example of what I mean by opportunities missed. During our recent excavation at San Felipe Springs near Del Rio, I pushed to get permission to allow Prewitt and Associates to host a public open house for the people and school kids to come visit the dig. We spent about a month digging up prehistoric Toyah phase evidence on the 6th fairway of the country club and we talked archeology to the dozens of golfers who happened by each day. I was excited at the prospect of having an open house; the City’s contracting engineering firm was fully supportive, as were the people at the Texas Historical Commission. Unfortunately, my hopes were squashed because the City of Del Rio decided not to do it for a variety of reasons, such as logistical hassles and liability issues, and the only press the project got was a single newspaper article after the fact. I strongly believe that any potential problems could have been overcome, but I do not blame the City for their decision. We, the archeological community, are at fault in this case. Although the benefits of public relations are obvious to us, we don’t do a good job of convincing project sponsors that they should host a public event, we don’t give them the tools to make it easy to plan such events, and we don’t offer the kinds of assistance that we
should be offering. The bottom line is that a public event at the San Felipe dig would certainly have attracted many hundreds of people if organized and promoted properly, and it is a damn shame every time we let such an opportunity go by.

This is what I plan to do about it. I will assist the Public Relations Committee and ask them to take on the task of coordinating an effort aimed specifically at public relations for publicly funded CRM archeology. Our first task is to meet with regulatory folks and agency sponsors (archeologists with THC, TxDOT, U.S. Army Corps, and others) to discuss ways to promote public involvement in archeological projects. We can then use CTA meetings to begin brainstorming and open a dialog among contractors, regulators, and agency sponsors. The ultimate goal will be to eventually develop a policy whereby every CRM project of any size incorporates several different types of public involvement. Preferably, every project will have a well-publicized public open house, followed up by newspaper, radio, and television coverage and public lectures. Achieving this will require a major change of attitude in that we all must stop viewing public involvement as a logistical hassle and potential liability that should be avoided. Public involvement should be viewed as an obligation that we must fulfill.

We are simply not being responsible when we spend hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer money on a major CRM project, but not a dime goes toward hosting a public event. It’s time to start changing our attitudes!
Austin have limited my own opportunity for involvement in the organization, please feel free to call on me for whatever needs may arise.

With that said, some points may need to be clarified not only for my own sake but for that of the membership in general if we are to achieve some of the goals set out for this organization. Concerning Doug Boyd’s comments of the ever failing unmarked graves protection act (S.B. 810), he notes that we must be careful not to become a lobbying organization (p. 6). He earlier states (p. 5), however, that Elton Prewitt in 1993 suggested this as a possible future role for the CTA. Furthermore, Bill Martin (p. 11) seems to imply that among the CTA’s other shortcomings, the fact that we are not a lobbying group has hindered our ability to make a difference in many critical instances.

While I understand that we have not lobbied in the past, is it possible for us to do so in the future? I agree that a strong and united cultural resources lobby might stand a better chance of helping to pass important legislation such as S.B. 810 in the future than did (apparently) the letters that many of us wrote and the support shown at the hearings.

If we decide that an active lobby in the legislature would help our cause(s), what are the means by which to go about implementing this plan?

The other primary issue I wanted to discuss is implicated both by the Gilmer situation as outlined by Martin and Black, and by Bob Skiles’s Ethics and Standards Committee report in the same newsletter.

Martin suggests that CTA’s closer involvement in the Gilmer proceedings as events unfolded might have enabled a different outcome. Specifically, and for future cases, he offers that the organization could sign on as interested parties on future MOAs to ensure that the CTA’s concerns are expressed.

I think this is an excellent idea. However, I don’t know that our organization is presently structured to accommodate this new task.

From my perspective, the committee report by Skiles concerning blackballing of one member by another is not unrelated to the Gilmer situation in terms of CTA’s role. In his summary, Skiles noted his committee (and CTA’s) general impotence in responding in any fashion to the situation he discussed. These separate issues (ethics complaints and the Gilmer incident) raise the question of our organization’s ability to police its members and ensure good work and fair labor practices.

I understand that current concerns of liability hinder our ability to take action in such instances as that reported on by Skiles, or to help the DAP reel in rogue contractors, or to meet many of the other crises that face archeology every year. If we’d like to do more than lament our inability to act, then what other factors are involved, besides financial liability and fear of lawsuits, that need to be addressed? How can we begin to address these concerns?

It would seem that these are sticky questions indeed, but they do seem to be the enduring ones. Many improvements can only come about through the persistent and long-term efforts of public education and proactive outreach, as you have remarked and was discussed in our recent meeting. (To this end, the Native American Relations Committee is to be commended for their long hours.) Advances may also be made by working in cooperation with other, like-minded organizations (the National Trust, local societies, Preservation Texas, etc.) that will not only reduce the duplication of effort,
but will present a stronger united front to
the public (and Legislature), and may
allow us to pool what meager financial
resources we have available.

In closing, I would like to say that after
reading your contribution, I did not feel
part of a do nothing organization at all.
Rather, I was impressed by the diversity
and involvement of the CTA membership.
However, it is not what we DO that seems
to keep attracting the most attention, it’s
what we DON’T do. Can or should we
pursue the issue of becoming involved as
an interested party in MOAs? What steps
can be taken to lend some potency to the
Ethics and Standards Committee? I have
some ideas, but would be interested in
hearing your thoughts on these matters.

Sincerely yours,
Jon C. Lohse

More recently, discussions were raised at the
recent spring meeting of the Antiquities Advisory
Board that are of concern to CTA members. One
proposal dealt with changing the rules for granting
extensions for defaulted permits that had already
been extended one time (under extenuating circum-
stances only). While no discussions were raised
that might have explained what an extenuating
circumstance would be, these are the sorts of issues
CTA should be involved in as this request pro-
ceeds. Another issue involved DAP’s introduction
of an Award of Merit for Archeological Projects.
This plan would serve as a mechanism by which
DAP can commend good work with the hopes of
eventually helping potential clients distinguish
between adequate and inadequate contractors. It
should be stressed that the Award of Merit program
is still in the discussion stage, and now is the best
time for concerns over its administration to be
raised. Both of these items would affect the
manner in which private contractors across the
state are able to operate, and (especially in the case
of the Awards of Merit) CTA should have some
input.

In closing, I propose that CTA begin to explore
for meaningful answers to these questions. From
the perspective of the Governmental Affairs
Committee, this could include examining the
possibility of defining, at the Legislative level,
what exactly a professional archeologist is. This
represents a departure from the previous patchwork
solutions that have been offered for permanent
problems, but would ultimately allow CTA to be
more effective in dealing with all the issues raised
here.

fff

Other CTA Business

Proposed Bylaws Amendment:
Two-Year Terms of Office

Steve Black

CTA officers should serve two-year terms.
This idea has been discussed several times in the
past, but no formal action has ever been taken. The
current executive committee and many other
members think that one-year terms of office are
simply too short to accomplish most worthwhile
endeavors. The learning curve occupies most of a
year; hence, we often lack the continuity and
consistent leadership that an effective professional
organization needs. A two-year term would require
a greater commitment from someone agreeing to
serve as a CTA officer. This is especially true for
presidential candidates who (as proposed) would be
looking at serving a year as President-elect, two
years as President, and a year as Immediate Past
President. However, the benefits of providing
greater continuity and having sufficient time to
implement long-term goals are substantial. An
added plus is that the CTA President would then
serve two years on the Antiquities Advisory Board
to the Texas Historical Commission. Recognizing
the need for greater continuity, Antiquities
Advisory Board chair Eileen Johnson has requested
that the CTA representative serve for two years at a
time.

To remedy this situation, I propose a simple
bylaws amendment to Article IV, Section 2a. The
amendment would replace the words “one year”
with “two years” so that the final statement reads:
Article IV, Section 2. Election and Terms.

a. Officers shall be elected by ballot at the regular Spring Meeting to serve for a term of two years or until their successors are elected, and their terms of office shall begin at the close of the meeting at which they are elected.

At the spring meeting, I will put forth a formal motion to amend the bylaws as stated above with the provision that the change take effect immediately. Happily, President-elect Doug Boyd has agreed to serve a two-year term as President if the membership votes in favor of this change. If this amendment is approved, then we will not need to elect a President-elect at our upcoming spring meeting, but would elect all other officers. The elections at all subsequent spring meetings would then alternate between voting on only the President-elect and voting for all other officers. Thus, an incoming President would serve as President-elect one year, as President for two years, and as Immediate Past President for two years. This means the Executive Committee would always include either a President-elect or Immediate Past President to stand in for the President when needed.

Article II, Section 1. Purpose.

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

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

2. The promotion of communication and cooperation between the archeological community and ethnic groups and other segments of society whose cultures we study;

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

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

Proposed Bylaws Amendment:
CTA Statement of Purpose

Douglas K. Boyd

In an earlier discussion concerning future directions for the CTA, I suggested a bylaws amendment that would acknowledge one of the organization’s major goals as cooperation with Native Americans and other ethnic groups (see CTA Newsletter 21[2]:4-7). The Native American Relations Committee suggested that this proposed bylaws amendment should not specifically single out Native Americans. I agree with their suggestion and offer the following bylaws amendment for consideration by the membership (the underlined portions indicate proposed changes):

Minutes of the CTA Fall Meeting,
October 31, 1997

Brett Cruse, Secretary-Treasurer

President Alston Thoms called the meeting to order at 12:00 noon at the Holiday Inn in Odessa. Approximately 30 members and several guests were in attendance. As the first order of business, Alston called for approval of the minutes of the Spring meeting as they appeared in Volume 21(2) of the CTA Newsletter. A motion was made and seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried.
President’s Report: President Alston Thoms stated that as the new CTA president, he wants CTA to have a more active role in bringing archeology to the public. Alston stated that CTA can do this by supporting the various archeology groups, organizations, and projects that interact directly with the public. These include the activities of the Texas Archeological Stewardship Network, the newly formed Texas Alliance for Public Archeology, and projects such as the public service announcement videos being developed by the Texas Archeological Society. He also encouraged members to volunteer as speakers for Texas Archeology Awareness Month activities and to volunteer as counselors for Boy Scouts interested in pursuing the recently established Archeology Merit Badge.

Alston announced that one thing he will be instituting is a slight restructuring of the Executive Committee to delegate to the CTA officers more responsibilities for overseeing certain duties and functions of the various committees. The officers will then report to the president on a quarterly basis, or more often if necessary. Each officer’s oversight responsibilities would be as follows:

President: In addition to regular duties, will work and meet on a regular basis with other Executive Committee members; will work especially with the chair of the Public Education Committee.

Immediate Past President: Regular duties plus will spearhead membership drives, and oversee the Governmental Affairs, Accreditation and Review, and CTA Web Page committees.

President-Elect: Regular duties plus will have oversight of the Native American, Auditing, Archeological Survey Standards, and Ethics committees.

Secretary-Treasurer: In addition to regular duties, will have oversight of the Contractors List and Nominating committees.

Newsletter Editor: Regular duties plus soliciting articles and contributions for the Newsletter.

President-Elect’s Report: As the CTA President-Elect, Doug Boyd stated that he is encouraged by the various CTA activities. He said that he would like to see CTA become more involved in educational endeavors, as well as more involved in the state political process. Doug stated that he would like to get more undergraduate and graduate students involved in CTA and Texas archeology and he invites ideas from the CTA members.

Secretary-Treasurer’s Report: Brett Cruse distributed copies of the Financial Report for the time period covering 5/1/97-10/31/97. Income for this period was $5,036.01. Income was generated from individual dues ($3,040.00), institutional dues ($700.00), Contractor Listing fees ($1,125.00), CTA Guideline sales ($82.50), and interest income ($88.51). Expenses for the year were $3,079.72 and included administrative costs ($202.88), printing of the Accreditation and Review Manual ($445.65), printing and mailing of the Contractors List ($797.39), donation to the Archaeological Conservancy ($1,000.00), committee expenses ($15.75), printing and mailing of the Newsletter ($537.30), and expenses for the Spring Social ($80.75). Current assets included $1,915.75 in our checking account and $6,035.80 in the money market account, for a total of $7,951.55. Outstanding obligations and estimated expenses for the next six months totaled $5,905.00 leaving available assets of $2,046.55.

Newsletter Editor’s Report: Alston reported for Robyn Lyle and requested that members send in contributions for the next Newsletter which is scheduled to be printed around the first of the year.

Governmental Affairs Committee Report: No report.

Ethics and Standards Committee Report: Submitted by Bob Skiles, Chair. The committee has not met in the interim since the Spring CTA meeting and no formal complaint has been received against any member. This summer, I was contacted by a CTA member, via telephone, who wanted to discuss the potential ethical ramifications of an employer/employee relationship, and was asked for my opinion on whether certain described
incidents involved a violation of ethical conduct by another member. After hearing a detailed description of the situation, I expressed my opinion that no issue of ethical misconduct was immediately apparent in the described events, but rather seemed to reflect an employer/employee conflict. I offered to submit the question to the committee for their discussion and opinion if the member chose to describe the incidents in a written complaint or report that I could submit to the committee. To date, I have received no further communication relating to this matter.

** Contractors List Committee Report:** No report.

**Public Education Committee Report:** Joan Few stated that she would like to get some information posted on the CTA web page so that the public can find and have access to information about CTA, counselors for the Boy Scout merit badge, and archeology in general. She stated she will be working to get this information available.

**Native American Relations Committee Report:** Submitted by Margaret Howard, Chair. The committee met on September 20, 1997 to discuss the proposed joint conference on Legislative Solutions to Loss of Texas’ Cultural Heritage, to be sponsored by the CTA and the Texas Indian Bar Association (TIBA). All committee members agreed that CTA should undertake this with TIBA, with the invited participation of influential speakers who are private landowners, archeologists, Native Americans, legislators, etc. The conference should be held in 1998, in advance of the next legislative session. CTA moneys would be used to assist in the sponsorship of the conference. Also mentioned in conjunction with the Joint Conference discussion were other steps that might be considered by CTA and others to curb the loss of archeological sites in Texas. These came up because of the question of whether legislative solutions were a realistic goal. These steps included: (1) making contact with the property rights advocates and educating them on fundamental issues of concern, as well as trying to ascertain and allay their fears regarding archeological sites on private lands, possibly by strengthening the ability to prosecute trespassers, and (2) considering legal action against the State of Texas for administering a racist cemetery code with respect to unmarked burials. This legal action could take the form of a civil rights suit, and TIBA could take a leading role. As part of an action such as this, it would be important for CTA members to provide to the committee substantiating evidence on adverse impacts to archeological sites and unmarked burials. This documentation should be kept on file for use in a potential civil rights suit. This approach can be more fully considered as steps are taken to organize the Joint Conference, and would also be dependent upon the results of the Joint Conference. Margaret Howard will convey these ideas to Steve Russell of TIBA.

The second item of business was to consider a request by Darrell Creel at TARL for the committee to discuss coordination of assessments of cultural affiliation under NAGPRA by different parties involved in the process. It was the opinion of the committee that CTA has no legal standing to be involved in the NAGPRA process in any direct way. Recognizing the political nature of much of the cultural affiliation determinations, the committee recommended that Margaret Howard suggest to Darrell Creel that decisions on cultural affiliation should follow the most currently acceptable geographic divisions of Native American tribes in Texas (e.g., the Handbook of North American Indians), and matters of debate in the political decisions should be worked out by the involved tribes and parties.

The next items to be discussed were several upcoming conferences on Native American issues, including the American Indian Resource and Education Coalition meetings in October, the Austin Pow Wow and Red Voices Conference, and the Indian Law Conference. Members of the committee and other CTA members should make an effort to participate in each of these events. If a committee member is asked to participate, it should be made clear whether they are representing the CTA or not. If they are, then it is important for the CTA President to see beforehand an abstract of their talk, so that the message we are sending is clear, and is shared by the CTA membership. Kimball Smith will speak at the Indian Law Conference, but not for the CTA or the committee. It was noted that the scheduling of the Red Voices Conference conflicts with the Texas Archeological
Society (TAS) meetings in Odessa. If we want to insure maximum CTA participation in these conferences that feature Native American issues, we need to make sure that any scheduling problems with archeological conferences are taken care of in the future. Alston Thoms thought it would be important to encourage Native American participation in the TAS, and he would like to make a pitch to the TAS Board regarding Native American participation. Tim Perttula agreed to discuss this with the appropriate TAS Board members to get Alston on the agenda at the next Board meeting.

The fourth item of business was to discuss the proposed CTA bylaws addition regarding the goals of CTA (as published in Volume 21[2], page 15 of the Newsletter). The committee supports the intent of the proposed bylaws change, but recommend it be revised to be more inclusive, namely: “2. The promotion of communication and cooperation between the archeological community and ethnic groups and other segments of society whose cultures we study.” Paul Maslyk will bring this suggestion to Doug Boyd, and the committee will make a motion to this effect at the CTA Business meeting in Odessa.

The committee next discussed adding two new members, Chris Lintz and Bob Skiles, to the committee. All were in agreement that these CTA members would be excellent additions to the committee.

The last order of business was a discussion brought up by Dorothy Lippert concerning unprovenienced and unaccessioned human remain collections at TARL. Since they are unaccessioned, they are not receiving consideration at this time under NAGPRA. The committee felt it was likely to be the case that similar circumstances exist in other museum/repository collections of human remains, and that it was important to not just focus on the actions or inaction of TARL in this regard. Although no final decision was reached on committee action, Tim Perttula proposed one way to broaden our viewpoint would be for the committee to undertake a long-term study of the NAGPRA assessment process in Texas, perhaps as a study that could be presented at the Joint Conference in 1998.

Accreditation and Review Committee:
Submitted by Carolyn Spock. A summary of the activities of the committee was published in the last CTA Newsletter (Volume 21[2], pp. 12-13). Since then, additional activities have been/will be:

- enrolling another Museum Science graduate student to help with upgrading and completing the accreditation documents and with reviewer training and assessment;
- incorporating workshop participants’ comments in a draft of the Field Reviewer Training Manual;
- canvassing the CTA membership to determine who would be the potential participants in the trial training session and inquiring as to the best date and time for the most participants;
- after tabulating the results of the membership poll taken at the fall meeting, setting a time and date for the trial training session (1 day in January starting at 1:00 p.m. on the first of two consecutive days);
- making arrangements for the trial training session at the Commons on the J.J. Pickle Research Campus at the University of Texas at Austin.

To date, ARC is staying close to its targeted time line, set to meet the Texas Historical Commission’s mandate to have repositories/museums which wish to hold State of Texas permitted collections reviewed for accreditation by the year 2000.

Archeological Survey Standards Committee Report: Submitted by Ross Fields, Chair. In August, members of the Archeological Survey Standards Committee met with Department of Antiquities Protection (DAP) staff to discuss the standards proposed by the committee for intensive surveys in Texas, as published in the August and October 1996 issues of the CTA Newsletter. After discussing DAP’s comments on the proposed standards and revisiting the question of why we thought standards might be a good idea in the first place, we decided to rethink our approach to the
problem. In the coming months, the committee and DAP staff will be exploring the feasibility of developing relatively concrete standards that would be applied only to small survey projects, since these are the ones where DAP tends to see most of the problems. These standards would deal primarily with how hard one should look to find sites (e.g., shovel testing intensity and transect intervals), and they would be brief (no more than a page or two) so that they could be used easily by project sponsors, most of whom lack archeological backgrounds. The potential advantage of such standards is that they would allow sponsors, contractors, and DAP to quickly develop a common understanding of what needs to be done on a given survey; this is particularly important on small projects since they often have to be done under short schedules.

Because of the size of large surveys, more factors usually must be considered when evaluating the appropriate level of effort. For this reason, we probably will not be proposing concrete standards for larger projects. Instead, the focus will be on developing mechanisms for ensuring that DAP has input into scopes of work (in most cases this already happens). The idea here is that early consultation is the key to heading off problems on large projects. In the August meeting, we discussed revamping the standards proposed in 1996 to serve as guidelines to help project sponsors and DAP in devising scopes of work for larger projects, and this is something that we will explore as well. The committee plans to meet with DAP in November or December for another round of discussions, and we hope to be able to present a revised set of standards at the Spring 1998 CTA meeting.

**CTA Web Page Committee Report:** Steve Black commented that even though the committee is trying, it is hard to keep the web page updated when you are relying solely on volunteer effort.

**Old Business: Contractors Listing Fee.** Brett summarized the proposal to raise the Contractors Listing Fee to $100 annually as detailed in Volume 21(2) of the Newsletter. There was some discussion whether CTA should raise individual dues as well, but the general consensus was to keep the individual dues as they are currently. Brett read a fax he received from CTA members Paul and Susana Katz who suggested that the proposed $100 listing fee also include the Cultural Resource Director’s annual CTA membership fee. After a brief discussion, a motion was made to increase the Contractors Listing fee to $100, and to keep all individual CTA membership dues separate. The motion was seconded and approved. The new listing fees will go in effect for the Contractors List that will be printed in May 1998.

**New Business: Committee Appointments.** Several spots were open on a number of the standing committees as members rotated off or resigned from the committees. The list of the current committee members is printed elsewhere in this newsletter.

**Membership Drive.** Steve Black stated that he is working on ways to increase the CTA membership and he is open to any ideas. He asked if anyone would like to work with him on the membership drive and Karl Kibler, Dana Anthony, Ruth Marie, and Curt Harrell all volunteered.

**Spring Meeting.** Alston announced that the Spring Meeting will be held in Austin, but the exact time and place are still being worked out. Details will be announced when they become available.

**Proposed changes to the Bylaws.** The proposed changes to the bylaws as published in the last issue of the Newsletter were discussed. The general consensus was that the wording should not single out Native Americans, but should be more inclusive of all ethnic groups. The proposed changes will be reworded and published in the next issue of the Newsletter for action at the Spring meeting.

**Request from TAS for Support for Video News Releases.** The Texas Archeological Society has made a request for financial support from the CTA in the amount of $1,500.00 to help with the costs of production of a series of Video News Releases. The videos would be short segments on some aspect of Texas archeology and would be submitted to air on television stations around the state in an attempt to help increase public
awareness of Texas archeology. After some discussion, the motion was made that CTA give $1,000.00 plus encourage individual CTA members to donate to the effort. The motion was seconded and approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

**Membership Information**

*It’s Time to Renew Your CTA Dues*

All CTA memberships expire in April. Please check your address label on this Newsletter. If there is a ‘97 next to your name then you need to renew your membership. If you have not paid your dues for 1998, please do so by filling out (or copying) the renewal form on the inside back cover of this Newsletter and mail it with your check. Or, if you plan on attending the Spring Meeting, you can renew your dues at the meeting.

**Announcements**

*New Web Sites*

- **Council of Texas Archeologists**
  http://www.thc.state.tx.us/cta_web
- **Texas Archeological Society**
  http://www.txarch.org
- **Southern Texas Archaeological Association**
  http://www.ijoan.org/staa.html

*TARL Material Culture Workshop*

*Darrell Creel*

The next TARL Material Culture Workshop is “Lithic Biface Caches” hosted by Kevin Miller; it will held in Room 100, Tuesday, April 7, 1998 at 7:30. This will be an opportunity to see a number of very interesting biface caches that most of you have never seen. A brief description of this topic follows:

“Biface caches have been recovered from a variety of contexts throughout Texas. In general, biface caches are accumulations of bifaces placed into a discrete locale for future recovery and utilization. Typically, these caches contain numerous bifaces of high-quality lithic materials at early to middle stages in the manufacturing process. Bifaces caches have a number of possible functions related to prehistoric technological organization, settlement strategy, trade and exchange systems, and possibly ritual behavior. For example, biface caches may have served as stockpiles of lithic resources for future use or as valuable trade items between prehistoric groups. Biface caches appear to mainly date from the Middle Archaic through the Late Prehistoric.”

Please contact Darrell Creel at (512) 471-6007 or via email <dcreel@mail.utexas.edu> to register. These workshops are proving to be popular and notices of upcoming workshops are getting wider
distribution, so please register as early as possible to ensure a seat. The next workshop (May 5, 1998) will be on Early Archaic artifact assemblages in central Texas and will be hosted by Steve Black. There will be no workshops during the summer. The first workshop in the fall will be on shell artifacts from the different parts of Texas. Given the anticipated interest and the wide range of shell artifacts, we are considering having open collections during the day with the workshop in the evening. If the level of interest is sufficient, we will also consider having both afternoon and evening workshop sessions. It would be helpful for those interested to convey in advance their thoughts on the desirability of multiple sessions.

Council of Texas Archeologists
Membership and Renewal Form

Please correct or update my address as indicated.

I wish to join or renew my membership in CTA (the dues year runs from Spring Meeting to Spring Meeting):

☐ Contractors’ List $100.00
☐ Professional or Student, annual income more than $20,000 $25.00
☐ Professional or Student, annual income less than $20,000 $15.00
☐ Institution/Library (Newsletter only--no voting privileges) $25.00
☐ I would like to purchase a copy of the CTA Guidelines $7.50

Total amount remitted to CTA $_____

Name (please print) ____________________________________________________________
Company/Institution _________________________________________________________
Address ___________________________________________________________________
City _____________________ State ___________ Zip ________________
Telephone __________________ Fax __________________
E-mail ________________________________

Return to:
Brett Cruse, Secretary-Treasurer
Council of Texas Archeologists
2445 Roundabout Ln.
Round Rock, TX 78664